

Appendix 1 Responses from email and Map-based system, Appyway

Appyway responses

Dear Mr Forden,

Thank you for your letter 09/12/2021 about the North Peckham Streetspace reference TMO2122-032 and is the 'implementation or making amendments' to keep the restriction from entering and leaving (with £65 penalty) at the Meeting House Lane and Goldsmith Road junction and having an obstacle in Fenham Road?

I apologise if I should have seen this on you website annotated map (i didn't understand the 'A', 'B' and 'X' with coloured lines) and because the 'submit feedback' hyperlink wasn't working my feedback is that I find obstructing routes results in more driving/emissions having to get round them and I'd prefer the scheme to be dropped.

Thanks and sorry again,

Email responses

As a resident in Commercial Way, I received a letter dated 9th December on the Statutory Consultation on the North Peckham Streetspace Scheme. This Streetspace scheme is essentially a square area with a corner removed. Its sides are made from part of Commercial Way, Naylor Road, Meeting House Lane, Peckham High Street and Peckham Hill Street. All of these boundary roads have experienced much higher levels of traffic since the scheme was implemented. Peckham Hill St and Peckham High St were already main thoroughfares carrying buses and other large vehicles. Now, since the scheme, Commercial Way also sees many more large and heavy vehicles along with a much greater volume of general traffic. Massive congestion is a regular feature on all the roads that are on the boundary of the scheme. This leads to residents on these boundary roads experiencing significant extra air pollution, extra noise pollution, extra danger from motorists who become enraged and reckless by the jams. Also they now have to experience intermittent periods, which happen daily, of stress from motorists being aggressive, shouting and using their horns. The living conditions of residents on the boundary roads have been severely and badly affected.

When referring to the informal consultation the letter states " The consultation found the majority of those who responded and had an address within the zone wanted to retain the zone.....so we are proposing to make the measures permanent.....". It seems entirely understandable that residents not on the boundary roads but within the zone who directly benefit from these measures might wish to retain them. However, their benefit is directly connected to the severe detriment of those on the boundary. It should be noted that the number of residents on the boundary roads will always be less than the number of residents within the scheme (but no on the edges). In these circumstances quoting a simple majority is an unacceptable justification for the proposals to be made permanent.

I believe this scheme to be discriminatory in that it results in unjust and prejudicial treatment of the residents on the boundary roads and I object to it being made permanent.

Desr Dale Forden,

Thank you for your letter of 9 December about implementing the existing trial changes in the North Peckham Estate. I attended all informal consultations between 31 July and 22 September and the residents clearly did not want these trial changes implemented.

Southwark Council is clearly a corrupt organisation and has no intention of listening to its residents. I want you to provide me with the results of the survey, a list of officials involved in the informal consultation and their notes about the North Peckham Streetspace scheme. I want all legal documentation to fight this in court.

I have no choice but to take legal proceedings against this corruption within Southwark Council. I cannot allow the corrupt officials in Southwark to destroy this community.

Yours sincerely,

Hello,

I am writing to support the decision to implement the trial changes in north Peckham permanently. They have vastly improved the area already and I hope more similar schemes are introduced soon. (Buller Close would be an ideal candidate)

Thank you,