# **APPENDIX 2**

# Herd, Michael

From: Herd, Michael
Sent: 24 June 2013 11:14

To: traffic orders

Subject: RE: Proposed removal of residents' parking at 165 Grove Lane

Dear

Thank you for objection to the proposal to remove 9.5 metres of permit bay and to install 9.5 metres of double yellow lines for a dropped kerb outside 165 Grove Lane.

Your objection will form part of a report that will be presented to the Camberwell Community Council at a meeting to held on 30 September 2013.

The agenda for this public meeting will be published on the council's web site at a date closer to the meeting, see here.

Regards

Michael Herd

From:

**Sent:** 24 June 2013 10:16

To: Herd, Michael

Subject: RE: Proposed removal of residents' parking at 165 Grove Lane

Dear Michael

Sorry for the misunderstanding.

If the proposal is to remove residents' parking simply to provide access to 165 then we would still object given the demand for parking at peak times. The removal of 9.5 metres probably equates to about 3 vehicles. Unless those spaces were reinstated nearby we believe that would be a significant reduction in residents parking (and visitors parking at evenings/weekends)

Yours sincerely

114 Grove Lane SE5 8BJ

From: Herd, Michael [mailto:Michael.Herd@southwark.gov.uk]

Sent: 24 June 2013 07:35

To:

Subject: FW: Proposed removal of residents' parking at 165 Grove Lane

Dear

Thank you for objection to the proposal to remove 9.5 metres of permit bay and to install 9.5 metres of double yellow lines for a dropped kerb outside 165 Grove Lane.

The proposal is to remove 9.5 metres of permit parking to allow vehicles access to 165 Grove Lane, see drawing attached, we have no plans to introduce a pedestrian crossing at this location.

Please advise me if you wish to continue your objection. If you do wish to maintain your objection, an objection report on the Grove Lane proposal will be sent to the Camberwell community council for deterination.

Regards

Michael Herd Transport and projects officer Public realm projects (Parking design)

From:

**Sent:** 21 June 2013 15:41

To: traffic orders

Subject: Proposed removal of residents' parking at 165 Grove Lane

#### Dear Sir/Madam

We regularly use the bays as we reside opposite. There is often a shortage of parking and I would submit this is not an ideal place for a crossing given the bend in the road: a zebra crossing would be dangerous at this point whilst a pelican crossing it not necessary and would cause traffic issues especially as the buses also stop opposite.

Therefore, we would strongly oppose such a proposal.





From: Herd, Michael

Sent:

Cc: traffic orders

Subject: RE: PRP/PD/TMO 1314-007 - Errington

Dear

Thank you for objection to the proposal to remove 9.5 metres of permit bay and to install 9.5 metres of double yellow lines for a dropped kerb outside 165 Grove Lane.

Your objection will form part of a report that will be presented to the Camberwell Community Council at a meeting to held on 30 September 2013.

The agenda for this public meeting will be published on the council's web site at a date closer to the meeting, see here.

## Regards

Michael Herd Transport and projects officer Public realm projects (Parking design)

From:

**Sent:** 12 June 2013 18:44

To: traffic orders

Subject: PRP/PD/TMO 1314-007

We're writing to object to the published proposal <u>to remove 9.5 m of permit holders parking</u> and introduce 'at any time' waiting restrictions on the east side at a footway crossover outside <u>165 Grove Lane.</u>

We have lived at 159 Grove Lane for over twenty years. In that time there have been several fatalities on this road (of both pedestrians and car passengers) as well as numerous accidents. We're therefore particularly concerned about the safety implications of the proposed amendment.

A 9.5m reduction in permit holders' space would reduce the size of the parking bay from 45m to 35.5m. There would be room for at least 2 fewer cars. The current space is barely adequate as it is to meet the needs of existing residents living between 153 & 165 (6 family houses + 4 flats). Two young families are currently moving into the area and another two properties are currently unoccupied, but likely to be occupied in the near future. We expect there to be significantly more pressure on these spaces over the next few months even retaining the current allowance. A 20% reduction in space will have the inevitable effect of forcing residents to park elsewhere. In practice, residents will be forced to park on the other side of the road.

On such a busy road where there is a risk of injury from fast-moving traffic it is vital that residents can park on the side of the road where they live. If young families are required to cross on a regular basis this will increase the risk of accidents.

In our view, the loss of amenity caused by reducing available car spaces from 9 to 7 and the increased risk of accidents outweigh any convenience benefit to the occupier of 165. We are also concerned that this could create a precedent for neighbouring properties.

We therefore urge the council to reject this proposal.

Please keep us updated about any future developments and on the timetabling of any public meetings in respect of this application.

Kind regards,



From: Herd, Michael

**Sent:** 07 June 2013 15:52

To:

Subject: RE: PRP/PD/TMO 1314-007

Dear

Thank you for objection to the proposal to remove 9.5 metres of permit bay and to install 9.5 metres of double yellow lines.

Your objection will form part of a report that will be presented to the Camberwell Community Council at a meeting to held on 30 September 2013.

The agenda for this public meeting will be published on the council's web site at a date closer to the meeting, see here.

#### Regards

Michael Herd Transport and projects officer Public realm projects (Parking design)

From: Herbert, Richard On Behalf Of traffic orders

Sent: 07 June 2013 10:08

To: Herd, Michael

Subject: FW: PRP/PD/TMO 1314-007

From:

**Sent:** 06 June 2013 22:22

To:

Subject: PRP/PD/TMO 1314-007

traffic.orders@southwark.gov.uk

Ref PRP/PD/TMO 1314-007 'Grove Lane- to remove 9.5 m of permit holders parking and introduce 'at any time' waiting restrictions on the east side at a footway crossover outside 165 Grove Lane'

Dear Ms N Costin,

Residents in Grove Lane pay used to pay £90 to park near their houses (the 'L' permit). Then a new crossing was added on the street and we lost two spaces. Further down Grove Lane towards Camberwell Church Street more 'L' spaces became meter only parking. Then the fee went up to £125 per annum. Now you propose losing more car spaces (9.5 meters) by allowing 165 a crossover when 161 and 163 have been refused this privilege on two separate occasions. Today you stopped Grove Lane residents parking their cars behind their houses by introducing another zone 'E-HF' without consultation (Stories Mews).

Yes I object- I strongly object your proposals.

From: Herd, Michael

**Sent:** 17 June 2013 07:36

To:

Subject: RE: Ref. PRP/PD/TMO 1314-0077 Grove Lane

Dear ,

Thank you for objection to the Traffic Management Order, Ref PRP/PD/TMO 1314-007, proposal to remove 9.5 metres of permit bay and to install 9.5 metres of double yellow lines.

Your objection will form part of a report that will be presented to the Camberwell Community Council at a meeting to held on 30 September 2013.

The agenda for this public meeting will be published on the council's web site at a date closer to the meeting, <u>see here</u>.

### Regards

Michael Herd Transport and projects officer Public realm projects (Parking design)

-----Original Message-----

From:

Sent: 14 June 2013 07:02

To: traffic orders

Subject: Fwd: Ref. PRP/PD/TMO 1314-0077 Grove Lane

----- Forwarded message -----

From

Date: Thu, 13 Jun 2013 20:19:20 +0200

Subject: Fwd: CORRECTED. Ref. PRP/PD/TMO 1314-0077 Grove Lane

Subject: Ref. PRP/PD/TMO 1314-0077 Grove Lane

To: traffic.orders@southwark.gov.uk

Attention Ms. Costin.

Dear Ms. Costin.

Many thanks for the notice placed in Grove Lane regarding the above proposal to reduce the permit holders (and thus the out of hours

visitors) parking space, by 9.5 m. outside 165 Grove Lane.

I wish to record my objection to this proposal. I believe that the further use of the limited garden space of residences in Grove Lane spoils the residential quality of the, Grove, making it increasingly akin to a 2nd Hand Car Dealers Yard.

In addition, as as resident of 50 years standing in this Conservation area, I am aware that 165 Grove Lane has always had a Two Car Garage on the Mews which was always used by the owner for his cars and boats.

In addition, I am aware that the development of Mews housing on Stories Mews was only permitted on condition that garage space was provide for any additional housing.with associated motor vehicles in the area. I see no reason for this rule to be relaxed at this stage.Not only do residents on Grove Lane need the space they pay for, but it would become unnecessarily restictive and awkward for visitors to residents during the "out of parking hours" periods, to park near their friends..Parking in Stories Road, is totally "Double Yellow Line"

restricted along its entire length and the pedestrianised portion to its West suggests that parking of any sort is not allowed there.

I trust these observations will be given full and proper consideration.

Yours sincerely,

---

From: Herd, Michael

**Sent:** 10 June 2013 13:09

To:

Subject: RE: Ref PRP/PD/TMO 1314-007 Grove Lane

Dear

Thank you for objection to the Traffic Management Order, Ref PRP/PD/TMO 1314-007, proposal to remove 9.5 metres of permit bay and to install 9.5 metres of double yellow lines.

Your objection will form part of a report that will be presented to the Camberwell Community Council at a meeting to held on 30 September 2013.

The agenda for this public meeting will be published on the council's web site at a date closer to the meeting, see here.

## Regards

Michael Herd Transport and projects officer Public realm projects (Parking design)

From:

Sent: 09 June 2013 12:45

To: traffic orders

Subject: Ref PRP/PD/TMO 1314-007 Grove Lane

Referring to PRP/PD/TMO 1314-007 Grove Lane

To whom it may concern:

I own 153 Grove Lane, and I struggle to find parking near my house. Many of CPZ "L" spaces have and continue to get lost to meter-only spaces. The proposed crossover at 165 will remove 9.5m - at least two spaces' worth - of parking that I and my neighbours have access to in favour of one or two spaces that we don't.

While I'm sure my neighbours at 165 Grove Lane have the best of intentions, this proposal simply attempts to respond to the same issues we all face - a serious lack of on-street parking available to residents of our street. Unfortunately, this proposal will not increase available parking, it will decrease it for everyone. I therefore strongly object to the proposed crossover at 165 Grove Lane.

Sincerely,

153 Grove Lane

From: Herd, Michael

Sent: 17 June 2013 10:34

To:

Subject: RE: Residents Parking on Grove Lane SE5

Dear

Thank you for objection to the proposal to remove 9.5 metres of permit bay and to install 9.5 metres of double yellow lines for a dropped kerb outside 165 Grove Lane.

Your objection will form part of a report that will be presented to the Camberwell Community Council at a meeting to held on 30 September 2013.

The agenda for this public meeting will be published on the council's web site at a date closer to the meeting, <u>see here</u>.

#### Regards

Michael Herd Transport and projects officer Public realm projects (Parking design)

From: **Sent:** 17 June 2013 09:56

To: traffic orders

Subject: Residents Parking on Grove Lane SE5

Dear Traffic Order Dept.

We understand that a request has been put in to Southwark council to place a footway crossover outside 165 Grove Lane and we wish to object to this proposals.

We are resident at 151 Grove Lane and are obliged to pay for a residents permit in order to park outside or near our house and are finding it increasingly difficult to find a parking space nearby, so any reduction in the residents' parking space available is not acceptable.

Nor is it desirable to replace a front garden with hard standing from the point of view of both aesthetics and drainage. When it rains the hill of Grove Lane has considerable run-off down the side of the road and it is undesirable to increase that run-off by decreasing the area of gardens.

From a safety point of view we also think that motor vehicles pulling out of and into a front drive has a negative effect on road safety on a busy bus route such as Grove Lane.

We request that the footway crossover will be denied.

Yours faithfully,