

## APPENDIX 1: Officer's Response to Objections

Ref	Objection/concern	Officer response	Uphold/ partially uphold/ reject
1.	<p>Statutory consultation should not have taken place during Covid-19 Social Distancing measures as members of the public won't be aware of this scheme.</p>	<p>Statutory consultation took place 8 July 2021 to 29 July 2021 and the Government's Covid-19 social distancing measures were enforced from 23 March 2020 and on 21 June 2021 all legal limits on social contact were removed. The decision was made to proceed with statutory consultation for Rotherhithe &amp; Surrey Docks CPZ because all the usual methods of advertising for the consultation were able to go ahead, including online advertising in local press and on the Southwark website. As well as virtual notification, there were no social distancing measures in place preventing members of the public from leaving their house, so would have been able to view the on-street signs that were posted around the area. We also sent a letter to every address in the CPZ area highlighting that the consultation was taking place.</p> <p>The measures taken to advertise the scheme were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A letter was sent to all postal addresses in the area</li> <li>2. Notice in the London Gazette</li> <li>3. Notice in Southwark news</li> <li>4. Notice was given on the Southwark Council Traffic Orders page</li> <li>5. Notice in Rotherhithe &amp; Surrey Docks project page on the Southwark Website (used throughout the consultation process)</li> <li>6. Physical on-street notices</li> <li>7. Notice given to the following statutory consultees: London Ambulance Service, London Fire Brigade, Metropolitan Police Service, TfL Buses, Freight Transport Association, and the Road Haulage Association.</li> <li>8. Notice was also given to non-statutory consultees including: Ward councillors, Transport for London, Southwark Disablement Association, Southwark Disability Forum, Southwark Cyclists, Living Streets and London Travel Watch.</li> </ol>	Reject

Ref	Objection/concern	Officer response	Uphold/ partially uphold/ reject
2.	A low number of residents had not received information of the previous consultation in 2019	<p>Significant consultation has taken place for this scheme to ensure the design meets the needs of residents and businesses. Residents were contacted directly with two separate mail outs sent to all addresses identified in the proposed CPZ area. Various exhibitions were held around the R&amp;SD area. Residents groups, and all residents and businesses, then had the opportunity to respond to the informal consultation.</p> <p>Further information on the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report appended to the Individual Decision Making Report at:</p> <p><a href="https://moderngov.southwark.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=6973">https://moderngov.southwark.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=6973</a></p>	Reject

Ref	Objection/concern	Officer response	Uphold/ partially uphold/ reject
3.	<p>The parking zone area hasn't been coordinated with due regard to planning law for a proposed new development in Southwark. It should only cover a ¼ mile zone area around the new development. Therefore there is no justification for this CPZ</p>	<p>Many of these objections were similar long emails that could have been written as a collective. They have similar long phrased sentences within them. However, they are believed to have been sent by genuine residents so are included as representing their views for this CPZ. Some of these emails did not contain address details but have been included for completeness.</p> <p>In order to ensure all CPZ zones are cohesive and follow guidance for new developments, officers have been having regular project meetings including visiting various sites in this proposed CPZ from 2019.</p> <p>The extent of the CPZ is considered to be correct having due regard to the extent that parking dispersion occurs when space is at a premium. It would be very difficult for residents to have knowledge of how additional developments in Southwark can directly affect them, until after the changes occur of course. They then see changes associated from the new development as time passes, and how the advantages of the CPZ will provide them with parking spaces. The layout and extent of the area was given extensive thought by officers and members, prior to any engagement occurring and the zone area being developed.</p> <p>That said, the CPZ will be reviewed in line with normal council policy after implementation. If any changes are required they will be identified then. Minor amendments needed to the parking zone would be included as part of that review. It is thought that this CPZ will complement adjacent CPZ's in Southwark and greatly assist parking management and regulation in the Rotherhithe peninsula and that there will be a great need for it by residents.</p>	Reject

Ref	Objection/concern	Officer response	Uphold/ partially uphold/ reject
4.	<p>There was a common theme of residents believing they hold private land, private parking bays and / or use private access roads and these were being incorrectly included in the CPZ</p>	<p>There are some instances in Southwark where there could be 'estate roads '. They exist due to historical presidencies and normally result due to necessary access roads into new developments connected via highways. Sometimes common land areas are re-surfaced and became 'hard standing' where grassed areas existed and become parking areas where residents believe they have a right to park. This often comes about due to informal understandings between residents where they agree a space where each resident parks. This is generally not enforceable in law and Southwark would rarely get involved in such disputes. However sometimes there is a legal right and this can only be recognised by study of land title and/or council highway records, but it is most unusual unless in a defined car park for the development, usually underground. If the development was initially built as council housing and is now social housing (or now purchased being previous social housing) it is very unlikely residents hold any legal right to a specific parking lot, unless off highway such as an adjacent driveway with a legal crossover. Sometimes there is a common parking area for them to use, on a first come basis.</p> <p>Sometimes access roads can appear to fall within the new zone on consultation plans. If they are ' Private Roads ' as defined under The Highways Act 1980 then they will be excluded from the scheme as there would not exist the right to pass and repass by the general public. However, should they be highways as defined under The Highways Act 1980, then they can be included within the CPZ in order to regulate and manage parking in these roads, whether adopted or un-adopted. The roads mentioned by residents are: Brunel Road, Steers Way, Middleton Drive, Capstan Way, Dean Close, Fisherman's Drive and Brunswick Quay.</p> <p>Some are independent of each other and different areas within the proposed CPZ. Thus it is considered unlikely that there has been discussions between these parties. Of these roads the only one that might be private looks to be Dean Close due to the type of highway construction and no defined footway. However the CPZ stops at the street junction with Surrey Water Road, so there is no issue to resolve here. More enquires are to be made by officers into these claims and will be reported separately, if requested.</p>	Reject

Ref	Objection/concern	Officer response	Uphold/ partially uphold/ reject
5.	Corrupt Southwark Council just making more money from residents	Southwark officers follow laid down procedures in order to progress all CPZ's. This CPZ is no exception. All CPZ's have cost elements and enforcement being one ongoing cost to the council. Payment received from permits rarely cover these costs, however any monies recovered above the expenditure costs are fed back into Southwark revenue streams in order to fund other public projects, as decided by elected members for the benefit of all Southwark residents.	Reject
6.	Nowhere to park for my boat in the marina. Should the CPZ go in then they will not be eligible for a permit	There have been some comments from boat owners that they currently park on roads nearby to various berths. The CPZ is for the benefit of providing parking stock for residents, rather than for boat owners who live outside of the CPZ. Vehicles parked for many days by boat owners would be one of possible annoyance to residents who might then have little space to park their own vehicles nearby where they live.	Reject
7.	No reason given to object to the CPZ	If no reason is given it is difficult to know why the resident is objecting to the scheme, but the objections are noted and included in the report.	n/a
8.	42 replies received but no identification as to the address	If no address is given it is difficult to know if the response was from a resident within the proposed new CPZ. There was a mix of reasons given these being, 29 objections for reasons include above, 10 enquires or comments of a general nature, such as to how permits would be issued and the cost along with 3 where no comment could be determined. All have been included in the report for completeness and consideration.	n/a