

Herd, Michael

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 13 May 2015 09:53
To: Herd, Michael
Subject: Re: [REDACTED] - FW: Formal Objection to Proposal for 'any time waiting' restrictions (double yellow lines) at junction of Beckwith Road and Wynham Road

Dear Mr Heard,

Thank you for your email. We confirm that we certainly do not wish to withdraw our objection. We are aware that other residents on the street have also objected.

In response to the reasons you have set out for the double yellow lines:

Whilst you state that 'Restrictions at junctions are often necessary because parking in these locations has a direct, negative impact upon both safety and congestion', you have not provided any specific evidence in the form of statistics on accidents or resident complaints showing that this has been the case with the junction of Beckwith Road and Wynham Road.

In the 14 years we have lived here, we are not aware that any pedestrians or cyclists have been injured much less killed at the junction - unsurprising perhaps in these suburban streets with road bumps and generally slow moving cars.

Large vehicles travelling through Wynham Road and Frankfurt Road will in any event have to travel single file due to the narrow width of those roads with cars parked on both sides. This affects their journey times, not parked cars close to junctions.

We would object to the implementation of the yellow lines, deferred or otherwise.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

On 12 May 2015, at 13:59, Herd, Michael <Michael.Herd@southwark.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear [REDACTED]

RE: PRP/ND/TMO1516-009 - proposed double yellow lines on junctions.

Thank you for your objection, dated 12 May 2015, in regard to the double yellow lines that are proposed for junction of Beckwith Road and Wyneham Road. A list of the junctions affected by this proposal are included at the foot of this email.

On 17 March 2015 Dulwich Community Council approved double yellow lines for the junctions listed, subject to the outcome of this statutory consultation. The community council members also agreed that – whilst statutory consultation could be carried out now – the actual painting of the yellow lines would be deferred until such time as the impending [parking zone project](#) was complete.

The technical reasons for the proposed double yellow line are detailed in the report to [Dulwich Community Council](#) (item 15) and are summarised at the foot of this email.

Whilst we acknowledge the pressure upon parking in your area, we consider that parking should be prevented wherever it poses a road safety risk or causes congestion. Restrictions at junctions are often necessary because parking in these locations has a direct, negative impact upon both safety and congestion.

I'd like to reiterate that the proposed yellow lines will not be implemented until (at least) after the planned [parking zone consultation](#) has been completed. We expect a final decision on the parking zone project in late 2015.

No additional enforcement staff would be required to enforce this proposal.

I hope the above is of reassurance to you.

Please could you let me know, before 19 May, if I have satisfactorily answered your objection and therefore wish to withdraw your objection? Alternatively, if you want to maintain your objection then please could you confirm this by 19 May. Any unwithdrawn objections will be reported to a future community council meeting for decision.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Herd
Network development officer

List of streets where double yellow lines are proposed

- Ardbeg Road and Half Moon Lane
- Ardbeg Road and Red Post Hill
- Beckwith Road and Wyneham Road
- Beckwith Road and Red Post Hill
- Danecroft Road and Elmwood Road
- Danecroft Road and Herne Hill
- Elfindale Road and Elmwood Road
- Elmwood Road and Wyneham Road
- Frankfurt Road and Elmwood Road

Reasons for the proposed double yellow lines

The proposals have been made in response to an investigation of the above junctions following concerns about road safety that were raised by a resident through a ward councillor.

Vehicles parked at or close to a junction have two primary effects upon the road network:

- a reduction in visibility between all road users
- a reduction in the effective space of the carriageway for vehicles to turn

The latter disproportionately affects large vehicles (such as the emergency services) who can be delayed (or, at worst, prevented access) by cars that are parked at junctions.

The former will affect anyone who uses the junction but the risks are greater to vulnerable road users such as pedestrians and cyclists.

The council considers that preventing parking at junction is important for the following reasons:

- Ensuring adequate visibility between road users is important to safety. Visibility should generally be sufficient to allow road users to see potential conflicts or dangers in advance of the distance in which they will be able to break and come to a stop.
- Vehicles that are parked at a junction have the effect of reducing visibility between road users and reducing stopping sight distance (SSD) which is the viewable distance required for a driver to see so that they can make a complete stop before colliding with something in the street, eg pedestrian, cyclist or a stopped vehicle.
- The Highway Code makes clear that motorists must not park within 10 metres of a junction, unless in a designated bay. However, the council has no power to enforce this without the introduction of a traffic order and subsequent implementation of waiting restrictions (yellow lines).
- Pedestrians will often cross the road at a junction where dropped kerbs have been installed to improve accessibility.
- Children and those in wheelchairs (whose eye level is below the height of a parked car) are disproportionately affected by vehicles parked too close to a junction.
- The Guide Dogs for the Blind Association (Guide Dogs) strongly recommend that yellow lines are implemented at junctions as these areas are potentially more dangerous.
- Almost two thirds of cyclists killed or seriously injured in 2013 were involved in collisions at, or near, a road junction, with 'T' junctions being the most commonly involved
- This proposal to install yellow lines at these junctions is in accordance with the council's adopted Southwark Streetscape Design Manual (SSDM) design standard on Highway Visibility (DS114 - [Highway Visibility](#))

For full detail of the specifics of the proposals please refer to the report to [Dulwich Community Council](#) (item 15)

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

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 12 May 2015 10:06

To: traffic orders

Subject: Formal Objection to Proposal for 'any time waiting' restrictions (double yellow lines) at junction of Beckwith Road and Wynham Road

Dear Sirs,

We are writing formally to object to the proposals by the council to have double yellow lines at the junction of Beckwith Road and Wynham Road. We live at [REDACTED], which is just beside the junction. We have considered the plans and the extent of the proposed double yellow lines. Our grounds for objection are as follows:

1. Residents in Beckwith Road and Wynham Road are already facing a shortage of parking spaces, which has been the subject of numerous complaints to the council, and for which the council is aware and has consulted with residents. The proposed double yellow lines will have the effect of removing a further four (4) parking spaces from Beckwith Road and Wynham Road, exacerbating the parking problem.
2. The council has produced no evidence showing that the double yellow lines are needed. Having lived in the same house for 14 years and taken our children across the junction on an almost daily basis, we are not aware of any traffic or other accidents which have occurred in the past years as a consequence of cars parking close to the junctions. Nor have we been made aware of any resident complaints. The existing arrangements do not create any health and safety hazards.
3. As council taxpayers, we fail to see that the additional costs which would inevitably be involved in employing traffic wardens to police compliance can be justified in these times of funding cuts. The money would be better spent on reinstating lollipop ladies and funding libraries. Nor should local residents be put through the time, inconvenience and expense of parking tickets and appealing against wrongly issued parking tickets, for no discernible benefit.

We would be grateful if you could kindly acknowledge receipt of this correspondence.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

The email you received and any files transmitted with it are confidential, may be covered by legal and/or professional privilege and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this in error please notify us immediately. If you are not the intended recipient of the email or the person responsible for delivering it to them you may not copy it, forward it or otherwise use it for any purpose or disclose its contents to any other person. To do so may be unlawful. Where opinions are expressed in the email they are not necessarily those of Southwark Council and Southwark Council is not responsible for any changes made to the message after it has been sent.

<North Dulwich proposed double yellow lines.pdf>

Herd, Michael

From: Herd, Michael
Sent: 12 May 2015 13:39
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: traffic orders
Subject: RE: [REDACTED] Elfindale Rd (objection)

Dear [REDACTED]

RE: PRP/ND/TMO1516-009 - proposed double yellow lines on junctions.

Thank you for your objection, dated 30 April 2015, in regard to the double yellow lines that are proposed for the North Dulwich triangle. A list of the junctions affected is included at the foot of this email.

On 17 March 2015 Dulwich Community Council approved double yellow lines for the junctions listed, subject to the outcome of this statutory consultation. The community council members also agreed that – whilst statutory consultation could be carried out now – the actual painting of the yellow lines would be deferred until such time as the impending [parking zone project](#) was complete.

The technical reasons for the proposed double yellow line are detailed in the report to [Dulwich Community Council](#) (item 15) and are summarised at the foot of this email.

Whilst we acknowledge the pressure upon parking in your area, we do not agree with your assertion that new double yellow lines on junctions will increase the risk of collisions elsewhere. This implies that a parking restriction in one location is an excuse to park badly in another.

We consider that parking should be prevented wherever it poses a road safety risk or causes congestion. Restrictions at junctions are often necessary because parking in these locations has a direct, negative impact upon both safety and congestion.

I'd like to reiterate that the proposed yellow lines will not be implemented until (at least) after the planned [parking zone consultation](#) has been completed. We expect a final decision on the parking zone project in late 2015.

I hope the above is of reassurance to you.

Please could you let me know, before 19 May, if I have satisfactorily answered your objection and therefore wish to withdraw your objection? Alternatively, if you want to maintain your objection then please could you confirm this by 19 May. Any unwithdrawn objections will be reported to a future community council meeting for decision.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Herd
Network development officer

List of streets where double yellow lines are proposed

- Ardbeg Road and Half Moon Lane
- Ardbeg Road and Red Post Hill
- Beckwith Road and Wyneham Road
- Beckwith Road and Red Post Hill
- Danecroft Road and Elmwood Road
- Danecroft Road and Herne Hill
- Elfindale Road and Elmwood Road
- Elmwood Road and Wyneham Road
- Frankfurt Road and Elmwood Road

Reasons for the proposed double yellow lines

The proposals have been made in response to an investigation of the above junctions following concerns about road safety that were raised by a resident through a ward councillor.

Vehicles parked at or close to a junction have two primary effects upon the road network:

- a reduction in visibility between all road users
- a reduction in the effective space of the carriageway for vehicles to turn

The latter disproportionately affects large vehicles (such as the emergency services) who can be delayed (or, at worst, prevented access) by cars that are parked at junctions.

The former will affect anyone who uses the junction but the risks are greater to vulnerable road users such as pedestrians and cyclists.

The council considers that preventing parking at junction is important for the following reasons:

- Ensuring adequate visibility between road users is important to safety. Visibility should generally be sufficient to allow road users to see potential conflicts or dangers in advance of the distance in which they will be able to break and come to a stop.
- Vehicles that are parked at a junction have the effect of reducing visibility between road users and reducing stopping sight distance (SSD) which is the viewable distance required for a driver to see so that they can make a complete stop before colliding with something in the street, eg pedestrian, cyclist or a stopped vehicle.
- The Highway Code makes clear that motorists must not park within 10 metres of a junction, unless in a designated bay. However, the council has no power to enforce this without the introduction of a traffic order and subsequent implementation of waiting restrictions (yellow lines).
- Pedestrians will often cross the road at a junction where dropped kerbs have been installed to improve accessibility.
- Children and those in wheelchairs (whose eye level is below the height of a parked car) are disproportionately affected by vehicles parked too close to a junction.
- The Guide Dogs for the Blind Association (Guide Dogs) strongly recommend that yellow lines are implemented at junctions as these areas are potentially more dangerous.
- Almost two thirds of cyclists killed or seriously injured in 2013 were involved in collisions at, or near, a road junction, with 'T' junctions being the most commonly involved
- This proposal to install yellow lines at these junctions is in accordance with the council's adopted Southwark Streetscape Design Manual (SSDM) design standard on Highway Visibility (DS114 - [Highway Visibility](#))

For full detail of the specifics of the proposals please refer to the report to [Dulwich Community Council](#) (item 15)

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 April 2015 17:35
To: traffic orders
Subject: TMO1314-040 local parking issues 1314Q3

Ref PRP/ND/TMO1516-009

I wish to register my objection to the above on the grounds that this will reduce the availability of residential and local business parking in an area already short of available street parking space. Elfindale Rd is already

heavily oversubscribed for parking and reducing this space further will lead to an increase in congestion, double parking and poses a greater risk of collisions to residents and foot traffic, particularly the pupils of the Charter School and Judith Kerr Primary, many of whom use this route.



Sent from my iPhone

Herd, Michael

From: Herd, Michael
Sent: 27 May 2015 10:52
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: [REDACTED] - objection re: N Dulwich triangle

Dear [REDACTED],

Thank you for your objection to the proposed double yellow lines in North Dulwich Triangle.

On 17 March 2015 Dulwich Community Council approved double yellow lines for the junctions listed, subject to the outcome of this statutory consultation. The community council members also agreed that – whilst statutory consultation could be carried out now – the actual painting of the yellow lines would be deferred until such time as the impending [parking zone project](#) was complete.

The technical reasons for the proposed double yellow line are detailed in the report to [Dulwich Community Council](#) (item 15) and are summarised at the foot of this email.

We consider that parking should be prevented wherever it poses a road safety risk or causes congestion. Restrictions at junctions are often necessary because parking in these locations has a direct, negative impact upon both safety and congestion.

I'd like to reiterate that the proposed yellow lines will not be implemented until (at least) after the planned [parking zone consultation](#) has been completed. We expect a final decision on the parking zone project in late 2015.

I hope the above is of reassurance to you.

List of streets where double yellow lines are proposed

- Ardbeg Road and Half Moon Lane
- Ardbeg Road and Red Post Hill
- Beckwith Road and Wyneham Road
- Beckwith Road and Red Post Hill
- Danecroft Road and Elmwood Road
- Danecroft Road and Herne Hill
- Elfindale Road and Elmwood Road
- Elmwood Road and Wyneham Road
- Frankfurt Road and Elmwood Road

Reasons for the proposed double yellow lines

The proposals have been made in response to an investigation of the above junctions following concerns about road safety that were raised by a resident through a ward councillor.

Vehicles parked at or close to a junction have two primary effects upon the road network:

- a reduction in visibility between all road users
- a reduction in the effective space of the carriageway for vehicles to turn

The latter disproportionately affects large vehicles (such as the emergency services) who can be delayed (or, at worst, prevented access) by cars that are parked at junctions.

The former will affect anyone who uses the junction but the risks are greater to vulnerable road users such as pedestrians and cyclists.

The council considers that preventing parking at junction is important for the following reasons:

- Ensuring adequate visibility between road users is important to safety. Visibility should generally be sufficient to allow road users to see potential conflicts or dangers in advance of the distance in which they will be able to break and come to a stop.

Appendix 6

- Vehicles that are parked at a junction have the effect of reducing visibility between road users and reducing stopping sight distance (SSD) which is the viewable distance required for a driver to see so that they can make a complete stop before colliding with something in the street, eg pedestrian, cyclist or a stopped vehicle.
- The Highway Code makes clear that motorists must not park within 10 metres of a junction, unless in a designated bay. However, the council has no power to enforce this without the introduction of a traffic order and subsequent implementation of waiting restrictions (yellow lines).
- Pedestrians will often cross the road at a junction where dropped kerbs have been installed to improve accessibility.
- Children and those in wheelchairs (whose eye level is below the height of a parked car) are disproportionately affected by vehicles parked too close to a junction.
- The Guide Dogs for the Blind Association (Guide Dogs) strongly recommend that yellow lines are implemented at junctions as these areas are potentially more dangerous.
- Almost two thirds of cyclists killed or seriously injured in 2013 were involved in collisions at, or near, a road junction, with 'T' junctions being the most commonly involved
- This proposal to install yellow lines at these junctions is in accordance with the council's adopted Southwark Streetscape Design Manual (SSDM) design standard on Highway Visibility (DS114 - [Highway Visibility](#))

For full detail of the specifics of the proposals please refer to the report to [Dulwich Community Council](#) (item 15)

Your objection will form part of a report that will be presented to the Dulwich Community Council at a meeting being held 24 June 2015.

The agenda for this public meeting will be published on the council website at a date closer to the meeting, [see here](#).

Regards

Michael Herd
Network development officer

From: Herbert, Richard **On Behalf Of** traffic orders
Sent: 21 May 2015 10:04
To: Herd, Michael
Subject: [REDACTED] - objection re: N Dulwich triangle

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 May 2015 16:09
To: traffic orders; Herd, Michael
Subject: Local parking issues

Dear Nicky Costin and Michael Herd

I am writing to object to the proposed parking restrictions:

ARDBEG ROAD, to introduce 'at any time' waiting restrictions on both sides at its junction with Half Moon Lane;

BECKWITH ROAD, to introduce 'at any time' waiting restrictions on the north-west side at

ELFINDALE ROAD, to introduce 'at any time' waiting restrictions on both sides at its junction with Elmwood Road;

ELMWOOD ROAD, to introduce 'at any time' waiting restrictions" [i] on the north-west side at its junction with Danecroft Road, [ii] on the north-west and west side at its junction with

Frankfurt Road, [iii] on the south-west side at its junction with Elfindale Road, and [iv] on the south-east and east side at its junction with Wyneham Road;

WYNEHAM ROAD, to introduce 'at any time' waiting restrictions: [i] on both sides at its junction with Elmwood Road, and [ii] on both sides at its junction with Beckwith Road.

FRANKFURT ROAD, to introduce 'at any time' waiting restrictions on both sides at its junction with Elmwood Road;

HALF MOON LANE, to introduce 'at any time' waiting restrictions on the north-west side at its junction with Ardbeg Road;

HERNE HILL, to introduce 'at any time' waiting restrictions on the south-east side at its junction with Danecroft Road;

As you are aware the availability of parking spaces on these roads is already at near maximum capacity. Imposing parking restrictions will only serve to further reduce the availability of parking spaces.

The implementation of these parking restrictions are being proposed at the same time that there is a consultation on the implementation of a CPZ in this area. Is this just a coincidence? By imposing 'at any time' waiting restrictions you are adding to the perceived parking problem and making it more likely that the CPZ will be realised. Why are the above restrictions deemed necessary? As a resident of Elmwood Road I know of no accident or near miss on the street due to cars being parked too close to the corners.

At the very least, could the implementation of these parking restrictions be put on hold until the results of the CPZ consultation are in?

Yours sincerely

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the sender.