

North Dulwich and Denmark Hill

Parking project - September 2015 Community councils

www.southwark.gov.uk

North Dulwich and Denmark Hill parking zone consultation

We are carrying out a parking study in this area and welcome your comments about the possible introduction of a parking zone.

For further information and to complete an online questionnaire, please visit:
www.southwark.gov.uk/parkingprojects

Consultation closes on Friday 12 June 2015



North Dulwich and Denmark Hill Parking project

September 2015 – Community councils

www.southwark.gov.uk

In response to feedback from local residents, the council has agreed to consult within the North Dulwich and Denmark Hill area to determine if a parking zone should be provided to meet local need.

Roads included within the project area		Consultation type
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ardbeg Road ▪ Arnould Avenue ▪ Basingdon Way ▪ Beckwith Road ▪ Blancedowne ▪ Casino Avenue ▪ Champion Hill ▪ Crossthaite Avenue ▪ Danecroft Road ▪ Denmark Hill ▪ Domett Close ▪ Dowson Close ▪ Dylways ▪ Elfindale Road ▪ Elmwood Road ▪ Frankfurt Road 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Green Dale ▪ Gylcote Close ▪ Half Moon Lane ▪ Henry Dent Close ▪ Herne Hill ▪ Monclar Road ▪ Nairne Grove ▪ Red Post Hill ▪ Royal George Mews ▪ Sunray Avenue ▪ Village Way ▪ Wanley Road ▪ Woodfarrs ▪ Wyneham Road 	<p>New zone – Consultation on the possible introduction of a new parking zone</p> <p>Resident and businesses in this area will be asked whether or not they support a parking zone and what times they would like any possible zone to operate.</p>

Document history

Project areas			Document ref:			
Revision	Purpose/description	Originated	Checked	Reviewed	Authorised	Date
0.1	1st draft	JF	PG	TW		4/8/15
1.0	Issued – Community Council	JF	PG	TW	LC/MH	26/8/15

Table of Contents

1	Executive summary	4
1.1	Methodology	4
1.2	Headline consultation results	4
1.3	Proposed parking zone options	4
1.4	Summary of consultation results	5
2	Introduction	6
2.1	Parking projects programme 2015/16	6
2.2	Project inception	6
2.3	Roads in the project area	7
2.4	History of parking in the project area	9
2.5	Representations from residents	11
2.6	Project process	12
2.7	Key dates of the consultation	13
3	Methodology	14
3.1	Parking occupancy and duration surveys	14
3.2	Consultation document	15
3.3	Street notices and banner	16
3.4	Website and social media	17
3.5	Exhibitions	18
3.6	Key stakeholders	18
4	Parking occupancy and duration surveys	19
4.1	Summary of parking occupancy and duration survey results	19
4.2	Review of survey data	20
5	Summary of consultation results	21
5.1	Consultation returns	21
5.2	Response rate	21
5.3	Omitted responses	22
5.4	Responses to questionnaire	23
5.5	Overall summary	25
6	Detailed analysis of consultation results	26
6.1	Introduction	26
6.2	Q1. Are you a resident or business?	26
6.3	Q2. How many vehicles does your household regularly park on the street?	26
6.4	Q3. What time of day do you or your visitors have difficulty parking?	27
6.5	Q4. Do you want a parking zone to be introduced in your street?	28
6.6	Q5. If you answered “No” or “Undecided” to question 4, would you change your mind if a parking zone was to be proposed in only part of the project area?	31
6.7	Q6. If you answered “No” or “Undecided” to question 4 of this section, please can you tell us why?	33
6.8	Q7. If a parking zone was introduced, which of the following hours would you like the parking zone to operate?	35
6.9	Q8. If a parking zone was introduced, which of the following days would you like the parking zone to operate?	36
6.10	Q9. Do you have any comments about the proposal or the consultation?	37
6.11	Other correspondence	40
6.12	Exhibition comments	40
7	Project conclusions and proposed options	44
7.1	Conclusions	44
7.2	Proposed parking zone options	45
7.3	Option 1 – rationale, risk and benefits	46
7.4	Option 2 – rationale, risk and benefits	47
7.5	Option 3 – rationale, risk and benefits	48
7.6	Option 4 – rationale, risk and benefits	48
7.7	Other proposals, notes and comments	50
	APPENDIX 1 – Parking zones in the London Borough of Southwark	52
	APPENDIX 2 – Parking occupancy and duration surveys	52
	APPENDIX 3 – Consultation materials	96
	APPENDIX 4 – Comments from consultation	105

1 Executive summary

1.1 Methodology

1.1.1 During May and early June 2015, a consultation was carried out in the North Dulwich and Denmark Hill area. All properties within the project area were consulted on whether they wanted a new parking zone, and if so, which times and days of operation would be preferred.

1.2 Headline consultation results

1.2.1 The consultation responses are summarised in section 5 with a detailed analysis presented in section 6 of this report.

1.2.2 The response to the headline question is summarised in Table 1. This shows that, when the overall result is considered, there is a justification to consider a new parking zone in the project area.

Response rate	Do you want a parking zone to be introduced in your street?		
	Yes	No	Undecided
23%	59%	32%	9%

Table 1 - Headline consultation results

1.3 Proposed parking zone options

1.3.1 Detailed street by street analysis, as well as the parking stress survey, identifies that there is justification to consider a parking zone within part or all of the project area and that the following options may be considered:

- **Option 1** – To introduce a parking zone in the entire project area
- **Option 2** – To introduce a parking zone in the North Dulwich and Denmark Hill area only
- **Option 3** – To introduce a parking zone in the North Dulwich area only
- **Option 4** – Do not introduce a parking zone within the project area

1.3.2 The rationale, risks and benefits of each of these options is discussed in section 7.

1.4 Summary of consultation results

Road	No. of properties	No. of responses	Response rate	What time of day do you have difficulty parking*	Do you want a parking zone to be introduced in your street?			If parking controls were introduced which of the following...		Average weekday parking stress
					Yes	No	Undecided	...hours would you like the parking zone to operate?*	...days would you like the parking zone to operate?*	
Ardbeg Road	53	17	32%	Monday - Friday, daytime	82%	6%	12%	Part day controls	Monday - Friday	89%
Arnould Avenue	20	2	10%	No clear majority	50%	50%	0%	No clear majority	No clear majority	88%
Basingdon Way	234	20	9%	Monday - Friday, daytime	50%	40%	10%	Part day controls	Monday - Friday	92%
Beckwith Road	126	43	34%	Monday - Friday, daytime	65%	28%	5%	Part day controls	Monday - Friday	99%
Blanchedowne	50	9	18%	Monday - Friday, daytime	67%	22%	11%	Part day controls	Monday - Friday	107%
Casino Avenue	130	41	32%	Monday - Friday, daytime	56%	32%	12%	Part day controls	Monday - Friday	70%
Champion Hill	40	4	10%	No clear majority	50%	50%	0%	No clear majority	Monday - Friday	42%
Crossthwaite Avenue	34	7	21%	Never	29%	71%	0%	No clear majority	Monday - Friday	72%
Danecroft Road	81	34	42%	Monday - Friday, daytime	79%	12%	9%	Part day controls	Monday - Friday	79%
Denmark Hill	198	14	7%	Never	21%	64%	21%	Part day controls	Monday - Friday	-
Domett Close	32	5	16%	No clear majority	40%	40%	0%	All day controls	Monday - Friday	60%
Dowson Close	28	2	7%	Never	0%	100%	0%	No clear majority	No clear majority	50%
Dylways	123	23	19%	Monday - Friday, daytime	57%	35%	9%	All day controls	Monday - Friday	91%
Elfindale Road	113	51	45%	Monday - Friday, daytime	82%	14%	4%	Part day controls	Monday - Friday	98%
Elmwood Road	91	27	30%	Monday - Friday, daytime	48%	37%	15%	Part day controls	Monday - Friday	77%
Frankfurt Road	95	38	40%	Monday - Friday, daytime	68%	24%	8%	Part day controls	Monday - Friday	89%
Green Dale	21	4	19%	Never	0%	100%	0%	Part day controls	Monday - Friday	-
Gylcote Close	23	6	26%	Never	33%	50%	17%	Part day controls	Monday - Friday	34%
Half Moon Lane	34	14	41%	Monday - Friday, daytime	79%	21%	0%	No clear majority	Monday - Friday	107%
Henry Dent Close	7	0	0%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	-
Herne Hill	59	15	25%	Monday - Friday, daytime	60%	40%	0%	Part day controls	Monday - Friday	80%
Monclar Road	33	7	21%	Monday - Friday, daytime	14%	71%	14%	No clear majority	Monday - Friday	84%
Nairne Grove	24	8	33%	Monday - Friday, daytime	38%	63%	0%	All day controls	Monday - Friday	58%
Red Post Hill	137	34	25%	Monday - Friday, daytime	56%	26%	18%	Part day controls	Monday - Friday	56%
Royal George Mews	3	0	0%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	-
Sunray Avenue	147	25	17%	Monday - Friday, daytime	28%	56%	16%	Part day controls	Monday - Friday	50%
Village Way	3	0	0%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	-
Wanley Road	42	4	10%	Never	50%	50%	0%	No clear majority	Monday - Friday	46%
Woodfars	68	12	18%	Monday - Friday, daytime	50%	42%	8%	No clear majority	Monday - Friday	67%
Wyneham Road	44	12	27%	Monday - Friday, evening	75%	8%	17%	Part day controls	Monday - Friday	91%
OVERALL	2093	478	23%	Monday - Friday, daytime	59%	32%	9%	Part day controls	Monday - Friday	74%

Table 2- Summary of consultation results *most common response

2 Introduction

2.1 Parking projects programme 2015/16

- 2.1.1 Southwark Council has 21 parking zones in operation which have been introduced over a period of forty years. This time frame reflects the historical and continuing challenge faced by every local authority in matching the demand to park with a finite supply of on-street spaces.
- 2.1.2 The council's strategic parking design programme, shown in Table 5, includes a consultation on the possible introduction of a new parking zone in the North Dulwich and Denmark Hill area. This consultation has been included within the programme following representations by local residents, via their resident associations and ward councillors. Streets around Champion Hill have been included based on correspondence, parking stress data, parking policy and a commitment to undertake a parking project associated with planning permission for a nearby development.

Area	Activity	Date
East Camberwell (EC) zone CPZ review	Consultation Commenced	11 May 2015
	Consultation closed	5 June 2015
North Dulwich and Denmark Hill parking project	Consultation Commenced	18 May 2015
	Consultation Closed	12 June 2015
Canada Water parking study	Consultation Commenced	1 June 2015
	Consultation Closed	19 June 2015

Table 3 – Strategic parking design programme approved 2014

- 2.1.3 The council's constitution sets out that, before consulting on a parking zone, we will discuss the consultation boundaries and methods with the local community council. For this project we reported to [Dulwich Community Council on 17 March 2015](#) and [Camberwell Community Council on 21 March 2015](#).

2.2 Project inception

- 2.2.1 Consultation methods and boundaries were discussed with both Dulwich and Camberwell community councils in March 2015.
- 2.2.2 Two separate consultation areas were recommended at those meetings, with different timeframes. The two boundaries focussed upon (a) the North Dulwich area where substantial representations had been made and (b) the Champion Hill area where the s106 development funding was sourced. The areas did not include the streets between those two areas (eg Dylways, Crossthwaite, Sunray Avenue etc.)
- 2.2.3 At the meeting, Dulwich Community Council asked that all roads up to the ward boundary be included in the consultation. Camberwell Community Council asked that additional roads in their area be added in response to Dulwich Community Council's request.
- 2.2.4 As a result of the changes requested by the community councils, the consultation boundary was amended to reflect the streets listed at the outset of this document. This larger consultation area also enabled the programme for the Champion Hill area to be brought forward.

2.3 Roads in the project area

2.3.1 The North Dulwich and Denmark project area includes the roads listed in Table 4 and shown in Figure 1.

Road Name	No. of properties	Ward(s)	Notes/comments
Ardbeg Road	53	Village	
Arnould Avenue	20	South Camberwell	
Basingdon Way	234	South Camberwell	
Beckwith Road	126	Village	
Blanchedowne	50	South Camberwell	
Casino Avenue	130	Village	
Champion Hill	40	South Camberwell	
Crossthaite Avenue	34	South Camberwell	
Danecroft Road	81	Village	
Denmark Hill	198	South Camberwell, Village	Lambeth are highway authority.
Domett Close	32	South Camberwell	
Dowson Close	28	South Camberwell	
Dylways	123	South Camberwell	
Elfindale Road	113	Village	
Elmwood Road	91	Village	
Frankfurt Road	95	Village	
Green Dale	21	South Camberwell	Part not public highway
Gylcote Close	23	South Camberwell	
Half Moon Lane	34	Village	
Henry Dent Close	7	South Camberwell	Not public highway
Herne Hill	59	Village	Lambeth are highway authority.
Monclar Road	33	South Camberwell	
Nairne Grove	24	South Camberwell	
Red Post Hill	137	South Camberwell, Village	
Royal George Mews	3	Village	Not public highway
Sunray Avenue	147	South Camberwell, Village	
Village Way	3	Village	Only partially within project area
Wanley Road	42	South Camberwell	
Woodfarrs	68	South Camberwell	
Wyneham Road	44	Village	

Table 4 – Roads in project area




Figure 1 – North Dulwich and Denmark Hill project area

2.4 History of parking in the project area

2.4.1 A timeline showing the history of previous consultations and parking zones in and around the North Dulwich and Denmark Hill area is shown in Table 5.





Date	Consultation	Outcome
2002/2003	1st stage consultation, extending approximately from Herne Hill station to East Dulwich station.	Decision to progress to 2nd stage consultation in supportive areas.
2004	2nd stage consultation in those areas identified in support during 2002/03 1st stage consultation.	HH CPZ is introduced on an experimental basis in the following streets: Burbage Road, Croxted Road, Half Moon Lane (west), Stradella Road, Norwood Road and Winterbrook Road.
2005/2006	3rd stage review of HH CPZ.	Experimental CPZ considered successful. Almost 60% thought parking situation was better. Local parking layouts amended. HH CPZ operational hours amended from 10hrs to 2hrs (Noon – 2pm) per day.
2005/2006	Combined 1st/2nd stage consultation with: Streets adjacent to HH CPZ Streets close to North Dulwich station bounded by Red Post Hill (south), Ardbeg Road, Half Moon Lane (east), Beckwith Road, Wyneham Road	CPZ extended to include the supportive streets of Carver Road, Ruskin Walk, Hollingbourne Road, Howletts Road and Warmington Road. No clear support in North Dulwich area.
2009/2010	1st stage consultation, extending from existing HH CPZ to Red Post Hill	Overall 71% of responses against a parking zone in the project area. Support for a parking zone identified in Holmdene Avenue where 74% of respondents were in favour of a parking zone.
2010/2011	2nd stage consultation with residents in Holmdene Avenue on proposed parking layout	Proposed parking layout supported HH CPZ extended to Holmdene Avenue in January 2011.
Late 2013*	Introduction of CPZ in Lambeth, in some streets to north west of Herne Hill	
Early 2014*	Lambeth CPZ extended to cover all streets to the north west of Herne Hill and Denmark Hill	

* These CPZs were consulted on and implemented by the London Borough of Lambeth.




Table 5 – Timeline for project area

2.4.2 The installation of parking zones in the Herne Hill and North Dulwich area are illustrated in Figure 2. Since 1999 the area has seen parking zones implemented or extended on seven occasions.

2.4.3 A plan showing the locations and times of operation of all current parking zones in Southwark is included in Appendix 1.



2009 – North Dulwich parking study



2015 - Current parking study

Figure 2 - Timeline for implementation of parking zones adjacent to the North Dulwich and Denmark Hill study area

2.5 Representations from residents

2.5.1 Prior to this project, Southwark Council received representations from residents in the project area requesting a parking zone and/or consultation on a zone. The number of representations is summarised for each street in the area in Table 6.

Road name	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015*	Total
Ardbeg Road			1	1	2					2	1	7
Arnould Avenue									1			1
Basingdon Way										1		1
Beckwith Road									2	13	5	20
Blanchedowne				1		1			1	2		5
Casino Avenue									2	5		7
Champion Hill							1	1		1		3
Crossthaite Avenue									1	4	2	7
Danecroft Road					1				1	25	4	31
Domett Close							1		1		1	3
Dylways	1					2			1	1	1	6
Elfindale Road							2		12	33	3	50
Elmwood Road										6	2	8
Frankfurt Road										13	4	17
Half Moon Lane					1					1		2
Herne Hill										1	1	2
Nairne Grove											1	1
Red Post Hill		1			1	1			3	4	2	12
Sunray Avenue					1						2	3
Wanley Road									1			1
Woodfarrs								1		1		2
Wyneham Road											1	1
Grand Total	1	1	1	2	6	4	4	2	26	113	30	190

*Responses for 2015 shown until March 2nd 2015

Table 6 - Representations from residents 2005 - 2015

2.5.2 The number of requests for a parking zone received from residents in the project area has increased substantially since parking zones were introduced and extended in London borough of Lambeth during 2013-14. The majority of request were received from the following streets:

Road name	Number of requests between 01/01/2011 and 03/03/2015
Elfindale Road	50
Danecroft Road	30
Beckwith Road	20
Frankfurt Road	17

Table 7 - Requests for parking zones 2011- March 2015

2.6 Project process

2.6.1 The consultation is being carried out in accordance with Southwark's consultation and implementation process for parking zones.

2.6.2 The consultation process is summarised in Figure 3.

CPZ – 1st and 2nd stage combined (in principle and detailed design) consultation and study process




Figure 3 - Southwark CPZ process

2.7 Key dates of the consultation

2.7.1 The key dates of the consultations are detailed in Table 8.

Date	Consultation summary
17 March 2015	Dulwich community council – report presenting project methods and boundary
21 March 2015	Camberwell community council – report presenting project methods and boundary
15 May 2015	Consultation materials and questionnaire sent out to all properties within the project area and published on Southwark website
4 June 2015	First exhibition held at Herne Hill Methodist Church Hall, between 6pm and 9pm
6 June 2015	Second exhibition held at Herne Hill Methodist Church Hall, between 2pm and 5pm
12 June 2015	Consultation closed
9 September 2015	Dulwich community council – report presenting the consultation findings and recommendations
9 September 2015	Camberwell community council – report presenting the consultation findings and recommendations

Table 8 – Consultation key dates

3 Methodology

3.1 Parking occupancy and duration surveys

- 3.1.1 Streetwise Services Ltd undertook the Parking Stress Surveys. Surveys were planned to avoid data collection during Mondays, Fridays, on school holidays or Bank Holidays as traffic characteristics on these days can be untypical.
- 3.1.2 A parking beat is a series of parking surveys of the same streets in an area, undertaken over the course of an extended period. The surveys are repeated hourly to ensure periods of high demand are captured and any parking patterns are identifiable.
- 3.1.3 The parking surveys recorded;
- the amount of safe parking spaces within the survey area; and
 - the number of vehicles parked within the survey area during each beat.
- 3.1.4 These two aspects are combined to determine the level of parking stress by dividing the number of available spaces by the number of parked vehicles. This is expressed as a percentage of space used.
- 3.1.5 For the purposes of this study, levels of parking stress have been categorised as follows:
- Very Low 0 to <=50%
 - Low to Medium 50 to <70%
 - Medium to High >=70 to <80%
 - High >=80 to <90%
 - Very High >=90%
- 3.1.6 It is possible for parking stress to exceed 100% where vehicles are parked illegally, or where compact vehicles (such as smartcars) result in a higher than expected density of parking.
- 3.1.7 Parking beat surveys of on-street parking activity were undertaken in the project area on:
- Thursday 15 January 2015, from 06:00 to 21:00
 - Saturday 24 January 2015, from 06:00 to 21:00
- 3.1.8 These days generally have different travel and parking patterns and so provide a good variation of data to inform the project.
- 3.1.9 Streetwise Services Ltd used hand-held surveying devices to record data from the walked parking beats at hourly intervals throughout each day. Surveys recorded partial vehicle registration marks (VRM) and parking space usage, along with any other unusual observations such as suspended Traffic Management Orders (TMOs), the presence of skips on the highway or temporary traffic management etc. The location of existing parking, waiting and loading restrictions were also noted down in each area as these provide vital information when calculating parking stress on each street.
- 3.1.10 Instances where parking space was not used correctly i.e. cars parked across driveways or vehicles causing an obstruction, and the specific locations were recorded and are considered key to the surveys. Vehicles parking in contravention to existing parking restrictions, such as vehicles parking in loading bays and the specific locations of such, were also recorded.
- 3.1.11 The parking beat surveys were used to classify duration of vehicle stay by identifying parking location, time and vehicle registration mark (VRM). Each type of parking activity was categorised into the sub-categories defined in the client brief:

- Resident – vehicles parked at 6am or 7am are assumed to be resident overnight stay.
- Short-stay visitor – vehicles staying for no longer than 3 hours.
- Long-stay visitor – vehicles staying between 3 and 6 hours.
- Commuter – vehicles arriving after 6am and staying for more than 6 hours.

3.1.12 The results of the parking occupancy and duration surveys are summarised in section 3.7 with further information on the parking occupancy and duration survey methodology in Appendix 2.

3.2 Consultation document

3.2.1 2093 postal addresses are located within the North Dulwich and Denmark Hill project area. This data was derived from the council's Local Land and Property Gazetteer (LLPG).

3.2.2 Distribution of the consultation documents was made on 15 May 2015 by way of a blanket, 2nd class, Royal Mail postal delivery to all properties (residential and commercial) within the project area. Appendix 3 to this document includes a copy of the consultation materials sent to addresses in the project area.

3.2.3 The document was designed to present information on:

- Why the consultation was being carried out
- How recipients could contribute / decision making
- What the parking consultation was about
- A feasibility design, showing the proposed type and positions of parking bays and restrictions
- Frequently asked questions
- Website link to the consultation document, online questionnaire, feasibility design and parking stress data.

3.2.4 By way of a questionnaire, the document sought the recipient's details and views on:

- Their address
- How many vehicles they park on street
- When they experience difficulty parking
- Whether they want a parking zone introduced in their street
- Would they change their mind if an adjacent street were in favour of the zone
- What operational days and times they would prefer if a zone were introduced
- Any other comments

3.2.5 Responses could be made by completing and returning the 'hard copy' of the questionnaire or by completing the questionnaire on-line.

3.2.6 Details of the consultation and a link to the on-line questionnaire were made available on the Southwark website at www.southwark.gov.uk/parkingprojects and street notices and a banner were displayed on-street.

3.3 Street notices and banner

3.3.1 41 street notices were erected evenly within the consultation area.

3.3.2 The notice, shown in Figure 4, provided contact details (telephone and email) for more detail on the consultation, details of the exhibitions and advice on what to do if a consultation pack had not been received.



Figure 4 – Street notice

3.3.3 Throughout the consultation period a banner was on display centrally in the project area to remind the community that a consultation was taking place. This banner was located on the railings of Sunray Park on Red Post Hill. A picture of the banner is shown in Figure 5.



Figure 5- Banner at Sunray Park

3.4 Website and social media

3.4.1 The council's parking projects page¹ and the new consultation portal² provided details of the consultation, the process and how decisions would be taken. A selection of frequently asked questions relating to the specific consultation (and parking zones in general) provided an additional source of information.

3.4.2 The consultation portal for Southwark Council included the following PDF downloads:

- The consultation document
- The questionnaire
- Feasibility drawing
- Parking stress data
- A direct phone number and email address to the parking projects team was made available to allow those wishing to making enquires via those methods. Officers provided advice and also encouraged the callers to complete their questionnaire.

3.4.3 The council sent out messages on social media to raise awareness of the consultation and exhibitions. This included a tweet to Southwark's 15,000 followers (Figure 6) and a message on Facebook. This provided a link to the project page on the Southwark Council website.




Figure 6 - Social media

¹ www.southwark.gov.uk/parkingprojects

² <https://consultations.southwark.gov.uk/environment-leisure/north-dulwich-and-denmark-hill-consultation>

3.5 Exhibitions

- 3.5.1 During the consultation, two public exhibitions, staffed by council officers, were held at the Herne Hill Methodist Church Hall on Half Moon Lane on the following dates:
- Thursday 4 June 2015, between 6pm and 9pm
 - Saturday 6 June 2015, between 2pm and 5pm
- 3.5.2 The exhibitions were well attended, with residents providing feedback and comments on the design. Attendees were present from all areas within the project boundary.
- 3.5.3 A summary of comments recorded at the exhibition (either to officers directly or on the comment forms provided) can be found in section 6.12.

3.6 Key stakeholders

- 3.6.1 The stakeholder organisations shown in Table 9 were also contacted to inform them of the consultation and provide the opportunity to comment.

Organisation name
Metropolitan Police Service
London Ambulance Service
London Fire Brigade
Road Haulage Association Ltd
Freight Transport Association Ltd
Internal departments within Southwark Council
Transport for London
Southwark Cyclists
Living Streets
Sustrans
Southwark Disability Forum
Southwark Disablement Association
London Travel Watch

Table 9 - Stakeholder organisations

4 Parking occupancy and duration surveys

4.1 Summary of parking occupancy and duration survey results

4.1.1 The methodology for the survey is discussed in section 3.1, the final report (excluding the mapped data) is provided in Appendix 2 and the weekday results are summarised in Table 10.

4.1.2 The mapped data can be found on our website³.

Street Name	Average occupancy %	Maximum occupancy %	Time of first max occupancy	Minimum occupancy %	Time of first min occupancy	Average % non-resident	
						all survey period 06:00-21:00	daytime 08:00-18:00
A215 Denmark Hill	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
A215 Herne Hill	80%	200%	19:00	0%	08:00	88%	54%
A2214 Village Way	69%	94%	10:00	13%	06:00	47%	25%
Ardbeg Road	89%	100%	17:00	78%	06:00	49%	35%
Arnould Avenue	88%	105%	07:00	65%	15:00	43%	31%
Basingdon Way	92%	101%	14:00	72%	20:00	46%	33%
Beckwith Road	99%	104%	12:00	93%	15:00	70%	48%
Blanchedowne	107%	116%	12:00	87%	20:00	55%	50%
Casino Avenue	70%	80%	11:00	58%	19:00	73%	67%
Champion Hill	42%	50%	07:00	27%	18:00	57%	45%
Crossthwaite Avenue	72%	93%	10:00	45%	20:00	58%	42%
Danecroft Road	79%	85%	06:00	69%	20:00	60%	46%
Domett Close	60%	80%	12:00	40%	17:00	60%	29%
Dowson Close	50%	59%	08:00	36%	18:00	52%	39%
Dylways	91%	100%	10:00	82%	16:00	52%	36%
Elfindale Road	98%	105%	11:00	85%	16:00	77%	67%
Elmwood Road	77%	86%	14:00	67%	06:00	75%	60%
Frankfurt Road	89%	94%	07:00	79%	18:00	61%	42%
Gylcote Close	34%	41%	09:00	25%	17:00	53%	50%
Half Moon Lane	107%	124%	17:00	54%	06:00	67%	50%
Monclar Road	84%	100%	07:00	69%	16:00	68%	28%
Nairne Grove	58%	84%	09:00	33%	06:00	65%	49%
Red Post Hill	56%	71%	12:00	32%	19:00	59%	32%
Sunray Avenue	50%	60%	11:00	31%	06:00	56%	31%
Unnamed Road	50%	62%	12:00	33%	17:00	65%	53%
Wanley Road	46%	52%	14:00	40%	15:00	52%	26%
Woodfarrs	67%	76%	10:00	52%	17:00	57%	37%
Wyneham Road	90%	97%	10:00	82%	18:00	64%	47%
Zone Average	74%	90%	N/A	54%	N/A	60%	43%
Zone Max	107%	200%	N/A	93%	N/A	88%	67%
Zone Min	34%	41%	N/A	0%	N/A	43%	25%

Table 10 - Revised weekday parking stress levels

Key

Very Low	0 to <=50%
Low to Medium	50 to <70%
Medium to High	>=70 to <80%
High	>=80 to <90%
Very High	>=90%

³ http://www.southwark.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/11991/parking_stress_survey_-_north_dulwich_and_denmark_hill_-_appendices

4.2 Review of survey data

4.2.1 It is noted that a draft of the survey data was published when the consultation commenced. This data has subsequently been reviewed and a number of small adjustments have been made in the final report. These adjustments reduced the number of safe parking spaces in four streets, which resulted in an increase of occupancy rate as shown in Table 11. This affected the overall parking stress level for the entire project area 70% to 74% for weekdays and from 53% to 55% for weekends.

Road	Weekday		Weekend	
	Original occupancy	Revised occupancy	Original occupancy	Revised occupancy
Champion Hill	26%	42%	32%	36%
Crossthaite Avenue	49%	72%	29%	42%
Dylways	47%	91%	79%	79%
Wyneham Road	85%	90%	66%	66%

Table 11- Revised occupancy

5 Summary of consultation results

5.1 Consultation returns

5.1.1 The consultation closed on **12 June 2015**. Public access to the online form was removed at close of play on this date. Questionnaires submitted by post were accepted up until the end of 17 June 2015.

5.1.2 Once all questionnaire responses were inputted, officers then verified the data to ensure that only one response per household was received and that all responses received were from an address within the project area. As a result 54 responses have been omitted from the data

5.1.3 Table 12 summarises the consultation returns.

Detail	Result
Number of properties consulted	2093
Number of responses	532
Number of duplicate responses	40
Number of responses received from outside the consultation boundary	14
Number of responses included in the analysis	478
Response rate	23%
Method of response	50% by post; 50% online

Table 12 – Analysis of consultation returns

5.2 Response rate

5.2.1 A total of **478** responses were received from the consultation. Based on the delivery of 2093 leaflets, this represents a **23%** response rate.

5.2.2 The overall response rate for the project area is shown in Table 13. A street-by-street analysis showing the number of properties can be found in Table 2 at the end of section 6 .

5.2.3 It should also be noted that not all of the respondents answered all of the questions within the questionnaire and that some questions allowed for multiple answers. Therefore the total number of responses for each question will not always be the same.

North Dulwich and Denmark Hill project area	Total returned	Total delivered	Overall response rate
TOTAL	478	2093	23%

Table 13 - Overall response rate




Figure 7 - Response rate by street

5.3 Omitted responses

- 5.3.1 During analysis, certain responses were omitted. These included duplicate responses and responses from outside of the area.
- 5.3.2 40 duplicate responses (responses from the same address) were removed.
- 5.3.3 13 responses were also received from properties situated outside the project boundary. These responses generally expressed concerns about being excluded from the consultation and the potential parking displacement that could be caused should a parking zone be introduced. The majority of these responses were received from Calton Avenue, Village Way and Woodwarde Road.
- 5.3.4 While some responses were received from Village Way, these were from properties outside of the consultation area, and have therefore not been included in the results.

5.4 Responses to questionnaire

5.4.1 Table 14 summarises the responses to each of the questions in the questionnaire.

Table 14 - Analysis of consultation responses

Question	Response
Q1. Are you a resident or business?	<p>The majority of responses were from residents, with a small number of businesses or properties with both residents and businesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Resident</i> 98% • <i>Business</i> 1% • <i>Business and resident</i> <1% <p>Streets with responses stating that they were businesses included Basingdon Way, Crossthwaite Avenue, Frankfurt Road, Herne Hill and Red Post Hill</p>
Q2. How many vehicles does your household regularly park on the street?	<p>The majority of respondents stated that they own one vehicle. Approximately 17% of respondents stated that they either did not own a vehicle or park off street.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>1 vehicle</i> 64% • <i>2 or more vehicles</i> 16% • <i>None (don't own a vehicle)</i> 11% • <i>None (park off street)</i> 6% • <i>No answer provided</i> 3%
Q3. What time of day do you or your visitors have difficulty parking?	<p>You</p> <p>The majority of respondents indicated that they had difficulty parking during the day on weekdays.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Never</i> 21% • <i>Monday to Friday (daytime)</i> 62% • <i>Monday to Friday (evening)</i> 31% • <i>Saturday</i> 14% • <i>Sunday</i> 11% <p>Your visitors</p> <p>The majority of respondents also reported that their visits had difficulty parking during the day on weekdays.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Never</i> 17% • <i>Monday to Friday (daytime)</i> 63% • <i>Monday to Friday (evening)</i> 27% • <i>Saturday</i> 16% • <i>Sunday</i> 10% <p>(Note that respondents were able to provide more than one answer to this question)</p>
Q4. Do you want a parking zone to be introduced in your street?	<p><i>This was the key question for the project.</i></p> <p>Overall, the majority of respondents were in favour of the introduction of a new parking zone within the project area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Yes</i> 59% • <i>No</i> 32% • <i>Undecided</i> 9% <p>Analysis on a street-by-street basis indicates some variation within the project area and this is presented in more detail in section 6.5.</p>

Question	Response
<p>Q5. If you answered “No” or “Undecided” to question 4, would you change your mind if a parking zone was to be proposed in only part of the project area? (i.e. if a neighbouring road was in favour, would you then want parking controls to be introduced in your street?)</p>	<p>This question is only of particular relevance where the road does not have a majority in favour of a zone but is adjacent to a road (or group of roads) that does. This criteria applies in the roads listed below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elmwood Road • Gylcote Close • Sunray Avenue • Woodfarrs <p>A detailed analysis of the responses to this question can be found in section 6.7.</p>
<p>Q6. If you answered “No” or “Undecided” to question 4 of this section, please can you tell us why?</p>	<p>Where respondents replied “No” or “Undecided” to question 4 above, the majority (77%) stated that the reason for their answer was the cost of permits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is not a parking problem 47% • <i>The cost of parking permits</i> 77% • Parking controls do not guarantee me a parking space outside my property 56% • Too much additional street clutter (road markings and signs) 25% • There is a parking problem, but a parking zone will not fix it 18% • Other (please specify) 24% <p>(Note that respondents were able to provide more than one answer to this question)</p>
<p>Q7. If a parking zone was introduced, which of the following hours would you like the parking zone to operate?</p>	<p>The most popular time selected was for a zone operating between 12 noon and 2pm</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10am to 12 noon (two hours per day) 13% • <i>12 noon to 2pm (two hours per day)</i> 38% • 10am to 2pm (four hours per day) 12% • 8.30am to 6.30pm (all day) 25% • Other 13% <p>It is noted that the total support for controls operating for just part of the day is 63%.</p>
<p>Q8. If a parking zone was introduced, which of the following <u>days</u> would you like the parking zone to operate?</p>	<p>Most respondents (70%) selected Monday to Friday as their preferred option for operational days if a parking zone were to be introduced.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Monday to Friday</i> 70% • Monday to Saturday 13% • Other 10%
<p>Q9. Do you have any comments about the proposal or the consultation?</p>	<p>Comments received during consultation are presented in detail in section 6.10.</p> <p>The table shows a comment for and a comment against parking controls from each street.</p> <p>Generally comments made mirror the respondents’ response to the headline question “Do you want a parking zone to be introduced in your street?”</p> <p>Any comments made about the proposed parking design have been considered and the detailed design drawing has been revised if there is justification to do so.</p>

5.5 Overall summary

- 5.5.1 A detailed analysis of the consultation results can be found in section 6. Table 2, presented in the Executive Summary, provides a summary of the headline figures of the consultation on a street-by-street basis.

6 Detailed analysis of consultation results

6.1 Introduction

6.1.1 This section provides detailed analysis of the responses to the questionnaire.

6.2 Q1. Are you a resident or business?

6.2.1 The majority of responses were from residents, with a small number of businesses or properties with both residents and businesses:

- Resident 98%
- Business 1%
- Business and resident <1%

6.2.2 Streets with responses from businesses included Basingdon Way, Crossthwaite Avenue, Frankfurt Road, Herne Hill and Red Post Hill.

6.3 Q2. How many vehicles does your household regularly park on the street?

6.3.1 The majority of respondents (80%) indicated that they parked at least one vehicle on street.

6.3.2 17% of respondents indicated that either they do not own a vehicle, or do not park a vehicle on street.




Figure 8 – How many vehicles does your household regularly park on street

6.4 Q3. What time of day do you or your visitors have difficulty parking?

6.4.1 Results indicate that residents and their visitors have greatest difficulty parking during the daytime on weekdays.




Figure 9 – What time of day do you or your visitors have difficulty parking?

6.4.2 Responses about “you” and “your visitor” are generally aligned.

6.4.3 The most common response for each street is shown in Table 15.

6.4.4 The majority of streets identify greatest difficulty with parking occurring during the day between Monday and Friday. Streets where the majority of respondents state that they never have difficulty parking are located to the north and east of Sunray Avenue. Only Wyneham Road has a majority of respondents in favour of controls during the weekday evenings.

Monday to Friday, daytime	Monday to Friday, evening	Never	No clear majority
Ardbeg Road	Wyneham Road	Crossthwaite Avenue	Arnould Avenue
Basingdon Way		Denmark Hill	Domett Close
Beckwith Road		Dowson Close	
Blanchdowne		Green Dale	
Casino Avenue		Gylcote Close	
Champion Hill		Wanley Road	
Danecroft Road			
Dylways			
Elfindale Road			
Elmwood Road			
Frankfurt Road			
Half Moon Lane			
Herne Hill			
Monclar Road			
Nairne Grove			
Red Post Hill			
Sunray Avenue			
Woodfarrs			

Table 15 - Question 3 by street

6.5 Q4. Do you want a parking zone to be introduced in your street?

6.5.1 The key question of “Do you want a parking zone to be introduced in your street” is tabulated (Table 16) and graphed (Figure 10) for the entire consultation area.

6.5.2 The result for the ‘headline’ question shows that a majority of residents in the project area want parking controls to be introduced in their street (Yes 59% v No 32%).

6.5.3 The response rate to the consultation is 23% overall. When examining the results on a street by street basis, the response rate peaked at 45% for Elfindale Road. There were no responses received at all from three streets – Henry Dent Close and Royal George Mews are private and a parking zone wouldn’t apply in these streets. Only 3 properties were consulted on Village Way as they border/face Half Moon Lane (see section 5.2 for further detail regarding the response rate).

Road Name	Yes	Undecided	Not Answered	No	Total returned	Total delivered	Response rate
Ardbeg Road	82%	12%	0%	6%	17	53	32%
Arnould Avenue	50%	0%	0%	50%	2	20	10%
Basingdon Way	50%	10%	0%	40%	20	234	9%
Beckwith Road	65%	5%	2%	28%	43	126	34%
Blanchedowne	67%	11%	0%	22%	9	50	18%
Casino Avenue	56%	12%	0%	32%	41	130	32%
Champion Hill	50%	0%	0%	50%	4	40	10%
Crossthaite Avenue	29%	0%	0%	71%	7	34	21%
Danecroft Road	79%	9%	0%	12%	34	81	42%
Denmark Hill	21%	14%	0%	64%	14	198	7%
Domett Close	40%	0%	20%	40%	5	32	16%
Dowson Close	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	28	7%
Dylways	57%	9%	0%	35%	23	123	19%
Elfindale Road	82%	4%	0%	14%	51	113	45%
Elmwood Road	48%	15%	0%	37%	27	91	30%
Frankfurt Road	68%	8%	0%	24%	38	95	40%
Green Dale	0%	0%	0%	100%	4	21	19%
Gylcote Close	33%	17%	0%	50%	6	23	26%
Half Moon Lane	79%	0%	0%	21%	14	34	41%
Henry Dent Close*	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	7	0%
Herne Hill	60%	0%	0%	40%	15	59	25%
Monclar Road	14%	14%	0%	71%	7	33	21%
Nairne Grove	38%	0%	0%	63%	8	24	33%
Red Post Hill	56%	18%	0%	26%	34	137	25%
Royal George Mews*	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	3	0%
Sunray Avenue	28%	16%	0%	56%	25	147	17%
Village Way*	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	3	0%
Wanley Road	50%	0%	0%	50%	4	42	10%
Woodfarrs	50%	8%	0%	42%	12	68	18%
Wyneham Road	75%	17%	0%	8%	12	44	27%
Grand Total	59%	9%	0%	32%	478	2093	23%

*No responses received from these streets

Table 16 - Do you want a parking zone in your street?


Key

Yes – Majority in favour

Undecided – No clear majority

No – Majority not in favour

6.5.4 The chart in Figure 10 shows the results for the project area as a whole. Figure 11 is a breakdown of the results for each street within the project area, in order of the number of “Yes” responses.



■ Yes ■ Undecided ■ No

Figure 10 – Question C4 chart




Figure 11 - Do you want a parking zone to be introduced in your street




Figure 12 - Distribution of responses to question C4




Figure 13 - Responses to question C4 by street

6.6 Q5. If you answered “No” or “Undecided” to question 4, would you change your mind if a parking zone was to be proposed in only part of the project area?

(i.e. if a neighbouring road was in favour, would you then want parking controls to be introduced in your street?)

6.6.1 Table 17 shows the number of responses to the question “would you change your mind if a parking zone was to be proposed in only part of the study area?” only from those answered “No” or “Undecided” to question 4 (“Do you want a parking zone in your street”) . Responses from persons that said “Yes “ to question 4 have been omitted from this table.

Row Labels	Yes	No	Undecided	Not Answered	Total
Ardbeg Road	1	1	1		3
Arnould Avenue		1			1
Basingdon Way	2	5	2	1	10
Beckwith Road	3	7	4		14
Blanchedowne	1	2			3
Casino Avenue	4	11	1	2	18
Champion Hill	1	1			2
Crossthaite Avenue		4		1	5
Danecroft Road	3	4			7
Denmark Hill	2	6	2	1	11
Domett Close		1	1		2
Dowson Close		2			2
Dylways	2	5	3		10
Elfindale Road	2	6	1		9
Elmwood Road	4	9	1		14
Frankfurt Road	3	3	4	2	12
Green Dale	1	1	1	1	4
Gylcote Close	1	2	1		4
Half Moon Lane		3			3
Herne Hill		5	1		6
Monclar Road	1	4	1		6
Nairne Grove		4		1	5
Red Post Hill	3	5	7		15
Sunray Avenue	6	10	1	1	18
Wanley Road		1	1		2
Woodfarrs	1	5			6
Wyneham Road	1	2			3
Total	42	110	33	10	195

Table 17 - Would you change your mind?

6.6.2 Where a response to question 5 was “Yes”, it is understood that the respondent would change their mind if a parking zone were to be implemented in a neighbouring street. Further analysis has been carried out to see what effect these respondents have upon the result to question 4.

6.6.3 Where a response to question 5 was “No” or “Undecided” it is understood that their response would have no effect on the result of question 4.

6.6.4 Table 18 lists roads that:

- **Do not** have a majority in favour of a parking zone according to question 4
- Area **adjacent to a road** that does have a majority in favour of a parking zone according to responses to question 4
- Would **change to a majority** in favour of a parking zone if a zone was introduced in an adjacent road, according to responses to question 5

Road Name	Response to question 4 "Do you want a parking zone in your street?"			Effect of responses to question C5 "Would you change your mind?"	
	Yes	Undecided	No	Adjusted "Yes" % for C4	% increase to C4 "Yes" total
Elmwood Road	48%	15%	37%	63%	15%
Gylcote Close*	33%	17%	50%	50%	17%
Sunray Avenue	28%	16%	56%	52%	24%
Woodfarrs	50%	8%	42%	58%	8%

*Adjusted figures for Gylcote Close show no clear majority for or against a parking zone

Table 18 - Effects of response to question 5 on question 4

6.6.5 The chart in Figure 14 shows the original percentages in favour of a parking zone from question 4 and the effect of the adjusted totals calculated above.

6.6.6 Note that the response from Gylcote Close after adjustment shows no clear majority in favour of a new parking zone with only 50% in favour. Also, Gylcote Close is not directly adjacent to a street that responded in favour of a new zone in question 4.




Figure 14 - Roads where responses to question 5 affect result

6.6.7 The effect of the adjustments to the responses to question 4 provided in Table 18 are shown in the map presented in Figure 15.



Figure 15 – Adjusted responses to question C4 by street

6.7 Q6. If you answered “No” or “Undecided” to question 4 of this section, please can you tell us why?

- 6.7.1 Those respondents who said “No” or “Undecided” to a new parking zone were asked to select a reason for their answer from a list, or to provide their own reason under “Other”.
- 6.7.2 Figure 16 shows the number and percentage of respondents to this question that selected each answer. Note that respondents were able to select more than one response.




Figure 16 - If you answered "No" or "Undecided" to question 4, please explain why

6.7.3 The major concerns appear to be related to cost or guaranteeing a parking place near to their own property. Other issues, such as street clutter, were less of a concern.

6.7.4 Those who selected "Other" could then provide additional reasons as to why they said "No" to new parking controls. A selection of comments is given below:

- *"You have no right to tax me to park outside my own house."*
- *"Parking controls would reduce chance of visitors finding a space."*
- *"Parking zones do not solve parking problems they merely pass it on to someone else."*
- *"Inconvenience of having to arrange parking permits for visitors."*
- *"I only need to use the car a few times during the weekdays."*
- *"We manage our parking on a first come first serve basis; we do not need parking control zone."*
- *"Doesn't mean residents will get to park as others may pay to park."*
- *"It is antisocial and causes issues for neighbouring streets."*
- *"Currently, poor parking in the estates are not policed. People double park, park on pavements and grass verges without comeuppance."*
- *"There is some pressure on places in the morning, and after school, but I don't consider this a problem. I can park outside or very near my house 90% of the time which seems pretty good!"*
- *"The Sunray Estate is a conservation area and the introduction of a CPZ would in my view encourage people to transform their front gardens into a parking, causing profound transformation to the look and feel of this cottage like area."*

6.8 Q7. If a parking zone was introduced, which of the following hours would you like the parking zone to operate?

6.8.1 Figure 17 shows the percentage breakdown of responses to this question. The majority of respondents (38%) selected 12noon to 2pm. Overall, the total percentage of respondents that preferred part-day controls was 63%.




Figure 17 - Which hours would you like the parking zone to operate?

6.8.2 A breakdown of the times preferred by each street is shown in Table 19. This shows that the majority of respondents from streets south of and including Red Post Hill would prefer that any new zone operate for two hours, from 12noon to 2pm.

8.30am to 6.30pm	10 am to 2 pm	12 noon to 2 pm	No clear majority
Domett Close Dylways Half Moon Lane Nairne Grove Woodfarrs	Monclar Road	Ardbeg Road Basingdon Way Beckwith Road Casino Avenue Danecroft Road Elfindale Road Elmwood Road Frankfurt Road Gylcote Close Herne Hill Red Post Hill Sunray Avenue	Arnould Avenue Blanchdowne Champion Hill Crossthwaite Avenue Denmark Hill Dowson Close Green Dale Wanley Road Wyneham Road

Table 19 - Breakdown of preferred times by street

6.8.3 13% of respondents indicated that they would prefer another time to those presented as options. Where respondents had indicated in response to question C4 that they did not want a parking zone, answers given here reflected that – e.g. No time, do not want a parking zone etc.

6.8.4 Suggestions for other times of operation included:

- "24 hours a day, 7 days a week (3 responses)"
- "6 am to 10 pm"
- "8am to 4pm"
- "8.30 am to 4pm"
- "8am to 10am"
- "Either of the two hour options"

- *“Please include evenings for Elfindale road. Major problem in the evening with people travelling in to attend Dee Dee’s bar.”*
- *“More than parking zone required in Nairne Grove.”*
- *“12 – 12.30 as short as possible”*
- *“12:00 to 13:00”*
- *“Except outside shops on Crossthwaite Avenue – must be free for 30 mins or so.”*
- *“Don’t know which I prefer, if any!”*

6.9 Q8. If a parking zone was introduced, which of the following days would you like the parking zone to operate?

6.9.1 Figure 18 shows the percentage breakdown of responses to this question. The majority of residents in the project area (70%) would prefer that any new zone operate from Monday to Friday. On a street by street basis, only Arnould Avenue had a majority in favour of a parking zone operating from Monday to Friday, while there was no clear majority for Dowson Close.




Figure 18 - Preferred days of operation for a parking zone

6.10 Q9. Do you have any comments about the proposal or the consultation?

6.10.1 Table 20 shows a selected comment for and against parking controls from each street.

6.10.2 A total of 380 comments were received; comments raised generally mirrored the view expressed to the key question, Question 4 “do you want a parking zone”. As well as this, comments were made about the feasibility design, which have been considered when revising the design drawing for this report.

6.10.3 All comments can be found in Appendix 4.

Table 20 - Comments

A comment from...	... in favour of parking controls	... against parking controls
Ardbeg Road	<i>“Over the past 12 years we have noticed that parking has become increasingly difficult near our home. I like the proposals and strongly support the introduction of a controlled parking zone.”</i>	No comments
Arnould Avenue	No comments	<i>“Currently around Arnould Avenue area it is the keepmoat contractors and their containers/cars have taken a fair number of parking spaces during the day. Parking restrictions will not solve the parking problem, however, it will mean residents with cars and their visitors have to pay for their parking. It is not fair for drivers to pay for road tax and also pay for parking in their own residential areas. Proposing (if the need be) residents to be given free parking permits including free permits for their visitors.”</i>
Basingdon Way	<i>“Restricted parking 12-2 would be ideal - similar to scheme opposite near ruskin park. My son and daughter have difficulty finding a parking space when visiting me. When I get up in morning the roads on this estate are already filling up with commuters.”</i>	<i>“I do not see the need for parking zone in this area, this a residential area.”</i>
Beckwith Road	<i>“I think that the area badly needs the introduction of a parking zone. My wife and I frequently find it impossible to park on our road on weekdays. The problem is much less acute on weekends, which leads us to conclude that commuters are parking their cars on our road before getting their train to work, thus leaving no parking spots for the people who actually live there.”</i>	<i>“The worst parking time is Sunday evening. This is not from commuters; more affluent residents have two cars. The problem could be solved along with visibility issues at junctions if permits were sold 1 per household with the second car permit at £1,000 or more. This could drive car ownership down. The introduction of permits will result in front gardens being turned into drives.”</i>
Blanchedowne	<i>“Very difficult to find parking spaces - disabled space in my street is often abused. I really would not mind paying a reasonable tax if it means that myself and my visitors would be able to park, students from king's college halls, staff from king's college hospital and lots of other people use all available parking spaces often having to drive quite a long way away in order to park.”</i>	<i>“I don't think permits are the answer. I think in order to utilise the space better, marked parking bay would work, at least in on a preliminary basis. Currently, you see cars parked with huge gaps between them, but not big enough for another car. By using permits you do limit the amount of parking for vehicles that are not registered to the street. Although I don't use parking in this way, many people on the street that live here do.”</i>
Casino Avenue	<i>“As well as problems with parking on Casino Avenue Monday to Friday, there are problems on Red Post Hill which make it very difficult for buses, particularly the stretch from Sunray Avenue to Herne Hill.”</i>	<i>“If the restricted parking zone is being proposed because of people using cars to travel to Kings College hospital then I suggest Southwark should provide more parking facilities at the hospital instead. This is NOT the way to do it. It will be expensive for residents and cause a HUGE headache for visitors, tradesmen etc. PLEASE: NO. NO. NO.”</i>

A comment from...	... in favour of parking controls	... against parking controls
Champion Hill	No comments related to consultation	<i>"I have been here 4 years I had 2 car before and I never had car park problem. I don't mind someone just come and park end of the day I will find front of my house car space in my front of flat house, 8 car space and 9 personal, lives this flat they all find space at front of their house no need parking zone:) thanks."</i>
Crossthwaite Avenue	<i>"We run a business and as people park in front of our shop and leave to go elsewhere, we are losing a lot of customers whom may shop around for an hour or so. If we could have a time limited bay, zone assigned in front of our shop for 2 cars or so, it would be of great help and if parking was free."</i>	<i>"1. No parking for 2 hours will affect the business as people using launderette need longer hours. 2 hours free parking will be better than not parking for 2 hours. 2. The cost for business permit is way too much for small and new businesses, like mine. I have open this business just about 3 years I am still not making any money or making small money, it is very hard for me to pay nearly £600 per year and I cannot stop using my car as it is part of the business."</i>
Danecroft Road	<i>"Very pleased you are consulting us and have responded to local concerns. Thank you!"</i>	<i>"Your consultation process is deliberately designed to allow minimum time for discussion with neighbours. Getting a letter from you this week, with a closing date of 12 June is not a democratic consultation period."</i>
Denmark Hill	<i>"On Blanchedowne towards the Community and welfare centre, instead of Permit and paid bay there should be at least 2 disabled bays and 1 or 2 permit and paid bays."</i>	<i>"Is there a problem? If so great - fix it. If not, and there isn't one for me - don't create one. This just seems like another waste of money trying to substantiate the councils traffic department. If you want to spend money - please fill in the pot holes between Herne Hill and Elephant and Castle and sort the disaster that is Elephant and Castle roundabout. Stop trying to raise more money for the council by finding more ways to tax us."</i>
Domett Close	<i>"My only suggestion would be that this should have been done sooner, and should be implemented ASAP. I have sat in my car in the evening for 45 minutes just waiting for a space to park. Non-residents has been parking regularly from 7 am to 7 pm. There is already a big enough demand for spaces from residents."</i>	<i>"In my street, Domett Close, the road has been narrowed with an extra layer of pavement to restrict parking making it harder for residents to park outside their property. This it seems unnecessary and counter productive."</i>
Dowson Close	No comments	<i>"We manage on a first come first serves on our estate, I cannot afford to pay for a parking bay or parking zone. I am working full time and not on benefit, cost of living is going up every day and some of us do not earn that much to pay for parking permit. So my answer is No to parking zone."</i>
Dylways	<i>"A parking zone is needed as a matter of urgency in Dylways, as a resident here I am finding it extremely difficult to park in the vicinity of my home and I know that all of my neighbours would also welcome controlled parking zones."</i>	<i>"We do not have enough parking spaces even at night so no parking restriction will solve our problem. The only things that will help us is more parking spaces."</i>
Elfindale Road	<i>"Excellent scheme propose."</i>	<i>"Looking outside my house at this exact moment on a Tuesday at 13.50 there are three free spaces that I can see and probably more around the corner. I wonder whether you should enquire amongst those who complain as to how many cars per household they actually have. And whether they expect to park right outside."</i>
Elmwood Road	<i>"The proposal looks very sensible. All I would add is that something will need to be done about the council owned garages area. This is already frequently used for parking when parking on street is busy, and there is a risk that this is seen as a free alternative to paying to park in a bay."</i>	<i>"The cost of parking will only continue to rise and may become unaffordable for some of us."</i>

A comment from...	... in favour of parking controls	... against parking controls
Frankfurt Road	<p><i>"I am thoroughly in favour of these new parking zones being brought in, but feel strongly that the timings of it should match the Herne Hill parking zone ie 12-2 Monday to Friday. If not, it will lead to huge confusion and possibly make residents regard the new introductions as merely a means of the council trying to catch out drivers and generate income - rather than what they are - a long overdue and much needed way to allow residents to be able to park on their own street."</i></p>	<p><i>"I believe that the present parking problems down our road (Frankfurt Road) as well as in the surrounding streets is due to the numerous skips and builders vans where residents are doing major renovations. Therefore, I think the problem is temporary and once the builders have gone, parking will no longer be an problem."</i></p>
Green Dale	No comments	<p><i>"I do not think parking is an issue on this estate and feel it would be wrong to charge residents for parking on a quiet street. This would be a money making exercise with no benefit for residents."</i></p>
Gylcote Close	<p><i>"If there is anything you can do here I would be very grateful"</i></p>	<p><i>"There isn't a parking problem on my street and I seriously do not want this."</i></p>
Half Moon Lane	<p><i>"The CPZ is badly needed, with massive pressure from commuter and worker parking in the area."</i></p>	<p><i>"In the part of Half Moon Lane nearest to North Dulwich station, home owners have off street parking. If we want people to use public transport, i think we need to allow some free parking for commuters who do not live near the station or who are elderly or disabled. Where home owners do not have off street parking they should have all day parking zones (if they want it). Near Herne Hill we also need to think about shopping - to sustain the shops some parking needs to be provided for shoppers."</i></p>
Herne Hill	<p><i>"This is long overdue. It is extremely frustrating when non-residents leave their cars on Frankfurt Road all day long or sometimes for days at a time. Since Lambeth introduced controlled parking on their side of Herne Hill Road, people now park on the Southwark side. It is clear that a majority of people parking here are using it for commuter parking and I welcome controlled parking and have no problem paying for a parking permit."</i></p>	<p><i>"The cost of permits especially visitors permits would be an unfair tax on local residents. I really would object to this as i doubt it would solve the issue, which is multi-car families. There does not seem, at the top of the proposed area to be a huge amount of commuter parkers."</i></p>
Monclar Road	<p><i>"Please, please, please can this be implemented. I would happily pay for parking so that I have the convenience of parking near our house."</i></p>	<p><i>"Do not want parking bays or restrictions and have to pay to park where I live. Do not feel we should be made to pay when already pay out enough to live here."</i></p>
Nairne Grove	<p><i>"In recent years our little one vehicle wide street has become a vehicle packed area partly due to overspill from nearby parking controlled zones. Some of the commuters - the main users - leave their cars badly parked often dangerously so. To make matters worse, our street is invaded by the twice daily school run where much of the driving and parking is horrendous. Vehicles now also do three point turns at other end of street is so choked. A nightmare and so, so dangerous."</i></p>	<p><i>"All parking permits will do is earn the council money and it will not help with parking. It will cause conflict between neighbours as well! It's all these parking restrictions that is causing the parking problems."</i></p>
Red Post Hill	<p><i>"Urgently needs a CPZ, lots of commuters park on Red Post Hill and then continue their journey by bus or train. Also, many people park weekends/evenings to use the leisure centre."</i></p>	<p><i>"I have noticed is that it is easier, for residents and visitors, to park in these streets than the many other places I have visited that have restricted parking.</i></p> <p><i>My main concern is that the CPZ decreases the number of available places and will exacerbate what I consider to be a very minor problem at a couple of times in the day.</i></p> <p><i>I don't want to have to pay to park outside my house, especially if it decreases the chance of being able to."</i></p>

A comment from...	... in favour of parking controls	... against parking controls
Sunray Avenue	<i>I would be very happy to see the parking zone introduced in my street because this has caused a lot of problem in parking. Thanks for this and I appreciate.!</i>	<i>"Introducing a parking zone will simply create a parking issue, particularly as the current proposal suggests that there will be double yellow lines in the cul de sac leading up to our property thus reducing the number of spaces available. Even on busy week days, we have never struggled to park our car on Sunray avenue and so we consider a parking zone unnecessary and disproportionate."</i>
Wanley Road	No comment	No comment
Woodfarrs	<i>"We need this introduced ASAP. The double yellow lines have made the situation 100 times worse. As I am writing this there is a car outside my property with a Kings College sticker on the windscreen. I cannot find a space and have parked my car almost at the main road, (Denmark Hill)."</i>	<i>"We do not need this on Denmark Hill estate. We are aware of staff from Kings College Hospital parking on the estate. However, these workers park when we leave for work and by the time we return from work they are not parked. This does not affect me personally."</i>
Wyneham Road	<i>"I'm happy for there to be controlled parking, as I have already emailed Southwark previously about parking problems in our area. The only thing that I'm concerned about is putting a telephone number on signs/meters to allow people to phone to get their tickets, I have been told that at the bottom of Herne Hill people still park in the mornings and phone the number from work still allowing them to park all day, whether this is correct or not, it could surely be a problem?"</i>	No comment

6.11 Other correspondence

- 6.11.1 The consultation also generated correspondence from residents in the project area relating to various issues regarding the consultation process, the design and general questions regarding the operation of parking in Southwark.
- 6.11.2 There were only five pieces of correspondence received from residents during the consultation relating to the project – these were responded to by an officer addressing the issues raised.
- 6.11.3 A small number of enquiries were received by telephone. These were mostly straightforward requests for information regarding the consultation which were addressed by the officer answering the call. Two calls provided feedback on the feasibility design plan which were recorded and considered when updating the plan.

6.12 Exhibition comments

- 6.12.1 As discussed in section 3.6, officers recorded comments made by persons attending the exhibitions. These included the following:
- 6.12.2 Key points raised by attendees to the exhibition were:
- *Concerns were raised regarding the removal of parking spaces on Red Post Hill. These included loss of parking between dropped kerbs and also concerns that the removal of parked cars would lead to an increase in average speed of traffic along Red Post Hill which was felt to be a safety issue.*

- Also on Red Post Hill, concerns were raised that some of the pedestrian traffic islands caused issues with loss of carriageway width, particularly for buses; residents reported that buses were driving partially on the footway to get past the traffic islands.
- Shopkeepers raised concerns regarding the proposed parking arrangements on Crossthwaite Avenue outside the shopping area.
- Parking problems caused or exacerbated by new CPZs in Lambeth on the other side of Herne Hill and by the extension to the existing Southwark HH zone.

6.12.3 Specific points raised at the exhibitions are detailed on a street by street basis in Table 21, together with officer responses.

Table 21 - Comments received at exhibition

Source	Comment(s)	Response
General	The general consensus from attendees to the exhibition was that the consultation has been well handled and that the consultation documents and plans were clear and easy to understand	Comments from this and other consultations are welcome and will be used to continuously feedback to and improve the informal consultation process. Positive comments tell us what we are doing right and will help us when preparing future consultations and associated documents
General	Parking problems caused or exacerbated by new CPZs in Lambeth on the other side of Herne Hill and by the extension to the existing Southwark HH zone. Other parking pressures from parking by commuters, parking by staff and visitors to the nearby hospital and parking for local schools	We are aware of this and since the implementation of parking zones in Lambeth, Southwark has received a large number of requests from residents requesting a parking zone or a consultation, this is explained further in section 2.4.
Crossthwaite Avenue	Shopkeepers were against the proposed parking arrangements on Crossthwaite Avenue outside the shopping parade, stating that they would have a negative impact on trading.	Existing proposals for 1 hour time limited parking are to be adopted for this section of road. It's also important to consider that the current parking arrangement offers no turnover in parking. Our proposal will ensure that there is regular turnover for genuine short stay parkers to the commercial premises.
Sunray Avenue	The feasibility design removed some parking on the south-east cul-de-sac section of Sunray Avenue opposite Crossthwaite Avenue. Requests were made to restore this.	Existing parking was on footway. However, on review permit parking bays will be added to the design for this section of road
Red Post Hill	Concerns were raised regarding the removal of parking spaces on Red Post Hill. These included loss of parking between dropped kerbs and also concerns that removal of parked cars would lead to an increase in average speed of traffic along Red Post Hill which was felt to be a safety issue.	Double yellow lines were proposed based on safety concerns (e.g. at junctions) and across dropped kerbs to maintain access. In some locations, double yellow lines were continued between dropped kerbs as off-street parking was available in order to minimise sign clutter. Restrictions on Red Post Hill are being reviewed – additional parking bays will be incorporated in the design where there is available space and it is safe to do so.

Source	Comment(s)	Response
	Concerns about the loss in parking in Red Post Hill outside the entrance to Sunray Gardens Park	Historically vehicles rarely parked in the section of the street. Our site observations have shown that when vehicles are parked at this location and when buses are stationary in the bus stops, this can lead to traffic congestion
	Also on Red Post Hill, concerns were raised that some of the pedestrian traffic islands caused issues with loss of carriageway width, particularly for buses, where residents reported that buses were having to drive partially on the footway to get past.	See above regarding review of parking spaces.
Village Way	Residents of Village Way attended and raised the issue of displacement, stating that this could affect them. Concerns from the Dance Club that runs classes daily throughout the week. The possible displacement would really affect the business	It would be more appropriate to review this once the consultation is complete, rather than on a hypothetical situation. As Village Way falls outside the project area, we are unable to make any parking proposals as part of this project. Dulwich community council will be asked to comment on the draft recommendations, in advance of the individual decision making (IDM), and members should use that opportunity to request any mitigating measures or further projects.
Various	Various individual design requests were made for bays outside individual properties	All design suggestions are welcome, if there is good justification to amend the feasibility design, we will consider these suggestions and propose changes where necessary, these will be included in our final design
Various	Some concerns were raised that having Pay by Phone parking spaces would lead to those spaces being occupied by commuters all day as they could pay remotely.	This is very rare and doesn't happen in any of our existing 21 parking zones. If this did happen, we are able to identify this and take appropriate action
Various (residents from roads included in earlier consultations)	Why are the council consulting again on the issue, residents said 'no' last time	This is due to the pressure the council has received from residents, it's important to consider that since the last consultation in 2009, parking zones have been introduced which may have caused a displacement into some of the streets in the project area.
Various	Why don't the council remove nearby CPZs to relieve parking pressure?	The nearby Herne Hill parking zone was introduced in 2002 and extended in 2006 and 2011. We have not to date received pressure from residents to remove the zone. This is an indication that the zone is working well. We are unable to review the parking zone recently installed by Lambeth as this is not under our jurisdiction.

Source	Comment(s)	Response
Various	Parking permits cost too much / why do we have to pay / the council just want to raise revenue etc.	<p>It is not possible for the council to provide parking permits at zero cost. The council's parking operation costs approximately £7 million per year. By law, we can only run this service from income that is generated from parking; we cannot use road tax, council tax, housing tax, etc.</p> <p>In terms of revenue, the parking account is ring fenced with legal restrictions on where it can be spent. Each council is also obliged to publish its parking income and expenditure on an annual basis, this is published within our Annual Transport Report</p> <p>Income from parking goes into the costs of operating and improving the system to meet the objectives of the parking controls. Any surplus is legally ring fenced and is spent on road safety (including school crossing patrols), nuisance/abandoned vehicles, network management and road maintenance.</p>
Various	The parking stress data says that there isn't a problem in my street.	The stress data can give us valuable information, such as who is parking in your street and for how long. It's important to consider that while the occupancy may be low in your street, this could potentially increase if a parking zone was introduced in a street where occupancy is high.
Various	The disabled bay is no longer in use	If you believe a disabled bay is no longer in use, i.e. due to the resident moving, we are able to make the necessary arrangement to remove the bay
Various	Your CPZ will result in a loss of space due to all the proposed DYLS	<p>Double yellow lines were proposed based on safety concerns (e.g. at junctions) and across dropped kerbs to maintain access.</p> <p>Some existing parking will be lost – however, it can be expected that the introduction of a parking zone will result in a reduction in the number of vehicles parked with the zone during its operational hours. For a local example, see the effect of a parking zone on Holmdene Avenue.</p>

7 Project conclusions and proposed options

7.1 Conclusions

- 7.1.1 Parking controls continue to provoke varied opinion. The perception on whether or not controls are required will depend on personal factors as well as the local conditions on-street.
- 7.1.2 It should also be noted that self-selection bias may occur in a study where potential respondents have control over whether they participate.
- 7.1.3 Typically when respondents are volunteers, people with strong opinions or substantial knowledge are more likely to reply, potentially making the sample non-representative of the general population. As the public response to a consultation is through self-administered surveys, there is no control over those who choose to fill out the questionnaire.
- 7.1.4 Inferential statistical methods rest on the assumption that the results from a small sample can be generalised to the population from which it was drawn. As feedback received tends to be a non-probabilistic sample, the statistical significance of our results (either in favour or against the proposals) has not been, nor should it be, extrapolated across all stakeholders. We can only be certain that the consultation feedback received is representative of those who chose to respond.
- 7.1.5 The results from the consultation are conclusive and show that in response to the headline question “Do you want a parking zone to be introduced in your street?”, there is a majority (59%) in favour of a parking zone across the project area as a whole.
- 7.1.6 The consultation results show a clear correlation between support for the parking zone and the average parking stress. Of the 12 streets that support a parking zone, the collective average parking occupancy was recorded as high at 84%. In comparison, of the 7 streets against a parking zone, the collective parking occupancy was recorded as low at 53%.
- 7.1.7 Although a majority of respondents for the project area are in favour of a parking zone, a street by street analysis was carried out and each individual response mapped in a geographical information system (GIS) which provided opportunity to look for patterns beyond that displayed on a street level.
- 7.1.8 The further analysis identified that parking stress and residents’ parking experience and views are different in the North Dulwich area when compared to the Denmark Hill area.
- 7.1.9 It is important that all options are explored when considering the introduction of a new parking zone and in the instance of this project, there is justification to consider a number of options in response to the project findings.
- 7.1.10 The proposed parking zone options are outlined in section 7.2.

7.2 Proposed parking zone options

7.2.1 The council have proposed four options that can be considered for the North Dulwich and Denmark Hill project area. The rationale, risks and benefits for each option is discussed as follows:

- **Option 1** – Introduce a parking zone in the entire project area
- **Option 2** – Introduce a parking zone in the North Dulwich and Denmark Hill area only
- **Option 3** – Introduce a parking zone in the North Dulwich area only
- **Option 4** – Do not introduce a parking zone within the project area

7.2.2 For ease of reference, we have divided the project area into three sections, A, B and C, as shown in Figure 19. Note that the proposed options may include more than one of these areas.



Figure 19 - Proposed parking zone options

7.2.3 The introduction of a new parking zone would result in lowered numbers of parked commuter vehicles, increasing available parking space. However, there is the financial impact on residents who will need to purchase a permit to park during the operating times of a parking zone and the environmental impact of traffic signs required to inform the public of the parking restrictions.

7.3 Option 1 – rationale, risk and benefits



Option 1	Rationale	Risks	Benefits
<p>Introduce a parking zone in the entire project area (Areas A, B and C in Figure 19).</p> <p>The new zone in this option would operate from 12noon to 2pm, Monday to Friday and be given the zone identification P.</p> <p>The Champion Hill area (Area B) should form an extension of the existing South Camberwell (L) parking zone.</p> 	<p>Consultation findings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 59% of respondents support a parking zone • A majority of 62% respondents indicated that they experience difficulty parking Monday to Friday (daytime) • 63% of respondents favoured controls for part of the day only • A majority of 70% respondents favoured controls to operate Monday to Friday. <p><i>Do you want a parking zone introduced in your street?</i></p>  <p>Parking stress surveys</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The overall average parking occupancy in the area was recorded at 71% 	<p>Although there is an overall majority in favour of a parking zone, some individual streets are not in support.</p> <p>This would result in the introduction of a parking zone to an area where 7 roads are against a parking zone and 8 roads where there is no clear majority</p> <p>The streets in the Champion Hill area do not currently support the introduction of a parking zone.</p> <p>The option may cause displacement to roads on the periphery of the proposed zone which could trigger the need for further consultation/ funding. However, displacement would be geographically limited because 3 of the 4 “sides” of the zone have existing zones in operation.</p>	<p>Will address the parking problem in the 12 streets that support a parking zone.</p> <p>There is no risk of parking displacement within the project area.</p> <p>Implementing a parking zone in the entire area would avoid the almost inevitable task of repeat consulting those areas excluded due to parking displacement.</p> <p>The proposed hours will offer greater parking flexibility than would otherwise be the case with the all day 8.30am to 6.30pm used in older parking zones in the borough.</p>

Table 22 – Option 1 - rationale, risks and benefits

7.4 Option 2 – rationale, risk and benefits



Option 2	Rationale	Risks	Benefits								
<p>Introduce a parking zone in the North Dulwich and Denmark Hill area only (Areas A and C in Figure 19).</p> <p>The new zone in this option would operate from 12noon to 2pm, Monday to Friday and be given the zone identification P.</p> 	<p>This option excludes the Champion Hill area where there was a majority 64% against a parking zone.</p> <p>Consultation findings for the North Dulwich and Denmark Hill area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 61% of respondents from streets in this area support a parking zone • A majority of 64% respondents indicated that they experience difficulty parking Monday to Friday (daytime) • 64% of respondents favoured controls for part of the day only • A majority of 71% respondents favoured controls to operate Monday to Friday <p><i>Do you want a parking zone introduced in your street?</i></p>  <table border="1"> <caption>Consultation Findings Data</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td>61%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No</td> <td>30%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Undecided</td> <td>9%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Response	Percentage	Yes	61%	No	30%	Undecided	9%	<p>The scheme may cause displacement to roads on the periphery of the proposed area which could trigger the need for further consultation and additional funding.</p>	<p>Will address the parking problem in the 12 streets that support a parking zone.</p> <p>The streets in the Champion Hill area do not currently support the introduction of a parking zone.</p> <p>Since the Denmark Hill and Champion Hill areas are not connected by road, the risk of displacement between these areas is low.</p> <p>Implementing a parking zone for this area would avoid the almost inevitable task of future repeat consultation in those areas excluded from this option.</p> <p>The proposed hours will offer greater parking flexibility than would otherwise be the case with the all day 8.30am to 6.30pm used in older parking zones in the borough.</p>
Response	Percentage										
Yes	61%										
No	30%										
Undecided	9%										

Table 23 – Option 2 – rationale, risk and benefits

7.5 Option 3 – rationale, risk and benefits



Option 3	Rationale	Risks	Benefits								
<p>Introduce a parking zone in the North Dulwich area only (Area C in Figure 19).</p> <p>The new zone would operate 12noon to 2pm, Monday to Friday and be given the zone identification P.</p> 	<p>This area only includes streets in the North Dulwich area.</p> <p>The majority of requests received since 2011 for a new parking zone came from streets in this area.</p> <p>Consultation findings for North Dulwich area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 68% of respondents from streets in this area support a parking zone • A majority of 70% respondents indicated that they experience difficulty parking Monday to Friday (daytime) • 69% of respondents favoured controls for part of the day only • A majority of 73% respondents favoured controls to operate Monday to Friday <p><i>Do you want a parking zone introduced in your street?</i></p>  <table border="1"> <caption>Do you want a parking zone introduced in your street?</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td>68%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Undecided</td> <td>10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No</td> <td>22%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Response	Percentage	Yes	68%	Undecided	10%	No	22%	<p>This will cause parking displacement and there will be an increase in parking stress in the uncontrolled streets in the Denmark Hill area</p> <p>The implementation of a parking zone in just this area is likely to increase the need to carry out another, future consultation in the Denmark Hill area due to the high probability of displacement combined with an already high level of parking stress in some streets in the Denmark Hill. This would require additional funding and further consultation which would take time to implement.</p>	<p>All roads in this area support a parking zone. Only Elmwood Road showed no clear majority in favour. However, Elmwood Road changes when asked if you would change your mind if a neighbouring street would support a parking zone.</p> <p>Includes the streets with the highest observed parking stress</p> <p>In line with the majority of respondents.</p> <p>Reflects the pre-consultation correspondence (ie where residents have written to the council requesting a zone).</p> <p>The proposed hours will offer greater parking flexibility than would otherwise be the case with the all day 8.30am to 6.30pm used in older parking zones in the borough.</p>
Response	Percentage										
Yes	68%										
Undecided	10%										
No	22%										

Table 24 – Option 3 – rationale, risk and benefits

7.6 Option 4 – rationale, risk and benefits

Option 4	Rationale	Risks	Benefits
<p>Not introduce a parking zone anywhere in the project area but introduce junction protection (double yellow lines) at all junctions to prevent obstructive or inconsiderate parking.</p> <p>This option would maintain the existing parking arrangements.</p>	<p>Parking zones can be unpopular in some areas with commonly expressed concerns including the cost of the permits and displacement of parking to adjacent areas, resulting in “creep” of parking zones.</p>	<p>This would not address any of the issues shown by the parking stress surveys or stated by local residents.</p> <p>The parking stress surveys show that a high number of streets in the project area are experiencing levels of parking stress that could be reduced by the use of a parking zone to remove commuter parking.</p> <p>The response to the questionnaire also indicates that there is local support for the introduction of a parking zone in the project area.</p> <p>Commuters would be able to continue parking in the area contributing to the overall high parking stress.</p> <p>Double yellow lines will be installed at junctions regardless of the outcome of this consultation (in the North Dulwich Triangle area of Dulwich Community Council). Some residents have raised concerns that this reduces the amount of available parking space. These concerns would not be mitigated by the reduction in non-resident parking activity which would normally be expected from the introduction of permit parking bays.</p>	<p>Residents and businesses would not incur the cost of permits to park within the area.</p> <p>No additional street clutter from signs and posts.</p> <p>Double yellow lines at junctions would remove obstructive or inconsiderate parking and improve safety.</p> <p>Commuters would still be able to park and access nearby facilities (e.g. rail stations, businesses).</p> <p>Double yellow lines will be installed at junctions regardless of the outcome of this consultation, which will improve vehicular and pedestrian safety.</p>

Table 25 – Option 4 – rationale, risk and benefits-

7.7 Other proposals, notes and comments

7.7.1 The following proposals or changes are recommended to be incorporated into the final design. These include changes to parking arrangements made following feedback from this consultation, or by the council as part of other works.

Table 26 – Other proposals, notes and comments

Reference	Road	Comment
1	All junctions	Regardless of the outcome of this consultation, double yellow lines will be recommended for all junctions in the project area.
2	Listed junctions in the “North Dulwich Triangle” area of Village Ward	<p>The installation of double lines at junctions within the project area was consulted on earlier and has been approved for the following junctions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 <p>The double yellow lines at the above locations were approved at Dulwich community council on 17 March 2015. During April 2015, the council commenced statutory consultation. Objections were received during this period and were reported to Dulwich community council on 24 June 2015 for determination where the three objections were rejected. Officers were instructed to proceed and make the traffic order but that implementation is deferred until this parking zone consultation is complete.</p>
3	Ardbeg Road	<p>Proposed permit + paid bays relocated from northern end (at junction with Red Post Hill) to southern end (junction with Half Moon Lane, following feedback received during consultation.</p> <p>Note that Ardbeg Road has a no entry restriction at its junction with Red Post Hill. Moving the permit + paid bays to its junction with Half Moon Lane makes them more accessible as vehicles do not need to travel the whole length of Ardbeg Road to reach them.</p>
4	Red Post Hill	<p>Additional permit parking bays have been included in the design for this road following feedback from consultation at the following locations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. One permit bay outside Nos. 40 and 42 b. One permit bay outside No 64 c. One permit + paid bay on the south side of Red Post Hill outside Sunray Gardens
5	Casino Avenue (fronting Nos. 9 to 45 and Nos. 55 to 83).	<p>The parking ‘bays’ within these two cul-de-sacs have, during the course of (but independently of) this project, been adopted as public highway.</p> <p>This adoption will enable the council to introduce any parking controls that are approved by way of this project.</p> <p>It is now proposed to introduce a permit parking area for these cul-de-sacs.</p>

Reference	Road	Comment
6	Sunray Avenue (fronting Nos. 18 to 40 and 81 to 111).	<p>Some parts of these two roads are not adopted highway. During the course of (but independently of) this project, the council has taken steps to adopt these as public highway but a final decision remains to be made.</p> <p>If the adoption is completed, it will enable the council to introduce any parking controls that are approved by way of this project. If they remain unadopted then it is unlikely that any parking controls can be introduced by way of this project and would result in sections of unregulated kerb space within the boundary of a wider zone, which could lead to parking and/or access problems.</p> <p>Assuming that the adoption is completed, it is proposed to introduce a permit parking area for this section of road.</p>
7	Crossthaite Avenue	<p>Shop owners with premises on Crossthaite Avenue expressed concerns that proposed shared used (permit +paid) parking bays outside the shops would deter shoppers and negatively impact their business. Earlier proposals for the provision of time limited parking at this location will replace the shared use parking should a parking zone be approved.</p> <p>This will be a parking bay with a maximum 1 hour stay to operate from Monday to Friday between 8.30am and 6.30pm</p>
8	Herne Hill	Proposals for the provision of time limited parking (maximum 1 hour stay to operate from Monday to Friday between 8.30am and 6.30pm) included in design outside shops at Nos. 75 and 77 Herne Hill.
9	Champion Hill	Additional double yellow line proposed on west side of Champion Hill between Arnould Avenue and the east – west arm of Champion Hill. The carriageway width is insufficient for cars to be parked on both sides of the road. The proposed double yellow line formalises the current parking arrangements where vehicles are normally parked on the east side.
10	Various	<p>New dropped kerbs for access to private driveways have been installed or scheduled for installation by the council since the start of the consultation process. The proposed design for the following roads will be amended to include the new dropped kerbs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> d. Blanchedowne (two new dropped kerbs outside Nos. 42/44 and No. 48) e. Dylways (one new dropped kerb outside No. 23, see 11b) f. Red Post Hill (one new dropped kerb outside No. 28) g. Nairne Grove (one new dropped kerb outside No. 14
11	Various	<p>Additional disabled bays removed, installed or scheduled for removal/installation by the council since the start of the consultation process. The proposed design for the following roads will be amended to include the new dropped kerbs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Blanchedowne (one new disabled bay outside Nos. 21/23) b. Dylways (disabled bay outside No. 23 removed, see 10b)
12	Basingdon Way	Turning head at by the entrance to Tayside Court and Swinburne Court. Proposed parking bays replaced by double yellow lines to maintain access for refuse collection.

APPENDIX 1 – Parking zones in the London Borough of Southwark

APPENDIX 2 – Parking occupancy and duration surveys

APPENDIX 3 – Consultation materials

APPENDIX 4 – Comments from consultation