Appendix 11

Herd, Michael

From: Herd, Michael
Sent: 15 April 2013 07:40
To: [redacted]'
Subject: RE: Elmwood Road - [redacted]

Dear [redacted],

Thank you for your objection to the proposed removal of double yellow lines on Elmwood Road.

Your objection will form part of a report that will be presented to the Dulwich Community Council at a meeting to held on 25 June 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 project officer
Public realm projects (Parking design

From: [redacted]
Sent: 13 April 2013 15:38
To: Herd, Michael
Subject: Re: Elmwood Road - [redacted]

Dear Michael,

Thank you for the response.

I based my initial email on the details below already supplied.

Please log this objection.

Thank you

[redacted]

From: "Herd, Michael" <Michael.Herd@southwark.gov.uk>
To: [redacted]
Sent: Monday, 8 April 2013, 10:07
Subject: RE: Elmwood Road - [redacted]

Dear [redacted],

Than you for your objection to the proposed double yellow lines on Elmwood Road.

In view of the above, I hope you will understand our proper reasons for the proposal at the northern end of Elmwood Road, that is:

- to allow sufficient space for vehicles to turn around and to avoid the necessity for vehicles to reverse up to 200m
- to maintain clear carriageway, from kerb-to-kerb, in the turning head through the introduction of double yellow lines
- to install these yellow lines only to such an extent as to enable a modest sized van (eg. a Tesco home delivery van) to make a 3-point turn
- in response to a concern raised about vehicles parking in this turning head, that was subsequently

observed by a council officer

We consider that the double yellow lines proposed are the minimum required to allow a modest sized vehicle to turn. I have attached a pdf showing an swept path simulation of a delivery vehicle.

General guidance (by the Fire Brigade) to traffic authorities is that turning facilities must be provided in any dead end street that is longer than 20m, either through provision of a hammerhead or turning circle.

Whilst I understand the concern you raise about parking possibly being displaced into an already heavily parked street, it is important to note that the authority has to meet the network management duty placed upon us (i.e.. to secure the expeditious movement of traffic) and this proposal attempts to discharge that duty. We do not have a duty to provide on-street parking, which is not a given right.

I hope this explains the proposal for Elmwood Road.

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

Regards

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

From: [redacted]
Sent: 06 April 2013 10:44
To: traffic orders
Subject: reference PRP/PD/TMO1213-037

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please can you register my email as a protest against the proposed Double Yellow markings on ELMWOOD ROAD.

From all the correspondence I've read and from my own use of the road when enjoying Sunray Gardens i find the reasons provided for this 'nimby' proposal to be quite pointless and a waste of funds and resource and that the councils energy and money can be much better spent in more needy areas.

This just appears to be an encroachment for the sake of it and is doing no favours to any local residents. I personally just see this as a way to gradually add further parking restrictions in the area as a whole and completely unnecessary. The road is a dead end for a start and the reason given are incredulous.

Please focus on issues that actually matter to the local community. A 3 point turn to a Tesco Delivery truck is not a local issue. Please think about channeling your energies to prioritise more meaningful local issues.

Resident at
[redacted]

Southwark Council and Southwark Council is not responsible for any changes made to the message after it has been sent.

Herd, Michael

From: [redacted]
Sent: 08 April 2013 11:43
To: Herd, Michael
Subject: Re: Elmwood Road - [redacted]

Dear Mr Herd

Thank you for your reply and apologies if mine was a little intemperate. I do understand that you have a job to do and parking/yellow lines is one of those issues that makes otherwise normal people rather hot under the colllar.

[redacted]

On 8 April 2013 11:30, Herd, Michael <Michael.Herd@southwark.gov.uk> wrote:

> Dear [redacted],
>
> Thank you for your objection reply to the proposed removal of double yellow lines on Elmwood Road.
>
> In my reply I use the the Tesco home delivery van as an example of the size of vehicles used in the pdf showing an swept path simulation, my apologies if this give the impression that Tesco's was involved in the proposal.
>
> Please let me reassure you that all objectors who wish their objection to be sent to the Dulwich community council will have their objection detailed in the report.
>
> Your objection will form part of a report that will be presented to the Dulwich Community Council at a meeting to held on 25 June 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 project officer
> Public realm projects (Parking design
>
> ---
>
> **From:** [redacted]
> **Sent:** 08 April 2013 11:08
> **To:** Herd, Michael
> **Subject:** Re: Elmwood Road - [redacted]
>
> Dear Mr Herd
>
> I do wish to maintain my objection, and I request that my objection is forwarded to the Dulwich Community Council. I have to say that I'm rather surprised an officer of the council should wish to intervene and not pass on my objection.
>
> I understand the council's desire to classify any objection to yellow lines under the bracket of "silly person, they don't understand that there is no given right to on-street parking." I can assure you I fully understand the law on that point.
>
> The point I made was that there are currently no issues around resident parking in the area, but that the council will be creating these issues. It seems a very odd thing to do. And for the council to act as an agent for Tesco is disturbing. To discharge the "network management duty" is it not necessary to comply with the commercial interests of Tesco or any other supermarket, for that matter. What if Tesco started using much larger vehicles? Would you then ban any on-street parking in order to ensure that Tesco's profits can be maintained? How absurd.
>
> In fact, I would be pleased if this email is also added to the objections that are put before Dulwich Community Council.
>
> How many other objections have not been passed on after the council's officers emailed back to the objector and effectively said "do you really want to pass this on?" What if the objector is, say, on Easter holiday, and doesn't see your reply? What a rather sneaky way of ensuring the number of objections are reduced.
>
> I know you have a job to do but foisting these unnecessary measures on local residents where there is no proven traffic issue is ridiculous. Please rethink this daft idea.
>
> [redacted]
>
> On 5 April 2013 13:27, Herd, Michael <Michael.Herd@southwark.gov.uk> wrote:
>
> > Dear [redacted],

Thank you for your objection to the proposed double yellow lines on Elmwood Road.

The Council's reasons for the proposal at the northern end of Elmwood Road, are:

- to allow sufficient space for vehicles to turn around and to avoid the necessity for vehicles to reverse up to 200m
- to maintain
  clear carriageway, from kerb-to-kerb, in the turning head through the introduction of double yellow lines

- to install these yellow lines only to such an extent as to enable a modest sized van (eg. a Tesco home delivery van) to make a 3-point turn
- in response to a concern raised about vehicles parking in this turning head, that was subsequently observed by a council officer

We consider that the double yellow lines proposed are the minimum required to allow a modest sized vehicle to turn. I have attached a pdf showing an swept path simulation of a delivery vehicle.

General guidance (by the Fire Brigade) to traffic authorities is that turning facilities must be provided in any dead end street that is longer than 20m, either through provision of a hammerhead or turning circle.

Whilst I understand the concern you raise about parking possibly being displaced into an already heavily parked street, it is important to note that the authority has to meet the network management duty placed upon us (i.e.. to secure the expeditious movement of traffic) and this proposal attempts to discharge that duty. We do not have a duty to provide on-street parking, which is not a given right.

I hope this explains the proposal for Elmwood Road.

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

Regards

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

From: [redacted]
Sent: 05 April 2013 12:42
To: traffic orders
Subject: reference PRP/PD/TMO1213-037 Elmwood Road

Hello

I'm a resident of Danecroft Road, adjacent to Elmwood Road

I would like to object to the imposition of yellow lines at the far end of Elmwood Road. I understand the council's desire to create a safe turning circle but unfortunately it is misguided. I have lived almost directly opposite that space, on Red Post Hill, for many years and now live on Danecroft Road. In none of that time have I witnessed or experienced any issues with cars parking in the turning area and have never heard of or seen cars having to reverse back down Elmwood Road as the council suggests. One does have to wonder why the council seeks to act upon maybe one or two outside voices in comparison with the many local voices objecting to this. Surely it is local residents who have knowledge of local parking and turning issues.
There is only one foreseeable result of yellow lines, which is a reduction in on-street parking. There is currently no problem with turning, but you will be creating a problem with parking. This is insane. One of the joys of living in these roads is that there is not, at present, a problem with on-street parking. The roads are sufficiently far from stations to eliminate that as an issue. Instead the council will be CREATING a problem by painting yellow lines.
Please listen to the people who understand the issues in these roads, namely the local residents, and do not implement this flawed plan.
Regards

[redacted]

--

[redacted]

[redacted]

Herd, Michael

From: [redacted]
Sent: 16 April 2013 08:35
To: Herd, Michael
Subject: Re: Elmwood Road - PRP/PD/TMO1213-037

Thanks Michael.

From my Blackberry

From: "Herd, Michael" <Michael.Herd@southwark.gov.uk>
Date: Mon, 15 Apr 2013 07:41:29 +0100
To: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Elmwood Road - PRP/PD/TMO1213-037

Dear [redacted],

Thank you for your objection to the proposed removal of double yellow lines on Elmwood Road.

Your objection will form part of a report that will be presented to the Dulwich Community Council at a meeting to held on 25 June 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 project officer
Public realm projects (Parking design

From: [redacted]
Sent: 14 April 2013 12:15
To: traffic orders; Herd, Michael
Subject: Elmwood Road - PRP/PD/TMO1213-037

Dear Michael,

Ref: PRP/PD/TMO1213-037

I've discussed this further with my neighbours and I would still like to object to the planned double yellow lines in Elmwood Road, for the following reasons:

1. There is no problem with cars parking in the turning area today.
Who, apart from Councillor Eckersley, has reported seeing cars parked in the turning area on a regular basis? Is there any documentary evidence of this? Has anyone complained about cars having to reverse down the road?

2. The turning simulation is flawed.
The vehicle shown in the simulation weaves all over the road and mounts the pavement. It is perfectly easy to turn round in the road as it is now.

3. Vehicles have never had to reverse as far as 200m.
There are always a few spaces for cars to turn just a few metres away from the end of the road. Drivers have never needed to reverse all the way to Danecroft Road, unless they are driving a very large lorry, which wouldn't be able to turn in the turning area anyway.

4. On street parking will be negatively affected.

Cars that would normally park towards the end of Elmwood Road will be not be able to do so, and will park further along the street, closer to the where the residents park, causing parking congestion.

The residents want to keep the on-street parking they have today without yellow lines which are an unnecessary cost to the citizenry of Southwark.

Regards

[redacted]

Herd, Michael

From: Herd, Michael
Sent: 08 April 2013 09:01
To: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Proposed parking restrictions - Elmwood Road

Dear [redacted],

Thank you for your objection to the proposed removal of double yellow lines on Elmwood Road.

Your objection will form part of a report that will be presented to the Dulwich Community Council at a meeting to held on 25 June 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 project officer
Public realm projects (Parking design)

From: [redacted]
Sent: 05 April 2013 13:38
To: Herd, Michael
Cc: Eckersley, Toby; Mitchell, Michael
Subject: Re: Proposed parking restrictions - Elmwood Road

Dear Michael

Ref: PRP/PD/TMO 1213-037

Thank you for your email. I am still of the opinion that the proposed yellow lines are completely unnecessary. My objection to the proposal therefore continues on the following grounds:

1. There is no problem with cars parking in the turning area.
Who, apart from Councillor Eckersley (who is not an impartial party), has reported seeing cars parked in the turning area on a regular basis? What is the documentary evidence of this? Has anyone complained about cars having to reverse down the road? Why now? The road has been blocked off for at least six years and there have been no yellow lines all this time. Has the Fire Brigade's guidance changed in this time? And for that matter, seeing as a fire engine is significantly larger than the Tesco van mentioned, and wouldn't be able to turn at the end of the road no matter how many yellow lines there are, why are the Fire Brigade's regulations at all relevant?

2. The turning simulation is flawed.
The vehicle shown in the simulation weaves all over the road and mounts the pavement. This morning I have twice turned my car around in the turning area. There was a car parked on the left side of the street, with its front end level with the postbox. I turned my car - which is not significantly smaller than a delivery van - without going anywhere near the parked car. If the yellow lines are imposed that car would be parked on them, and probably the car parked behind it too, as well as any car parked on the opposite side of the road to them.

3. Vehicles have never have to reverse as far as 200m.
There are always a few spaces for cars to turn just a few metres away from the end of the road. Drivers have never needed to reverse all the way to Danecroft Road, unless they are driving a very large lorry, which wouldn't be able to turn in the turning area anyway. For that matter, if a Tesco delivery van (or any other delivery van) delivers to the houses at the end of Elmwood Road they always turn at the empty area at the gates of the park. I know this because I live opposite those gates, at the penultimate house on the Red Post HIll end of Elmwood Road, which is at least 100m from the end of the road.

4. On street parking will be negatively affected.

Cars that would normally park towards the end of Elmwood Road will be not be able to do so, and will park further along the street, closer to the where the residents park. You wrote that, 'We do not have a duty to provide on-street parking, which is not a given right.' It might not be a given right but it is what the residents of Elmwood Road want. That's one of the reasons why we live here, and why we have long campaigned not to have a CPZ in this area.

What the residents of Elmwood Road and the surrounding area don't want is completely unnecessary double yellow lines at the end of Elmwood Road.

Yours sincerely

[redacted]

On Thu, Apr 4, 2013 at 1:32 PM, Herd, Michael <Michael.Herd@southwark.gov.uk> wrote:

> Dear Councillor Eckersley, [redacted],
>
> Thank you for your objection to the proposed double yellow lines on Elmwood Road.
>
> Firstly, please accept my apologies for confusion created by the incorrect information in the statement of reasons (SoR).
>
> The SoR is meant to be an explanation for the proposals made on the legal notice published in the press and installed on street. The SoR is the bare minimum of an explanation that the Regulations require from the council, acting in it's role as Traffic Authority.
>
> These days, we don't give much emphasis to the SoR and instead provide more details on our proposals in a council report. In the case of Elmwood Road the reasons for the proposal were reported to Dulwich Community Council on 30 Jan 2013 (report available under Supporting Documents at this link).
>
> In the case of Elmwood Road the content of the SoR was incorrect. It clearly does not reflect the justification for the proposal. The proposal is made to enable sufficient space for vehicles to turn around in the purpose-built turning head, at the northern end of Elmwood Road.
>
> The mistake in the SoR was a human error which occurred when information was transferred between two different teams. We're going to make improvements to this process.
>
> In view of the above, I hope you will understand our proper reasons for the proposal at the northern end of Elmwood Road, that is:
>
> - to allow sufficient space for vehicles to turn around and to avoid the necessity for vehicles to reverse up to 200m
> - to maintain clear carriageway, from kerb-to-kerb, in the turning head through the introduction of double yellow lines
>
> - to install these yellow lines only to such an extent as to enable a modest sized van (eg. a Tesco home delivery van) to make a 3-point turn
> - in response to a concern raised about vehicles parking in this turning head, that was subsequently observed by a council officer

We consider that the double yellow lines proposed are the minimum required to allow a modest sized vehicle to turn. I have attached a pdf showing an swept path simulation of

a delivery vehicle.

General guidance (by the Fire Brigade) to traffic authorities is that turning facilities must be provided in any dead end street that is longer than 20m, either through provision of a hammerhead or turning circle.

Whilst I understand the concern you raise about parking possibly being displaced into an already heavily parked street, it is important to note that the authority has to meet the network management duty placed upon us (i.e.. to secure the expeditious movement of traffic) and this proposal attempts to discharge that duty. We do not have a duty to provide on-street parking, which is not a given right.

There will be no addition costs associated with the enforcement of any new restrictions. It is expected that double yellow lines will largely be self enforcing, but should Civil Enforcement Officers need to visit this would be included within the existing borough-wide patrols carried out by the council's parking contractor.

I hope this explains the proposal for Elmwood Road.

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

Regards

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

From: Eckersley, Toby
Sent: 29 March 2013 22:08
To: Herd, Michael
Subject: Fw: Proposed parking restrictions - Elmwood Road

Michael
In Tim's absence till 3 April, pl wd your deal with the below?
Toby

"Southwark Council does not accept liability for loss or damage resulting from software viruses.

The views expressed in this e-mail may be personal to the sender and should not be taken as necessarily representing those of Southwark Council.

The information in this e-mail and any attached files is confidential and may be covered by legal and/or professional privilege or be subject to privacy legislation. It is intended solely for the individual or entity to which it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, the retaining, distribution or other use of any transmitted information is strictly prohibited.

E-mails are transmitted over a public network and Southwark Council

cannot accept any responsibility for the accuracy of a message that may have sustained changes in transmission".

From: Eckersley, Toby
To: Walker, Tim
Cc: Mitchell, Michael
Sent: Fri Mar 29 22:05:55 2013
Subject: Fw: Proposed parking restrictions - Elmwood Road

Tim
It seems that someone in your unit may have provided [redacted] with somewhat misleading information about the reason for DCC's decision to authorise double yellow lines in the hammerhead turning area at the north end of Elmwood Rd - a cul de sac. The members' reasons were safety-related (to avoid the risk of vehicles having to reverse all the way back to the junction with Danecoft Rd if a vehicle is parked in the hammerhead). Pl cd you consider re-advising [redacted], with a copy to [redacted] of Elmwood Rd who also seems to object? Pl also check that the extent of double yellows proposed to be installed is the minimum to achieve the above safety objective.
Toby

"Southwark Council does not accept liability for loss or damage resulting from software viruses.

The views expressed in this e-mail may be personal to the sender and should not be taken as necessarily representing those of Southwark Council.

The information in this e-mail and any attached files is confidential and may be covered by legal and/or professional privilege or be subject to privacy legislation. It is intended solely for the individual or entity to which it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, the retaining, distribution or other use of any transmitted information is strictly prohibited.

E-mails are transmitted over a public network and Southwark Council cannot accept any responsibility for the accuracy of a message that may have sustained changes in transmission".

From: [redacted]
To: traffic orders
Cc: Eckersley, Toby; [redacted]
Sent: Fri Mar 29 14:15:35 2013

Subject: Proposed parking restrictions - Elmwood Road

I am writing to object to this proposal, for which I can see no justification. Your stated reason is "to provide access and improve traffic flow". This is nonsense as that end of Elmwood is closed, so there is no traffic flow and access to what? The section on which you propose to introduce 'any time' parking restrictions is mainly used by staff at the Charter School who, if prevented from parking there, will transfer to the already crowded sections of Elmwood & Beckwith Roads. Thereby making life more difficult for all of us and presumably adding the unnecessary cost of patrolling & enforcing the new restrictions.

To repeat, this seems to be an entirely unjustifiable proposal whose only effect will be to inconvenience people who live and work in the area.

Regards,

[redacted]