

Responses to objections

Ref	Summary Response	Representation	Officers response
Obj1	<p>Waste of public money.</p> <p>Proposal will cause obstruction and delays to traffic (change in priority).</p>	<p>1 I object to these orders because they are a waste of public money. Residents of this area felt so strongly about these suggestions they had an independent consultation done and you seem to be totally ignoring the recommendations from this. The results of the independent consultation support Southwark's Kerbside strategy for healthy streets. It is therefore a waste of public resources to be consulting on an option which local residents have already said they disagree with.</p> <p>2 I further object to the proposed CALTON AVENUE cycle lane, on the grounds that it will cause serious obstruction and delay to traffic approaching the traffic lights at the Dulwich Village junction. This is because it will reduce the approach carriageway from three lanes to two, so reducing the traffic capacity by a third. This will cause difficulty to the flow of the traffic on Carlton Avenue and make it difficult for unconfident cyclists to manage.</p> <p>3 Removing the right of way for traffic from Court Lane to Carlton Avenue will speed the traffic up down Carlton Avenue causing risks to cyclists and pedestrians. The current right of way from Court lane to the junction means traffic has to slow down and be careful, which makes it safer. I am very familiar with this junction, having used it both as a driver, a cyclist and a pedestrian for about 20 years. The traffic flow is only heavy at rush hours for about 2 hours, during the remainder of the day there is no problem. There have been no accidents here, so it seems to be a waste of money just to allow cars to go faster.</p> <p>4 Introducing a separate cycle lane at the junction of Dulwich Village will cause a traffic build up and worsen the flow of traffic.</p> <p>5 If as proposed the cycle lane goes first, the trialling goes second this is recklessness with public money and potentially a waste. This is another ground for rejection.</p>	<p><u>Waste of Money</u></p> <p>Quietways are part of the council's Transport Plan and cycling strategy which aims at delivering polices within the plan by improving the highway infrastructure to encourage walking and cycling. The plan is aligned with the Major's Transport Strategy and healthy street principles. Cycling and walking improves health and reduce congestion. Cycling and walking infrastructure improves road safety conditions and enhance quality of the public realm. Funding for transport improvements schemes are ring fenced. For more information on the benefits of quietway programme refer to link: http://content.tfl.gov.uk/pic-161130-07-cycle-quietways.pdf</p> <p><u>Segregated Cycle Lane</u></p> <p>Cyclists have their own space and phase which will help reduce conflict with traffic. Traffic modelling shows that the cycle lane will not adversely affect the junction operation. Segregated cycle lanes are fundamental to the safe operation of the scheme .Independent assessment of the impact of the changes on delays and congestion shows that the changes will improve the operation and flow of traffic. This feature will be trialled with temporary material to assess its impact. Any changes will be carefully considered.</p>

Ref	Summary Response	Representation	Officers response
			<p><u>Change in priority at Calton Avenue</u></p> <p>The change in priority at Calton Avenue will be trialled and assessed. If impact is deemed unacceptable priority will be restored to Court Lane. The trial can be done only after the new layout is in place.</p>
Obj 2	<p>Alternative design is being considered by residents.</p> <p>New road marking for parking outside shops on Dulwich Village not flagged during consultation.</p>	<p>I live on Woodwarde Road and have used the Calton Avenue/ Dulwich village junction for 13 years. I object to the TMO happening now when Councillor Wingate had promised that alternative options would be considered. It is a very complex junction and requires a thorough investigation, not a rushed ill thought through proposal. There are changes in the proposals which have not been discussed by the public e.g. Changes to parking by the shops.</p>	<p><u>Alternative scheme by residents</u></p> <p>Alternative design is in very early stages. Consulted design will deliver significant safety benefits and can be implemented within programme and on budget.</p> <p><u>New marking outside shops on Dulwich Village</u></p> <p>Marking two or three bays outside shops on Dulwich Village will improve safety for all road users and ensure the efficient use of space.</p>
Obj 3	<p>Waste of public money.</p> <p>Cycle lane will cause obstruction and delays to traffic.</p> <p>Trialling should be done before scheme is implemented.</p> <p>Parking restriction will adversely affect access to shops and restrict</p>	<p>I object to the following elements of the proposals covered in the Public Notice re QW7 published in June 2017, using as a reference the paragraphs of the front public notice summary of the effects</p> <p>A) Objections re: Cycle Lanes at Dulwich Village 2. The effect of the orders would be:</p> <p>(a) to introduce a south-westbound segregated cycle lane in CALTON AVENUE between its junctions with Court Lane and Dulwich Village, aligned with the south-eastern kerb;</p> <p>(b) to introduce a north-eastbound segregated cycle lane in TURNEY ROAD between a point 28 metres south-west of the south-western kerb-line of Dulwich Village and its junction with Dulwich Village, aligned with the north-western kerb.</p>	<p><u>Waste of Money</u></p> <p>Quietways are part of the council's Transport Plan and cycling strategy which aims at delivering policies within the plan by improving the highway infrastructure to encourage walking and cycling. The plan is aligned with the Mayor's Transport Strategy and healthy street principles. Cycling and walking improves health and reduce congestion. Cycling and walking infrastructure improves road safety conditions and enhance quality of the public realm. Funding for transport improvements schemes are ring fenced. For more information on the benefits of Quietway programme refer to link: http://content.tfl.gov.uk/pic-161130-07-cycle-quietways.pdf</p>

Ref	Summary Response	Representation	Officers response
	<p>access for those with reduced mobility.</p> <p>Road humps will impede emergency access.</p> <p>Scheme is premature.</p> <p>Should await alternative design by residents.</p> <p>Concerns about marking parking bays adjacent to shops on Dulwich Village.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I object to these orders on the grounds that they are a waste of public money. This is because these cycle lanes are part of one of two different options that could be adopted for the QW7 at these points, both of which have been under consideration for adoption. The alternative option does not require this form of cycle lanes No decision has yet been published as to which option is to be adopted. It is therefore a waste of public resources to be consulting on an option which may not be adopted. 2. I further object to the proposed CALTON AVENUE cycle lane, on the grounds that it will cause serious obstruction and delay to traffic approaching the traffic lights at the Dulwich Village junction. This is because it will reduce the approach carriageway from three lanes to two, so reducing the traffic capacity by a third. 3. I am very familiar with this junction, having used it both as a driver, a cyclist and a pedestrian for about 40 years in various configurations over this period. This is a complex traffic location with the junction between Calton Avenue and Court Lane close the traffic lights, which already results in unstable congested traffic flow, only relieved by occasional 3-lane flow into the junction. 4. It has already been acknowledged that it is almost impossible to traffic-model this junction. Provision for trialling the proposed layout here is included in the decisions so far. This trialling must be done first before introducing the cycle lane. 5. If as proposed the cycle lane goes first, the trialling goes second this is recklessness with public money and potentially a waste. This is another ground for rejection. <p>B) Objections re proposed parking restrictions at Calton Avenue 2</p> <p>(f) to introduce new or extend existing lengths of 'at any time' waiting restrictions in: CALTON AVENUE (i) on both sides at its junction with Woodward Road, (ii) on the north-west side at its junction with Gilkes Crescent; (iii) on both sides between its junctions with Gilkes Crescent and</p>	<p><u>Segregated Cycle Lane</u></p> <p>Cyclists have their own space and phase which will help reduce conflict with traffic. Traffic modelling shows that the cycle lane will not adversely affect the junction operation. Segregated cycle lanes are fundamental to the safe operation of the scheme. Independent assessment of the impact of the changes on delays and congestion shows that the changes will improve the operation and flow of traffic. This feature will be trialled with temporary material to assess its impact. Any changes will be carefully considered</p> <p><u>Change in priority at Calton Avenue</u></p> <p>The change in priority at Calton Avenue will be trialled and assessed. If impact is deemed unacceptable priority will be restored to Court Lane. The trial can be done only after the new layout is in place.</p>

Ref	Summary Response	Representation	Officers response
		<p>Dulwich Village. I object to this proposal for new parking restrictions both in Gilkes Crescent at its intersection with Calton Avenue, and in Calton Avenue between Gilkes Crescent and the junction with Court Lane. Reasons follow but can be summarised as:</p> <p>a) The parking restrictions will adversely affect access to the shops in Calton Avenue and adjoining part of Dulwich Village and so will have a bad effect on the businesses themselves</p> <p>b) the parking restrictions are not needed to improve safety and will not improve conditions for the QW:</p> <p>1. The existing much used parking here is an important part of the access (particularly for those many people of limited personal mobility dependent on motor transport) to get to the shops in Calton Avenue and round the corner into Dulwich Village north leg and the important Chemist and Post Office there (where parking also is proposed to be restricted). IF this parking is removed or seriously reduced it will have a negative effect on the viability of the shops and will also make a serious restriction for many of reduced mobility. Southwark Council has a current policy to support and revive various highstreets in LBS. This proposed parking restriction is in conflict with that policy.</p> <p>2. The stated reasons for reduction of parking here are not valid.</p> <p>a) It has been stated as necessary to improve safety: but there is no record of any accidents on this length in the last ten years. The safety argument has not been addressed to the locality but is simply based on generic principles which do not apply here.</p> <p>b) It is stated to be necessary to remove a bottle neck: but this is mistaken as there is easy two-way traffic with the parking in place. It looks as if there was no accurate survey of this length of Calton Avenue, and the proposal is based on a misestimate of the width of the road.</p> <p>c) (But there is a real bottle neck in the middle part of the length between Gilkes Crescent and Woodwarde Road when cars park on both sides</p>	<p><u>Parking and loading restrictions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The loading and parking restrictions will: improve sight lines, provide clear access for pedestrians crossing the road. This is consistent with the council's borough wide junction protection approach. • Improve safe access for two-way traffic and remove pinch points which cause delays, safety issues and altercations during the rush hour period. • The restrictions considered with a balanced and considerate approach, to reduce any adverse impact on parking needs of local residents and consistent with policies set out in paragraph 15 of report.

Ref	Summary Response	Representation	Officers response
		<p>there. But that does not seem to be covered by the present order proposals. Furthermore, it is not a problem for the aims of the QW. The bottleneck makes a positive contribution to calming the traffic, and making the route more suitable for quietway cycling.)</p> <p>d) A further reason given for the parking restriction is stated to be '<i>Remove pinch points which impede traffic flow</i>'. However a) this is not a pinch point, b) the order seems to have forgotten that Calton Avenue is supposed to be a quietway, and anything which reduces and slows traffic – particularly through traffic – will improve the low-speed environment that is highly desirable for QW cyclists.</p> <p>e) There is also reference to safer junctions with double yellow lines, but the tee junction with Gilkes Crescent is into a short length I would say about 50m of road, blocked by a permanently closed gate. There is almost no traffic going in and out of this junction. There is no record of any accidents here, the double yellow line restrictions proposed here are a complete misunderstanding of the situation giving no actual safety benefit whatsoever and with only negative consequences by further restricting parking to the inconvenience of both visitors and residents.</p> <p>f) Finally in the official reasons given for the various measures there is reference to Encourage safer driving behaviours with the introduction of additional traffic calming measures where necessary. The parking at this location provides real traffic calming and should be retained both for that reason and for the benefit of the area.</p> <p>g) The best environment for a quietway street is not going to be provided by unthinking application of highway principles of traffic control that are designed for maximising traffic through flow and traffic speed. This location deserves proper and detailed attention to the best interests of both the QW cyclists, the residents, the visitors and the businesses in the area.</p>	

Ref	Summary Response	Representation	Officers response
		<p>C) Objections re: road humps</p> <p>Southwark Council hereby GIVES FURTHER NOTICE under sections 90A to 90I of the Highways Act 19804 and in accordance with the provisions of the Highways (Roadhumps) Regulations 19995 and the Highways (Traffic calming) Regulations 19996, propose to construct:</p> <p>(b) road humps of sinusoidal cross-section construction, 3.7 metres in length, having a maximum height of 100 millimetres and covering the greater width of the carriageway, centred upon the following locations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I object to these orders because the proposed road humps are too big. They conflict with London fire service access recommendations which advises best no speed humps or if deemed necessary, maximum 50mm. See following quotation. Speed humps are even worse for ambulance access, particularly when carrying patients whose conditions may be worsened by being shaken by speed humps. 2. There is a further problem that there is a long history of road humps put in under Southwark's authority being oversized and incorrectly profiled, to the great inconvenience and danger of everyone. In the case of Court Lane a few years ago, this was acknowledged and partially corrected. However, many oversized road humps remain in place including in my road of Woodwarde Road and in Turney Road east end. These oversized humps endanger users fire victims and patients by delay of arrival of ambulances and fire engines, and by delaying and shaking emergency ambulance patients on the way to A&E – double hazards that should have no place in modern traffic management schemes. 3. Until there is a proper independent and accountable mechanism for checking of the sizes of new road humps no new humps should be installed. As there is no such mechanism in place at the present time, I further object to these speed humps being installed at all. <p>I quote (FIRE SAFETY GUIDANCE NOTE: Access for Fire Appliances Number GN29): Although the LFEPA is supportive of the aims of traffic management schemes it should be remembered that each road hump</p>	<p><u>Road Humps</u></p> <p>Design of road humps is consistent with road humps regulations and with the council's usual standards. Road humps will ensure borough wide 20mph speed zone is self-enforcing.</p> <p><u>Gilkes Crescent junction with Calton Avenue</u></p> <p>Parking occurs close to Gilkes Crescent junction with Calton Avenue. Although this is a cul de sac, the number of pupils crossing the junction necessitates the need for safety improvement.</p>

Ref	Summary Response	Representation	Officers response
		<p>delays a fire appliance by approximately ten seconds. (Six humps represent a delay of one minute). Every consideration should be given to the introduction of other traffic calming measures in place of road humps with road humps only being used to complement the total scheme.....</p> <p>Size: Humps of 50mm high are preferable to those of 75mm or 100mm high. The overall length of a specific type of hump should be as near to the recommended minimum as possible.</p>	
Obj 4	<p>Segregated cycle lane.</p> <p>Parking/Loading restrictions.</p>	<p>I wish to object to those aspects of the above TMO as they relate to the Village Way junction, Calton Avenue, Court Lane and Woodward Road in relation to segregated cycle ways and parking restrictions, as these are premature pending a decision by Cllr. Wingfield on the type of junction proposed in Dulwich for this Quietway route.</p> <p>This TMO is broader than that consulted upon, fails to consider a much improved shared space environment and is therefore failing the democratic process enshrined in the Road Traffic Regulations Act and its responsibility towards residents.</p>	<p><u>Segregated Cycle Lane</u></p> <p>Cyclists have their own space and phase which will help reduce conflict with traffic. Traffic modelling shows that the cycle lane will not adversely affect the junction operation. Segregated cycle lane are fundamental to the safe operation of the scheme .Independent assessment of the impact of the changes on delays and congestion shows that the changes will improve the operation and flow of traffic</p> <p>This feature will be trialled with temporary material to assess its impact. Any changes will be carefully considered</p> <p><u>Parking and loading restrictions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The loading and parking restrictions will: improve sight lines, provide clear access for pedestrians crossing the road. This is consistent with the council's borough wide junction protection approach. • Improve safe access for two-way traffic and remove pinch points which cause delays, safety issues and altercations during the rush hour period.

Ref	Summary Response	Representation	Officers response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The restrictions considered with a balanced and considerate approach, to reduce any adverse impact on parking needs of local residents and consistent with policies set out in paragraph 15 of report
Obj 5	<p>Not to proceed with Quietway scheme until issue with school coaches is resolved.</p> <p>Proposal not discussed with the public e.g. marking parking outside shops on Dulwich Village.</p>	<p>I am writing both personally and on behalf of the Calton Avenue Residents Association in relation to the traffic orders above.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I support entirely the view expressed in recent correspondence between you and Brigid Gardner among others that unless the school coach problem is dealt with, there is no possibility whatsoever of the Dulwich Village Junction part of Quietway 7 succeeding, no matter what scheme is introduced. This view is entirely consistent with the views expressed by residents during the long consultations and discussions over the last couple of years. I am grateful for your support for these sentiments and for your encouraging officers to push for a resolution of the issue with TfL. As it is common ground - between you and your officer colleagues at Southwark on the one hand and local residents of Dulwich on the other - that this part of Quietway 7 needs a solution to the coach problem and that solution depends upon action by TfL, I would ask that implementation of the traffic orders and the DV junction scheme overall are delayed until the coach problem has been satisfactorily resolved. The proposals for a second local Quietway route using Woodwarde Road reinforce the case for a considered and consistent approach that makes overall sense for all the various stakeholders. As to the specific details of the draft Orders, there is at least one that is a complete surprise: in relation to the echelon parking in Dulwich Village between the DV junction and Gilkes Place, the proposal that “reduces in length and formalises an existing free short stay parking placecomplementary to a scheme of 'Quietway' pedal cycle priority measures.” I am not aware of any previous consultation on this proposal. The detailed implications of this Order on available parking places are not clear at all from the text of the order and there has not been sufficient time to explore them. 	<p><u>Coaches on Calton Avenue</u></p> <p>Council officers are working closely with TfL and the foundation coach service to find the best possible resolution of this issue. A meeting was held recently with key local stakeholders and TfL where 5 alternative options were considered. A preferred option has been shortlisted and borough officers and TfL are working on delivering this option in as short a timescale as possible, funded by TfL.</p> <p><u>New marking outside shops on Dulwich Village</u></p> <p>Marking out the parking outside the shops on Dulwich Village will improve safety for all road users:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Buildout the footway to improve visibility to the traffic lights and shelter the parking (there will be a loss of approximately one space, closer to the traffic lights.) Mark out a few bays (2 No) to ensure cars are aligned properly and not sticking out onto the traffic lane. This will also ensure efficient use of space with free parking.

Ref	Summary Response	Representation	Officers response
		<p>5. As a likely consequence of the recently introduced N Dulwich CPZ, parking in Calton Avenue during the core of term time weekdays is largely impossible: available space is fully occupied. What is clear is that the other Orders will further reduce parking available in Calton Avenue. As far as parking is concerned, you will understand those of us that feel we are clamped in a salami slicer, especially in the Woodwarde to Dulwich Village section of Calton Avenue. Please may we have an explanation of why the echelon parking Order is considered necessary and whether it will reduce available parking places and if so by how many? In the meantime, please delay the echelon parking Order until its implications may be fully explored.</p>	
Obj 6	<p>Parking restriction will affect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to shops on Calton Avenue and Dulwich Village • Affect businesses • Restrict those with reduced mobility <p>Use parking to calm traffic</p>	<p>I object to this proposal for new parking restrictions both in Gilkes Crescent at its intersection with Calton Avenue, and in Calton Avenue between Gilkes Crescent and the junction with Court Lane. Reasons follow but can be summarised as:</p> <p>a) The parking restrictions will adversely affect access to the shops in Calton Avenue and adjoining part of Dulwich Village and so will have a bad effect on the businesses themselves.</p> <p>b) The parking restrictions:</p> <p>1. The existing much used parking here is an important part of the access (for those many people of limited personal mobility dependent on motor transport) to get to the shops in Calton Avenue and round the corner into Dulwich Village north leg (where parking also is proposed to be restricted). IF this parking is removed or seriously reduced it will have a negative effect on the viability of the shops and will also make a serious restriction for many of reduced mobility. Southwark Council has a current policy to support and revive various highstreets in LBS. This proposed parking restriction is in conflict with that policy.</p> <p>2. The stated reasons for reduction of parking here are not valid.</p>	<p><u>Parking and loading restrictions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The loading and parking restrictions will: improve sight lines, provide clear access for pedestrians crossing the road .This is consistent with the council's borough wide junction protection approach. • Improve safe access for two-way traffic and remove pinch points which cause delays, safety issues and altercations during the rush hour period. • The restrictions considered with a balanced and considerate approach, to reduce any adverse impact on parking needs of local residents and consistent with policies set out in paragraph 15 of report. • A new loading bay is to be introduced on Calton Avenue to accommodate business activities.

Ref	Summary Response	Representation	Officers response
		<p>a) It has been stated as necessary to improve safety: but there is no record of any accidents on this length in the last ten years. The safety argument has not been addressed to the locality but is simply based on generic principles which do not apply here.</p> <p>b) It is stated to be necessary to remove a bottle neck: but this is mistaken as there is easy two-way traffic with the parking in place. It looks as if there was no accurate survey of this length of Calton Avenue, and the proposal is based on a misestimate of the width of the road.</p> <p>c) A further reason given for the parking restriction is stated to be <i>Remove pinch points which impede traffic flow</i>. However, a) this is not a pinch point, b) the order seems to have forgotten that Calton Avenue is supposed to be a quietway, and anything which reduces and slows traffic – particularly through traffic – will improve the low-speed environment that is highly desirable for QW cyclists.</p> <p>d) There is also reference to <i>Safer junctions with double yellow lines</i> but the tee junction with Gilkes Crescent is into a short length I would say about 50m of road, blocked by a permanently closed gate. There is almost no traffic going in and out of this junction. There is no record of any accidents here. The double yellow line restrictions proposed here are a complete misunderstanding of the situation with only negative consequences by further restricting parking to the inconvenience of both visitors and residents.</p> <p>e) Finally in the official reasons given for the various measures there is reference to <i>Encourage safer driving behaviours with the introduction of additional traffic calming measures where necessary</i>. The parking at this location provides real traffic calming and should be retained both for that reason and for the benefit of the area.</p>	<p><u>Alternative scheme by residents</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The alternative design is at a very early stage and will require significant review and expenditure. • The consulted design will deliver safety benefits for all road users and comparatively deem deliverable within programme and budget. The consensus was therefore to proceed to implementing the consulted design. <p><u>New marking outside shops on Dulwich Village</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marking two or three bays outside shops on Dulwich Village will improve safety for all road users and ensure the efficient use of space. <p><u>Road Humps</u></p> <p>Design of road humps is consistent with road humps regulations and current council standards. Road hump will ensure borough wide 20mph speed zone is self-enforcing.</p> <p><u>Segregated Cycle Lane</u></p> <p>Segregated cycle lane is fundamental to the safe operation of the scheme. Independent assessment of the impact of the changes on delays and congestion shows that the changes will improve the operation and flow of traffic. This feature will be trialled with temporary material to assess its impact. Any changes will be carefully considered.</p>

Ref	Summary Response	Representation	Officers response
Obj 7	<p>Scheme is premature, should await alternative design by residents.</p> <p>Marking parking outside shops on Dulwich Village not flagged during consultation.</p> <p>Road marking will affect the local streetscape.</p> <p>Cycle lane will cause delays to traffic.</p> <p>Trialling should be done before scheme is implemented.</p> <p>Parking and loading restrictions will badly affect business and accessibility by those with less physical mobility.</p>	<p>I object to the following aspects of the proposals covered in the Public Notice.</p> <p>In relation to the proposal as a whole, Cllr Wingfield promised to consider the alternative professionally modelled proposals paid for by residents through crowdfunding and so this TMO is premature and a waste of public money which could be put to better public use.</p> <p>It ignores a more effective solution in line with the Healthy Streets philosophy. It is also broader in effect; notifying changes to locations beyond the Quietway 7 consultation proposals consulted upon and is therefore failing the democratic process embodied in the Road Traffic Regulation Act and its responsibility towards residents.</p> <p>With regard to the TMO on waiting restriction, I object to all that were not part of the Quietway 7 consultation, specifically to those relating to Woodwarde Rd (order 119) and all associated signage. No such consultation has taken place and these waiting restriction are therefore opportunistic and the method is not transparent and reasonable to allow resident consultation. The introduction of these markings and signage will have a major negative impact on the local streetscape.</p> <p><i>2. The effect of the orders would be:</i></p> <p><i>a) to introduce a south-westbound segregated cycle lane in CALTON AVENUE between its junctions with Court Lane and Dulwich Village, aligned with the south-eastern kerb;</i></p> <p><i>b) to introduce a north-eastbound segregated cycle lane in TURNEY ROAD between a point 28 metres south-west of the south-western kerb-line of Dulwich Village and its junction with Dulwich Village, aligned with the north-western kerb;</i></p> <p><i>(j) to reduce in length and formalise the existing free echelon parking places on the north-east side of DULWICH VILLAGE outside Nos. 25 - 49 Dulwich Village.</i></p>	<p><u>Parking and loading restrictions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The loading and parking restrictions will: improve sight lines, provide clear access for pedestrians crossing the road .This is consistent with the council's borough wide junction protection approach. • Improve safe access for two-way traffic and remove pinch points which cause delays, safety issues and altercations during the rush hour period. • The restrictions considered with a balanced and considerate approach, to reduce any adverse impact on parking needs of local residents and consistent with policies set out in paragraph 15 of report. • A new loading bay is to be introduced on Calton Avenue to accommodate business activities <p><u>Segregated Cycle Lane</u></p> <p>Segregated cycle lane are fundamental to the safe operation of the scheme .Independent assessment of the impact of the changes on delays and congestion shows that the changes will improve the operation and flow of traffic</p> <p>This feature will be trialled with temporary material to assess its impact. Any changes will be carefully considered</p>

Ref	Summary Response	Representation	Officers response
		<p>1. I object because these cycle lanes are part of one of two different options that could be adopted for the QW7, both of which have been under consideration for adoption. The alternative option does not require this form of cycle lanes and no decision has yet been published as to which option is to be adopted. It is therefore a waste of public resources.</p> <p>I object to the proposed CALTON AVENUE cycle lane on the grounds that it will cause serious obstruction and delay to traffic approaching the traffic lights at the Dulwich Village junction. This has all been stated during the public consultation and ignored. Reducing the approach carriageway from three lanes to two, will cause a major reduction in the capacity of the junction.</p> <p>It has already been acknowledged that it is almost impossible to traffic-model this junction. Provision for trialling the proposed layout here is included in the decisions so far. This trialling must be done first before introducing the cycle lane and in any event Southwark have been asked to conduct a trial in advance of any permanent lane change.</p> <p>The changes to the echelon parking in Dulwich Village will have a major impact on the viability of the local high street, causing reduction in capacity and utility which is against Southwark policy for local community amenities and access. It has not been consulted upon during Quietway7 and as such is an opportunistic and unacceptable introduction as part of this TMO. It must be removed and form part of a separate and transparent consultation.</p> <p>2.</p> <p><i>(f) to introduce new or extend existing lengths of 'at any time' waiting restrictions in:</i></p> <p><i>CALTON AVENUE, (i) on both sides at its junction with Woodwarde Road, (ii) on the north-west side at its junction with Gilkes Crescent; (iii) on both sides between its junctions with Gilkes Crescent and Dulwich Village;</i></p>	<p><u>New marking outside shops on Dulwich Village</u></p> <p>Marking two or three bays outside shops on Dulwich Village will improve safety for all road users and ensure the efficient use of space.</p> <p><u>Road Humps</u></p> <p>Design of road humps is consistent with road humps regulations .Road hump will ensure borough wide 20mph speed zone is self-enforcing.</p> <p><u>Coaches on Calton Avenue</u></p> <p>Council officers are working closely with TfL and the foundation coach service to find the best possible resolution of this issue. A meeting was held recently with key local stakeholders and TfL where 5 alternative options were considered. A preferred option has been shortlisted and borough officers and TfL are working on delivering this option in as short a timescale as possible, funded by TfL.</p> <p><u>Gilkes Crescent junction with Calton Avenue</u></p> <p>Parking occurs close to Gilkes Crescent junction with Calton Avenue. Although this is a cul de sac, the number of pupils crossing the junction necessitates the need for safety improvement</p>

Ref	Summary Response	Representation	Officers response
		<p>I object to this proposal for new parking restrictions both in Gilkes Crescent at its intersection with Calton Avenue, and in Calton Avenue between Gilkes Crescent and the junction with Court Lane. Such parking restrictions will adversely affect the community by restricting access to the shops in Calton Avenue and adjoining part of Dulwich Village and so will have a bad effect on the businesses themselves and their viability and accessibility by those less physically mobile.</p> <p>C)</p> <p><i>4. Southwark Council hereby GIVES FURTHER NOTICE under sections 90A to 90I of the Highways Act 1980 and in accordance with the provisions of the Highways (Road humps) Regulations 1995 and the Highways (Traffic calming) Regulations 1996, propose to construct:</i></p> <p><i>(b) road humps of sinusoidal cross-section construction, 3.7 metres in length, having a maximum height of 100 millimetres and covering the greater width of the carriageway, centred upon the following locations:</i></p> <p>I object to these orders because the proposed road humps are too big. They conflict with London fire service access recommendations which advises best no speed humps or if deemed necessary, maximum 50mm. Existing humps in Woodwarde Rd are already too large and cause a hazard and problem for emergency vehicles and services.</p> <p><i>Southwark Council hereby GIVES FURTHER NOTICE under sections 90A to 90I of the Highways Act 1980 and in accordance with the provisions of the Highways (Road humps) Regulations 1999 and the Highways (Traffic calming) Regulations 1999, propose to construct:</i></p> <p><i>(a) speed tables of flat-top construction having a maximum height of 100 millimetres and covering the entire width of the carriageway, in:</i></p> <p><i>(i) COURT LANE, at its junction with Calton Avenue, extending from a point 1 metre south-east of the south-eastern wall of No. 1b Court Lane north-westward for a distance of 9.5 metres, measured on the north-east side of Court Lane;</i></p>	

Ref	Summary Response	Representation	Officers response
		<p>(ii) <i>DULWICH WOOD AVENUE, at its junction with Farquhar Road, extending from the south-western kerb-line of Farquhar Road south-westward for a distance of 13 metres, measured on the north-west side of Dulwich Wood Avenue; and (iii) WOODWARDE ROAD, at its junction with Calton Avenue, extending from the south-eastern kerb-line of Calton Avenue south-eastward for a distance of 9 metres, measured on the north-east side of Woodward Road.</i></p> <p>I object to iii – the length of 9 metres is excessive and unnecessary causing negative visibility and undue impact on local conditions.</p>	