

[Title]  
Mrs

[Firstname]  
[REDACTED]

[Lastname]  
[REDACTED]

[Telephone\_number]  
[REDACTED]

[Email\_address]  
[REDACTED]

[Areyou]  
A resident

[Whichconsultation]  
Peckham West area parking zone 'PW'

[overallresponse]  
4. I object to part

[response]  
The double yellow lines proposed for the top of Danby Street near Coppleston Road should not be added. The residents of these properties do not use the dropped kerb parking and it has been used as street parking for the last 18 years. These two spaces will dramatically impact on the amount of parking available to residents.

[Title]  
Mr

[Firstname]  
[REDACTED]

[Lastname]  
[REDACTED]

[Telephone\_number]  
[REDACTED]

[Email\_address]  
[REDACTED]

[Areyou]  
A resident

[Whichconsultation]  
TMO1920-026 Peckham W parking zone

[overallresponse]  
4. I object to part

[response]  
I would like the council to consider alternative designs for the end of Hinckley Road. This is a very short cul-de-sac. Currently the council propose to place double yellow lines around most of the cul de sac end of our road to facilitate vehicles turning. No vehicles that park at that end of the cul-de-sac are quite happy to reverse in and out as the distance is short.

We estimate that applying yellow lines at the end of the cul-de-sac as proposed would result in the loss of 4-5 spaces. This is likely to cause unnecessary constraints on parking in the road partially negating the point of the CPZ (to enable residents to park closer to their properties).

The operating hours of the proposal of 9-11 is likely to impact overnight guests unduly. We would prefer operating hours of 11-1.

Hi,

I live at [REDACTED] Keston Rd, SE15 4JA.

I oppose the proposed parking zone because I have never had a problem parking near to my home. I also can't afford the extra cost of a parking permit.

Please consider the financial implications for residents who do not have a spare £130

Regards

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

I am a resident of Hinckley Road, SE15 4HZ, and this submission is on the details of the scheme as it affects me in Hinckley Road. I'm in a household of three drivers and sometimes use a car to drive to work.

The main issue for residents in this area of the proposed zone is the lack of residents' parking spaces in the evenings, not the commuter or shopper daytime parking that affects other areas of the zone. The proposals as they stand will make this worse. I understand that it is easier for the council to impose a common set of restrictions on a whole area, but this ignores the significant differences that exist in parts of the CPZ, and the needs of residents and local businesses relating to particular streets.

Although I am content with the reduced parking period of 2 hours per day, I object to the precise time period proposed and would prefer a later period such as 11:00 to 13:00. The 09:00 to 11:00 period will make it difficult for overnight guests of residents or early morning carers for those who are ill or disabled and need help getting up in the morning.

The proposal for parking spaces for about 20 residents' cars is an unacceptable reduction in the space available for Hinckley Road parking, given the difficulties residents currently experience in the evenings. The shortage of spaces is due mainly to the excessive use of double yellow lines (see below).

I also object to the excessive use of double yellow lines which further restrict the parking spaces available. For safety reasons the double yellow lines either side of an entrance, such as to the business units in Gowlett Road do not need to extend more than a metre either side.

Furthermore, the proposed double yellow lines on the junctions Hinckley Road and the adjoining roads unnecessarily long and not needed for safety reasons. Elsewhere in the borough the lines are much shorter. My objection is to the length of the double yellow lines: 2m should be sufficient to allow pedestrians to cross the road safely and to allow vehicles to turn the corner. If lines are too long, it encourages large lorries to use our residential streets as short cuts, and there has always been sufficient access for the council's waste disposal lorries, even before the yellow lines were introduced in 2015.

I also object to the totally unnecessary imposition of double yellow lines in the Hinckley Road cul de sac. This makes no sense as it would in any case be impossible for vehicles to use this for turning. The road is so short that all vehicles access the parking spaces by reversing.

Please take these objections seriously. I and other residents would be happy to discuss the details of the proposed restrictions and the above objections on site so that the proposals can be properly considered.

Regards,

[Redacted Signature]  
[Redacted Name]  
[Redacted Address]

[Title]

Mr

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone\_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email\_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-026 Peckham W parking zone - Hinckley Road

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

The cost of parking permits is too high at £125.

There are too many double yellow lines suggested. By having yellow lines on Hinckley road it will reduce the amount of parking spaces on my street. As this will be one of the only streets in the area that does not have restriction it will make parking on my own street near impossible. If this space is yellow line it will only encourage school pick ups on our street from the local school.

To whom it make concern,

I am a resident of Hinckley Road, London SE15 4HZ and I object to the proposed council CPZ.

The cost of parking permits is too high at £125.

The proposed yellow lines will negatively impact my parking. By having yellow lines on Hinckley road it will reduce the amount of parking spaces on my street. As this will be one of the only streets in the area that does not have restriction it will make parking on my own street near impossible. If this space is yellow line it will only encourage school pickups on our street from the local school.

I could not disagree with the planed CPZ in our area.

Kind Regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[Title]  
Ms

[Firstname]  
[REDACTED]

[Lastname]  
[REDACTED]

[Telephone\_number]  
[REDACTED]

[Email\_address]  
[REDACTED]

[Areyou]  
A resident

[Whichconsultation]  
TMO1920-026 Peckham W parking zone

[overallresponse]  
5. I wholly object to

[response]  
There was an overall majority against implementing a CPZ when asked if one was wanted in their street

We, the twenty-nine undersigned, who are **all residents** of streets within the proposed Peckham West CPZ, met on 3rd October 2019 to reflect on the proposed parameters for the final CPZ structure and application.

The majority of residents attending **do not want** a CPZ and are dismayed that the simple **No** majority to the initial consultation has been disregarded and **What If** responses have been disproportionately weighted to provide statistics that were able to be interpreted as a positive response. Changes to the Dog Kennel Hill CPZ could alleviate many of the parking problems that had arisen since its implementation.

Based on our discussion and reflection, we require that the following objections and suggestions should be taken account of when framing the final shape of the CPZ in the Peckham West Parking Zone.

*NB This group submission relates to zone-wide strategic considerations and individual submissions relating to localised considerations will be made independently by signatories to this document.*

## **1. Payment system**

**1.1** Payment by phone for parking in parking bays should not be via 'Pay by phone' applications (apps). Residents should not be **required/forced** to have mobile phones to park; download apps; and upload card details to the web. Not all drivers choose to have a mobile phone. In certain bays, payment by phone also enables commuters to park outside the restricted hours and then, when restrictions apply, phone in payment from their place of work. **Payment machines must be made available for use with a card-tap mechanism (as used in public transport) and cash.**

## **2. Permit costs & numbers issued**

**2.2** We are united in concern over the high proposed costs of the resident permits and even greater costs of visitor permits. A self-funding CPZ is not one that we, as residents, should have to fund through expensive permits, year after year. **We require that councillors review and reduce the level of cost.**

**2.3** We have deep fears around Southwark council issuing parking permits in numbers far outstripping the number of spaces that the CPZ will be able to accommodate and the motivation behind the creeping CPZs phenomenon. We understand that income from a CPZ is a restricted income stream and must be spent on transport expenditure. However, we believe that this is a disingenuous response since by generating income in this way, unrestricted core income available to the Council from other sources would remain unused and would be available for allocation to other expenditure. Information on Southwark's own website showed that surplus income from Parking zones in Southwark after expenditure was deducted for 2017/18 reached £6.5million.

**2.4** Unfairly high and hostile business permit costs will put pressure in businesses and jeopardise their future as well as our high street shops, along with the re-designation of currently unrestricted parking (such as on East Dulwich Road) as double yellow lines (see xxx below). **We ask that in addition to reviewing the blanket proposals for double yellow lines, business permit costs are set much lower than proposed, at a level that will not damage business viability.**

## **3. Impact of CPZ on residents**

**3.1** One outcome of the CPZ is that it will make it more difficult and costly for residents who are restricted to their homes to receive casual visitors, relatives or friends visiting from other areas and informal carers. This will result directly in increased isolation for less ambulant older, disabled or otherwise housebound residents and will also place a strain on other council services when these residents who can no longer rely on informal carers have to be included in formal care provision. **We ask that Council increases the number of visitor permits available per affected household in such cases and exempts visits by informal carers.**

**3.2** The proposed 9-11am restrictions will undoubtedly impact the work and effectiveness of formal support and care workers who are programmed to make visits to assist with morning routines and feeding. **We ask for exemptions for key workers in such cases.**

## **4. Paid parking bays**

**4.1** Placement of paid parking bays is ill-thought-out with some paid bays ill placed, far from shops and other amenities: **paid parking bays need to be more strategically considered on the ground.**

**4.2** Grove Vale parking for shops was noted to be working well so that there appears to be no need for change, especially as it will adversely impact existing vulnerable businesses.

**4.3** We have significant concerns over the reduction in available parking spaces as a result of over-use of yellow lines, for example on and around dropped kerbs, in roads outside commercial outlets, around cul-de-sacs, at junctions (for example,

[illegible]

I am a resident of Hinckley Road, ~~XXXX XXXX~~, and this submission is on the details of the scheme as it affects me in Hinckley Road. I have also put my signature to more general objections affecting the whole CPZ area, but these are specific objections to what is proposed for Hinckley Road and the adjoining streets.

#### **The London Borough of Southwark (Parking places) (Parking zone 'PW') (No. 1) Order 201\***

First, I am disappointed that the objections to the CPZ made by residents in Hinckley Road and the adjoining streets appear not to have been taken into account, in an attempt to push through with this scheme in its entirety. As explained to council officers and councillors on numerous occasions, the main issue for residents in this area of the proposed zone is the lack of residents' parking spaces in the evenings, not the commuter or shopper daytime parking that affects other areas of the zone. The proposals as they stand will make this worse. I understand that it is easier for the council to impose a common set of restrictions on a whole area, but this ignores the significant differences that exist in parts of the CPZ, and the needs of residents and local businesses relating to particular streets.

#### Schedule 1, parking places ~~91~~ to ~~94~~

I am pleased that the initial proposals for 08:30 to 18:30 parking restrictions have been modified to the 2 hours per day period. However, I object to the precise time period proposed. I would prefer a later period, such as 11:00 to 13:00, 13:00 to 15:00, or even 14:00 to 16:00 to deter cars from picking up children from St John's & St Clement's School at the end of the school day. The 09:00 to 11:00 period will make it difficult for overnight guests of residents or early morning carers for those who are ill or disabled and need help getting up in the morning. (I assume this is covered in the impact assessment that will have been completed for the scheme under the council's public sector equality duty.)

#### Schedule 1, parking places 92 to 94

The proposal is for parking spaces amounting to 124m, which is space for about 21 residents' cars. This will significantly reduce the parking spaces available for residents. There are currently spaces for about 26 vehicles. This is an unacceptable reduction in the space available for Hinckley Road parking, given the difficulties residents currently experience in the evenings. The shortage of spaces is due mainly to the excessive use of double yellow lines (see below).

#### Schedule 5, paragraph 4 (visitors' permits)

If Hinckley Road and the adjoining streets have 2 hour parking restrictions, why are the charges set for all day and and 5 hour parking sessions? That makes no sense at all. I object to the way that these charges have been set, as they do not align with the restricted parking periods, and the charges are excessive. I propose a reduced charge for 2 hour parking sessions.

#### **The London Borough of Southwark (Waiting and loading restrictions) (Amendment No. \*\*) Order 201\***

#### Schedule 1, item no. 429(a)(ii)

For safety reasons the double yellow lines do not need to extend for more than a metre either side of the entrance to the business units in Gowlett Road, and should therefore be reduced in length.

#### Schedule 1, item no. 429(b)(ii)

At 6.5m, the proposed double yellow lines on the junction of Gowlett Road and Hinckley Road are also too long, restricting residents' parking, and are unnecessary for safety reasons. There is no obvious reason for differences in the length of the lines: some are 6.5m, some are 7.5m, some are 8m and some are 6m. Elsewhere in the borough the lines are much shorter. My objection is to the length of the double yellow lines: 2m should be sufficient to allow pedestrians to cross the road safely and to allow vehicles to turn the corner. If lines are too long, it encourages large lorries to use our residential streets as short cuts, and there has always been sufficient access for the council's waste disposal lorries, even before the yellow lines were introduced in 2015.

#### Schedule 1, item no. 1128

For the reasons given above I object to the length of the double yellow lines proposed for Hinckley Road and its junctions with Gowlett Road and Keston Road. As above these should be reduced to a minimum - 2m would be sufficient. My main objection here, however, is the totally unnecessary imposition of double yellow lines in the Hinckley Road cul de sac. This makes no sense as it would in any case be impossible for vehicles to use this for turning. The road is so short that all vehicles access the parking spaces by reversing. I cannot emphasise too much the strength of feeling amongst Hinckley Road residents if this parking area was removed. The council was recently successfully challenged when parking tickets began to appear on vehicles parked at the end of the road.

Schedule 1, Item no. 1130(a)(ii) and (b)(iii)

Again I object to the excessive length of the double yellow lines proposed for the junction between Keston Road and Hinckley Road, for the reasons stated above. Arguably, there is no need for double yellow lines at all on the south-west corner of Keston Road and the adjoining north side of Hinckley Road as this corner is not used as a through route for any vehicles because of the cul de sac.

Please take these objections seriously. I and other residents would be happy to discuss the details of the proposed restrictions and the above objections on site so that the proposals can be properly considered.

Regards

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

I am a resident of Gowlett Road.

**Please note we do not want a CPZ.**

In response to your proposed plans (which I reiterate we do not want)

We will lose parking spaces which we need especially in the evenings. We don't have any commitment from you that we will keep the number of spaces we currently have 70 spaces with a variety of sizes of vehicles.

**Too expensive** both for a residents permit as well as visitor permits (especially for pensioners and the lower paid, of which we have many. This will also impact on mental health of residents due to increased loneliness and isolation issues.

This is not a 'self funding CPZ' it is funded by the residents paying for permits to park when parking is currently free - we already pay our road tax. It is disingenuous of the council and associates to give it this status.

Paying by phone should not be the only way of paying. Tap and pay, as on the buses is vitally important for those who do not have debit cards ( do not want to upload our data) or even mobile phones.

Introduction of more **double yellow** lines is unnecessary (dropped curbs and entrances). Double yellow lines around Hinkley Impass are ridiculous. double yellow lines at junctions of Amott and Adys, Adys and Nutbrook are unnecessary as we have never needed them before. these will also impact on availability of parking which will spill over into the other streets, creating further problems not alleviating any.

We want to explore implementing **school streets** as we have 2 primary schools and a nursery within a minute's walk. This will not only reduce traffic and parking difficulties as well as improve air quality and safety for children.

Shared car schemes are already creating problems to resident parking, from which I believe the council makes money over and above residents permits which you wish to introduce. These do not seem to be managed in the proposal.

Yours

[Redacted signature block]

I am not happy about this consultation in any way. It has been a farce. No matter how much we have shown up your massaging of the figures and obfuscation of the results you have continued to bulldoze a CPZ into our streets - Gowlett, Hinckley and Keston.

We have repeatedly told you THERE IS NO PARKING PROBLEM in our streets - except at night - in Gowlett Rd - since you added so many metres to the yellow lines at the corners. As a CPZ will in no way alleviate our night time parking problems we have rejected the CPZ again and again. Any worries about day time commuter parking can easily be dealt with by putting a 'school street' into Keston, Hinckley and Gowlett - which would prevent any dangerous parking and driving at drop off and pick up for the school and nurseries in our area.

This has been done at Tintagel road for Goose Green Primary School. It is cheap and does not involve residents parking permits.

Leave our streets alone. The ULEZ and the use of zipcars will take care of many of the car users in the near future. We do not want to pay to park in our Peckham Streets so we reject your proposals

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Gowlett Road

London [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I am writing to register my objection to the current proposals on the basis that the solution did not take account of the effect of the Southwark Spine proposals (released after this consultation was done) which further impacts parking pressures due to the loss of additional spaces associated with these works and the fact the proposals were changed off the back of a public meeting where only the loudest and most abusive were listened to.

The CPZ and Southwark Spine proposals should have been done concurrently so residents were aware of the full impact.

The results of the CPZ were clearly in favour of it being introduced if other local streets had one (which they all now do) as was the feedback in relation to the first Southwark Spine proposals (link attached below for reference) it appears that the initial proposals were watered down after an awful public meeting which was attended overwhelmingly people who objected to the principle of CPZs in general who then shouted down anyone who wanted to speak in favour of the CPZ and local residents. It was appalling behaviour, the council officers were verbally abused and such people should not get to influence the results in this way against what the majority of people voted for and fed back during the consultations.

<http://modern.gov.southwark.gov.uk/documents/s74432/Appendix%20C.pdf>

Pages 21-25 specifically Maxted, Amott, Oglander and Adys Rd.

Introducing a 9-11am restriction is not going to deliver the promised 40% reduction in commuter parking as many people will choose to pay for 2 hours. The other areas which have seen a reduction in the number of vehicles parking have longer restrictions to deter this. The parking is so pressured in the streets named above and we will lose even more spaces with the introduction of the Southwark Spine measures particularly on Adys Road / Oglander. This feels like the worst of all combinations for local residents i.e. we won't get a significant reduction in commuter parking but will still have to pay for a permit.

Many thanks

██████████

I am a long standing resident of Keston Road and I wish to state that I am implacably opposed to the implementation of a CPZ either on my road or on the surrounding roads. I object on the grounds that there is absolutely no need for one on this road or the surrounding roads. On Keston Road we are 100% opposed. This was the response of the whole road at the time of the initial consultation and it remains NO.

Our problem in this area is parents from the Little Jungle nursery and St. John's School dropping off and picking up children in the morning and afternoon. The road is virtually empty during the day. We want school streets NOT a CPZ.

This area is residential. We are not near the railway station, Rye Lane, Lordship Lane or Bellenden Road. We do not have a problem with commuter, shopper or business/commercial parking. As such we have no concerns about displacement. There is capacity for all.

We do however have very serious concerns about the dangerous situation that ensues each day due to parents at above establishments. I have tried so hard to make the council aware of just how dangerous this is but nobody is interested. All the council want to do is impose a CPZ from 9-11 am which will just facilitate this mayhem, because school starts at 9am and most children have been dropped at nursery by this time so it will continue, at financial and personal cost to the residents. We the residents have given up trying to reason with parents to have some responsibility and consideration. They simply do not care. It is particularly bad in the morning. Their only objective is to pull up as near to the nursery/school as possible, drop the children and drive off, usually in a rush. There are too many cars in a confined area, they drive too fast, park on double yellow lines and dropped kerbs and on school markings. Once they leave by 9am all is peace and quiet for the day with plenty of space to park, until they return at picking up time.

We are very angry that our initial response to the consultation has been ignored. Also, the way in which this was conducted was unfair and dishonest. Most people in the area did not receive the consultation through their door. On Keston Road word got around, but on other roads such as Hinckley, Gowlett and Amott it did not, so many people were unaware and therefore were unable to respond. Having lived here for so many years and talking to so many of my neighbours I know that they are as opposed as we are on Keston Road. This latest notification enabling us to object has been pinned to a few lamp posts. Most people simply haven't noticed it or thought it was about a planning application. Again, this is dishonest on the part of the council. Every household should have received a consultation pack and all information regarding this should be displayed prominently on large notice boards on each road, not lamp posts. We are appalled at the way the data has been massaged by Southwark parking Dept. The people responsible for implementing the CPZ against our wishes do not live on our road or in the locality. Most of the councillors concerned represent wards in North Southwark and don't even know our road or those nearby. I went to see James Mc Ash, who is ward councillor for Goose Green. He informed me that the decision to implement the CPZ had been taken - so why are we being invited to object. Anyway, he stated that most of his ward is situated in East Dulwich. He does not appear interested in the part of his ward in SE15. Actually, 68% of people in East Dulwich objected anyway, so their wishes are also being ignored and over ruled. At one of the meetings about this issue Dale Foden stated that where individual streets have been excluded from a CPZ in the past, they have later asked to be included. We would like to assure him we will not. He does not live on our road, yet has the audacity to think he knows better than us. Most people here have lived here for many years. We know that a CPZ is totally unnecessary here.

To sum up - NO to the CPZ. Implement school streets INSTEAD OF the CPZ, NOT in conjunction with.

██████████

██████████ Keston Road

LONDON ~~9999 444~~

[Title]  
Mr

[Firstname]  
[REDACTED]

[Lastname]  
[REDACTED]

[Telephone\_number]  
[REDACTED]

[Email\_address]  
[REDACTED]

[Areyou]  
A resident

[Whichconsultation]  
Peckham West area parking zone 'PW' order 201

[overallresponse]  
5. I wholly object to

[response]  
You are creating another zone which further segregates the area. I will not be able to park near Dulwich leisure centre or visit friends in this district in my car and visitors will not be able to park. I already pay for a an expensive Zone B parking permit. I live in Bellenden Rd, [REDACTED]

Hello

My name is [REDACTED] - I am the co-resident at [REDACTED] Oglander road and I strongly concur with the below email

With thanks

Sent from my iPhone

On 8 Oct 2019, at 21:07, [REDACTED] > wrote:

Hello,

My name is [REDACTED]. I am a resident at [REDACTED] Oglander Road [REDACTED].

I STRONGLY object to the proposed location of the paid bays outside [REDACTED] in the pdf "'Peckham W area parking zone 'PW'".

It makes no sense for these to be located outside two residential properties, when they could be across the road outside an area of fencing which has no house frontage.

As well as it being aesthetically undesirable, not just for our house but for the whole road, the curve of the road on the [REDACTED] Oglander road side is a pinch point - and having paid bays there will cause unnecessary congestion as cars try to park and move in and out, thus blocking the whole road.

It will also cause extra noise, movement, and pollution (both from noise and emissions) outside these two properties. Both of the families at [REDACTED], so there is also a safety concern of having an increased volume of cars moving in and out so close to an area where children will be walking and crossing the road.

None of these factors would apply if the bays were simply on the other side of the road, where no one's property is affected, and where the road will be less blocked by people parking. We would ask you to revise the proposals.

Many thanks for you time.

Faithfully,

[REDACTED]

Hello,

My name is [REDACTED]. I am a resident at [REDACTED] Oglander Road, London, [REDACTED].

I STRONGLY object to the proposed location of the paid bays outside [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] Oglander road in the pdf "'Peckham W area parking zone 'PW'".

It makes no sense for these to be located outside two residential properties, when they could be across the road outside an area of fencing which has no house frontage.

As well as it being aesthetically undesirable, not just for our house but for the whole road, the curve of the road on the [REDACTED] Oglander road side is a pinch point - and having paid bays there will cause unnecessary congestion as cars try to park and move in and out, thus blocking the whole road.

It will also cause extra noise, movement, and pollution (both from noise and emissions) outside these two properties. Both of the families at [REDACTED] have [REDACTED], so there is also a safety concern of having an increased volume of cars moving in and out so close to an area where children will be walking and crossing the road.

None of these factors would apply if the bays were simply on the other side of the road, where no one's property is affected, and where the road will be less blocked by people parking. We would ask you to revise the proposals.

Many thanks for you time.

Faithfully,

[REDACTED]

[Title]

Ms

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone\_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email\_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-026 Peckham W parking zone

[overallresponse]

4. I object to part

[response]

4 x "Resting places" or parklets proposed in Choumert Road - further to my original response dated 6/10/19 I would like to additionally point out that Choumert road already has an existing parklet close to the junction of Bellenden Road which does not feature on these maps at all. This is the small garden which was developed by a resident. In addition there is a seating space outside Review bookshop. This would mean Choumert road would have a significantly higher number of "resting places" than any other street in the immediate locality.

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your e-mail.

The information you attached and on the website doesn't state Southwark Council's reasons for introducing the parking zone in Peckham West. The information just states the proposal to enforce the order.

I object to the proposal as this will add further expenses and admin for local residents. This is an area where there isn't an issue with parking.

Kind Regards

[REDACTED]

[Title]

Mrs

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone\_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email\_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-026 Peckham West area parking zone 'PW'

[overallresponse]

2. I support this proposal

[response]

I wanted to amend my previous response to reflect that I am completely in favour of parking restrictions but feel that the proposal is not serious enough at the moment. I think the parking restrictions should be Monday to Friday from 9-4 pm at least

[Title]  
Mrs

[Firstname]  
[REDACTED]

[Lastname]  
[REDACTED]

[Telephone\_number]  
[REDACTED]

[Email\_address]  
[REDACTED]

[Areyou]  
A resident

[Whichconsultation]  
TM01920 - 026 Peckham West Parking Zone

[overallresponse]  
5. I wholly object to

[response]

A) I object to the proposed two hour window as it will not alleviate the pressure on parking on Danby Street, where I am a resident. I feel that paying the full amount for a permit to have very little impact is grossly unfair and ridiculous.

B) The yellow lines proposed at the top of Danby street are non sensical. The dropped kerb parking spaces have not been in use in the entire time I have been a resident of Danby Street ([REDACTED]) and will add even more pressure on parking spaces.

C) NOTHING has been done to address many of the emails I have sent regarding the loss of residents parking in the resurfacing work on Danby street a year ago. Southwark council took away 5 -6 real parking spaces in 2018 and extended the pay and display at the bottom of the street (the high numbers) WITHOUT CONSULTATION. Danby Street already suffers the brunt of parking issues around the Bellenden road area and we were not consulted about this loss of parking space which has made parking on our road 10-15% worse.

D) Finally I wholeheartedly object on the grounds that the restrictions the other side of Bellenden Road towards Peckham Rye are fully operational Monday - Saturday 8.30- 6.30 and we are subject to similar pressures on our parking on Danby Street that are faced by those near Rye Lane and the station. It seems illogical to have a 2 hour limit on parking when we face the same pressure and would urge the committee to seriously reconsider the scheme given that Danby Street and its neighbouring sister roads are directly in the line of fire from non residents parking in a way that those nearer Goose Green are not. For example Amott Road, Fenwick Road, and Marsden Road are not desirable parking locations and have never in the time that I have been a resident, had the issues that Danby Street has faced. The Roads near goose green are not comparable.

[Title]

Mrs

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone\_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email\_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-026 Peckham West area parking zone 'PW

[overallresponse]

4. I object to part

[response]

I object to the proposal of introducing permits for only 2 hours a day . This needs to be made mon - Friday, 8.30-6.30 for it to make any difference. The situation on danby street is dire. All day cars are driving up and down looking for spaces , this is not just people dumping their cars all day to be close to the station- This is an all day problem!! the 2 hr parking restriction will be totally ineffective to residents of danby street, Avondale rise, Copleston road and Choumert road. The cost is the same as all day, but for us to have to pay this for 2 hours is totally unacceptable as it doesn't help us at all and just costs money - please extend this to 8.30-6.30pm as it's making our lives a misery. I have had to email regularly with issues we are facing including abusive neighbours fighting over spaces, double parking, high traffic levels , air quality, and collisions. I have ~~been told to move~~ and often have to park on oglander road, I have parked as far as gowlett road on occasion. Please consider this and reevaluate

Thank you

[REDACTED]

Dear Highways

Your website will not register my submission so I am attaching a copy in a word doc and also copied and pasted below.

Please acknowledge that this has been received.

-----  
Parking - Road traffic and highway schemes - responding to statutory consultation notices

(\* Required field)

Contact details

1. Title \* Ms

2. First name \* [REDACTED]

3. Last name \* [REDACTED]

4. Telephone number \* [REDACTED]

5. Email address \* <[REDACTED]>

6. Are you:

A resident YES

Which statutory consultation do you wish to respond to?

Type the title of the notice, reference number (if you have it) or the name of the road/area affected

ANSWER:

TMO1920-026 Peckham W parking zone

this includes my street which is [REDACTED]

Please select your overall response (you can only choose one)

ANSWER:

4. I object to part of the proposal, but support or am neutral to other elements of it

Please give details of your response (note: if you wish to object to a proposal you must state the grounds on which your objection is made)

MY COMMENTS & OBJECTIONS:

\* If we are to have a CPZ, I strongly support the choice of a two hour control instead of all day control which I would strongly object to. This is because all day controls would cause disproportionate hardship, and all day commuting parking in the streets where this is a problem can be controlled by a two hour control. This is provided that the process prevents the driver from leaving their vehicle and paying at a distance for the time of the two hour control.

\* I object to the time chosen as 9am to 11am. This is because it is too early. It will result in overnight visitors having to leave earlier than they need to and also interfere with informal carers who have to visit to help people get ready for the day. Until there are special

arrangements for exemptions for informal carers such an early start will be a real hardship. A later time of day eg 11am to 1pm would be much better.

\* I object to the special arrangements for carers' permits to be available only for employed carers. Most caring is done by informal carers. The Council should have a scheme which enables informal carers to register with appropriate evidence as carers for the purpose of special arrangements either free or at a significant discount for parking in the CPZ area.

\* I object to the extent of the yellow lines taking up too much of the current car parking spaces. This is known to be an area with higher than average car ownership. This is probably why we have a car parking problem throughout the evening and overnight much of the time, as it is not in some of the streets mainly or at all a commuter problem or a town centre issue. We have to have as much of the streets available for residents parking as possible so there needs to be a reduction in the scheme of the use of yellow lines at junctions, dropped curbs etc. Could a walk around the area with you be arranged to look at where this can be redesigned?

There is a substantial opposition in many streets to the CPZ for this reason, and very reluctant agreement that if it is going to be imposed throughout the area, then just one street can't be excluded. But to make this tolerable we have to have as many spaces as possible for residents parking. This is not the case in your proposals.

\* I object to the significant reduction of parking spaces on East Dulwich Road on the north side alongside the Goose Green playground and outside the shops. Currently there are about 7 spaces alongside the Goose Green playground railings. Half of this is controlled free for 30 minutes and no return for 2 hours and half has no controls. Also there are about 7 spaces outside the shops in a section, leading up to the bus stop space. There are no controls there. The current arrangements work and self manage well for the shops. The south side of the road is not in the proposed CPZ area and the north side should be taken out of the Peckham West CPZ and left as it is.

I have been told, only in the last few weeks after raising these issues by email again, that the road markings are not accurate in relation to a previous traffic order. However the traffic order being proposed is going to change this so you can just leave well alone, or if you can't do that make a traffic order to formalise the parking arrangements as they are in practice on the ground with about 4 spaces controlled. I am sending you by email photos of the current arrangements. Throughout the consultation period there has been no engagement with me on this issue that I have raised since the January drop in, until I asked again in a series of emails during this far too late a point in the consultation why my point was continuously being ignored.

\* You say that the effect of the new CPZ will be reviewed after several months. We want local residents to contribute and comment on the design of the monitoring and review process after implementation. Will you discuss with us, before you implement the new CPZ, how this could work, so it is ready at implementation? This would be needed to follow the Council's new community engagement principles recently agreed by the Cabinet for collaboration and co-production.

[Title]  
Mrs

[Firstname]  
[REDACTED]

[Lastname]  
[REDACTED]

[Telephone\_number]  
[REDACTED]

[Email\_address]  
[REDACTED]

[Areyou]  
A resident

[Whichconsultation]  
TMO1920-026  
Peckham West parking zone

[overallresponse]  
5. I wholly object to

[response]

I object on the grounds that the original question was did we or didn't we want a CPZ. the overall response was no but his was dismissed and only responses to IF other streets wanted a CPZ did we. The original question cannot should not be overridden. As a result we are being railroaded in response to your proposed plans (which I reiterate we do not want)

We will lose parking spaces which we need especially in the evenings. We don't have any commitment from you that we will keep the number of spaces we currently have 70 spaces with a variety of sizes of vehicles.

Too expensive both for a residents permit as well as visitor permits (especially for pensioners and the lower paid, of which we have many. This will also impact on mental health of residents due to increased loneliness and isolation issues.

This is not a 'self funding CPZ' it is funded by the residents paying for permits to park when parking is currently free - we already pay our road tax. It is disingenuous of the council and associates to give it this status.

Paying by phone should not be the only way of paying. Tap and pay, as on the buses is vitally important for those who do not have debit cards (do not want to upload our data) or even mobile phones.

Introduction of more double yellow lines is unnecessary (dropped curbs and entrances). Double yellow lines around Hinkley Impass are ridiculous. double yellow lines at junctions of Amott and Adys, Adys and Nutbrook are unnecessary as we have never needed them before. these will also impact on availability of parking which will spill over into the other streets, creating further problems not alleviating any.

We want to explore implementing school streets as we have 2 primary schools and a nursery within a minute's walk. This will not only reduce traffic and parking difficulties as well as improve air quality and safety for children.

Shared car schemes are already creating problems to resident parking, from which I believe the council makes money over and above residents permits which you wish to introduce. These do not seem to be managed in the proposal.

## TMO1920-026 Peckham W parking zone

For the attention of Traffic Order consultation, Highways, Southwark Council

I have lived at [REDACTED] and own and drive one car between a family of four.

The latest CPZ consultation paper was s the third form we were given asking whether we wanted CPZ for this area and in the first two we said NO and in the third we were away when it needed to be submitted. Overwhelmingly people locally have rejected this.

Il feel the council has pecked away at this until they got the result they wanted.

Firstly if this is to go ahead it is only of benefit to residents if it will create MORE parking opportunities.

One of the parking problems is pressure on spaces by bad parking from residents where they take up more than one space by impeding on a second.

Should a CPZ be implemented, a division into marked out spaces might help this.

Overlong and overzealous double yellow lines at junctions - shortening these could create space for one more car at each junction.

Please do not reduce parking opportunities further with designated spaces for car borrowing schemes.

Please make it accessible to the elderly, to health visitors, to workmen/women who may be called out at short notice.

DO NOT make any meters payable by phone

give residents VISITORS VOUCHERS that can be used in the residence spaces.

I would much prefer as an alternative a SCHOOL STREET OPTION-the implementation of a school street scheme whereby roads are closed off to general traffic between 8.30-9.30am and 3-4pm, at no cost to residents and only residents may come and go. Southwark

has already implemented other school streets in the borough.

This would immediately remove the pressure of school drops, often badly parked and spacially greedy cars, and encourage parents to walk their children to school.

YOURS

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[Title]  
Mrs

[Firstname]  
[REDACTED]

[Lastname]  
[REDACTED]

[Telephone\_number]  
[REDACTED]

[Email\_address]  
[REDACTED]

[Areyou]  
A resident

[Whichconsultation]  
TMO1920-026 Peckham W Parking Zone  
Danby Street

[overallresponse]  
5. I wholly object to

[response]  
I think that imposing a CPZ on the rest of Danby Street will create hardships for myself and some residents on Danby Street. I will have to pay a yearly fee to park my car outside my house and also permits for any subsequent visitors. I strongly believe that I contribute enough money by way of Council Tax every year. Also there is my elderly neighbour who have visitors that frequently visit her, e.g. her children, grandchildren, cleaner and people that help her on a day to day basis. I also know of other persons on Danby Street in a similar position. Danby Street is not in the heart of Peckham, so I do not understand why we need a CPZ in Danby Street.

Ref: TMO 1920-026 Peckham W Parking Zone

In certain aspects of the proposed parking changes - Peckham W and E Dulwich parking zones cannot be considered separately as both areas interlink with obvious repercussions/"knock on" effects from one area to the other. All consultation meetings over the past 5 - 10 years, including the one earlier this year, have been very well attended and had an overwhelming majority AGAINST ANY introduction of CPZ's and AGAINST ANY change to existing restrictions especially involving payment. At the last consultation, the majority was 69% and for some areas of Peckham W even higher. Only Derwent and Melbourne in the E Dulwich zone, appeared to want some form of restriction - eg: 9am - 11am but not "blanket" CPZ's and not 830am - 630pm which was "pushed" by the highway officer. When a shorter timeframe was mooted, this was dismissed out of hand with no attempt at consultation. There were no "voices" from Peckham W zone requesting ANY changes to the current free parking arrangements.

Existing free "short term" parking in areas with retail outlets works well. There is therefore NO requirement to introduce paid parking of any kind. In fact it has been shown in other areas of London this can seriously affect trade. People living in both zones are overwhelmingly against the introduction of CPZ's/permits, as parking close to one's dwelling can be found.

"Shared use" parking places should not be introduced in residential roads with no retail outlets, as this would just create a parking problem where none currently exists. The current AAT waiting restrictions work adequately and certainly do not need extending. It would only reduce easy access for all with no obvious gain. If anything, the extension of double yellow lines around corners continues unnecessarily far, so restricting the area of free parking within the adjoining roads. Safety would still be maintained if in most roads, the equivalent of at least 1 car's length of double yellow line was removed! The proposed extension of AAT between kerbside and all designated parking places in ALL mentioned streets would be appallingly restrictive.

There is no requirement to change existing "free short stay" parking places into paying "stop and shop" parking places. All work efficiently now.

Conclusion:

The proposed changes would penalise all local residents and businesses by introducing costly permits/parking charges and severely restricted access. The overwhelming majority of residents have consistently declared they do NOT want to have CPZ's introduced, nor any other type of charged parking, nor increased restrictions on available access.

This proposed scheme, other than raising funds for the council, would have a catastrophically detrimental effect on the whole area: both residents and businesses. Instead of improved parking, it would become totally restrictive and be instrumental in changing the whole ethos of the Peckham W/E Dulwich area which is almost unique in inner London boroughs.

It would inevitably have a "knock on" negative effect on businesses in Bellenden and Lordship lane/Northcross road, which currently are areas so "loved" and popular with both locals and people from across London who enjoy visiting.

When ALL public 'consultation' meetings have so consistently been overwhelmingly AGAINST the introduction of CPZ's/parking charges/restrictions etc., then how can the council possibly justify such a "blanket" plan?

The cost involved in setting up this extreme parking plan and the subsequent running costs (maintaining/monitoring), have to my knowledge never been made public.

As a resident of Oglander road for the past 20 years, I am appalled to contemplate not only the possibility of only being able to park in my own road with a paid permit, but also the closing down/implementation of restrictions across the area reducing the current freedoms almost totally and altering the whole "feel" of this unique part of London.

The system, with very few shortcomings, works now. What the council proposes would ruin this by introducing so many restrictions (parking charges/reduced bays/massively greater areas of double yellow lines/paid residents' permits etc). The council infers that it "listens". If it really does and pays more than 'lip service' to democracy, it will NOT go ahead with this proposed scheme.

It is blatantly obvious to those living in the area that nothing constructive can come from these draconian, very restrictive parking plans. The outcome would be:

- considerable increase in costs both to residents and visitors;
- significantly reduced available parking for all;
- reduced common freedoms and
- a serious threat to local business.

All of which I would hope the council wishes to avoid. [REDACTED]

I live at [redacted] Hinckley Road, and wish to endorse the views expressed below by other members of my household, [redacted]. Please treat this as a separate consultation response.

My objections are to what is proposed for Hinckley Road and the adjoining streets, and my own parking requirements.

**The London Borough of Southwark (Parking places) (Parking zone 'PW') (No. 1) Order 201\***

I am very disappointed that the objections to the CPZ made by residents in Hinckley Road and the adjoining streets appear not to have been taken into account, in an attempt to push through with this scheme as a whole. The current proposals impose a common set of restrictions on a whole area, but this ignores the significant differences that exist in parts of the CPZ, and the needs of residents and local businesses relating to particular streets. The main issue for residents in this area of the proposed zone is the lack of residents' parking spaces in the evenings, not the commuter or shopper daytime parking that affects other areas of the zone. The proposals as they stand will make this worse.

Schedule 1, parking places 92 to 94

I am pleased that the initial proposals for 08:30 to 18:30 parking restrictions have been modified to the 2 hours per day period. However, I object to the precise time period proposed. I would prefer a later period, such as 11:00 to 13:00, 13:00 to 15:00, or even 14:00 to 16:00 to deter cars from picking up children from St John's & St Clement's School at the end of the school day. The 09:00 to 11:00 period will make it difficult for overnight guests of residents or early morning carers for those who are ill or disabled and need help getting up in the morning.

Schedule 1, parking places 92 to 94

The proposal is for parking spaces amounting to 124m, which is space for about 21 residents' cars. This will significantly reduce the parking spaces available for residents. There are currently spaces for about 26 vehicles. This is an unacceptable reduction in the space available for Hinckley Road parking, given the difficulties residents currently experience in the evenings. The shortage of spaces is due mainly to the excessive use of double yellow lines (see below).

Schedule 5, paragraph 4 (visitors' permits)

If Hinckley Road and the adjoining streets have 2 hour parking restrictions, why are the charges set for all day and 5 hour parking sessions? That makes no sense at all. I object to the way that these charges have been set, as they do not align with the restricted parking periods, and the charges are excessive. I propose a reduced charge for 2 hour parking sessions.

**The London Borough of Southwark (Waiting and loading restrictions) (Amendment No. \*\*) Order 201\***

Schedule 1, item no. 429(a)(ii)

For safety reasons the double yellow lines do not need to extend for more than a metre either side of the entrance to the business units in Gowlett Road, and should therefore be reduced in length.

Schedule 1, item no. 429(b)(ii)

At 6.5m, the proposed double yellow lines on the junction of Gowlett Road and Hinckley Road are also too long, restricting residents' parking, and are unnecessary for safety reasons. There is no obvious reason for differences in the length of the lines: some are 6.5m, some are 7.5m, some are 8m and some are 6m. Elsewhere in the borough the lines are much shorter. My objection is to the length of the double yellow lines: 2m should be sufficient to allow pedestrians to cross the road safely and to allow vehicles to turn the corner. If lines are too long, it encourages large lorries to use our residential streets as short cuts, and there has always been sufficient access for the council's waste disposal lorries, even before the yellow lines were introduced in 2015.

Schedule 1, item no. 1128

For the reasons given above I object to the length of the double yellow lines proposed for Hinckley Road and its junctions with Gowlett Road and Keston Road. As above these should be reduced to a minimum - 2m would be sufficient. My main objection here, however, is the totally unnecessary imposition of double yellow lines in the Hinckley Road cul de sac. This

makes no sense as it would in any case be impossible for vehicles to use this for turning. The road is so short that all vehicles access the parking spaces by reversing. I cannot emphasise too much the strength of feeling amongst Hinckley Road residents if this parking area was removed. The council was recently successfully challenged when parking tickets began to appear on vehicles parked at the end of the road.

Schedule 1, item no. 1130(a)(ii) and (b)(ii)

Again I object to the excessive length of the double yellow lines proposed for the junction between Keston Road and Hinckley Road, for the reasons stated above. Arguably, there is no need for double yellow lines at all on the south-west corner of Keston Road and the adjoining north side of Hinckley Road as this corner is not used as a through route for any vehicles because of the cul de sac.

Please take these objections seriously. I and other residents would be happy to discuss the details of the proposed restrictions and the above objections on site so that modifications can be properly considered.

Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[Title]  
Mr

[Firstname]  
[REDACTED]

[Lastname]  
[REDACTED]

[Telephone\_number]  
[REDACTED]

[Email\_address]  
[REDACTED]

[Areyou]  
A resident

[Whichconsultation]  
'Peckham West area parking zone 'PW'

[overallresponse]  
5. I wholly object to

[response]

1) The proposed duration of the residents parking zone is only two hours, which is against the wishes of the Danby Street residents, who responded with the desire that the zone should operate between 08:30 hours and 18:30 hours;

2) This minimal two-hour window does nothing to alleviate the stressful parking situation on Danby Street. Myself and my fellow Danby Street residents have repeatedly expressed our anger and frustration at the parking situation on Danby Street and the massive impact on our quality of life; especially those with families and our older residents; my mother and our next-door neighbour, for example.

3) This new proposal is completely nonsensical, and is clearly a proposal to make money out of Danby Street residents without providing any benefit whatsoever. As stated above, a Danby Street Resident will pay £125.00 per year (or whatever the current charge) for a two-hour slot of protection from an all-day problem. Worse still, non-residents can still park in our limited parking spaces if they pay. So where's the benefit to Danby Street residents?! Ultimately, the situation remains exactly the same, except Southwark Council make money from residents and non-residents alike, which is nothing more than a disgraceful, underhanded cash-grab;

4) Clearly, Southwark Council making money from parking fees and the wishes of businesses have taken precedence over the suffering of Danby Street residents, which is disgusting. What is also disgusting is that I had to hear about these proposals second-hand from one of my neighbours. Why wasn't I written to about these plans so I could state my objections earlier? This is the 21st century; people live busy lives, with work and family. We don't live in the archaic local council world where you post a Public Notice and the townsfolk will all wander by and have a read. This entire situation has been mishandled, and I contend that this is on purpose. I am constantly being asked by my fellow Danby Street residents, "What's happening with the parking? I haven't heard anything." We residents have not heard from you on this most important issue, yet, clearly, Southwark Council and businesses have been making deals to suit themselves, whilst putting the onus on residents to find out what you're up to, instead of advising us; we find that absolutely disgusting. The objection period should be extended, and Joanna Lesak, the Project Manager in charge, should write to all Danby Street residents - indeed all residents within the zone - to advise them of the proposal, as the vast majority of residents who will be affected and charged for parking will not be aware of what is proposed. It is the job of the Project Manager to make all necessary efforts to ensure that the public are kept well-informed of developments, and this absolutely has not been done;

5) Our position:

a. We on Danby Street want the 08:30 hours to 18:30 Monday to Saturday parking zone that WE want, with NO SHARED SPACES. Put what you like on other roads. It is in your power to make this alteration, and it is what we want;

b. If you plan to go ahead with this useless cash-grab, then we want to abandon the entire project, because it is of absolutely no use to Danby Street residents. And we will not allow you to rob us of £125.00 per year for doing absolutely nothing to help us, as with these plans we are charged money, but the terrible parking situation on Danby Street will remain unchanged.

Dear Sir

I wish to object to the making of this traffic order on the following grounds:

1. The consultation on this proposal was fundamentally flawed. It did not take into account the views of the majority of residents and the results were dishonestly reinterpreted to create "support" based on a small minority of roads.
2. Officers failed in their duty to take into account or address the objections of local residents both of the scheme as a whole and specific elements of the scheme. The fact that despite majority objection to the scheme it has been pressed through in an unchanged manner indicated that the officers misdirected themselves in determining if the scheme should progress.
3. The scheme incorporates significant elements of the Southwark Spine plan, which was also subject to many detailed objections by local residents none of which were addressed.
4. The effect of points 2.d and 2.e of the scheme AAT waiting restrictions would create unacceptable loss of parking for local residents in the affected streets. The effect of this would significantly outweigh any proposed benefits of the scheme in reducing commuter parking. This was raised during consultation by a large number of residents but has not been addressed by Officers.
5. The proposed addition of AAT waiting restrictions opposite the junction of ADYS ROAD and NUTBROOK ST will exacerbate the use of these roads as rat-runs for HGV traffic, significantly increasing the danger to pedestrians and local pollution. Again these concerns were raised by numerous local residents during the consultation and during the two previous Southwark Spine consultations but ignored by officers.

Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Adys Road,

London, SE15 4DX

[REDACTED]

Tel: + [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Please note the new email address.

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone\_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email\_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-026 Peckham West Parking Zone

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

Double yellow lines on Gowlett road by dropped curbs are unnecessary nobody parks on those.

Double yellow lines on the cul-de-sac of Hinkley road are unnecessary and will create artificial parking problems.

Double yellow lines on the junctions of Amott and Ady as well as Adys and Nutbrook are wholly unnecessary. all those proposed will make resident parking much more troublesome in the evenings which are the only times when parking is difficult due to residents cars.

Pay by phone must not be the only option. Tap and pay and cash payment machines must be available.

To Traffic Orders

I write expressing my opposition to both sets of proposals for the East Dulwich (ED) and Peckham West parking zones.

I have read through the rationale for the proposals and feel that in both cases there is an extremely slim majority in favour of the proposals. I think that this should call into doubt the benefits of going ahead. Being a regular in both areas I don't regularly see a parking issue therefore do not believe that there is a need for such a scheme in either case. In particular I don't feel that your use of the statistics for the Peckham West zone stands up to scrutiny. Essentially a majority are only in favour if a neighbouring zone goes ahead - so it's rather self-fulfilling. Otherwise there is no majority support. I don't believe that the zones are useful or necessary.

Yours sincerely,

■

■

■

[Title]  
Mr

[Firstname]  
[REDACTED]

[Lastname]  
[REDACTED]

[Telephone number]  
[REDACTED]

[Email address]  
[REDACTED]

[Are you]  
A resident

[Which consultation]  
TMO1920-026 Peckham W  
parking zone

[Overall response]  
5. I wholly object to

[response]

There is no need what so ever for controlled parking in Fenwick Road. There is widespread local objection to this proposal. Also on the map of the controlled areas there is a area shown as existing disabled bay marked outside [REDACTED] Fenwick Road, SE15 4HW. There has never been a Disabled bay [REDACTED], so the very fact that this basic information is incorrect makes me believe that the whole of the information presented is highly flawed and based on bad data, and therefore should be totally disregarded. Let me be completely clear I do not want a CPZ on Fenwick Road.

To whom it may concern,

My name is [REDACTED] and I reside at [REDACTED]

I object to the imposition of a parking zone. Keston Road does not have a need for parking control as there is always places for residents to park. Accordingly, I believe the proposal to include it in the control area are solely a revenue raiser, which the Council have said was not the point of introducing the parking control.

I would be happy to have Keston Road included in the School Streets parking restrictions, but I stringently oppose including it in the controlled parking zone.

Lastly, we are being told that the zone is set up to protect parking for local residents (and not as a revenue raiser). I understand that 100 percent of Keston Road residents responding to the survey have opposed the imposition of a controlled parking zone, yet it is still being included in the final proposal. The Council should be reminded of its duties under public law and the rights of Keston Road residents to seek judicial review of the Council's decision to impose the controlled parking zone on Keston Road despite 100 percent opposition from residents.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

Thursday 26<sup>th</sup> September 2019, 11.25am

Cars double parked near to top left and right hand sides of Choumert Road



No available parking spaces anywhere on Choumert Road, including cars parked in Disabled Badge bays without permits (left/bottom of picture)



Cars parked on double yellow lines at the top of the road, plus a driver 'hovering' at the top waiting for a parking space to become free.



Please note that I'm happy to send you time stamped jpeg's of these pictures if helpful.

Choumert Road is the nearest road in the proposed CPZ to Peckham Rye station, and a significant amount of cars are often vying for parking spaces in the road from 7.45am onwards. A 9am to 11am controlled zone would help to address some of the issue, however it would not stop commuters who work later shifts in London parking in Choumert Road after 11am. The journey time to London Bridge is approx. 12 minutes, so anyone who's working hours are from 12pm onwards would still be likely to take advantage of packing in Choumert Road, so I do not believe a 2 hour period of control would significantly reduce parking in the area. I often arrive home from work after 8pm and Choumert Road has no available parking spaces. Indeed I have often seen cars leaving the road between 8pm and 9.30pm which could well be commuters collecting their cars when arriving back after later shift work.

The times proposed for a CPZ are also not consistent with the timings of controlled zones in the rest of Southwark.

Other than zones P (12pm to 2pm) and HH (12pm to 2pm), all other existing controlled zone operate from either 8am or 8.30am to 6.30pm (with the exception of Zone C1).

The Peckham West area, particularly around Choumert Road is not only very close to Peckham Rye station, a major commuter hub, but also to both the Bellenden Road retail area and Rye Lane. Therefore it is highly likely that visitors to the area will simply plan their journeys around the times when the CPZ is not in operation.

Further, not only is the proposal for a 9am to 11am zone inconsistent with other zones in operation, it leaves the area open to 'zone hopping' from the adjacent zone P. For someone working in the area it would be entirely feasible for them to park their car in zone P in the morning, and then during the morning move the car into the Peckham West zone when the controlled time has expired. Indeed, with current mobile phone/internet/social media technology, an enterprising individual could quite easily develop a legitimate business idea to move commuters cars for them whilst at work, as there would be a free parking hour – between 11am and 12pm – which would enable cars to be moved from one zone to the other.

I have spoken with numerous neighbours and local residents about the proposed restricted time for the zone, and within the areas in which I reside and Danby Street/Copleston Road, and the overwhelming feeling and desire is for an all day zone to be implemented. I know that residents in other areas have lobbied the council for either no zone at all, which may account for the council amending the proposal to restricted times, however this does not support the overall findings of the consultation, as quoted above, that the adjusted highest number of responses was for an all-day zone.

I therefore request that the panels urgently re-assess the time of the proposed CPZ and to seriously consider changing this to an all-day zone of 8.30am to 6.30pm. This would be both consistent with the current neighbouring zones, and indeed fair on the residents of the Peckham West proposed zone.

Your sincerely

[Redacted Signature]

[Title]  
Ms

[Firstname]

[Lastname]

[Telephone\_number]

[Email\_address]

[Areyou]  
A resident

[Whichconsultation]  
TMO1920-026 Peckham W parking zone  
KESTON ROAD

[overallresponse]  
5. I wholly object to

```
[response]
```

I wholly and strongly object to this proposal on the grounds that, I am one of a significant number of residents who have lived on Keston Road for over twenty years. The Imposition of parking permits would unfairly introduce a considerable additional expense to me as a lone parent low income household. And further where this requirement extends to visitors, the effect of which would definately limit and in some cases stop relatives and friends from visiting as before as I would be unable to pay for the visitors permit, leaving me isolated.

**Reference no. 'TMO1920-026 Peckham W parking zone'**

The following paragraphs detail my objections, with rationale, and suggestions/solutions that I wish to be taken account of when framing the final shape of the CPZ in the Peckham West Parking Zone. They are derived from careful study of the zone maps and my personal knowledge of road and pedestrian traffic in the road on which I live as well as the adjacent roads through which I walk on a daily basis, and intelligence obtained as a result of my close relationships with my neighbours in the area.

I have divided my comments into two sections: the first relates to specific and detailed proposals in the geographical area that I am familiar with whilst the second deals with general concerns that have zone-wide application.

**1. My neighbourhood**

**1.1** Many of the proposals as shown on the map suggest that they have been drawn up by personnel who have not had the opportunity to go on site and therefore have not been able to gain an appreciation of the actual road layout and the practicalities of the proposals. That is understandable, since to cover the whole of the proposed zone on foot to prepare proposals would be time-consuming. For that reason, I believe that the following insights will be helpful in improving parking usage within the zone.

**1.2 Proposed layout: paid-for parking bays outside 136/138 Oglander Road and 'existing restrictions' opposite.** The size of the houses in Oglander Road is such that they are very popular with growing families. Managing the transfer of babies and young children to parking spaces across the road, or some distance away, carries attendant issues of safety and practicality. Paid-for bays are less likely to be available than permit-holder bays for resident parking. The proposed paid-for parking bays at the Grove Vale end are directly outside the two homes of residents each with very young children. On the opposite side of the road is a stretch that is approximately the same length as the proposed paid-for bays and runs down the side of the back garden of 83 Grove Vale. In this regard, part of that stretch towards the end is shown to remain with 'existing restrictions' but is, in fact, completely unrestricted.

**1.3 Proposed change:** A more sympathetic layout that would deliver the same number of paid-for bays set in similar proximity to the Grove Vale shops would be to site them on the opposite side of the road, from the end of the existing double yellow lines and within the space of slightly more than 12m. that runs alongside the garden wall. This would release the space outside 136/138 for the convenience of the young families, at no loss to paid-for or permit-holder spaces.

**1.4 Proposed layout: 'stop and rest' area outside 120 Oglander Road.** With only four 'stop and rest' areas in the zone roads within Grove Vale, East Dulwich Road, Avondale Rise and Adys Road, it is not the best use of resources to site one of those spaces at the foot of an incline and just 308ft, less than a minute's walk, from an established, large and hospitable 'stop and rest' area containing tree shade, a community notice-board, bench and two large and colourful planters (maintained and refreshed by my neighbour and me since the time they were installed, by formal agreement with Southwark Council and with watering assistance from local children).

**1.5** The proposed 'stop and rest' area is also outside a family house with small children. It goes against all instincts to facilitate the 'resting' of unknown adults immediately outside their garden gate, with a full view into the front windows and the comings and goings of the residents, of all ages. There are also issues of concern relating to the proximity of parking for a family with very young children, as cited in relation to families at 136/138 (1.2 & 1.3 above).

**1.6 Proposed change:** A 'stop and rest' facility in Oglander Road would be of enhanced value if positioned a further distance from the existing area. The topography of the road, with an incline up from the junction with Everthorpe Road to Marsden Road, means that there is an increased likelihood that those needing such a facility would find it of more benefit were it set where a breathing space might be appreciated, for example, if the hill has generated physical exertion or if returning home with shopping, carrying travel cases or managing other heavy loads. It is logical therefore to site a 'stop and rest' area at least another 525ft further up the road from the proposed site, on the road length where the garden walls between 25 and 23 Oglander Road meet, where no garden gates open out, and where foot-travellers will have just breached the crest of the hill and if breathless, would most welcome a resting place.

**1.7 Proposed layout: permit bays on Everthorpe Road and Oxenford Street.** An on-the-ground review would show that there is a logic, and capacity, for pay to park spaces in the run of road alongside the garden areas of Copleston Road and Oxenford Street on both sides from the junction with Oxenford Street in Everthorpe Road, and along the side of gardens between the junctions of Copleston Road and Bellenden Road on Oxenford Street. At present, this space is used heavily during the day by commuters to East Dulwich Station and is therefore not available to shoppers or other short-stay visitors.

**1.8 Proposed change:** Move the pay-to-park bays from the Oglander Road end of Everthorpe Road and from outside 98 Oglander Road to the large garden-backed spaces on both Oxenford and Everthorpe Roads, where they will not impede resident, trades, or visitor parking to any adjacent homes.

**1.9 Proposed layout: Anomalous 'existing restrictions' on East Dulwich Road alongside Play Area and shops.** This area has previously had no parking restrictions whatsoever, apart from a short run of double yellow lines. The vehicles that currently use the space do not cause congestion or other problems. Parking is invaluable for those using the shops on this parade and for residents of the accommodation above the shops.

**1.10 Proposed change:** The location needs to be surveyed on the ground and any space not already carrying double yellow lines should be designated as space available for pay-to-park, to facilitate use of the shops, and resident permit holders, for use of the residents who live above the shops.

**1.11 Proposed layout: 'stop and shop' bays on Grove Vale.**

**1.12 Proposed change:** Grove Vale parking for shops seems now to be working well so that there appears to be no need for change, especially as it will adversely impact existing vulnerable businesses.

## **2. Zone-wide issues**

### **2.1. Payment system**

**2.1.1** Residents should not be required/forced to have mobile phones to download parking apps or upload card details to the web. Not all drivers choose to have a mobile phone and in particular, a smart phone. No-one should be able to pay for their parking when they are not present at the site. **Payment machines must be made available for use by present travellers with a card-tap mechanism (as used in public transport) and cash.**

### **2.2 Permit costs & numbers issued**

**2.2.1** High proposed costs of the resident permits and even greater costs of visitor permits penalises those reliant on vehicular travel and those in need of regular visits from third parties. A CPZ that makes a surplus, as those in Southwark do (more than £6million in 2017/18, according to the information on the Council website) is not appropriate. **A review, published for resident scrutiny, and reduction of the proposed level of cost would go some way towards helping residents to support other actions of the Council.**

**2.2.2** Unfairly high and hostile business permit costs and low limits on numbers of permits available will put pressure in businesses and jeopardise their future as well as our high street shops, along with the re-designation of currently unrestricted parking (such as on East Dulwich Road) as double yellow lines (*see also 2.4.3/4/5 below*). **Business permit costs need to be set much lower than proposed, at a level that will not damage business viability, and exceptional arrangements need to be made for key workers such as teachers.**

### **2.3 Impact of CPZ on incapacitated or isolated residents**

**2.3.1** One outcome of the CPZ is that it will make it more difficult and costly for residents who are restricted to their homes to receive casual visitors, relatives or friends visiting from other areas and informal carers. This will result directly in increased isolation for less ambulant older, disabled or otherwise housebound residents and will also place a strain on other council services when these residents who can no longer rely on informal carers have to be included in formal care provision. **The number of visitors permits available per affected household in such cases should be increased significantly and visits by informal carers, exempted since they are relieving the Council of additional budget drain on Social Services provision.**

**2.3.2** The proposed 9-11am restrictions will undoubtedly impact the work and effectiveness of formal support and care workers who are programmed to make visits to assist with morning routines and feeding. **We ask for exemptions for key workers in such cases.**

### **2.4 Paid parking bay issues**

**2.4.1** Placement of paid parking bays is ill-thought-out with some paid bays ill placed, far from shops and other amenities: paid parking bays need to be more strategically considered after an on the ground survey has been made.

**2.4.2** The reduction in available parking spaces as a result of over-use of yellow lines, for example on and around dropped kerbs, in roads outside commercial outlets, around cul-de-sacs, at junctions (for example, Amott/Adys or Nutbrook/Adys) are unnecessary and combined with those arising from designated *stop and rest* areas, will rob our streets of much needed parking spaces.

Dear Sir, Madam

Further to the invitation to comment on the proposals for the Peckham West parking zone, I write to strongly object to the current proposal for the controlled zone to operate only between the hours of 9am and 11am, and request that the proposal is amended for the zone be implemented from the hours of 8.30am to 6.30pm. As stated in the councils Feedback update dated 31 May 2019, "When responses were adjusted to include those that would change their mind, **the highest number of responses were in support of an all-day zone**, albeit by a small margin."

I have lived at [REDACTED] Choumert Road for over 12 years, and have experienced first hand the significant increase in the volume of parking in the area, and most notably in recent years as CPZ's have been introduced in neighbouring areas. Indeed I have been writing to the Transport Projects department at Southwark Council for a number of years now.

The introduction of the Zone P parking zone transferred a significant volume of cars and vans from this area immediately to Choumert Road when this was introduced. This has led to not only severe difficulty in parking close to my house, but also an increase in road rage incidents and dangerous double parking. To demonstrate the extent of the current parking issue, please see attached some photos of parking in Choumert Road recently, and **outside** of the proposed hours of the CPZ:

Wednesday 25<sup>th</sup> September 2019, 7.24pm

Cars and vans double parked near the top of the road, travelling from the Copleston Road end:



**2.4.3** The number of proposed spaces available can be increased through review of the intended imposition of additional double yellow lines across the CPZ area; an on-the-ground review by officers, of all locations in which application or lengthening of new yellow lines is proposed will ensure that they are necessary in practice.

**2.4.4** The introduction of double yellow lines around dropped kerbs where none currently exist need not exceed the dropped kerb by more than 1metre each side. Two metres on either side will result in unnecessary loss of available space for parking.

#### **2.5 Car Club cars**

**2.5.1** There has been an observably dramatic increase in car club car use which means that many cars will be parked in resident permit holder spaces, taking up spaces that will already be at a premium. **Car club designated spaces should be included in consideration and equally spaced out over several streets.** Permits issued by Southwark to car clubs must be strictly monitored so their use doesn't impact negatively on permit paying residents.

████████████████████

**Resident**

████ Oglander Road, London SE15 4DB

[Title]

Mr

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone\_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email\_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-026 Peckham west Parking zone

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

Double yellow lines on Gowlett road by dropped curbs are unnecessary nobody parks on those.

Double yellow lines on the cul-de-sac of Hinkley road are unnecessary and will create artificial parking problems.

Double yellow lines on the junctions of Amott and Ady as well as Adys and Nutbrook are wholly unnecessary. all thoseproposed will make resident parking much more troublesome in the evenings which are the only times when parking is difficult due to residents cars.

Pay by phine must not be the only option. Tap and pay and cash payment machines must be available.

Hello

I am writing to express my support for the implementation of the CPZ in Peckham West.

The parking situation on my street - Danby Street - is becoming completely unsustainable and I frequently drive around for 10+ minutes searching for a space. Most neighbours have now resorted to reserving their spaces with bins when they go out.

Best wishes



[Title]  
Mr

[Firstname]  
[REDACTED]

[Lastname]  
[REDACTED]

[Telephone\_number]  
[REDACTED]

[Email\_address]  
[REDACTED]

[Areyou]  
A resident

[Whichconsultation]  
TMO1920-026 Peckham West Parking Zone

[overallresponse]  
5. I wholly object to

[response]

Double yellow lines on Gowlett road by dropped curbs are unnecessary nobody parks on those.  
Double yellow lines on the cul-de-sac of Hinkley road are unnecessary and will create artificial parking problems.  
Double yellow lines on the junctions of Amott and Ady as well as Adys and Nutbrook are wholly unnecessary. all those proposed will make resident parking much more troublesome in the evenings which are the only times when parking is difficult due to residents cars.  
Pay by phone must not be the only option. Tap and pay and cash payment machines must be available.

## **2. CPZ -Wide Issues**

### ***2.1. Parking payment system***

**2.1.1** Residents should not be required/forced to have mobile phones to download parking apps or upload card details to the web. Not all drivers choose to have a mobile phone and in particular, a smart phone. No-one should be able to pay for their parking when they are not present at the site. **Payment machines must be made available for use by present travellers with a card-tap mechanism (as used in public transport) and cash.**

### ***2.2 Parking Permit costs & numbers issued***

**2.2.1** High proposed costs of the resident permits and even greater costs of visitor permits penalises those reliant on vehicular travel and those in need of regular visits from third parties. A CPZ that makes a surplus, as those in Southwark do (more than £6million in 2017/18, according to the information on the Council website) is not appropriate. **A review, published for resident scrutiny, and reduction of the proposed level of cost would go some way towards helping residents to support other actions of the Council.**

**2.2.2** Unfairly high and hostile business permit costs and low limits on numbers of permits available will put pressure in businesses and jeopardise their future as well as our high street shops, along with the re-designation of currently unrestricted parking (such as on East Dulwich Road) as double yellow lines (*see also 2.4.3/4/5 below*). **Business permit costs need to be set much lower than proposed, at a level that will not damage business viability, and exceptional arrangements need to be made for key workers such as teachers.**

### ***2.3 Impact of CPZ on incapacitated or isolated residents***

**2.3.1** One outcome of the CPZ is that it will make it more difficult and costly for residents who are restricted to their homes to receive casual visitors, relatives or friends visiting from other areas and informal carers. This will result directly in increased isolation for less ambulant older, disabled or otherwise housebound residents and will also place a strain on other council services when these residents who can no longer rely on informal carers have to be included in formal care provision. **The number of visitors permits available per affected household in such cases should be increased significantly and visits by informal carers, exempted since they are relieving the Council of additional expenditure on Social Services provision.**

**2.3.2** The proposed 9-11am restrictions will undoubtedly impact the work and effectiveness of formal support and care workers who are programmed to make visits to assist with morning routines and feeding. **We ask for exemptions for key workers in such cases.**

### ***2.4 Excessive Imposition of Double Yellow Lines .***

**2.4.1** The reduction in available parking spaces as a result of over-use of yellow lines, for example on and around dropped kerbs, in roads outside commercial outlets, around cul-de-sacs, at junctions (for example, Amott/Adys or Nutbrook/Adys) are unnecessary and combined with those arising from designated *stop and rest* areas, will rob our streets of much needed parking spaces.

**2.4.2** The number of proposed spaces available can be increased through review of the intended imposition of additional double yellow lines across the CPZ area; an on-the-ground review by officers, of all locations in which application or lengthening of new yellow lines is proposed will ensure that they are necessary in practice.

**2.4.3** The introduction of double yellow lines around dropped kerbs where none currently exist need not exceed the dropped kerb by more than 1metre each side.. Two meters on either side will result in unnecessary loss of parking

From

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Dear Sirs,

This is from [REDACTED] a resident of [REDACTED] Oglander Road.

1. I do not want and have never wanted a CPZ for Oglander Road. I have made my objections clear at numerous public meetings and in writing via community forums. Whilst parking by non-residents in the area has increased over the years, I believe it is still at a manageable level. We do not need one.
2. A way should have been found by the council to have a plurality of systems in place in the area they have chosen to call 'Peckham West'. Different pressures on parking and different attitudes from residents are evident depending on where people live. The area around Peckham Rye station is very different from Oglander Road surrounding streets.
3. The council has been dishonest in its approach to residents over the issue. It has wanted to impose a CPZ from the outset and its claim that it wished to hold a 'consultation' on the issue has been found wanting. When people in our area and surrounding streets voted against the council proposals, their views were simply ignored. Worse still, the figures recorded were later misreported and misrepresented.
4. A CPZ comes with a cost to residents. Where previously residents paid nothing extra on top of their council tax to park, now they will have to. This is an extra tax, pure and simple. It is a money-generating exercise by Southwark council, on top of any purported environmental initiative it wishes to pursue.
5. CPZ payment also disproportionately impacts lower income and potentially vulnerable groups, including key workers in education and health services and low income pensioners.

This is from Isabelle Gregory, also a resident of [REDACTED] Oglander Road.

1. I do not want a CPZ in Oglander Road.
2. I do not want a 'rest area' outside number [REDACTED] Oglander Road, should CPZ be brought in, as this will reduce the number of parking spaces.

I would like to you to record the addition of my voice to these points raised in the Peckham West CPZ meeting 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2019

**3. 4.1 Opening statements of Concern**

4. 4.1.1 Before the review of the matters arising from the workshop groups was begun, attendees noted their marked disappointment among that no Ward Councillors or officers were present at the meeting despite having been made aware of it and invited. This was viewed as an indicator that led residents to believe that their concerns have not been listened to and indicated that it they felt that this was disrespectful to community members.
5. 4.1.2 Attendees particularly wished to record that the view was expressed, and recognised by the majority of residents attending, that the majority of people do not want a CPZ. The simple No majority to the initial consultation had been disregarded and What if responses were then disproportionately weighted to provide statistics that were able to be interpreted as a positive response.
6. 4.1.3 This was seen as evidence that Southwark council's pincer movement on Peckham West was a deliberate means of putting undue pressure on residents, supported by the inclusion of the responses to 'what if' questions in the consultation document.
7. 4.1.4 It was also widely felt that changes to the Dog Kennel Hill CPZ could alleviate many of the parking problems that had arisen since its implementation.
8. 4.1.5 Concern was expressed that merely participating in the feedback process on the proposed Peckham West (PW)CPZ ran the risk of being interpreted as adding support to the Council's proposals and detracting from the general view that residents do not want a CPZ, allowing the Council once again to disregard the overall rejection of the CPZ as they focus only the feedback to the definite proposals.
9. 4.1.6 Residents present agreed that in addition to the minute of the meeting, they would contact their Councillors to express their disappointment at a no show; at previous concerns on CPZ not being taken seriously; and at the massaging of data and numbers by officers of Southwark Parking department and their associates.
10. **4.2 Further Agreed Points of Concern. These are to be understood to be in response to a feared imposition by the Council of a CPZ – and not requested otherwise,**
11. **4.2.1 Payment system**

12. The meeting agreed that payment by phone for parking in parking bays should not be via 'Pay by phone' applications. Residents should not be required/forced to have mobile phones to park, download apps and upload card details to the web. In particular, concern was expressed that not all drivers choose to have a mobile phone. It was noted with concern that in certain bays, payment by phone also enables commuters to park outside the restricted hours and then, when restrictions apply, phone in payment from their place of work. **The meeting requested that payment machines be made available for use with a card-tap mechanism (as used in public transport) and cash.**
13. **4.2.2 Permit costs & numbers issued**
14. a) The meeting was united in concern over the high proposed costs of the resident permits and even greater costs of visitor permits. It was agreed that a self-funding CPZ was not one that we, as residents, should have to fund through expensive permits, year after year. **The meeting required that councillors review and reduce the level of cost.**
15. b) Residents expressed deep fears around Southwark council issuing parking permits in numbers far outstripping the number of spaces that the CPZ will be able to accommodate and the motivation behind the creeping CPZs phenomenon, noting that a CPZ is considered a 'cash cow' for the Council. They acknowledged that the standard response by the Council to this complaint was to state that income from a CPZ is a restricted income stream and must be spent on transport expenditure. They believe that this is a disingenuous response since by generating income in this way, unrestricted core income available to the Council from other sources would remain unused and would be available for allocation to other expenditure. It was noted that information on Southwark's own website showed that surplus income from Parking zones in Southwark after expenditure was deducted for 2017/18 reached £6.5million.
16. d) It was agreed that unfairly high and hostile business permit costs (circa £570 p.a.) will put pressure in businesses and jeopardise their future as well as our high street shops, along with the re-designation of currently unrestricted parking (such as on East Dulwich Road) as double yellow lines (see 4.2.5 below). **Council is asked that in addition to reviewing the blanket proposals for double yellow lines, business permit costs are set much lower than proposed, at a level that will not damage business viability.**
17. **4.2.3 Impact of CPZ on residents**
18. a) One outcome of the CPZ is that it will make it more difficult and costly for residents who are restricted to their homes to receive casual visitors, relatives or friends visiting from other areas and informal carers. This will result directly in increased isolation for less ambulant older, disabled or otherwise housebound residents and will also place a strain on other council services when these residents who can no longer rely on informal carers have to be included in formal care provision. **The meeting requested that Council improves the number of visitor permits available in such cases and exempts visits by informal carers.**
19. b) The proposed 9-11am restrictions will undoubtedly impact the work and effectiveness of formal support and care workers who are programmed to make visits to assist with morning routines and feeding. **The meeting requested exemptions for key workers in such cases.**
20. **4.2.4 Paid parking bays**
21. a) The meeting noted that placement of paid parking bays is ill-thought-out with some paid bays ill placed, far from shops and other amenities, and that **paid parking bays need to be more strategically considered on the ground.**
22. b) Grove Vale parking for shops was noted to be working well so that there appears to be no need for change, especially as it will adversely impact existing vulnerable businesses.
23. **4.2.5 Double yellow lines**
24. a) Great concern was expressed over the reduction in available parking spaces as a result of over-use of yellow lines, for example on and around dropped kerbs, in roads outside commercial outlets, around cul-de-sacs, at junctions (for example, Amott/Adys or Nutbrook/Adys) and on designated stop and rest areas, which are unnecessary and will rob our streets of much needed parking spaces.
25. b) **The meeting required that councillors increase the number of proposed spaces available through review of the intended application of double yellow lines across the CPZ area; and asked for an on-the-ground review by officers, of all locations in which application of new yellow lines were proposed.**
26. c) **The meeting proposes that introduction of double yellow lines around dropped kerbs where none currently exist must not exceed the dropped kerb by more than 1metre each side.**
27. **4.2.6 Car Club cars**
28. a) Attendees noted that the dramatic increase in car club car use means many cars will be parked in resident permit holder spaces, taking up spaces that will already be at a premium. **Car club designated spaces should be included in consideration and equally spaced out over several streets.** Permits issued by Southwark to car clubs need to be strictly monitored so their use doesn't impact negatively on permit paying residents.
29. b) Attendees particularly noted that Southwark's disabled badge policy in relation to CPZ restrictions seems to be less generous than found in other boroughs and needs to be clarified.
30. **4.2.7 School Street Option**
31. The meeting suggested that roads around schools & nurseries may want to be considered for the implementation of a school street scheme whereby roads are closed off to general traffic between 8.30-9.30am

and 3-4pm, at no cost to residents and only residents may come and go. Southwark has already implemented other school streets in the borough.

Response To Traffic Management Order: Ref. No. 'TMO1920-026 Peckham W parking zone'

From: [REDACTED] Oglander Road SE 15 4DB ( Resident)

I have divided my comments into two sections: the first relates to specific and detailed proposals in the area in which I live, while the second deals with general CPZ wide concerns.

### **1. My Locality**

**1.1 Proposed layout: paid-for parking bays outside 136/138 Oglander Road and 'existing restrictions' opposite.** The proposed paid-for parking bays at the Grove Vale end are directly outside the homes of residents with several very young children. On the opposite side of the road is a stretch that is approximately the same length as the proposed paid-for bays and runs down the side of the back garden of 83 Grove Vale. In this regard, part of that stretch is shown to remain with 'existing restrictions' but is, in fact, completely unrestricted.

**Proposed change to paid for parking bays:** A better layout that would deliver the same number of paid-for bays set in similar proximity to the Grove Vale shops would be to site them on the opposite side of the road, from the end of the existing double yellow lines and within the space of slightly more than 12m. that runs alongside the garden wall. This would release the space outside 136/138 for the convenience of the young families, at no loss to paid-for or permit-holder spaces.

**1.2 Proposed layout: 'stop and rest' area outside 120 Oglander Road.** With only four 'stop and rest' areas in the roads within Grove Vale, East Dulwich Road, Avondale Rise and Adys Road, it is not the best use of resources to site one of those spaces at the foot of an incline and just 308ft, less than a minute's walk, from an established, large and hospitable 'stop and rest' area containing tree shade, a bench and two large and colourful planters at the end of Oglander Road

**Proposed change to stop & rest** A 'stop and rest' facility in Oglander Road would be of enhanced value if positioned a further distance from the existing area. It is logical therefore to site a 'stop and rest' area at least another 525ft further up the road, in the road length where the garden walls between 25 and 23 Oglander Road meet, where no garden gates open out, and where foot-travellers will have just breached the crest of the hill and if breathless, would most welcome a resting place.

**1.3 Proposed layout: permit bays on junction of Oglander & Everthorpe Road Road .** These are alongside some dwelling frontages.

**Proposed change to permit bays :** Move the pay-to-park bays from the Oglander Road end of Everthorpe Road and from outside 98 Oglander Road to the large garden-backed spaces on both Oxenford and Everthorpe Roads, where they will not impede resident, trades, or visitor parking to any adjacent homes.

**1.4 Proposed layout: Anomalous 'existing restrictions' on East Dulwich Road alongside Play Area and shops.** This area has previously had no parking restrictions whatsoever, apart from a short run of double yellow lines. The vehicles that currently use the space do not cause congestion or other problems. Parking is important to local businesses for those using their shops on this parade and for residents of the accommodation above the shops.

**Proposed change to East Dulwich Road Restrictions:** The location needs to be surveyed on the ground and any space not already carrying double yellow lines should be designated as space available for pay-to-park, to facilitate use of the shops, and resident permit holders, for use of the residents who live above the shops.

**1.5 Proposed layout: 'stop and shop' bays on Grove Vale.**

**Proposed change on Grove Vale :** Grove Vale parking for shops seems now to be working well so that there appears to be no need for change, especially as it will adversely impact existing vulnerable businesses.

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone number]

■

[Email address]

■

[Are you]

A resident

[Which consultation]

Peckham West CPZ Consultation October 2019 Adys Road

[overall response]

2. I support this proposal

[response]

This submission seriously questions the evidence and reasoning given for the latest changes in operating hours of the proposed Peckham West CPZ. It also raises concerns about the validity of such changes and the new consultation process, presented as they have been.

9-11 am parking restrictions will not much help the residents of Adys Road, particularly those of us who are located in the part that bears the brunt of non-residential parking near: The Leisure Centre, St John's School, St John's Church, Nurseries, Shopping and Café facilities, Goose Green Open Space and Goose Green children's Play Park. Our road is also an easy walk to all Lordship lane facilities. Adys Road directly abuts the roads that will have all-day parking, so we would be an attractive street for even more non-residential parking after 9-11 am. This is not just "commuter" parking, it is an all-day problem. We must have all-day restrictions to actually tackle it.

There has been one properly conducted consultation with a Council decision published, but there is now a second "consultation" that is based on a changed decision.

The first consultation had a printed, simple questionnaire circulated to all houses accompanied by a Council-run exhibition of large-scale maps for all to see. Backup, detailed information was available online to those who could access it.

The new "consultation" has been launched haphazardly, online only. Decisions have been changed (notably, the now useless two-hour restrictions instead of all-day) and those residents that have somehow become aware of it have to follow online links

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone\_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email\_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-026 Peckham West area parking zone 'PW'

[overallresponse]

2. I support this proposal

[response]

I wanted to amend my previous response to reflect that I am completely in favour of parking restrictions but feel that the proposal is not serious enough at the moment. I think the parking restrictions should be Monday to Friday from 9-4 pm at least

only, if they are able. Of course, letters may be sent to the Council (by those who have discovered this is an option).

There has been no official display/information event for the residents to attend to examine the changes and give their views.

The new, online Council documentation says:

"The residents and businesses within the Peckham West study area were divided in regards to preference for all day versus two hour zone (35% and 29% respectively) however community meetings (Dulwich Community Council and two informal Peckham meetings) identified support for a two hour zone. Officers have indicated that a two hour zone should be sufficient to address the commuter issue in this area."

This strangely contradictory paragraph is offered as a reason to have two-hour parking restrictions instead of the proposed all-day. It says there has been "support identified" for two-hour restrictions - after pointing out the fact that this "support" was less over the whole of Peckham West than that for all-day restrictions (29% vs 35%)!

So, what of these "community meetings" that caused the Council to go against the wishes of the community and change all-day to two-hour restrictions?

Firstly, we attended a third "informal Peckham meeting" on 4/10/19 in Amott Road Baptist Church. It had been arranged by the same organisation that had sponsored the first two "informal Peckham meetings" referred to in the above extract.

There were less than 30 people present (obviously, a tiny percentage of those who will be affected), including the organisers. Despite the low attendance, views ranged across the spectrum from 'no restrictions at all, we're alright as we are', through 'It's just a Council scheme to raise money', to 'all-day restrictions are essential'. The organisers, however were enthusiastic about representing our "views" to the Council. At best, these so-called "community meetings" are redundant because we all have been properly asked to represent our individual views to the Council. At worst, the meeting organisers are highlighting unrepresentative views to the Council, possibly flavoured by the organisers' own agenda. Even if all the people present were to be in agreement, and they definitely were not in this case, why should the views of a tiny few receive such amplification?

If these "informal Peckham meetings" are informing Council Officers and decisions, this is a democratic travesty.

Secondly, we made written representations to all the Goose Green Councillors, before they attended the Dulwich Community Council meeting, supporting the need for this part of Adys Road to have all-day restrictions. Why is this support in favour of all-day restrictions not mentioned in the extract above?

Thirdly, the fact keeps being ignored, and we keep having to repeat it – it is not "commuters" (most commonly interpreted as people who travel to transport connections, particularly stations, perhaps to attend work all day) who are mainly responsible for our parking problems here. So, the Officers indicating that "a two-hour zone should be sufficient to address the commuter issue in this area" is not a relevant judgement. It does not address the actual parking problem here in Adys Road (and others).

This new "consultation" based on its quoted information for the changes is, in itself, very poorly delivered to the community. The opinions provided as reasons for the decision changes is non-representative and highly questionable – yet is being used to frustrate the wishes of residents who have already made their views clear in a properly-run Council consultation. Those of us in Peckham West, who live in streets that are over-run during the day by non-residential parking, deserve to be able to trust the Council to give us the support they have promised us. Is this not reasonable?

Finally, why has the Council said in this latest communication that, upon review, the all-day control may be reduced, but the two-hour restriction cannot be increased? On what basis, statutory or otherwise, is this being said?

If (the useless to us) two-hour control is brought in as opposed to all-day controls, will residents' permit fees reflect the four-fifths time reduction? If the original all-day resident permit fee would have been, for example, £125 – then why should we pay more than £25?

[Telephone number]

[REDACTED]

[Email address]

[REDACTED]

[Are you]

A resident

[Which consultation]

Peckham West Parking Zone (Revised since decisions made and published after consultation) Adys Road

[overall response]

2. I support this proposal

[response]

Adys Road (south) needs special consideration. The ability of residents to park here is seriously affected by the following non-residential vehicle domination:

\*The Leisure Centre (Adys Road south is its carpark now), \*St John's School staff and visitors (carpark = Adys Road), \*Parents parking for drop-off, pickup, Playpark and Café use, \*Lordship lane shoppers (Adys Road = carpark), \* Goose Green Open Space, Church and Nursery users (Adys Road = carpark), and \*Predicted overflow from East Dulwich all day parking restrictions.

Two hour daily restrictions here will not address the problem. Adys Road south needs to have all day restrictions to match East Dulwich. The original decision after the consultation recognised this and there has been no explanation to, or fresh consultation of, the residents of Adys Road south to account for this strange change in the plan.

The original consultation was issued to all households in the area. It was well laid out and the conclusions were sound. Now, it seems, that exercise was pointless and we in Adys Road south are suffering the whims of people who are not in our situation, who appear to be able to change Council decisions that were based on the evidence collected.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I did attend the community meeting below, although I had to leave early. I see my name and address has been included at the foot of the previous email.

I wish it noted that I totally support the introduction of a CPZ in Peckham West as the parking near my house in Copleston Road is so difficult, due I believe to commuter parkers. I am despondent some days about the lack of parking especially when returning home with my young children. I have to leave items in the boot of my car for days as they are sometimes too heavy to carry back so far and I can't just pop out in the evening when spaces become available and leave my children at home alone whilst I walk two or three streets away. The 9am to 11am slot meets my needs thank you.

Regards

  
Copleston Rd SE15 4AF

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone\_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email\_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-026Peckham W parking zone

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

I am a teacher assistant at a special needs school - Highshore school. Thus, on low salary and for me to pay for a parking permit, it will have effect my household budget deeply on top of the rent I pay for a flat. I am usually using my car only during the weekends so parking space is necessary permanently. Kind regards.

To whom this may concern,

My name is [REDACTED]

I reside at [REDACTED] Keston road SE15 4JA and i am opposed to putting parking permits on the street. I have lived at [REDACTED] keston road for over 15 years and can assure you we have no issues parking therefore we do not need it. I am for school streets.

Many thanks

[REDACTED]

To whom this may concern,

My name is [REDACTED]

I reside at [REDACTED] Keston road SE15 4JA and i am opposed to putting parking permits on the street. I have lived at [REDACTED] keston road for over 15 years and can assure you we have no issues parking therefore we do not need it. I am for school streets.

Many thanks

[REDACTED]

To whom this may concern,

My name is [REDACTED] I reside at [REDACTED] Keston road SE15 4JA and i am opposed to putting parking permits on the street. I have lived at [REDACTED] keston road for over 15 years and can assure you we have no issues parking therefore we do not need it. I am for school streets.

Many thanks

[REDACTED]

[Title]

Mrs

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone\_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email\_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

LBo Southwark Notice of Proposals\_2019 Peckham West area parking zone 'PW'

Hinckley Road

[overallresponse]

4. I object to part

[response]

On the whole I support this scheme however:

There should not be yellow lines in the dead-end section of Hinckley Road. This will lead to the unnecessary loss of parking space (as per emails to James McAsh and Joanna Lesak dated 27/9/2019). Also 9am - 11am is inconvenient for overnight visitors. 11am - 1pm would be better.

[Title]  
Mrs

[Firstname]  
[REDACTED]

[Lastname]  
[REDACTED]

[Telephone\_number]  
[REDACTED]

[Email\_address]  
[REDACTED]

[Areyou]  
A resident

[Whichconsultation]  
<https://www.southwark.gov.uk/assets/attach/10535/Peckham-W-area-parking-zone-PW-correction-notice-dated-26-Sept-2019-.pdf>

[overallresponse]  
4. I object to part

[response]  
I do not agree with the implementation of a 'stopping place' outside [REDACTED] Oglander Road. This will limit the number of parking places on a road that is already too full of cars already. There is no need for a 'stopping place' as we have the wonderful bench on the Grove Vale corner of Oglander and Copleston Road.

[Title]  
Mr

[Firstname]  
[REDACTED]

[Lastname]  
[REDACTED]

[Telephone number]  
[REDACTED]

[Email address]  
[REDACTED]

[Areyou]  
A resident

[Whichconsultation]  
TMO1920-026 Peckham W parking zone

[overallresponse]  
4. I object to part

[response]

1. There should not be yellow lines in the dead-end section of Hinckley Road. This will lead to the unnecessary loss of parking space.
2. £125 per year is an unreasonably high fee. £50 per year would be more reasonable.
3. 9am - 11am is inconvenient for overnight visitors. 10am - 12pm would be better.

[Title]  
Mr

[Firstname]  
[REDACTED]

[Lastname]  
[REDACTED]

[Telephone\_number]  
[REDACTED]

[Email\_address]  
[REDACTED]

[Areyou]  
A resident

[Whichconsultation]  
East dulwich cpz

[overallresponse]  
5. I wholly object to

[response]  
65% of dulwich objected to cpz in dulwich how is this going through ? And its just a start of strategy to make the whole of dulwich cpz and generate money

[Title]

Mr

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone\_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email\_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-026 Peckham West area parking zone 'PW'

[overallresponse]

4. I object to part

[response]

I object to the permitted hours of use for non-residents in the parking zones across Choumert as this does not benefit the residents of the area that struggle on a daily basis to find parking in close proximity to their own homes. The roads are congested and parking areas occupied across the entire day from 6am until late evening due to commuters, residents, builders, contractors and delivery companies using the unrestricted parking spaces. Further, as a resident, I have struggled to park anyway close to my house on a regular basis due to unrecognisable vehicles parked outside my house, from business vans, abandoned vehicles and commuters. From a safety perspective, this leaves me vulnerable to leaving my car streets away from my home and also leaving valuable items in my without being able to monitor the whereabouts of my belonging such as baby car seats and buggies.

[Title]  
Mrs

[Firstname]  
[REDACTED]

[Lastname]  
[REDACTED]

[Telephone\_number]  
[REDACTED]

[Email\_address]  
[REDACTED]

[Areyou]  
A resident

[Whichconsultation]  
TMO1920-026 Peckham W parking zone

[overallresponse]  
5. I wholly object to

[response]  
I do feel the need for Parking Restrictions in this zone but if it is go ahead then

1. I object double yellow lines outside drives and the length they will go either side of the drive. Single yellow would be enough.

2. Paid parking of £2.75 per hour from 9 am to 11 am will do nothing to stop daytime or evening parking from non residents. It is worth a commuter paying £5.50 to park their car for the day.

3. Can the times be changed to 3 pm to 5 pm say to stop people parking all day and give residents a chance.

4 I live in Fenwick Grove SE15 4HT and a lot of the existing parking will go on yellow lines creating an even worse situation and residents will not be able to park in front of their own drives.. There is not usually a problem now.

5. As Fenwick Grove is such a short road with drives and would lose much of it's parking space then can the area be only residents of the Grove ONLY otherwise cars from other roads where there is less parking will take up existing spaces.

Thank you for your help in this matter.

[Title]  
Ms.

[Firstname]  
[REDACTED]

[Lastname]  
[REDACTED]

[Telephone number]  
[REDACTED]

[Email address]  
[REDACTED]

[Areyou]  
A resident

[Whichconsultation]  
Peckham W parking Zone PW order 201

[overallresponse]  
4. I object to part

[response]  
I object to the removal of over ten parking spaces on the north side of Oglander Road at the intersection with Adys Road. I can see no good reason why these spaces are being taken away - a total of about ten spaces - which will impact all the residents near that intersection. We will have to pay for parking but still won't be able to park anywhere near our homes - this really does not seem fair. Also 9-11 is too early - support 11 - 1 as in other areas. Also where do visitors park?

Hi there

We live at [REDACTED] Amott Road, SE15 4JD, which falls within the proposed Peckham West parking zone.

We support parts of this proposal, but object to other elements and would like the council to consider alternatives. Specifically, we would like the 2 hour controlled parking period to be pushed back to 10-12 or 11-1. A 9am start makes things difficult when we have overnight visitors. If the objective of the 2 hour controlled parking period is to deter all-day parking by train commuters, it feels like this could be achieved with a slightly later start.

Thanks

[REDACTED]



Hi there

We live at [REDACTED] Amott Road, SE15 4JD, which falls within the proposed Peckham West parking zone.

We support parts of this proposal, but object to other elements and would like the council to consider alternatives. Specifically, we would like the 2 hour controlled parking period to be pushed back to 10-12 or 11-1. A 9am start makes things difficult when we have overnight visitors. If the objective of the 2 hour controlled parking period is to deter all-day parking by train commuters, it feels like this could be achieved with a slightly later start.

Thanks

[REDACTED]

[Title]

Mr

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone\_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email\_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

Parking west

[overallresponse]

1. I wholly support

[response]

I live in WAGHORN STREET SE15 ,which was part of the Peckham west CPZ . But on reading your list of roads Waghorn Street is not included. Please can you let me know why. The only reason I'm hoping it was not included was you are going to make it resident only parking....I can only pray ...hope it is.

Please can you let me know as I do 12 hour shifts and start night shift at 7pm and cannot attend the meeting on the 03/Oct/19 .

Thank you

[REDACTED]

WAGHORN ST

We are aware that residents in other parts of the PW zone have objected to the introduction of a CPZ and have organised meetings and representations. We wish to alert Southwark Council to the fact that although this group has been more vocal in their objections, there are many other views of residents in this zone, and like me, many many of our neighbours wholly support the introduction of the CPZ in this area.

Hello,

I support the introduction of the CPZ, however I am disappointed by the proposed time frame of the restrictions being just for two hours. I live in the south of Reedham Street, which is on the edge of the proposed CPZ and gets predominantly used by motorists from outside the area to make use of the parking opportunities near to the high street. Given residents on the street voted 100% of the CPZ, could we be included in the existing CPZ (like the north of Reedham Street and adjacent McDermott Rd) that operates all day? Otherwise our street will continue to be used as a free parking space by others after 11am for the rest of the day.

Also, in a previous map I saw the proposal of on street cycle parking. This is much needed, particularly around amenities, such as the Gowlett Arms and around the area. I did not see this included in the recent map and hope that was a simplification of the map and cycling parking will still be included.

In the consultation I also welcome the idea of resident led parklets and I said I would like one outside my house. I am glad this will be taken forward. Can I find out when this will be taken forward?

Kind Regards,

  
Reedham Street

[Title]

[Firstname]

[Lastname]

[Telephone number]

[Email address]

[Are you]

A resident

[Which consultation]

Peckham West area parking zone PW

[overall response]

2. I support this proposal

[response]

As a resident of Choumert Road, one of the busiest residential roads in this entire proposed CPZ, I wish to put forward the views of myself and my household.

I wholly support the introduction of the proposed Peckham West CPZ. For many years the parking situation on Choumert Road has been extremely difficult, but over the past few years, and particularly since 2018 when the neighbouring Grove Hill Road CPZ was introduced, parking for residents has become nigh on impossible during Monday-Friday. As a stay-at-home mother and someone who works from home, this has made my daily life intolerable for many years. We therefore wholeheartedly welcome the introduction of a CPZ in this zone.

However, the proposal for this to be operational only during 9-11am is not sufficient to address the problem in this road. The majority of cars/vans parked throughout the working day/week (ie Monday-Friday 8am-6pm) are not those of local residents, but of commuters and contractors such as builders, engineers etc. A short 2-hour window will certainly help with the morning commuters, but will not address the significant problem that continues throughout the rest of the day. Choumert Road, Coplestone Road and Danby Street in particular are subject to heavy traffic and drivers looking for parking spaces throughout the entire day from 8am-6pm daily. Furthermore, the discrepancy between the proposed 9-11am zone and the neighbouring Grove Hill Road zone means that we anticipate that many drivers will park in the Grove Hill Road zone until 10.59am when they will simply move their vehicles to our zone at 11am.

I would therefore request that the Cabinet member and panels re-assess the time of the CPZ and re-consider amending this to an all-day zone (8.30-6.30), consistent with the current neighbouring zones on the south/east side of Bellenden Road, and that of Lyndhurst Way/Lyndhurst Grove etc.

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone\_number]

■

[Email\_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

Peckham West area parking zone 'PW'

[overallresponse]

2. I support this proposal

[response]

There should be no double-yellow lines outside 2A Danby Street. Where there was previously an off-street parking space there is now a built extension to 2A so it is no longer possible to park off-street. The dropped kerb is now redundant and should not be 'protected' by a double-yellow line.

There should be no double-yellow line outside 1 Danby Street. It is not currently possible to park off-street here and the dropped kerb has not been used for off-street parking for at least 18 years. A double-yellow line would simply reduce the parking space available to residents.

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone\_number]

■

[Email\_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

Peckham West area parking zone 'PW'

[overallresponse]

1. I wholly support

[response]

on a Sunday evening, Copleston Road(near to Grove Vale) has approx 50% parking capacity. By 8am on Monday morning the street is full of cars parking, by who I presume are driven by commuters for East Dulwich station. The pollution by the time my son goes to nursery at 7.50 is a real concern.

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone\_number]

■

[Email\_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

Peckham West Area Parking Zone.

[overallresponse]

2. I support this proposal

[response]

I live on Amott Road and am supportive of parking restrictions in our area but I do not think the proposed restrictions of 9am-11am go far enough. I have a young child and often struggle to find a parking spot near our home throughout the day and evening. There are a number of tradespeople and commuters who use the parking in the area and also a number of schools and shops etc which have a high flow of customers who use the side streets around Peckham, thereby depriving local residents of parking spaces. I think the restrictions should therefore be in place from 8:30am to 6:30pm.

[Title]  
Mrs

[Firstname]  
[REDACTED]

[Lastname]  
[REDACTED]

[Telephone\_number]  
[REDACTED]

[Email\_address]  
[REDACTED]

[Areyou]  
A resident

[Whichconsultation]  
Peckham West Area Parking Zone

[overallresponse]  
2. I support this proposal

[response]

I live on Amott Road. The road is flanked by two schools and is close to Peckham Rye Station in addition to various shops and restaurants. As a result the road is extremely busy Monday to Friday from 8-6.30pm (and also on Saturdays). I have a baby and struggle to find a space at any time during the day and evening/night. I often have to park a couple of minutes away from the house which is very difficult with a baby and shopping etc. As a resident I would really benefit from having easier access to parking close to my house and the 9-11am parking zone will not alleviate the parking issues we have on the road. When a parking space becomes available, another car, within a couple of minutes, pulls in to take the space. I am concerned that the council's proposal is insufficient and the CPZ time needs to be extended to 8.30 - 6.30 Monday to Friday at a minimum.

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone\_number]

■

[Email\_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

Peckham west parking zone (waghorn street and surrounding)

[overallresponse]

2. I support this proposal

[response]

I am in agreement with the residents parking permit but it makes no sense to only be in operation from 9am -11am. I believe it should be extended to a later time otherwise it will still be impossible for residents to park when returning home from work. Other surrounding roads have a permit system in place from 08:30-18:30 which already leads to waghorn street and close by being impossible for residents to park. --

I would also point out that it's unfair to charge residents the full £125 per year for a parking permit that only guarantees a parking space for 2 hours per morning

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone\_number]

■

[Email\_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

Peckham West Area Parking Zone PW  
at Choumert Road

[overallresponse]

4. I object to part

[response]

Any support I give to this proposal is reliant on the timing of the two-hour slot, during which only residents may park in residents' parking bays. I object to that time slot possibly being from 9-11am on the grounds that overnight visitors will need to leave before 9am and commuters can adjust to making a later commute. The mid-morning hours of 11-1pm seem to work well for the adjoining area (around Ivanhoe and Grove Park Rds), and a similar timing or 12-2pm slot may work equally well in the PW area. Bearing in mind that residents are going to have to pay to park in their own roads, their views as to which is the most effective slot to deter commuters should be listened to. This is the view I have also heard from other residents in Choumert and Danby Rds.

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone\_number]

■

[Email\_address]

■

[Areyou]

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-026 Peckham W parking zone

[overallresponse]

2. I support this proposal

[response]

I think the hours should be 11am to 1pm. This allows residents who have guests time to leave, and prevent people leaving their cars all day who get a later train to work after 11am.

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone number]

[REDACTED]

[Email address]

[REDACTED]

[Are you]

A resident

[Which consultation]

TMO1920-026 Peckham West Parking Zone "PW"

[Overall response]

2. I support this proposal

[Response]

This is to question the validity of reducing the restricted parking times from all day to 2 hours in the Peckham West CPZ.

I am disappointed that Southwark Council Traffic Management Group have gone against the democratic outcome of the well organised council survey concerning the controlled parking zone in the Peckham West area. This was delivered to all residents who had the opportunity to respond by various options. The result of the survey clearly showed a majority in favour of all day parking restrictions.

Since then a small self-serving, undemocratic group lead by [REDACTED] have taken it upon themselves to run poorly advertised meetings, where fewer than 30 people attended. Their proposal to reduce the parking restriction time to 2 hours in the morning from 9am to 11am has been adopted by the council as if this were the wishes of the entire area of 31 streets.

This is useless in discouraging the parking habits of the non-residents using the south end of Adys Road in order to access:

1. The Crystal Palace Road leisure centre where people keeping fit drive to the gym.
2. The schools and nurseries.
3. The teachers and assistants working there who should be setting an example.
4. The parents whose parking manoeuvres are often dangerous.
4. The church and community centre used by people from nearby localities.
5. The children's play park and Goose Green open space.

6. The local shops, cafes and restaurants.

This has impacted on the quality of life of the residents living in Adys Road, particularly for the four houses opposite the church, adjacent to the facilities mentioned above.

Please look again at the hours of the parking restrictions particularly at the south end of Adys Road, where the problem parking continuing throughout the day must be addressed.

The health and well-being of the children playing in the park and on the green, the children in the schools and nurseries and the residents living in the houses at this end of Adys Road should be of paramount concern to Southwark Council.

(This has been re-submitted as there has been no acknowledgement of receipt- and time is pressing)

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone\_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email\_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

Peckham West Area Parking Zone "PW"

Adys Road

[overallresponse]

2. I support this proposal

[response]

This is to question the validity of reducing the restricted parking times from all day to 2 hours in the Peckham West CPZ.

I am disappointed that Southwark Council Traffic Management Group have gone against the democratic outcome of the well organised council survey concerning the controlled parking zone in the Peckham West area. This was delivered to all residents who had the opportunity to respond by various options.

The result of the survey clearly showed a majority in favour of all day parking restrictions.

Since then a small self-serving, undemocratic group lead by [REDACTED] have taken it upon themselves to run poorly advertised meetings, where fewer than 30 people attended. Their proposal to reduce the parking restriction time to 2 hours in the morning from 9am to 11am has been adopted by the council as if this were the wishes of the entire area of 31 streets.

This is useless in discouraging the parking habits of the non-residents using the south end of Adys Road in order to access:

1. The Crystal Palace Road leisure centre where people keeping fit drive to the gym.
2. The schools and nurseries.
3. The teachers and assistants working there who should be setting an example.
4. The parents whose parking manoeuvres are often dangerous.
4. The church and community centre used by people from nearby localities.
5. The children's play park and Goose Green open space.

6. The local shops, cafes and restaurants.

This has impacted on the quality of life of the residents living in Adys Road, particularly for the four houses opposite the church, adjacent to the facilities mentioned above.

Please look again at the hours of the parking restrictions particularly at the south end of Adys Road, where the problem parking continuing throughout the day must be addressed.

The health and well-being of the children playing in the park and on the green, the children in the schools and nurseries and the residents living in the houses at this end of Adys Road should be of paramount concern to Southwark Council.

[Title]  
Mrs

[Firstname]  
[REDACTED]

[Lastname]  
[REDACTED]

[Telephone\_number]  
[REDACTED]

[Email\_address]  
[REDACTED]

[Areyou]  
A resident

[Whichconsultation]  
Peckham West Parking Area Zone "PW"

[overallresponse]  
2. I support this proposal

[response]  
Misrepresentation.

There has been a submission from [REDACTED] - a member of the group that organised the previous "two informal Peckham meetings" which helped persuade the Council to reduce the hours of the CPZ operation from all day to two hours. This group does not identify itself, but is connected to Peckham Vision.

My name appears as a signatory on the above submission.

At no time was I asked for, or gave, my permission to be a signatory.

I would suggest that every name given as a signatory on this document, and any others put forward by this "Peckham Vision group", have their true opinions verified by Council Officers to confirm their views and avoid unsound practices.

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] Adys Road  
SE15 4DX

[Title]



[Firstname]



[Lastname]



[Telephone\_number]



[Email\_address]



[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

Peckham West CPZ

Amott Road

[overallresponse]

2. I support this proposal

[response]

Please give extra consideration to the following:

1. As a resident of a street with junior schools located at either end, we notice additional weekday demand for parking spaces in the afternoon (3-4.30pm) as well as the morning. Could an additional time zone be added to the proposed 9-11am?

2. Near the junction of Amott Road and Fenwick Road, on the north side of Amott Road, there is proposed to be a small section of double yellow lines where there is a gate to a communal garden. In over three years living here (and an additional 3 1/2 living in Kinsale Road previously) I have never seen it heard of the gate being used. There are no current restrictions on parking in that section. It therefore seems excessive to add double yellow lines there. It ought simply to be part of the proposed residents' parking zone. If not then at the very most it should be a single yellow line.

Amott Road also desperately needs traffic calming measures. It is a busy road with a nursery on it and primary schools at either end. Currently there are frequently instances of drivers driving considerably faster than 20mph along the road. Without calming measures it is only a matter of time before a serious accident occurs. Please pass this comment on to the relevant person along with my contact details.

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone\_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email\_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-026 Peckham W parking zone

[overallresponse]

2. I support this proposal

[response]

I support measures to reduce commuter parking in this zone but feel that:

1. The use of yellow lines is over-zealous at junctions, entrances and cul-de-sacs in predominantly residential roads. They could often be shorter or not needed.
2. Parking regulations in the Grove Vale parade of shops seem to work well at present and should not need significant change.
3. The parking charge for small businesses seems excessive.
4. The 9-11am window should be reviewed after a year to see if it is an appropriate time period, give surrounding zones' times.
5. A mechanism should be found to exempt from charge visitors to housebound residents.

I am a resident of Maxted road. I think the CPZ is needed, however, I think the time should be 12:00 to 14:00. This time would stop commuters parking their cars for the day and also give overnight visitors enough time to vacate. Also, carers who need to help vulnerable people normally do their visits in the morning. This 9-11 time would have a negative impact on their job.

9 to 11 is such an odd time. I've never seen a CPZ display that time before in my life. Normally it is 8:30 to 6:30, 11 to 1 or 12 to 2.

The other thing I would like to say is can we please have the yellow lines at the junction of Maxted road and Howden st shortened. They were extended maybe 2 years ago, taking at least 4 parking spaces away.

Finally, why do we have to have a stopping area outside No. 50 on Maxted road. Surely, the junction at Maxted and Howden is plenty room for cars to let other cars go by.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

club bays which are now unused given the facility to park car club cars anywhere – which is also leading to a loss of parking space for residents as they are often clustered in Choumert Road.

[Title]

██████

[Firstname]

██████

[Lastname]

██████

[Telephone\_number]

██████████

[Email\_address]

████████████████████

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TM01920 . 026

[overallresponse]

2. I support this proposal

[response]

My husband and I think parking restrictions between 12 and 2 would be better than 8 to 11 because it would stop all day parking which is what we suffer from now. When we move our car we often have to park in another street, even sometimes four streets away, and can only be sure of a space near us again on Sunday.

[Title]



[Firstname]



[Lastname]



[Telephone number]



[Email address]



[Are you]

A resident

[Which consultation]

TMO1920-026 Peckham W parking zone

[Overall response]

2. I support this proposal

[Response]

Choumert Road (West)

The proposed 9.00 to 11.00 restriction: Whilst this may deter the commuter parking problems endured by residents of Choumert Road (who voted positively in favour of a CPZ), the hours of restriction seem to be decided to facilitate council management of the existing zones and not to be beneficial to residents. This will impact indirectly on having visitors staying or early morning works/deliveries and will mean residents will therefore incur additional costs. I would prefer a closer to midday restriction in order to manage parking across the day. The "Resting Places": In her response to my email query Joanna Lesak indicated "These are spaces that could accommodate a seat and cycle stand to encourage walking for the less mobile based on Department for Transport recommendations for a rest stop every 50m for people walking with a stick, and cycling for people that may need a rest (e.g. pregnant women). The number and location per street could be adjusted based on the response we have to the statutory consultation as well as further feasibility and would only be implemented once the effect of the parking zone was assessed. The double yellow lines would therefore act as placeholder and can be replaced with a parking space if need be without the need for further consultation." Looking at the plans, Choumert road seems to have a disproportionate number compared to longer, busier streets such as Bellenden Road. In fact I cannot see any other resting places except those in Copleston Road. This is unfair to residents of Choumert Road who will lose a substantial amount of parking space, and if it is a requirement why are they not more evenly spaced across the whole CPZ or even existing new zones such as Dog Kennel Hill??

Paid for bays in Choumert Rd: Given the distance from the shops I would be surprised that these would be used by anyone except residents. We also have car