

Appendix 4_Objections on Mapper

I have lived on Rotherhithe St for about 8 years and have never had or seen a parking problem in our part of the street. There is considerable congestion on the east end of the road, but this would be better served by not allowing parking on both sides of the street. I think the extent of this parking scheme is too much. It may be applicable in the areas around the railway stations and Canda Waters bus/tube station but even there I have not seen an issue. Please reconsider

Don't restrict the parking

I object to the given proposal based on there currently being ample parking on Rotherhithe Street. Potentially time-limited bays would be understandable around the Co-Op but even then I have not noticed any difficulties in parking there. Adding these zones creates an administrative burden to get passes for visitors or expect them or us to have to pay in addition to the ULEZ charges that are coming into force. For me this feels like an exercise for the council to make more money, whereas I feel it detracts from the neighbourhood feel of the area and turns it into a policed car park.

To visit /stay with sick and elderly family people can't do this when permits or charging is in place

Further to my initial response, it should be stated that when this area was developed, some houses were given parking on a dedicated driveway, for example some of the houses on Marlow Way. Others, like ours on Hurley Crescent, had the driveway planned as more of an open plan area in front of the houses. Yet, it was considered the same dedicated parking place that came with each house. It is not Southwark Council's place to remove these parking places. Also, some areas, for example, Smith Place, will now be getting no restrictions, and so there parking will now become under great pressure from people living in other areas trying to park there. Having no parking all the way along Salter Road is ridiculous, and unpractical around area like Redriff School, where parents who have to travel to the school and drop their young children off have to park their cars somewhere. There have to be short term parking in many areas, especially around the schools and Doctors surgeries. This is a really badly thought out plan and should be scrapped before it does lasting damage to our pleasant community.

There is no issue with parking in this area, and this is just a money grabbing move by Southwark Council. The NN area and the other 2 crescent nearby areas look like they will have part of the street restricted, and part unrestricted which is going to cause chaos. I have always parked outside my garage at number 8. Are you now saying that there is going to be a parking bay outside my garage that anyone can use and block access to my garage? There should be no restrictions as it has worked perfectly well since the whole area was developed in the 80s. This is a ridiculous move by Southwark Council that is just going to cause cost and inconvenience to your residence. I wholeheartedly oppose this move

Please listen to your community. The meetings were very well attended by residents and the objections to the CPZ were loud and clear. In your own report you said that the majority of residents more than 60% stated that they never had any difficulty parking in the area, so why aren't you listening to them? CPZ is not required or wanted in this area at all. Only a tiny proportion of people said they ever had any weekday parking difficulty so what are you trying to achieve? You will just make it more difficult for people who can't afford to pay and their visitors too. Leave our street alone, we don't want your ugly signs and road markings! Have you forgotten about Covid and ULEZ too! Less people will be driving anyway.

No one parks in Rotherhithe Street other than residents. You would just be penalising them for parking outside their own homes. Your proposed hours make no sense. The street is quietest weekday daytime. It is busier in the evenings when people come home from work to park at home. It is not a commuter parking area. Introduction of parking restrictions would create unnecessary inconvenience and expense for residents and their visitors including tradesman and deliveries. Introduction of parking restrictions would create unnecessary inconvenience and loss of business and revenue for local businesses. The ongoing cost of enforcing implementing, administering the scheme would be significant and is a wasteful and unnecessary use of the Council's resources and public funds. It is clear that the Council is simply trying to force through the CPZ in order to meet the planning requirements for the Canada Water development with no due consideration for existing residents or worse still to try and raise revenue. We don't want this scheme.

The proposals seem to suggest that there won't be a charge for visitors' permits for Ann Moss Way, for which I am supportive. I don't support any new charging our visitors for parking. Also it's not clear what the impact will be of the massive new development by Peabody that has been imposed on our street. As I understand it, apart from disabled parking bays, no provision has been made for parking at the development. It would be unwelcome if commuter parking were suddenly replaced by parking by people resident at these new large blocks and their visitors. As the vast majority of people who responded to the consultation on the Peabody development from Ann Moss Way were opposed to the development, it should be a condition that none of the permit holder spaces be made available to Peabody residents.

I generally support many of the suggestions in this proposal, however I have concerns how the implementation of double yellows on many of the roads surrounding Greenacre Square, will result in permit holders parking around the island in Greenacre Square or in front of the properties, causing obstruction to service and emergency vehicles, and possibly obstructing access to the driveways. Greenacre Square is also used very frequently by resident children who currently safely play around the island in the square, and I

feel pushing permitted but unmarked parking into the Square would be a safety hazard for the children. I agree that double yellow lines need to be implemented on the corners of the surrounding roads, but more parking bays need to be provided for residents. I would like to see single lines around the island and housing side of Greenacre Square, with restricted parking 8-6.30pm, with 2 permit bays on the right as you enter Greenacre Square.

Parking should remain as is in the area.

I am responding in relation to the proposal to implement the new CPZ 'S' in the north-eastern part of the London Borough of Southwark, within the Rotherhithe ward and the Surrey Docks ward, and specifically the lack of inclusion of Plover Way in the restriction proposals. If restrictions are introduced on Omega Gate and Finland Street, and not Plover Way there will be an increased number of cars attempting to park on Plover Way roadway as drivers (many of whom are not local residents) attempt to find new unrestricted locations for parking. Residents already have allocated parking spaces in front of houses or allocated parking bays, but the problem relates to common areas on the bends where anyone can park. The parking situation on Plover Way is already serious in terms of public safety, with cars parking on bends and in front of the green spaces. Norway Dock Realty Limited, the community interest company which owns the green spaces has already received numerous requests to place no parking signs on the bends in response to the safety concerns. Having unrestricted parking on Plover Way will only exacerbate this situation. Plover Way is a Council adopted road as the land was transferred to Southwark Council when the LDDC was wound up, and I think the Council should take responsibility for ensuring that there is not a further increase in people parking on Plover Way roadway.

I support the majority of suggestions here, especially with regards to double yellow lines at the corner of all junctions. However, I feel that you haven't fairly considered how additional restrictions on roads such as fisherman's drive will impact the adjoining squares (namely Greenacre sq & maple leaf square) by displacing parking to the same. These squares are currently safe, quiet spaces that offer no parking outside of the privately owned spaces, which makes them a safe place for children to play - and they do. In addition, our deeds state that the square itself must be kept clear for fire brigade access, and vehicle manoeuvring space. You have marked the whole of Greenacre sq as "permit parking", but given the above information you may agree that no safe spaces exist within the square. I'm concerned about people parking around the island, and around the outer edge. Either would make manoeuvring dangerous and/or block access for emergency & service vehicles. The only safe space is on the left of the entrance slip road, which I feel should be given 2 dedicated bays. All remaining areas should be at least single yellow lines between 8am - 6.30pm.

Residents in the marina must be allowed to purchase residents parking permits

As a resident of St Elmos Rd i would like to remove the section B along the corner of our properties with Fishermans Drive to allow one car parking along the front of St Elmos or i would like a guarantee that if i park on my driveway (along Fishermans Drive) i will not receive a parking ticket as has happened on two previous occasions . In addition i would prefer St Elmos Rd to be granted the same status as Maple Leaf Square to facilitate deliveries/work to my property for which there is no other access. Finally as a member of Holy Trinity Church Rotherhithe who often takes an elderly neighbour from the locality I object to the fact i will be charged to park on Bryan road or the end of rotherhithe st to attend church on a Sunday morning. I would expect that, as happens in other areas, the parking charge times in those bays could be adjusted to allow the elderly or mobility limited to attend worship at the parish church without charging for parking.

CPZ is not required in this area particularly not on the peninsula of Rotherhithe Street. There are no problems with weekday parking in the area. Only 13% of residents indicated any weekday parking difficulties. There is actually an abundance of kerbside parking in Rotherhithe Street. The CPZ seems to be more about making money for the council than to assist residents as there seems to be no evidence that supports the requirement for CPZ. In the initial public consultation questionnaire there was no option for no CPZ and the response rate was only 2% which indicates it was not widely distributed. However, community meetings were attended by residents and many objections raised but these have not been cited or addressed within proposals. Additionally, the consultation took place before COVID and there is now even less traffic than previously. Ultimately the proposal seems fundamentally flawed as the requirement is for the council to have access to kerbside space in Rotherhithe Street yet there is an abundance of kerbside space? Also, only 25% of journeys are made by car in the local vicinity. I use kerbside space for visits from friends and family who live miles away in Kent and do not have any other choice than to drive. The CPZ will create an additional financial burden as I will need to pay for permits. It will deter people from visiting which in turn impacts the local economy as we visit the farm, the pub for lunch and local cafes. I believe the consultation should be repeated in a fair and equitable manner, and providing the option for no CPZ, and to take into account the changes to commuting and driving since COVID.

I wholly object to the parking proposals. I would like register my objection to the proposed increases in parking costs As a regular user of the free parking on Finland Street, I view the proposals as unacceptable. The surrounding areas on road parking is mainly permit only. By increasing restrictions you are penalising people who can not make use of parking elsewhere, who are travelling in from outside the borough. These people are the patrons of local business and supporters of local sporting activity. No plans have been put forward for the uses of increased revenue. This worries me.

The recommendations in the report for the scheme to progress are insubstantial and contradictory. In the report 16a. states that the council must prioritise kerbside space but there is already an abundance of kerbside space in Rotherhithe Street. • The Council state that their objective is to maintain and improve resident's current quality of life, but the introduction of a CPZ will likely achieve the opposite. • The Council reports that only 25% of journeys are made by driving, further reinforcing the point that the CPZ is unnecessary. • The fact that the Council have chosen to proceed with planning for up to 3000 new homes (in excess of the normally allowable urban density) at Canada Water and therefore create possible future parking issues in those new-build areas is not an equitable or fair reason to penalise the existing residents in the surrounding areas who have currently have no parking issues. • The majority of Rotherhithe Street is sufficiently geographically distant from the new-build areas to be unaffected. Locally targeted solutions at the new-build sites should be considered instead. • The annual cost of permits for residents and visitors will prove to be an unnecessary additional financial burden for many at this already difficult time. • The ongoing applications process for residents and their visitors will prove to be an unnecessary additional administrative burden. • The signage, road markings and street furniture would be unsightly particularly along Rotherhithe Street which has many listed buildings and other buildings of historical or architectural interest. Some of the installations may also pose an obstruction or health and safety risk. • Installation of signage, road markings and street furniture will cause significant and unnecessary disruption for many residents. • Introduction of parking restrictions would create unnecessary inconvenience for residents and their visitors including tradesman and deliveries.

The parking is already not fitting for the residents you are making it extremely difficult for disabled people and parents to park at any time in Rotherhithe and Bermondsey. This is not justified just because we are in a city be careful you will push families out and schools will close and money we leave. Great is the end.

This is outrageous with the ULEZ coming into force in October, the Council is opposing for people to pay to park their car in front of their house. What the Council need to do is work alongside the government and help build more electric cars and stop crippling families with extra parking charges.

NB The online submission system has an unspecified character limit and returns a fetch error so it is only possible to make short submissions online. The annual cost of permits for residents and visitors will prove to be an unnecessary additional financial burden for many at this already difficult time. If the Council genuinely wished to maintain residents current quality of life there would be no cost or limits for any proposed permits. Will you therefore commit to free for life and unlimited permits for all affected residents, businesses and their visitors if you proceed with this scheme? Introduction of parking restrictions would create unnecessary inconvenience and loss of business and revenue for local businesses particularly retailers. The ongoing cost of implementing, administering and enforcing the scheme would be significant and is a wasteful and unnecessary use of resources and public funds.

The signage, road markings and street furniture would be unsightly particularly along Rotherhithe Street which has many listed buildings and buildings of architectural interest. Some of the installations may also pose an obstruction or health and safety risk. Have you fully considered the negative aesthetic impact of this scheme? Installation of the above signage, road markings and street furniture will cause significant and unnecessary disruption for many residents.

The majority of respondents 61% stated that they never had any difficulty parking on the streets in the area. This important statistic does not seem to have been taken into account at all in the decision making process. CPZ is not and has never been required in this area. Only 13% of residents indicated any weekday parking difficulty. The majority of the respondents, some 83 in number, lived on Rotherhithe Street. The next highest named street was Rope St with just 16 respondents. The Rotherhithe St responses and observations should therefore carry suitable weight. There is never any shortage of kerbside parking space on Rotherhithe Street. I will send you by separately by email an attached example photo set taken on a typical weekday 7th July at approx. 16:40. You will see that there is an abundance of available kerbside parking space along the entire length of Rotherhithe Street. This contradicts the stated need to prioritise kerbside space as it is already plentiful. If you wish to use kerbside space for other purposes then there is already surplus without the need to introduce CPZ.

Plover Way has not been included in the plans. It is the only omitted road in the entire wider area. This will have significant implications for residents of Plover Way if no parking space is identified. As comparison, neighbouring Finland Street residents will note that the entire street has been marked for permitting. I would suggest parking areas be identified for Plover Way and its residents.

The initial public consultation and decision making process was fundamentally flawed. When giving consultees initial options for when they would like the restrictions to operate you did not include "No Zone" as an option. Consultees were only left with the option to select "Other" and then write "No Zone". This was not intuitive for respondents. Respondents were not given a fair or reasonable opportunity to select "No Zone" and this should have been included as a headline option. The consultees were given the impression that they had no choice but to select a time. You cannot therefore rely on the subsequent data analysis as the survey questionnaire design was flawed and unduly biased. Essentially it predetermined the outcome. It is apparent that the Council is simply trying to force through the CPZ in order to meet the planning requirements for the Canada Water development, with no due consideration given to the needs of existing residents who were not able to easily and properly put forward their objections due to a flawed survey design. Taking all of the above into account and notwithstanding the impact of Covid 19, the effect of the imminent ULEZ and the Transport Minister's recent statement, I cannot see that the Council are left with any option but to restart the public

consultation process to better reflect the changing needs of the community. Increased trends towards homeworking and online shopping have dramatically reduced trip rates and seem unlikely to be fully reversed. A flawed public consultation which ended in 2019 before any of these changes is simply no longer relevant and should be repeated in a fair and equitable manner with "No Zone" or "No CPZ" as a viable and presented option.

- The signage, road markings and street furniture would be unsightly particularly along Rotherhithe Street which has many listed buildings and other buildings of historical or architectural interest. Some of the installations may also pose an obstruction or health and safety risk.
- Installation of signage, road markings and street furniture will cause significant and unnecessary disruption for many residents.
- Introduction of parking restrictions would create unnecessary inconvenience for residents and their visitors including tradesman and deliveries.
- Introduction of parking restrictions would create unnecessary inconvenience and loss of business and revenue for local businesses particularly retailers where customers park outside.
- The ongoing cost of implementing and administering the scheme would be significant and is a wasteful and unnecessary use of the Council's resources and public funds.
- It is clear that the Council is simply trying to force through the CPZ in order to meet the planning requirements for the Canada Water development with no due consideration for existing residents.
- Increased trends towards homeworking and online shopping have dramatically reduced trip rates and seem unlikely to be fully reversed. This has not been taken into account.
- A flawed public consultation which ended in 2019 before COVID 19 and the introduction of ULEZ is no longer relevant.
- The consultation should be repeated in a fair and equitable manner with "No Zone" or "No CPZ" as an option.

The current parking arrangements in Howland Way and the immediate vicinity in respect thereof are adequate to meet the needs of residents. The current proposals take no account of the planning permissions which have been granted in Howland Way and which permit conversion of garages into living areas; drop kerbs remain in place yet there is no provision made for resident's to utilise the space outside of their properties to park where drop kerbs are in situ. Howland Way is also a considerable distance from the proposed developments to which the need to implement a controlled parking zone has been stated. The current proposals do not demonstrate how parking in Howland Way would be impeded. The current proposed CDZ radius should be significantly reduced. Moreover, the granting of planning permission for the new residential areas should make sure that adequate provision is given for parking on those developments. No such provision has been made; you cannot keep granting permission enabling developer's to ignore parking. No provision has been made to support transport infrastructure nor make improvements in respect thereof, which would be alternatives to the implementation of a controlled parking zone. No consideration has been given to feedback previously submitted by this household.

It is not the responsibility of residents to resolve parking issues caused by large scale new development projects. Nor should they be expected to bear additional costs because of these projects. New developments have recently come into existence on Quebec Way but no onstreet parking is available i.e their own street is nearly entirely double yellow lined. This leads these residents to park in surrounding roads (Onega gate) which pushes their problem onto other people. If sufficient parking does not exist for them, such developments should not be permitted. Preventing commuters parking in the area is also supposed justification. In 10 years of living here in the street I have not seen a single commuter using the road to park.

As a Rotherhithe resident for the last 8 years, I have been strongly appreciative of our free on-street parking, particularly when our underground garage door was out of order for a few weeks so we had to park the car in the street, and when we need to carry heavy furniture or shopping up to our home. Please keep it this way for all of us needing easy access to houses and flats for various personal and professional reasons. With many thanks.

I strongly oppose to this . Parking cars for unloading and loading will become difficult . No parking for visitors or even other businesses . Already there is not enough availability and these parking restrictions will further enhance the problem

These parking restrictions will increase the parking problem.

I strongly support this proposal especially to stop the cars idling on Rotherhithe Street outside the Coop and Peter Hills school.

I dont agree with it.

There is already too much permit parking areas in Rotherhithe. I live on an estate but occasionally need on-street parking in a nearby area (e.g. for visitors during the daytime, or when my permit has run out and I need to park elsewhere for a few days until I can gather the documentation required to renew the permit). The number of spaces available to non-permit-holders is already too few, please do not decrease them. I am already having to park about 1/2 mile away from my own flat. For most of the proposed streets there is no existing parking problem, this appears to be just a revenue-generating scheme for the council.

I object to the proposal

I strongly disagree with having parking permits within the area of SE16. Seems to be a big scheme of gentrification, making it impossible for residents that have lived here for decades to survive let alone live pushing us out of London all together.

We walk and cycle in the area through thick congestion on the school run. I have safety concerns about the number of cars as a pedestrian and as a cyclist. I am also very concerned about pollution. I don't think the proposals go far enough. All people should be encouraged to walk or cycle.

Currently, there are no issues with parking, and this introduces an unnecessary burden for the residence.

I am concerned about being able to visit my elderly parents

I am very concerned as my family will be unable to visit ...it doesn't make sense as if you take out roads from parking then it will just make situation worse and I help my children with childcare which will be a problem

This is not required

It is not required. There's always parking spaces available to me as a local resident and for when people visit.

I live here. There is No need for a controlled parking zone. It will bring extra costs and hassle and make traffic worse not better.

I very much welcome this proposal. I live on Brunswick Quay, and even though only a minority of residents own a car, during the week the street is crammed with commuter's cars. This proposal will make the area more pleasant to live in, as well as reducing congestion and pollution. The sooner it is implemented the better.

I object to this proposal on the grounds that on street parking is how most residents use their cars - where will residents park if all streets are cpzs? I also object on the grounds that plover way is the only road excluded from the proposal - meaning that other residents will simply park on plover way instead.

I object to this proposal as the street I live on is only used by residents for parking and asking them to pay to park outside of their own homes is obscene.

Strongly object, pollution is already being monitored by tfl with extra charges for higher pollutions cars and increasing rate of congestion charge. As a resident for many years there's I don't feel there's a big enough issue to justify charging residents for permits. Many new builds will have private parking. With COVID is important that elderly and vulnerable can use car for daily essentials and errands. A car is not a luxury, it is a necessity these days. Not only due to COVID, as a mother it was difficult trying to carry everything and at the same time make sure my son doesn't get abducted while I have my hands full. Therefore I strongly oppose to parking restrictions.

Fully support the implementation of these proposals.

Plover Way has no proposed restrictions, it will therefore attract displaced parking from those areas where new restrictions are proposed.

Resident parking should remain free and unrestricted.

My partner and I share one parking space and therefore require on street parking as both need cars for work. There is already limited parking used by residents so further restrictions and charges to park outside our home will make our lives a living hell. It is surprising that this is even being considered since we are so far away from the tube/train.

I live in a property with one parking space, but both my partner and I each need a car for our work. There is already a limited amount of parking on Howland Way and this will be made worse by the introduction of further no waiting areas, further reducing the amount of available spaces. It seems crazy to have to limit such a quiet residential area, that is so far from tube/train stations. There are very few (if any) cars parked on street that do not belong to residents.

I strongly oppose the proposed parking restrictions. Parking has never been an issue around Rotherhithe St and therefore we do not need the parking permit scheme to be implemented. This is another money making scheme by the local authority during a time when the COVID pandemic has had a financial impact on families. This is a scheme that is not welcomed by residents.

Surrounding roads are either no parking or permit, which means plover way will be congested. There are parking spaces which are leased to the leaseholders and cars are not allowed to park along the road for safety purposes, which has increasingly been ignored and led to accidents in the road. These proposals will make it much worse.

While I can agree that the parking situation around Omega Gate and Finland Street has been a bit disorganised in the past, this proposal is too extreme as regular residents will have to pay to park on their own streets and will not solve any problems. In fact, if this proposal comes into fruition, it will make life much more complex for residents who regularly use the parking spaces. Additionally, you have not allocated any loading bays of any sort on Finland Street, which will make taking deliveries or moving homes extremely difficult. This proposal is a deterioration on the current situation, rather than an improvement.

I do not support the permit parking scheme

I am concerned that Plover Way is the only street not included in the parking permit or no waiting proposals, as this will inevitably lead to congestion in a quiet residential street, as those living or working nearby park there instead. I would like there to be parking permits on Plover Way as well. If this cannot be done, I would prefer no parking permits or no waiting limits in the surrounding areas.

I am a resident of Finland street and strongly oppose to the proposal to establish paid parking zones in Finland street, Norway Dock and Onega gate as well as any other street earmarked for managed parking. The council should much rather install a zebra crossing at the Onega gate busstop leading to Russia Dock woodlands..

How can make two wait street just one way, just to allow parking. If you look out address when there are football matches in Dockland and cars park both sites, there are not visibility for cyclist and pedestrian due to the previous curves. Also large vehicles won't be able to past as happens in the past. You should just allow parking permits in one side of the road.

I object to designating the front of number St Elmos Rd SE16 6SA as zone B as it is used, without issue or inconvenience exclusively by the residents of and St Elmos Rd (and do not own or use vehicles) to enable simply unloading and access to our properties from our vehicles. It would therefore be more appropriate to make it resident permit only. These zones will have a large impact on existing residents who have no problems parking apart from when it is school run time OR working week when the area has become seen as suitable for commuter parking to Canada Water. I would be grateful if you could redesign to consider the needs of residents who will have to now pay to park on their own street : give this enabling them to access spaces in the vicinity of their properties is a minor concession.

I'm very much against the parking restriction. Having lived at 3 addresses in the area over the last 10 years - and beeing a car owner myself- parking has never been issue. For me it's a case of "what's fixing what is not broken". The ease of movements of the local community will be impaired by parking restriction. It would be a disservice done to us locals. It would make life and movement harder. The area will - I'm convinced - also receive less visitors going to pubs and shops. It would be bad for the local economy. I'm utterly against any parking restriction in the area.

This proposal is wholly unacceptable. There is no problem with parking any time of the day, night or weekends. So it is solving for a problem that does not exist!

I have lived in Finland Street for more than years, and in my view there is absolutely no need for parking restrictions to be applied in this street., it's useful to have unrestricted on street parking for those times when I need to leave the car near the front door of my block for short periods of time, when visitors arrive, or when I need short term parking for tradesmen. I see no advantage to putting parking restrictions into Finland Street other than as a revenue collecting device for the local council. We do not have an issue with non-residents parking in this street, for the purposes of commuting etc. The street is never blocked by parked cars.

I am writing to say that I am completely opposed to the additional parking being added to Finland Street (zones A). I am also not in favour of the changes to restrict the existing spots to be paid parking (Zone B) . Here are the main reasons for the first objection: 1) Character of the street - currently, the street has a quiet leafy character, that would be damaged by the addition of cars on both sides of the street, especially views along the length of Finland street would be harmed. 2) Need - Generally, existing spaces tend to be underused, with many spaces available in the existing lots. Adding charges to these spots is likely to further reduce demand for these spaces. It makes no sense to have cars parked on both sides of the street, when the existing spaces are sufficient. I would also note that flats all have underground parking and there are residential buildings on one side of the street only (the central area is empty), so the need to expand capacity is not there. All this would do is create a situation with cars parked on both sides of the street, giving a disorderly appearance. 3) Congestion - The two existing lanes on Finland street are very narrow, allowing parked cars to be left on both sides will create congestion if vans or larger vehicles cannot pass between two parked cars.

While I love the idea of less traffic and haphazard parking on the peninsula I object to parts of the plan. Residents should get free/subsidised on street parking for one car (and one car only) if they do not have access to a garage or drive way. I strongly support marked parking bays/spots, especially if it helps limit rogue and bad parking.

Finland Street is a lovely street set back from the main roads. There has never been the need for parking restrictions and would ruin the whole essence of living freely in London. The cost of installing the scheme would be better spent on other schemes in Southwark ensuring local residents are cared for and looked after. I do not want to see this parking scheme in Finland Street, it will ruin the whole street.

I do not have any problem finding parking space at anytime. This is a another money making scheme for the council. This is not helping the people except the council.

I object

Hi, thanks for taking the time to read this. I'll try to outline my objections in a helpful way as my aim is not to be critical in a blanket way but to help improve the proposals for all concerned; council, residents, visitors etc. Here goes... While I had to pick one

category in terms of why I object, there are a number of reasons. Overall the area is a safe one with good access. The proposals will serve to take away from this. If I look specifically at Finland Street where I live currently..the proposals would reduce the current two lanes to one for extra parking...this will cause safety issues with reduced driving space. Finland Street is a quiet residential street. At times the current car spaces aren't in full use so I would also say that the proposals are a waste of council money and the extra parking isn't needed. I can appreciate that paid parking creates money for the council and I'm not against that :) but there is no need to create extra unnecessary car spaces which ultimately serve to reduce driving space and cause safety issues for drivers. Perhaps a revised view of the possible carspaces in consultation with residents would help (happy to help if needed). As the proposals stand, I object for the above reasons.

I am writing in response to the statutory consultation letter sent to my residence. I would like to state my strong opposition any implementation of Controlled Parking Zones in the Surrey Docks area for any duration whatsoever. The current supply of roadside parking is more than adequate for all current and future residents. Moreover, Norway, Greenland and South docks are located a substantial distance from the proposed developments referenced in the consultation, greatly removing the risk of any increases in roadside parking. Implementation of a CPZ will add significant financial burden to the population in the Surrey Docks area and will destroy the welcoming character of this location. Instead, I propose that any CPZ implementation be limited to a 1/4 mile radius of all new developments in Rotherhithe if at all necessary. I would like to request that you kindly confirm receipt of this strongest possible objection.

I am writing in response to the statutory consultation letter sent to my residence. I would like to state my strong opposition any implementation of Controlled Parking Zones in the Surrey Docks area for any duration whatsoever. The current supply of roadside parking is more than adequate for all current and future residents. Moreover, Norway, Greenland and South docks are located a substantial distance from the proposed developments referenced in the consultation, greatly removing the risk of any increases in roadside parking. Implementation of a CPZ will add significant financial burden to the population in the Surrey Docks area and will destroy the welcoming character of this location. Instead, I propose that any CPZ implementation be limited to a 1/4 mile radius of all new developments in Rotherhithe if at all necessary. I would like to request that you kindly confirm receipt of this strongest possible objection.

We do not have a problem with parking right now, and these restrictions are trying to solve a problem that doesn't exist.

There would be nowhere for delivery vehicles to park. They would have to leave their lorry in the road, blocking the road to other vehicles.

There would be nowhere for delivery people to park. They would have to park in the road blocking the road for cars.

Great to see more restrictions on free parking in the area. Car owners should pay their fair share to store their private property on public roads.

I would like to state my strong opposition any implementation of Controlled Parking Zones in the Surrey Docks area for any duration whatsoever. The current supply of roadside parking is more than adequate for all current and future residents. Moreover, Norway, Greenland and South docks are located a substantial distance from the proposed developments referenced in the consultation, greatly removing the risk of any increases in roadside parking. Implementation of a CPZ will add significant financial burden to the population in the Surrey Docks area and will destroy the welcoming character of this location. Instead, I propose that any CPZ implementation be limited to a 1/4 mile radius of all new developments in Rotherhithe if at all necessary. I would like to request that you kindly confirm receipt of this strongest possible objection.

There is no need to charge for parking in Finland Street. No shortage of parking. This is just the next tax on residents. Stop it! Build a bridge over the Thames instead!

For the last 18! Years we live here there is no parking problem - the proposal will create one.

I broadly support the restrictions identified for Omega Gate and Finland Street Se16. However, I disagree with the banding type shown as 'A' which is shown in three small sections outside of blocks 1-58 Finland Street, near to the junction of Omega Gate. This should be class 'B' prohibited parking. If parking is allowed there it will block the view of people exiting the underground car parks on the site and will be a safety issue. Furthermore, it will block/constrain passage for any large vehicles wishing to traverse Finland Street which is already too tight for two cars to pass either way. The areas here marked 'C' have hedging that is currently pushing cars out of these spaces and into the main carriageway due to lack of proper trimming by the council.

I understand that with new buildings and new residents coming to the area, parking will become an issue and put pressure on an already collapsed traffic system. That's why I fully support the idea of Salter Road having doubled yellow lines. With cars parked there buses cannot circulate and adds to delays. But, there are streets like Howland way where only residents park. We are not close to tube stations so I don't believe it will be necessary to implement CPZ here.

I think that all current residents (therefore people who lived here before development) should get free automatic residents parking permit to be used in all areas. I also think the entire Salter road should have NO parking as it is dangerous.

I believe that residents who already live in the area (therefore were here before the new development) should automatically get free resident parking permits that can be used in any part of the proposed area without paying at any time. Also, there should be NO parking allowed on the entire stretch of B205 road (Salter Road) as this causes dangerous driving.

The roads are too clogged up by cars parking making active travel difficult

SOUTHWARK COUNCIL AGAIN ALL THEY CAN THINK OF IS HITTING THE WORKING CLASS WHERE IT HURTS, MONEY MONEY MONEY

In my opinion our neighbourhood don't need a pay park there is space for all this action will be negative and to ruin all the shops in the area.

I have to have access because my daughter has disabilities I have to park near

I don't think there is a need for payed parking in the area! There are not many business here and those there are are used by residents. Most of the buildings have their own parking and those that park on street are not causing any disruption for the residents and the traffic in the area.

I am writing in response to the statutory consultation letter sent to my residence. I would like to state my strong opposition any implementation of Controlled Parking Zones in the Surrey Docks area for any duration whatsoever. The current supply of roadside parking is more than adequate for all current and future residents. Moreover, Norway, Greenland and South docks are located a substantial distance from the proposed developments referenced in the consultation, greatly removing the risk of any increases in roadside parking. Implementation of a CPZ will add significant financial burden to the population in the Surrey Docks area and will destroy the welcoming character of this location. Instead, I propose that any CPZ implementation be limited to a 1/4 mile radius of all new developments in Rotherhithe if at all necessary. I would like to request that you kindly confirm receipt of this strongest possible objection..

It would be great if as part of this we also put in more bike hangars. I know many residents on the peninsula who do not drive and this should be encouraged. To support active travel and reduce climate impact we should encourage people to use alternative forms of transport, by charging for car use / parking and also by making alternative methods easier.

I believe it will make our lives difficult to receive friends, to move around, it will impact local businesses. We don't need more local shops destroyed. We are going to spend more in permits. It will impact working parents that need to collect kids from school straight after working hours

Parking management is much needed around the wider Southwark and north Deptford area.

I strongly reject this proposal. There has been no issue in finding parking or any disruption to traffic due to parking on the street. Implementing this proposal would negatively affect residents not being able to have visitors especially difficult during this difficult time when it is allowed from short periods. It affects businesses like the farm and local independent shops. It would increase costs for residents and visitors to their detriment with no benefit.

I would like to state my strong opposition to any implementation of Controlled Parking Zones in the Surrey Docks area for any duration whatsoever. The current supply of roadside parking is more than adequate for all current and future residents. Moreover, Norway, Greenland and South docks are located a substantial distance from the proposed developments referenced in the consultation, greatly removing the risk of any increases in roadside parking. Implementation of a CPZ will add significant financial burden to the population in the Surrey Docks area and will destroy the welcoming character of this location. Instead, I propose that any CPZ implementation be limited to a 1/4 mile radius of all new developments in Rotherhithe if at all necessary.

I'm trying to run a Business and where is my staff going to park. How do I find out about getting Business permits for my staff.

I feel we paid enough money for how road let alone having to pay to park outside our housing. As for when you have visitors they can not park, it's a joke.

We have not got a problem with parking on our private estate, so I do not understand why restrictions needs to be put in place.

This is not needed in Rotherhithe! It will restrict the area and make it feel like any other London suburb.

Objectioning double yellow lines

The current plzns will cause major difficulty for residents znd will not stop school drop off traffic frkm breaking current parking regulstions.

I strongly object to all of these proposed new parking restrictions.

I would like to state my strong opposition to any implementation of Controlled Parking Zones in the Surrey Docks area for any duration whatsoever. The current supply of roadside parking is more than adequate for all current and future residents. Moreover, Norway, Greenland and South docks are located a substantial distance from the proposed developments referenced in the consultation, greatly removing the risk of any increases in roadside parking. Implementation of a CPZ will add significant financial burden to the population in the Surrey Docks area and will destroy the welcoming character of this location.

There is no need for there to be restricted car parking. The parking in place is perfectly used and does not cause any disruptions to residents or cause traffic.

I am a resident in Fisherman's Drive. The street has many converted garages but dropped curves remain. We park in front of our dropped curve because it no longer serves a purpose and this is common. The proposal is that there will be no parking here, but this will eliminate a huge amount of parking from the street and will force cars into other streets which will get over crowded. I am a We don't have a driveway we can park on so this will have a big negative impact on us. I think we need much more careful consideration of the dropped curves in Fisherman's Drive so that spaces for residents with permits are created to allow a similar volume of parking to current and stopping for deliveries and drop off etc needs to be allowed for the many residents.

I am writing to voice my concern about the plan to mark double yellow line for Fishermans Drive because: - Parking restrictions are welcome by the residents as we have observed ruthless parking on the street on an ongoing basis which caused a lot of disruptions of traffic. However, double yellow line is overkill for a small street like this. Resident-only parking is sufficient to tackle the traffic flows. - The residents on the street were not consulted, and most of us are opposed to this plan/proposal - Overall, I believe resident only parking permit is a good solution to bring revenue to the council while keeping the traffic and climate impacts in control.

On Fisherman's Drive, a double yellow line is being proposed. I assume this is because of the dropped kerb. However many of the dropped kerbs on Fisherman's Drive lead to drives that cannot be used (they're shorter than a car and the garage has been converted). This means that parking is being unnecessarily restricted. I'm particularly bothered as it means I won't be able to park in front of my own house! Broadly I agree with the parking restrictions and the residents permits, however this detail needs to be resolved. With young children, being able to park in front of my house is a big deal!

I agree that something needs to be done about parking in the area especially with the proposed new developments. I think the hours proposed are too long 8.30-6.30pm and instead think a couple of restrictions a day would be better between 8-9.30 and then 2.30-4.30. In my opinion it is the parents parking for schools which are the most dangerous and they have no issue with ignoring current parking restrictions. The parents of St Johns school don't have an issue with parking in private driveways so these restrictions need to be dealt with alongside parking enforcement officers who will actually challenge people parking inconsiderately and dangerously. The council should also consider adding more Safer Street areas around schools like the recent one by Alfred Salter. The council and schools should be encouraging pupils to walk to school especially where the catchment area is under 1km for most schools on the Rotherhithe peninsula. As a resident with small children I am concerned that there appears to be some areas of parking zones on the corner of roads, the one outside Maple Leaf Square in particular which could be dangerous and I do worry about emergency vehicle access to the surrounding areas. I don't agree with making Maple Leaf Square permit only outside of the resident spaces as this will encourage people to park making it hard for residents to actually get in or out of their spaces. These resident spaces need to be clearly marked out to make sure the right number of spaces are there and to stop people taking up two spaces instead of one.

I do not object to permit parking in the area, however I have concerns about the amount of parking available for residents. Off street parking is not an option for us as our property has sold/subletted spaces to the Hilton. This is true for a number of local residents. The way the parking is distributed means that if we were not able to park in the small section allocated for our part of Rotherhithe Street, we'd need to park a fair distance away. The parking outside our property is predominantly used by local residents, the owner of the shop across the road and sometimes guests to events at the Hilton (working from home this year - I've got to know the local cars and the owners.) Another concern I have about the permit parking timings to park outside our home between Friday evening and Sunday evening meaning if we were to use the car on the weekend (as we most frequently do) it would be even harder to park near our home. This would only be exacerbated weekend functions held by the Hilton hotel. It is already difficult to park in our area and I would be extremely frustrated if we were to pay for a permit and still not be able to park near our home which I anticipate would be the case with the proposed reduction in parking spaces.

I reject the proposal for double yellow lines along Fishermans drive as I am not able to park in my driveway due to a garage conversion. Additionally double yellow lines will preclude visitors, tradespeople, delivery drivers and groceries deliveries from stopping to service the properties on the street. As I do not have anywhere to park my car, I would like to request a parking permit holders bay in front of my house (Fishermans Drive). Having no driveway or garage, I feel that having a parking bay outside my home is a reasonable provision as I need it to load my car and get my kids safely into my car.

I object to the proposal for double yellow lines on Fishermans Drive on the basis that: - My property (and many others on Fishermans Drive) has a garage conversion (converted into a living space). There is insufficient space to park on my driveway

without obstructing the public pavement. The dropped kerb is therefore not in use and I park my car on the street. - I have a young family (as do a substantial number of residents on Fisherman's Drive) and there would be material inconvenience and safety concerns if I am not able to park outside my property to load my children into my car. - I (and many residents of Fishermans Drive) regularly have groceries delivered in order to stay safe during the pandemic. I have relied on grocery deliveries before the pandemic and will continue to do so after. If double yellow lines are introduced, the delivery driver will have nowhere to park for the safe attended unloading of the groceries. - There will be no reasonable place to park for trades people carrying out works at my property and for my other visitors. I am happy for single yellow lines to be conditionally introduced on Fishermans Drive contingent upon agreement to the following request which I am making here: - A Resident Permit Holder Parking bay directly outside my property - Fishermans Drive, London (and where the owners consent, any properties on the street where the dropped kerb cannot be used due to garage conversions/obstruction of the public pavement). Otherwise, I object to the proposal for double yellow lines and a controlled parking zone on Fishermans Drive.

I support this proposal in the area around the tube station but not within the whole of the Rotherhithe Peninsular. Residents who have lived in the area for years are paying the price for all the new developments including the Canada Water Masterplan where the main focus seems to be on building as many flats as possible rather than building communities. If this proposal goes through, many of us will have to pay to park outside our own houses, as will our visitors. I live in a quiet street where parking is not currently as issue and is unlikely to be an issue as it is too far from the station and new developments. I strongly urge you to reconsider the catchment area of the proposal. If the proposal does go through then I would like to see revenues put 100% to local environmental issues/net zero schemes.

I agree to the parking restrictions outside St Johns School as the number of parents driving to the school is excessive. Proper parking enforcement is required to police it though during the school run. However, the areas shown with parking restrictions (parking permits) in Maple Leaf Square should either be removed as cars can't park there because they are blocking existing private parking bays or should be restricted in the morning to prevent parents parking there in the mornings at peak times between 8:30-9:30. This would then allow tradesman and delivery drivers to use these spaces to undertake their works. Also it will be difficult for parking inspectors to distinguish between private and parking permit bays as there will be a mixture of cars parked in Maple Leaf Square and parking inspectors could inadvertently penalise residential parked in their private bays. Note the whole consultation for this process has been managed poorly, this is the first time we have been consulted about this and as residential we should have been given more notification earlier on to collectively take part in this change of parking restrictions.

In principal I am not opposed to parking restrictions, but by leaving large areas with no restriction is just moving the cars to areas where they will cause more inconvenience. Many new flats have no parking and they will most probably not qualify for permits and these people already park inconsiderately so the problem will escalate.

Punishing residents who have work vehicles needed to keep the country supplied and moving.

I cannot see the benefit of the proposal and will be wholly inconvenient to the residents in the areas proposed. I am not sure why this is needed.

Whilst I understand the need as the population grows for parking restrictions, I think it is a massive shame to implement them as I personally am unable to take public transport and find being able to park a great benefit. As an owner of a flat with parking, I believe I am not entitled to get a resident permit, but I think given all the spaces are occupied in the car park we must be entitled to visitors permits which I am not sure we are. Will add a lot of stress when we have workmen or visitors to the property if they are unable to park. Will be another reason on top of the antisocial behaviour which adds to a decision to leave the area

Agree some CPZ may be required but do not reduce the currently available parking for residents- noted additional no parking areas where there are currently cars parked regularly with no obstruction to traffic flow as we're on a peninsula so not much through traffic along this road. We will have to pay AND end up with nowhere to park our cars. Very unfair for those with no access to off street parking with their apartments.

Whilst I am in support of a CPZ I am against the implementation of double yellow lines on Fishermans Drive. My property has its own parking space, which we own, however, the addition of double yellow lines will lead to residents, workers, as well as parents of the school children parking in our area potentially limiting our ability the use and access our own parking space and creating wholly unnecessary conflict.

I get a lot of my business around this area and my clients won't be happy with the added cost to every job. Plus my son go's to school there. A school what is allocated by southward council.

Don't agree with the parking

As a tenant of Rotherhithe street, I feel I have a good knowledge of the parking situation. I do not believe the proposed parking bays will serve any purpose other than inconvenience to the people who live here, as well as their guests and visitors. As well as a

monetary disadvantage. There is no lack of parking spaces, you are never at a loss for somewhere to park along the entire street and I don't believe commuters will take advantage of the free parking as Rotherhithe Street is not close enough to any main transport links. I think what needs to be addressed is the lack of yellow lines / double yellow lines on the blind corners of the street allowing all to park making the driving conditions unsafe for all. Parking should be prohibited in certain spots along the road to better enable visibility to both drivers and bike riders. Another issue I find is the lack of crossings for the entire street, especially the junction from Rotherhithe Street to Salter Road, by the youth hostel. It's extremely dangerous to attempt to cross that road, especially as a pedestrian with a young child. I am not in favour of Rotherhithe Street's proposed parking permits, I am however in favour of strategically placed parking restrictions and safe crossings.

I live in Onega Gate and also keep a leisure boat on Greenland Dock. The proposed restrictions would prevent me from parking outside my own flat and I would be charged for a permit to park near to the marina entrance (essential when I am delivering supplies to my boat). This is bureaucracy for the sake of bureaucracy. There are no problems with parking on my street or by the marina. I have never struggled to find a space and having lived here for nearly 14 years I have never known there to be a problem with parked cars in the neighbourhood. I can't understand why, with so many more urgent demands on the time and finances of Southwark Council right now, you are faffing around trying to fix problems that don't exist. The staff time and other resources could be much better spent. (For example rubbish collection around here, or lack thereof too often - a far greater risk to residents health and well-being.)

There are already yellow lines, double yellow lines, residents numbered bays & no parking areas all of which are abused, ignored & exploited by non residents & residents alike. Particularly by non residents who use the area Se167th & Se167tb for illegal drug trade & blatant consumption. Whilst engaging in antisocial behaviour. It's these unsavoury elements that need control & regulation enforcement. Not the odd visitor who parks in the area! Get your priorities right. This is a blatant money grabbing exercise that will do absolutely nothing to curb the genuine anti social & illegal activity in the area. Shame on you for such a daft plan.

Parking in Elgar Street is a big issue being a resident with disabilities finding a space at times is crazy I'm very much for the this to take place

I would like to express my renewed full support for the proposals to implement a controlled parking zone in Rotherhithe and Surrey Docks. It's high time that private car owners pay the true price of their luxury. Ropemaker Road is overparked with cars, with neighbours and their guests insisting on parking in my drive or in front of it. I would further recommend that some secure cycle parkings (cycle hoops/hangars) are installed on that road. A couple of remarks on the specifics of the proposals, with reference to Appendix B: 1. Please ensure that the lowered kerb that gives access to Russia Dock Woodland from the North-West (top) part of Downtown Road is marked with double-yellow. Currently seems blue, which would mean permit holders would block that ramp. Currently, vehicles unfortunately park there and block the ramp, which causes dangerous conflicts between pedestrians and bicycles, which are forced onto the pavement behind a blind spot. 2. Please ensure that double-yellow marks allow wheeled pedestrians (wheelchair users, buggies) who move on the pavement from Lovell Place into the North side of Ropemaker Road, have enough space to get into the road without having to negotiate the step next to the cobbled ramp.

We have been parking on our estate for over 30 years and it works very well. Why change it? It will be punishing people like myself with another bill that they can't pay. I struggle every month as it is.

I wholly object to the new parking restrictions. Many residents are wholeheartedly against this

This will probably happen anyway, cause the council will not listen to the residents. We get charged enough in this country its just another way for the council to take more money from people. A lot of people have lost their jobs and are struggling we do not need this extra charge now.

I object to some roads having permits and not others. I live in Byfield close which looks like it will not have permit parking on it, even though multiple roads around it will. This will lead to an increase in parking in this road which is already busy. I also object to permit parking all day, you could put a shorter day in place which would then still allow us to have friends/family visit without costing residents even more money in an already difficult financial time for a lot of people. To make this sort of change when only 2% of residents responded is in my view irresponsible (I was one of the 2% that did respond).

This would make our lives much more difficult

On behalf of, a licensed business of Southwark who have operated in the area for 8 years, I wholly object to these restrictions. Should they go ahead myself and my team will have nowhere in the area to park and how will we then be able to conduct our business at Stave Hill. We propose that you enable a two hour free parking gap so that businesses can continue to conduct. Many businesses will be affected by these reductions, such as delivery drivers, estate agents etc. Not to mention the locals not being able to have visitors. For example, Cathey Street in Bermondsey next to the Angel Pub, has a similar parking restriction and allows a 4 hour parking gap with no return. This should be offered to Dock Hill Avenue and surrounding areas to keep the restrictions fair and to not make businesses suffer more than they have throughout COVID.

I would like to object the parking restrictions on the Fisherman's Drive and surrounding street. Not all residents have a driveway and the restrictions will greatly limit the ability to park next to the properties.

I object to the proposed areas for parking permits and double yellow lines. First, the proposed parking area for Fishermans Drive is too limited. Second, the zone permitting hours are too short. There are several residents along Fishermans Drive with cars and visitors with cars. Third, there has never been problems with parking in our area and I am concerned the disharmony it will create among neighbours competing for space. I do not understand why we need double yellow lines and parking permits when there is no problem with parking in our area.

I have owned a property in the affected area for more than 23 years, recently relocated outside of the zone now the landlord of a property in the area, likely to move back to the zone again in the future. I'm satisfied that the existing arrangement with free/unrestricted parking should continue, I have never seen this as problematic. Also, where would I park when visiting my own property when performing maintenance since I'm not currently a resident. Invest in more schools in the area, and don't mess with parking facilities...

Object to the double yellow lines for our resident

I have lived on this street since 2013 and am writing to object to the proposed CPZ in its current form in Fishermans Drive SE16 and its surrounding areas. I support the introduction of residents permits to mitigate some of the impact of the Canada Water Development. However, I believe the current proposals will be detrimental to existing residents as the proposed parking provision will be inadequate even for current residents. In my opinion, the proposed number of resident spaces (three) is insufficient given the number of driveways which are too short, leading to indiscriminate parking and not enough options for existing residents. I am also concerned about the inability for tradespeople to visit my property for repairs and deliveries. Instead I would ask that the council consider the following as an alternative, consider single yellow lines instead on Fishermans Drive, with only time restrictions during weekdays e.g. 12-2pm to deter commuters or 8.30-9.30/3/4 to deter indiscriminate school run parking.

As a landlord at Fisherman's Drive I need to be able to park near my property during the day time to carry necessary maintenance and also the tradesmen should be able to park on the street. There is hardly any traffic ever on the street (except for school run hours) and double yellow line with the all day restrictions are a nuisance for residents and an additional financial burden.

I believe that the double line is overkill, unnecessary and creating several issues for residents besides moving the issue to other streets (somewhere we need to park!) or just increasing costs for standard people - amongst the issues: safe deliveries (especially during a pandemic), difficult logistics with smaller children (predominant demographic in the street) - what problem are we trying to solve? Dissuade people from owning cars? Is it possible during a pandemic where mass transports and public travelling is less safe? Some of us got a car because of the pandemic and inability to move outside our small area safely can cause mental well-being issues in case of further restrictions. Or is the council saying pandemic is over? 😊 - No major concerns of traffic/parking outside school areas so single line with permits for residents is more than enough w/o impacting unnecessarily to people who are trying to lead a peaceful life in a peaceful area - what about encouraging electric cars instead and putting charging spots in the area to encourage a greener approach to transport? Or rental schemes (most withdrew offers availability during pandemic due to volumes/biz case)? Or what about the bridge to Canary Wharf to encourage cycling or walking! Or ask companies for proper facilities for cycling schemes? Yes London has built cycling lanes but still big Corps don't have enough facilities (eg Lloyds does have 1 single shower in the main building!).

reviewing the proposal I see that for Fishermans Drive there is a full "no waiting at any time" on both sides of the road for the section 12-26. I believe this is an unnecessary step that will only add more disadvantages to the residents than benefits: - most of the houses in the street have converted their garages and cannot use the front of the house to park because it's too short to accommodate cars - this would create issues with workers like plumbers, electricians, nannies, babysitters and for any kind of delivery as there won't be enough areas to leave the vehicle - the current load of parked cars and daily traffic is acceptable and only during school drop offs and pick ups we see some issues - visitors would be penalized, especially the weak ones at risk due to the pandemic that cannot travel via public transport The ideal solution would be to introduce a mix of single lines and Resident Permit holders for Fishermans Drive from 12 to 26

We were not consulted at all regarding this plan of adding double yellow lines in our neighborhood. This design is an overkill and we would like to have the option of single yellow line and/or resident parking permits.

There is utterly no need for CPZ's in this district of London. There is plenty of parking everywhere within the area. No one uses it as a stop gap for commuting. It is not an overly busy area within London and not once has I or any of my neighbours or friends struggled to get parking. The road conditions within the area are something that need far more attention than the current rules. No resident that I know has ever complained of parking especially within the Surrey docks district. There is already limited enough parking in that particular area without the additional need for CPZ's which are claimed to be put in to protect the needs of parking for residents with an influx of traffic. There has been no increase, therefore the only reason I see these CPZ's being implemented is a money-making scheme for Southwark council. Other aspects of this proposal in regards to disabled parking and no waiting zones

I'm for. However making parking in this area more difficult needlessly will only prove to the residents here that their local city council is not interested in the people but the money they can exploit from them. I repeat one final time, there is NO need.

In principle I see advantages to having parking control zones which could reduce the number of commuters who park in the locality all day for free taking up space that residents and local businesses need. I live close to the river bus pontoon at Greenland pier and there are people who park all day and travel on into central London. I think that a shorter controlled period say 8.00 to 13.00 weekdays would work, as in other boroughs eg Tower Hamlets. We are a diverse community and the disadvantages of the scheme don't just relate to commuters. I have neighbours who are self employed or run small businesses and they need clients and colleagues to be able to visit them. They will have to park several streets away from the marina if the zone is implemented, and negatively impact local maritime and creative businesses and retail and hospitality venues which in the past 2-3 have brought economic activity to the South Dock and Greenland Dock areas. There is very limited parking within South Dock Marina premises for residents. A few spaces are available within the SDM boatyard for a fee. Because there is no vehicle access within the marina we rely on the parking spaces at the Calypso Way gate for deliveries, loading and unloading and taking items to our home. There will be an increased use on these bays as drivers try to avoid the new control zone. I would be more in favour of the scheme if 1. It is morning only control 2. Marina residents should have some dedicated parking bays in Rope Street. Most of the other apartments in Rope St have their own private parking so it should only be Marina residents who need to park there. 3. The permit fee should be affordable

Please don't put double or single yellow lines along Fishermans Drive. Double yellow lines would be very unhelpful and inconvenient for residents. Instead, please use a resident parking permit system with dedicated spaces outside each property for residents where the garage has already been converted to a living space. Many of the garages have been converted already so the dropped curbs outside those properties are not so much of an issue. Thank you for your consideration.

This is fantastic as, at the moment, there are various pinch points on Rotherhithe Street where buses (C10) struggle to pass through let alone pass each other. Also, there are blind corners where cars travel far too fast and it is very difficult to cross the road safely. Driving out the Abbotshade Road of Bellamys Court is also very difficult if vans have parked either side of the entrance and you cannot see around them. The attached plans will be a great improvement to safety especially as the Council has decided to authorise scooters which in my opinion is utter madness on Rotherhithe Street and someone will be seriously injured.

The only parking issue that I have observed locally is along the stretch of Salter Road from (approximately) opposite Fisher Close to the sports ground. Long lines of cars parked along the road frequently impede the 2-way flow of traffic, especially buses. If my reading of the proposals is correct, this stretch of road would become 'no waiting' with double yellow lines, and on this basis I would support the proposal.

I think it will affect visitors and businesses negatively

Could you please clarify how the new control parking proposal in Rotherhithe and Surrey docks will affect leisure mooring license holders in South Dock Marina issued by Southwark council? The leisure mooring license holders are permitted to stay/live on board 27/7 - 365 days in a year as per South Dock Marina T&C. In order to pursue the leisure activities onboard of their crafts they would require parking access at all times. This is especially relevant for berth-holders parking on South Sea Street, Calypso Way and Rope Street. Could you please elaborate how this is addressed in the proposed changes.

This is a ridiculous plan for the council to earn money through fines and parking fees whilst inconveniencing the residents of the area, who already pay council tax and don't get enough value for it. The road has deteriorated so much that the entrance to the garage is unusable by a car - and now they want to charge parking when we've never had a parking problem.

Hi all, I don't understand zone II for Maple Leaf Square. It says it's Permit Parking Area? We have our private parking spaces, and we can't accept people parking in the blue area marked in the map. That would BLOCK us from being able to park in our private parking spaces. The triangle around the square HAS to be a DOUBLE YELLOW line.

The main problem these new measures cause is largely for anyone moving house or having work done whereby parking is needed for short periods of time and cannot be found anywhere locally. Any tradesman refuse jobs if parking isn't provided and it means it will become a lot more difficult. I support the reduction of on street parking on Rotherhithe Street and Salter Road as it does affect driving and cyclists significantly, especially on Rotherhithe Street, but please consider where short term spaces are going to be made available.

Completely object to this proposal as absolutely not necessary

I live in Windrose Close which will go under Parking permit holders zone under your plan. This is a private road and there are allocated parking bays as per our lease. Can my guests who want to park in the bays continue to do so? Also will we have to pay for permits to use our parking bays? I don't see the point on Kinburn Street, there isn't much congestion here after the entrance to Kinburn was made single yellow

I have lived in Rotherhithe / Surrey Quays for over 10 years but the high cost of renting has forced me out of the city so I now commute via Basildon. I have parked in Rotherhithe Street with no problems for a number of years. There is always plenty of room for parking. I understand there are lots of new developments but surely this should have been planned before and underground car parks should have been built to supply the new residential areas. Why should current residents and commuters have to suffer for this? I have already been forced out of London due to the high cost of renting and now it's possible I may be forced out due to lack of adequate parking. I am unable to catch a train due to the often unsociable hours I work. I hope that you can reconsider the amount of parking that you are offering in this situation

Apologies I was unable to respond to the minimally noticed initial consult but I see no reason to permit up our neighbourhood. We get little parking issues and we do not want to become a revenue centre for the council.

It is ridiculous and unnecessary. We live in a calm area where nothing happens and no problems with parking

Maple Quays residents do not have access to any form of parking permit from the council. Residents, such as myself, need to use our motor vehicles daily for transport. I am a young woman and work far out in Kent during unsociable hours as a key worker, doing shift work meaning public transport is not an option for me to travel to work. I already have to park a 10 minute walk away from my home. When I am leaving for work before 5am and getting home from work sometimes after 1am it is extremely unsafe for me to be walking alone at night in an area which is experience heightened rates of crime at the moment. The safety and well-being of residents who need to drive (shift workers, elderly people, vulnerable people) is not being considered throughout all of these decisions around parking. I am terrified walking alone every single day to my house because I am unable to park remotely near my residence. To add more restrictions to parking without an option for residents of Maple Quays to have some form of parking permit etc is beyond ridiculous. London is not a safe place to live, and I think it is disgusting that people with different circumstances, those who do not have luxury of working from home, working a 9-5 job or have a perfect health record, are not being considered. I have not worked throughout the entire pandemic, supporting those most in need, to put myself at risk upon returning home after putting myself at risk the entire day at work. Please consider those of us who do not fall into the "normal" category!

Great to see steps taken to reduce car usage! Please can we also have more segregated cycling lanes, bike parking and Low Traffic Neighbourhood areas as well? For example the corner of Quebec Way and Canada Street, which is already a time restricted School Street, would be a good area for an LTN especially when the new Kings college campus opens leading to much more foot traffic with students, as well as the planned office developments of Printworks and Canada Water Dockside also happening nearby. The Kings college planning application shows there is due to be a shop or commercial space on this corner which would also increase the number of pedestrians and other non-motorised road users on this corner. Our garden backs onto this corner and we have observed quite a few near misses between cars and pedestrians at this junction - blocking vehicular traffic here would make it safer for everyone as the number of pedestrians in this location increases over time

Rotherhithe is a little oasis within London. Has a village feel and close community. We don't have to heavy flow of traffic like most of London and cars and traffic that enter the peninsula are only those that need to visit or are residents. It is not necessary to have these parking restrictions to deter outsider traffic or cars which is the purpose of the restrictions. Putting these restrictions in will only negatively effect the residents and families which is not the point of having parking restrictions.

Pure money making scheme Also if parking is an issue for the council then why approve the addition to Benyamin apartments, who from this map / key, you can clearly see will have no parking allocation.

I don't understand the areas designated C in Finland Street. On the north side of Finland Street which is an elongated roundabout, there is an existing footway but your proposal shows it is as parking. Is the proposal to move the existing kerb line north to create a reduced footway and take part of one of the roundabout lanes for parking? On the south side of Aland Court, there are 2 roundabout lanes, a central island parking bay and what I believe outside Aland Court is a footway with no kerbs and is used by motorists as an area to park in. This isn't acceptable now and neither is your proposal. Residents of Aland Court as pedestrians shouldn't have to walk in the road. Given the road width available outside Aland Court and the proposal for the northside, I cannot see why a proper footway cannot be constructed outside Aland Court. Another problem on Finland Street at Aland Court is motorists driving the wrong way along Finland Street. The signage shows the correct direction to take and the road markings indicate which lane you should be in when you use the roundabout. The flats opposite Aland Court have fewer accesses to garages and have now proper pedestrian facilities. At Aland Court, there are 8 garage accesses off Finland Street.

I still see no reason to implement this scheme whatsoever. I have never experienced any problem with parking in the area and it feels like you are simply trying to charge us for something we currently get for free, in addition to erecting lots of additional unwanted street clutter. Please abandon this ill thought out scheme.

I strongly support the implementation of a CPZ to discourage car use in alignment with the climate emergency declaration. It will also prevent the area from being a car parking lot, overtime free up kerbspace for local residents' enjoyment and bring in additional funding to fund improved active travel infrastructure. Whilst I agree with the overall proposal there are some minor issues relating to the South side of Finland Street, opposite the Aland Court buildings. The proposed plans show resident parking on the south side of the street. However, this should be amended to double yellow lines for the following reasons: 1. Cars are actually using a

footpath to park (the kerb wasn't built so cars treat it as free space to park). This forces pedestrians to walk on the road. This is a particular issue for disabled users, and you children on scooters or families with pushchairs.

I strongly support this measure as it will help to discourage car use in alignment with the climate emergency declaration. Whilst I agree with the overall proposal there are some minor issues specifically on the South side of Finland Street, opposite the Aland Court buildings. The proposed plans show resident parking on the south side of the street. This should be amended to double yellow lines for the following reasons: 1. There is no footpath on the south side of Finland Street. This will force pedestrians to weave through cars or walk on the road. This is a particular issue for disabled users. 2. The proposed parking arrangements would obstruct vehicular access to the Aland Court garages.

This is a money making enterprise. There is no need whatsoever for CPZ in our street (Howland Way). We don't have issues with parking on this street. Most residents have their own private parking and there is always room on the street for those that don't. There is no justification for it in any way. Rotherhithe street could probably do with some parking controls, as it does get congested, but this could be solved with double yellows on one side of the street. I wholly object to this proposal.

While I know as a council, you do not care regarding the responses of the people who you are supposed to serve and you will continue with this regardless of what people actually think. Parking in the area, on a whole is fine. Issues exist because you allowed expensive new builds to be built down Salter road in a park with not enough parking, hence the slight inconvenience. I cannot believe that a council would try and implement restrictions based off a 2% response - of which about half say they park on street. Is this proper planning? If permit were to be say, £20 that would be reasonable. But knowing councils, it will be over £100. Another tax on the residents in the area where the gap between poor and wealth is to continue.

There are large areas of "No Loading/Waiting" stated near my property, which might be a positive proposal, however if the scheme is implemented what consideration has been given to temporary visitors to properties i.e. tradesman and deliveries, these do not seem to have been accounted for. Can you advise on this please.

This looks like a money grab by the Council, disguised as having some kind of environmental impact. This will undoubtedly lead to an increase in parking fines to help fill Council coffers. Much easier than rolling out public charging points to encourage people to switch to EV's. Like many residents in the area I do not have access to off street parking, so much as I would like to switch to an EV the rollout of public charge points, particularly rapid chargers, has been woefully inadequate.

As my mobility is reduced and will continue to do so I need my car parked all day near my house. Nothing I have seen or read clarifies whether Capstan Way will have a CPZ so I would appreciate some clarification on this matter and whether anything can be done about it. Currently there is no details except for a red line on a map to show where a cycle lane may be installed!! In this highly residential area I can't be the only person with such a need. Thankyou in anticipation of a reply

The creation of the CPZ around the roads of the Redriff Estate, and the requirement that parking in the street require a permit is just another way to squeeze money out of residents without providing any benefit. What will inevitably occur is that people who can't park in the street will fill up our estate car parks creating more traffic on our estate, bringing non-residents into our space, lead to conflict and create danger for children. Our car parks are not CCTV protected; nor are the roads around the estate. This measure will bring no benefit to the residents of the area and will inevitably lead to an increase in crime and anti-social behaviour. It is a very bad idea.