

### Redacted comments

Object/Support	FeedbackText
Partly Support	<p>Hi, I agree with the proposed changes. Our area is almost like a junkyard for "project" cars. This will clean up and declutter the streets.</p> <p>There is a small change I would suggest. In front of my building, the pavement is often blocked by people not parking in the designated bays. This causes issues for people with prams, as they need to use the street instead of the pavement. It blocks the visibility on the corner and raises the risk of a cycle accident. Also in case of a bad event, emergency vehicles won't have easy access.</p> <p>So what I suggest, is extending the K rule (no waiting at any time) up to the corner of the street, making sure the pavement is for pedestrians, not for cars.</p> <p>I am attaching a screenshot of the proposed area, and also 2 pictures from the actual area.</p>
Object	<p>We have a residential parking permit in Manor Grove. Despite this, there are no parking bays on the estate and the council is reducing them further. Therefore we often need to park on the street where our car is damaged and vandalised. My car has been completely scratched, the mirrors have been stolen, the window wipers have been broken. You are now asking us to pay for Street parking. I feel that you are adding a financial burden to a miserable parking situation. If the council wants to charge for street parking they should first ensure that people with residential permit have a parking bay assigned to them. Cameras on the estate would also help. Once this has been implemented, street parking charges could be introduced. The situation is particularly critical from Friday to Sunday when attendants to the local churches and pubs occupy the few parking bays on the estate. No one monitors or fines them. I think issues should be solved before creating new financial burdens for us. Also, street parking for residents at reduced cost should be considered. I hope this helps.</p> <p>Thank you</p>
Object	<p>Family will not be able to visit as they cannot afford the parking cost. As a community there is no problem with parking in our area. We don't need to have any parking controls put in place. It just a way for council to make money off of local residents. Do not do this to our community.</p>
Object	<p>I completely disagree with introducing parking restrictions and permitted parking in this area.</p> <p>This area is under served by public transport, with huge numbers of flats being granted planning permission with no consideration of the impact on the already overwhelmed transport services in the area. Cycle paths barely exist, or include dangerous areas.</p> <p>By punishing car owners financially who cannot afford a house with private parking and where public transport is appalling, you risk further deepening inequalities in the borough. Those who can afford large houses will not need a permit while first time buyers in small flats will be forced to pay.</p>

	<p>There is one station in the area, with only 4 trains an hour. The proposed overground extension hasn't been confirmed. The proposed bakerloo line extension is on hold.</p> <p>No one keeps and maintains an expensive vehicle who doesn't need one. Instead of punishing residents, the council should stop granting planning permission for hundreds of flats and instead work on ensuring that residents have access to public transport.</p>
Object	<p>There is absolutely no need for a CPZ in this area. There are hundreds of unused parking spaces on the estates in the area, driveways not being used etc. This will detrimentally impact anyone who has no recourse to a parking permit. The train and bus service from this area has worsened since Covid, and was never very good to begin with. This is nothing but a money grab by the council, traffic in the area won't be affected or reduced in any way by introducing a CPZ. There are absolutely no problems leaving things the way they are. I don't recall ever being approached for feedback last year as I would've strongly opposed this then as well.</p>
Object	<p>Living on a private estate with no parking restrictions, (xx Close), I have concerns that the new parking restrictions around this area will mean that residents in the newly built and future blocks will use our private parking areas resulting on a negative impact to residents on the estate. I feel these new restrictions will take away the freedom that local residents have previously enjoyed, in being able to have visitors etc without the worry and expense of parking restrictions. We do not have parking issues at the moment but these restrictions will force those who are unable to get a permit to seek options which will no doubt be detrimental to those with unrestricted parking.</p>
Partly Support	<p>I am noticing a lot of cars parked which do not belong to xx Gardens residents. Noticed when I am commuting to my office / work, these individuals park up my street and walk out of the cul de sac. It is easy to know they are not residents as I pretty much know everyone who lives here by face if not by name. Additionally I notice some households such as xx has multiple cars parked all across the street and sometime they recourse to nuisance parking in others driveways including in front of my house. I have resorted to placing wheel bins placed in front of my house with stickers stating the obvious "No nuisance parking". I have reported this matter to the parking enforcement office in Southwark Council but I am not sure if the investigation yielded anything as I never got a confirmation from the department.</p> <p>I would have preferred that barrier be placed at the entrance of Sherwood Gardens from Catlin Street to eliminate this problem from the root. Only residences enter from the outside can help this situation considerably. Also can deter residents having multiple vehicles from abusing the system if council allow only 1 or 2 tokens for the gate. I hope the council pick up this advise instead of enforcing a no waiting / permitted parking zone. But if not possible I guess a CPZ is the only option, then so be it.</p>
Partly Support	<p>Suggestion: provide more electric vehicle charging points/spaces.</p>

I write on behalf of members of the Vital OKR business association (and some other businesses) to object to Southwark's Traffic Management Orders 202\* No. 0\*\* and 202\* No. xxx relating to the proposed OKR CPZ, for the following reasons:

1. There has been insufficient consultation of businesses potentially affected by the proposed parking bay locations and the parking charge regime. Most businesses I have spoken to were unaware of the earlier consultations and knew nothing of the proposed CPZ and associated parking bay scheme. There appear to be serious deficiencies in the Council's consultation process. We have recently requested a discussion about potential amendments to the scheme, and a review of the charging regime, and we asked for an urgent meeting. Several businesses have also written expressing their concerns, but there have been no responses from the Council. It was a surprise and a disappointment to realise that instead on entering into dialogue about reasonable concerns, the Council has gone ahead with the TMOs based on an un-amended scheme that includes significant problems

2. Parking bays are proposed in several locations that would restrict goods vehicle access to businesses that enjoy rights of vehicle access. These access restrictions would have significant adverse impact on the operation of several businesses, and hence are unacceptable. Examples noted include (but are not limited to) these: on the south side of Verney Road that could restrict goods access to the small business accommodation in the anticipated development by xx; north side of Verney Road opposite to the eastern HGV entrance of xx; north side of Verney Road adjacent to the entrance used by xx, north side of Verney Road adjacent to both goods vehicle entrances of the xx; east side of Ormside Street and west side of Hatcham Road that would compromise goods access to premises in the Penarth Centre; on Penarth Street that would likely restrict goods vehicle access to xx; on Hatcham Road and Ormside Street that would restrict goods vehicle access to xx and potentially limit access to the breezeway in their proposed future development.

3. No provision has been made for the on-street parking requirements of the several taxi repair businesses that operate in the area of the proposed CPZ.

4. The timing of the restrictions, the high cost of business parking permits, and the unavailability of visitor parking vouchers to businesses, will place considerable additional financial strain on many businesses. The timings and the charging regime appear to have been designed to favour residents and to punish business, which seems discriminatory and is sure to undermine the viability of some businesses and reduce willingness to continue trading in the area.

I repeat requests for a review of the scheme and the charging regime, for dialogue with businesses, and for an urgent meeting.

Object

xx (xx London Ltd) on behalf of Vital OKR (business association) and some other businesses in the proposed CPZ area.

Object	This proposal is just another way to let the resident and visitors just spend more money, without giving any practical benefit
Object	<p>I operate xx at xx Verney Road. I have multiple very serious concerns about the CPZ proposals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Business critical: We currently have a KEEP CLEAR zone immediately in front of our shutters. These are absolutely critical to our business as they allow unobstructed access to road tankers which pull up outside of our shutters while we load them. We need guaranteed all day access for road tankers for our business to survive. A tanker takes two hours to load. I believe (not clear from the plan here?) the restrictions may allow up to 40 minutes loading time, this is insufficient.</li> <li>2. There is a second KEEP CLEAR zone in the parking bays opposite. These allow for HGV's to access the yard within the T Marchant estate. It's already very tight access as it stands and cannot be reduced, as appears to be the case in your proposals.</li> <li>3. On top of running a xx our site doubles up as an events venue. Our business relies on trade customers, maintenance engineers, cleaners, suppliers, musicians, sound technicians, caterers, etc who all park out on the road. If there is nowhere for them to park and no access to temporary permits or similar, our business will not survive.</li> <li>4. We have fifteen employees at present. In the next two years we expect this figure to triple. At present the vast majority of our employees either cycle to work or take public transport. However, some do occasionally drive in and we have an increasing number of sales and delivery personnel who work in London and the commuter belt in electric cars and vans. We have no other parking space for delivery and sales personnel vehicles other than on the road, there are no demised parking spaces under our lease and no room to park off road. As a small business we are also unable to pay the extortionate proposed permit fees and I believe these are capped to four per business? This is nowhere near enough. And how is there no reduction for small businesses?</li> <li>5. The trade from passing vehicles and match goes picking up beer from our shop / stopping by the taproom is vital to our income. Attracting footfall to the taproom is proving really tough, so this may just be the nail in the coffin for what should be a really nice local cultural hub. If you are not aware, we are which supports the physical and mental well-being of the community. I don't suppose you care much about the latter, but you should.</li> <li>6. Finally, just as a word of advice: our section of the road is constantly flooded. The drains are all at the highest points on both sides of the roads so the parking bays either side are like large swamps complete with heaps of dog excrement. Charging anyone to park there isn't just unsavoury, it's unrealistic.</li> </ol> <p>To summarise, it's not in the interest of residents or fellow businesses to impose this friction to trade and everyday life in South Bermondsey. If the council are doing this in order to generate income, I can think of a million and one ways to incentivise frictionless trade first and then tax that trade when it's roaring, than to stamp all over the embers in a community of people trying their absolute hardest to make a living right now. Please feel free to contact me any time to discuss our options here,</p>

	I fully appreciate your motive, but the details have clearly not been thought out.
Object	I totally oppose the new parking restrictions being put in place outside my business premises, as a small business, really can't accommodate another expense, the area has been fine for 30 years +, until the new flats were built, which were built with no onsite parking for residents, so they are parking where business owners were parking, the £615 per year for a permit, is outrageous, there is no availability for me to park in the yard, I need my car for picking up and dropping off work, there are a lot of businesses in my road in the same situation, making it permitted Parking, will not sort the problem, because you are allowing everyone to park there, but now you are making money out of us, there has to be a concession, ie 1 free permit per business, the only other option I have, is to find other premises, it is totally unfair for small businesses, being forced out, the business community was there a lot longer than the new flats.
Object	Just over 20 years ago the local community voted to object to the council from implementing a CPZ in this area it was presented to the then government and they agreed not to implement the CPZ. So it is with this in mind that after all those years without a CPZ we still don't want a CPZ. The excuse that we now have more flats in the area is down to the council to have made sure that in the planning process parking should have been a top priority, as this was a failure by the council then why should the residents have to pay for your failure in doing your job.
Object	I do not agree with the Statutory Consultation of the Old Kent Road Controlled Parking Zone letter that I received recently. I do not support the Council's vision that by introducing a new controlled parking zone (CPZ OKR), it will reduce car journeys in the borough whatsoever! I have a car and would still continue to use it to carry out necessary journeys if a new controlled parking zone is implemented. Likewise I would assume, other people who own cars in this area.
Object	I would like to raise a strong objection to this proposal as it has clearly not been designed with the welfare of residents in mind. The controlled zone is planned to be only on week days, which is the time when there is not a parking problem in the area. The times when there are parking problems are on the weekends and evening when there are games on at the nearby Millwall stadium. Implementing the zones to this plan will only make life more difficult to residents while not addressing the main issue with parking in the area. I have read the report and am disappointed that the scheme is being recommended when the local community clearly does not want it. I would like to particularly object to the no stopping at any time area on Varcoe road, as currently many people use this space to park to use the shop on the road to no inconvenience as the road is perfectly wide enough, and not allowing people to park there would have a very detrimental effect on this local business. Also the lack of provision for electric car charging in the plan is concerning as surely the ownership of electric cars is to be encouraged to reduce emissions in the area.
Object	There is ample spare parking around the estates to cope with additional cars needing to be parked, with sufficient space as and when required, so we don't see permit parking being necessary. In addition many of the

	new flats will be rented out to transient renters, who don't own cars in the first place
Object	I object to estate parking restrictions, as currently there is sufficient parking space for additional cars. In addition many of the flats will be rented, and many renters are transient, so are less likely to have cars in the 1st place
Object/Multi	<p>I solely object this proposal. I have been living in the area for the past 3 years and do not struggle to find a parking space.</p> <p>Regardless even if there are new residential properties being developed in old Kent road, it's highly likely that they will end up parking their vehicles all the way around Varcoe Road area.</p> <p>Therefore I highly object this proposal.</p>
Object/Multi	<p>I am mostly in favour of the proposed plans, aside from a couple of points.</p> <p>1. Ormside street outside unit xx, we applied for a double yellow outside of our unit to allow for our loading bay to be kept clear this needs to be reflected in the plans.</p> <p>2 The timing, the current measure surrounding Penarth Center do not take into consideration the extreme disruption caused by church goers parking on Saturday and Sunday. I would propose that the timing would be extended to include Mon- Sat 8.30 - 18.30 and Sunday 8.30 - 14.30.</p> <p>Other than this the plans as a whole will create a less antisocial use of the roads in the area and be both conducive to positive atmosphere for both business and residential use in the surrounding area.</p>
Object/Multi	<p>Hey Southwark Traffic team,</p> <p>The form on the consultation website is not functioning and I wanted to submit feedback.</p> <p>I submitted one thing and realised I had left one point off, am I able to make sure my original feedback was submitted.</p> <p>Here is my second lot of feedback. Please let me know if my initial feedback was received.</p> <p>I missed off one final suggestion that additional Disabled badge holder parking be considered outside of the main entrance to the Penarth Center on Penarth street to the left of the Paid/Permit holder parking . We are building an arts charity the building and access for us extremely important, and there are a number of other public facing organisations within the building who would also benefit from this. We feel access is incredibly important inline with Southwark Council's Fairer, Greener, Safer Southwark's Council Delivery Plan, under the theme A thriving and inclusive economy.</p> <p>And here is a paraphrasing of my initial feedback</p> <p>We requested double yellow lines outside unit xx Ormside street to allow our loading bay to remain clear,this was accepted and is due to be painted any time now this is not reflected in the plans.</p> <p>I would suggest an alteration of the times for paid/permit holder parking as the current plans do not take into consideration the current significant disruption to business and residents caused on Saturdays and Sundays</p>

	<p>by Church goes parking. I would suggest Mon- Sat 8.30 - 18.30 Sunday 8.30-14.30</p> <p>Mostly in support of these changes as they will curb antisocial use of the roads in the area to support both Residential and Business uses. Kindest Regards, xx</p>
Object	I do not wish to install permit parking around this area
	<p>The proposed cpz will have a huge impact on my own and other businesses and staff in the area. Already all businesses around this area are driving around for extended periods of time looking for parking due to the overly excessive amount of yellow lines already in place. I own a vehicle repair business and can see that there are no benefits or concessions of any kind in an already difficult situation enforced on all by the yellow lines. this will become unworkable for all if the cpz goes live. One of the reasons we've been given for the need of a cpz is to reduce car ownership in the area, if this is the case why enforce this during normal business working hours and not during the evening when homeowners and tenants would be home?</p> <p>Being an employer is already hard and getting harder the increase in costs of permits and loss of custom from expense and lack of parking will truly be detrimental to business and will result in loss of jobs which surely goes against the idea of regeneration.</p> <p>I also find it hard to understand why such a large decision has been made without any real and proper consultation with the people it really affects, how is it I've only received a letter two weeks in advance of the cpz going live? And why is it that most businesses in hatchem and Penarth Street still aren't even aware of the scheme?</p> <p>I truly believe this scheme needs a rethink.</p>
Object	Regards xx
Object/Multi	<p>I am writing on behalf of xx Ltd, the leading terrazzo company in the UK and employer of 40-50 staff. We occupy premises on xx Street. We are very concerned that the proposed parking bays on Penarth Street will inhibit our ability to access our yard off Penarth Street with HGVs and this will have a significantly negative impact on our business. We need HGV vehicles to have clear access in order to ensure the smooth running of the business and would be grateful please if the location of these bays could be reconsidered. We believe the proposed parking permit charges for businesses are unreasonably high and would request they are reconsidered to bring them into line with proposed resident charges. In addition we would like to be able to purchase visitor passes please. Excessive car parking charges will have a negative impact on our business as it will affect our ability to attract and retain staff and also visitors.</p>
Object	<p>I wholly reject the idea on the grounds that its purely a money making exercise by Southwark and doesn't benefit the local residents, if this was to go ahead I will have to start paying for parking for people to visit me, I am already struggling with the cost of living as it is, this will be another stealth tax for local residents. I have lived he for over 50 years and never to this day had an issue with parking outside or near my property.</p>

Partly Support	<p>I agree with the proposal to introduce a CPZ, however I would like the council to consider a modification.</p> <p>there is only one car club bay near my building, which is a car free building. More should be provided, and it should be for a car and not a van. While the Zipcar “one way” cars can be left anywhere in Southwark, they are more expensive than the cars with a designated bay, there’s no guarantee there will be one within reasonable walking distance when you need it, and you can only reserve them for 15 mins. Hence I think you need to reconsider the car club bay provision and ensure it’s for a car and not a van. People in this building cannot own cars, which is reasonable and something we knew when we moved here, but there are times when you just need a car and the car club bay provision is not consistent with this.</p>
Object	<p>I am totally against this parking control as it will afford my business which I have been in trade under your Borough for 20 years.</p> <p>In the past I have applied for a drop Kerb for loading &amp; unloading which was refused over the years, then Covid hit and you closed all the side roads so it make more traffic on the main roads which increased my journey times longer.</p> <p>I understand we need more houses but never understand you knock down tall buildings that were built in the 70s/80s to rebuild new ones.</p> <p>Now you want to oppose an parking control with the area to cut down traffic pollution but that’s not really quite the case as our cars are getting cleaner and more Electric cars now are on the road. It just pure greed to make more money at the time things are getting so hard to survive.</p> <p>I have noticed since you have built quite a few housing around the Borough, that more cars seemed to be parking within our area and can see this will just get worse, so are you going to give us traders who’s been there like me for over 20 years of trading a special parking bay control; parking outside our units so we can get on within our business working &amp; suppling to help our Economy.</p> <p>Kind regards xx</p>

	<p>I refer to my concern over illegal carparking in my living area, that is xx London.</p> <p>Your attention is drawn that occupants in xx the extension building) has breached the planning approval condition that xx does not have any parking right inside the Culloden Close. In fact, it is obvious that multiple vehicles (1 allowable for x). This is in contravention of planning condition (Planning ref: 20/AP/2239) of no parking right for 9A. (See also attached planning statement by Mr xx issued by the Council). To facilitate your verification, I attached photos of the vehicles in concern:-</p> <p>1) I trust the xx has been registered with xx ? Otherwise, it is regarded as illegal parking in the Close ?</p> <p>2) The xx is illegal without any parking right ?</p> <p>3) Two more unknown cars xx and xx may related to xxs well ?</p> <p>In the other words, xx have now occupied multiple parkings. Those from xx being illegal and are subject to your verification and action.</p> <p>Furthermore, the above named vehicles should ne verified and shall not be granted any sort of permit for parking in the Control Parking Zone to safeguard landlords and residents' right.</p> <p>Furthermore, it is weird that you found new cars from outsiders parked without parking right inside the private Culloden Close just in front of my house everyday. This affects the general safety and not fair to all residents of Culloden Close area.</p> <p>Grateful for your investigation, management and action.</p> <p>Please keep me posted of the outcome.</p> <p>Thanks</p>
Comments only	
Object	<p>This scheme is a waste of time and money. They only time parking is an issue in this area is when there is a Millwall match on. These are mostly on Saturdays, when the scheme will not be in effect. This makes the whole idea ridiculous. Putting in pay parking in a residential area is a money making stealth tax scheme by the council and an example of greenwashing. A parking scheme will do nothing to improve traffic or air quality in the area. Public transport remains poor. This is a terrible idea, along with the proposed logistics facility on Verney Road.</p>
Object/Multi	<p>I'm writing on behalf of xx the leading UK terrazzo supplier and employer of 40-50 staff. We have been made aware that each business will only be able to purchase one parking permit. This is totally unworkable and would be catastrophic for us. We have approx 8-10 staff who travel to work by car each day and cannot get here any other way. They park on the street all day. We also have 6 company vehicles that are at the property for various times each day, collecting and dropping off supplies before servicing customers. In addition we rely on visitors coming to the property to visit our showroom. Many do this by car. Please would you urgently reconsider this policy. We are very concerned it has the potential to put us out of business.</p>

Object/Multi	<p>Our vehicles are sometimes parked outside our works for longer than 1-2 hours, whilst we are processing the glass they will use to carry out emergency repairs</p> <p>will there be business parking permits available?</p> <p>if so, how many, how much etc.</p> <p>Regards</p>
Object/Multi	<p>Regarding the proposed controlled parking on Devon St.</p> <p>Further to my previous email</p> <p>It appears in the proposals, we will only be able to park our vehicles for a maximum of 1-2 hours outside our own work units,</p> <p>A few days each week our vehicles are normally parked for longer periods of time whilst we are processing the glass for the vehicles to be loaded &amp; carry out the (emergency) work</p> <p>Has anyone physically, been to any of the companies situated on Devon Street &amp; spoken to any of the employers regarding their requirements to carry on trading?</p> <p>Regards</p>
Support	Agree
Object	..
Object	<p>I do not agree with the parking restrictions from tourist and placement of spaces as I believe this will only have a negative impact on the people who live on these roads and always have people wanting to visit people who live in this area. I also do not agree with the prices for permits and parking charges. It is unfair that people currently are able to park for free. However if these proposed changes come into effect people will have to now pay on average £150 a year for a permit</p>
Object	<p>I am the owner of xx garage in Penarth Street. These parking restrictions will have a detrimental impact on my business. I have suppliers who need to deliver parts to my business who need to be able to park. I have xx drivers who need to park their vehicles in the street before they can gain access to the garage. I have staff who need to park their vehicles to attend work.</p>
Object	<p>This will have a detrimental impact on my taxi repair garage. I have suppliers who need to park to deliver parts, I have customers who need to park their Taxis whilst they gain access to my premises and I have staff who need to park their cars to attend work. The industrial areas need to be considered in this proposal we are being penalised by the regeneration of the area and pay our business rates so should be entitled to operate effectively and efficiently. Ultimately this is a Soutwark Council money making scheme targeting businesses that are already being stretched during the cost of living crisis.</p>
Object	<p>I think during these times it's unacceptable that you would bring in paid parking restrictions into quite a low income area. The area has a natural autonomy, there is even enough parking on Millwall game days. I think the councils efforts should be in using the money we pay to improve the green spaces in the area and keeping the community open and</p>

	supported. Nobody ever has an issue parking here and most people's cars are needed for work. There is a mix of ambulance workers vehicles, delivery mopeds, teachers, couriers. You're looking at creating a really difficult situation for a lot of members of the community here.
Object	No one is going to be able to live! Family and friends won't be able to visit unless they pay for parking? We're not allowed a social life? Everything is money making and it's ridiculous, suicidal rate will rocket with the cost of living! People don't know when their next meal is going to be now Southwark council wants to hit south bermondsey with permits? Be considerate!
Object/Multi	<p>It is business critical for us that the existing scheme is amended in line with the points made below.</p> <p>Our businesses xx Verney Road, and have done so for over 50 years. We have HGVs accessing our site through multiple gate ways.</p> <p>1. If this CPZ were to go ahead in its present form, we would be unable to access our site with HGVs, which is critical to our business. Southwark Highways have agreed to implement Double Yellow Lines and Keep Clear each side of our gates and importantly on the opposite side of the road to allow HGVs to have safe access. This CPZ is not compatible with that, as it would have parking bays on the Double Yellow lines. I attach the agreement we have from Highways showing the positioning of the Double Yellow Lines.</p> <p>2. For our business to operate effectively we would need a number of visitor parking spaces. These are needed for e.g. employees, customers, potential customers, suppliers, maintenance contractors, auditors (i.e. many different vehicles). Presumably this would be best achieved through visitor parking vouchers, and it is therefore critically important that our business is able to have these.</p> <p>3. In the interests of promoting business in the borough, I would expect the visitor parking spaces/ vouchers to be free of charge; and most definitely at no greater a charge than for any resident or single vehicle parking space (so as to avoid discrimination).</p> <p>I have already raised the important points above as part of the informal consultation of the CPZ, and urgently request that this time they are properly considered and the CPZ adjusted accordingly.</p>
Comments only	I think councils should take into account the effect on neighbouring boroughs when making decisions particular roads adjacent to the border. The knock on effect is significant on both boroughs.
Object	It doesn't matter what is proposed if they want to do it to make themselves look good they will, if it may have a negative effect on their position (financial or otherwise) then they won't do it. It called politics 101
Object	We don't have any problems with parking in the area. Lots of spaces in Varcoe road. I do NOT want this area to become one where teachers from school have to pay
Object	This is just another way of taxing the working class people in this area in this cost of living crisis, Tip k al Labour run council, they do nothing for the people of Southwark, they just take take take, Just like the London mayor out right disgusting.

Object	Do not increase kerb parking costs for residents. I need my car for work and it's already hard for me to afford. I am a teacher living in Bermondsey who needs car for aspects of work.
Object	I think that the residents of Southwark have seen increases in council tax, less services and still having to pay extra for parking in an area where bus routes being cut It's outrageous. Already with ULEZ, congestion charge and now this. Where do the council think people get their money from.
Object	The cost of living has become extremely difficult for a lot of people, the last thing people need at the minute is additional fee for parking that has been free. Please taking all this into consideration.
Object	<p>I am very concerned about these proposals.</p> <p>Firstly there seems to have been no consultation with any of the local businesses, since I have been in contact with many of them and none have been spoken to.</p> <p>There has been no explanation as to what you are trying to achieve. The implementation will not benefit accessibility nor safety in the area so seems only to be a moneymaking scheme.</p> <p>Parts of my yard are rented to other businesses, at least one of whom has informed me they will have to move if this proposal goes ahead, when have been told businesses are to be encouraged into the area.</p> <p>Why do we need restrictions across our driveways?</p> <p>Our Ward Councillor informed us it was to discourage the new residents from owning cars but the hours of use (8.30am-6.30pm) would only affect the local business operations, all whom are small and already under financial pressure and for many this could prove to be the last straw.</p> <p>You need to arrange a meeting between yourselves and all the affected parties to open a conversation.</p> <p>Looking forward to hear from you.</p> <p>xx</p>
Object	<p>FAO: TMO Officer  Date: 25th March 2023  Ref: TMO2223-037 CPZ OKR</p> <p>I object to the planned introduction of a Controlled Parking Zone on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Introducing these zones will mean local residents will start finding it difficult to move around and park in their own area. Whilst that might be what the Council wants, this will negatively impact people who for various reasons cannot use alternative means of transport.</li> <li>2. It could cause issues with people wishing to visit as now they will have nowhere to legitimately park and can be awkward if parking spaces are limited.</li> <li>3. Introduction of these zones will usually cost residents more money as they will then have to apply for parking permits, which are not convenient and (usually) not free.</li> <li>4. Inconvenience. Where I currently park is crowded and although there usually spaces, occasionally there are not. I then have to park elsewhere which is around 15 minutes' walk, away. If this zone is implemented, it may mean I cannot do this. This is not acceptable!</li> </ol>

	<p>5. Like many people, I no longer drive for “leisure” but because I have to. I work a long distance away and travelling by Public Transport is not acceptable. Whilst it’s “nice” that the Council want to “encourage” more walking/cycling etc., some of us just want to get stuff done and using a car is the way this is accomplished.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>
Object	I object to the constant attack on motorists.
Object	Parking costs are ridiculous for people who do earn a decent wage but need a vehicle. Somethings just have to be taken by a vehicle and the mini cabs are very unscrupulous and I don’t feel safe with them. Most times I have had to use a mini cab I always have someone with me or I cannot go, and not to sound patronising or rude but many cannot understand what I’m saying and it, as a female makes me extremely uncomfortable to get into their vehicle. Why aren’t the cyclists paying to use the roads and pavements?
Object	Just another cash cow for Southwark council
Object	It is completely unreasonable to keep building properties without providing sufficient parking for residents. You can’t keep increasing parking costs when there is no parking available
Object	Very difficult to find a parking space, extremely expensive to purchase a permit.
Object	As a director of the xx Residents Management Company fir the. xx estate I would like to comment that for 20 years we have had non stop issues with non residents parking on our private estate and this will make the situation unbearable. The council's policy of not giving resident parking permits to people living in new builds means our estate will be overrun.
Object	The current parking arrangement is fine. We live on a private close and if the cpz is introduced the non residents cars will end up parking in our spaces.
Object	This will put a burden in all families and resident 300£more a year when you now need to chose hitting or food, insolation even more the elderly when people go and visit.
Object	Can the council not make this harder than it is, it’s hard enough to pay hugely already, can council stop making life harder. Please.
Object	Totally against this
Object	<p>Parking in our road (Hatcham Road) is currently not a problem - there is no congestion, lorries unload freely, visitors come, go and park briefly without causing any aggravation to us or our neighbours.</p> <p>At least one of our tenants is looking to leave as a result of this potential scheme.</p> <p>We and none of our neighbours had been consulted on this proposal and only found out about it by chance.</p> <p>No one that I have spoken to is in favour of these parking restrictions.</p> <p>The cynic in me can only conclude that this is being inflicted on us to generate income.</p> <p>The only excuses that we have been given are (A) that this is to prevent residents in the new apartment blocks from owning vehicles - if that's genuinely the case then restrict parking out of normal working hours</p>

	<p>....say weekends or overnight....and don't punish local businesses.....and (B) that parking restrictions elsewhere will push drivers to park in unrestricted areas....so don't restrict those other areas either.....none of this is necessary.</p> <p>In short, leave everything as it is and stop trying to take more money off us.</p>
Partly Support	<p>I am writing to provide my feedback on the proposed new CPZ arrangement in the area, and I would like to express my support for the proposal on the condition that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) we, the residents of xx Ilderton Road, are eligible for a parking permit, and that</li> <li>2) loading bay(s) to be established instead of a 'no waiting' zone on Stockholm Road.</li> </ol> <p>As a resident of the area, I understand the need for a new CPZ arrangement to manage parking and reduce congestion in the area. However, I would like to stress the importance of ensuring that residents have fair access to parking permits. It's crucial that we're able to park near our homes, particularly as many of us rely on our cars for work, childcare, and other essential activities.</p> <p>Additionally, I believe that establishing loading bay(s) on Stockholm Road would be a more practical and efficient solution than simply a 'no waiting at any time' zone. A loading zone would provide residents on the two apartment blocks (xx) with the necessary space to load and unload, while a no waiting at all times zone may result in vehicles blocking the road and causing unnecessary congestion.</p> <p>Overall, I support the proposed new CPZ arrangement, but I urge the council to consider the concerns of residents and ensure that the arrangement is fair and practical for everyone in the area.</p>
Partly Support	<p>Thank you for considering my feedback.</p> <p>I would like to support any and all reduction in parking where it might free space for more useful infrastructure. Certain respondents in my building are complaining about the development and upgrade of the area which they knowingly moved into, and are crying crocodile tears about imagined vulnerable groups who nonetheless own property in zone two and own/operate numerous cars. I wish to make it known that some residents support the development of the area, including any changes that would reduce car dominance and improve connections by accessible public transport.</p> <p>Incidentally, to that end I would like to (I) thank the council for the new local rentable cycling options, (ii) note the inaccessible nature of south bermondsey station and (III) request better disabled access to the area by public transport to facilitate life in this increasingly densely populated area.</p>
Support	<p>We need more parking restrictions to discourage car use. There is a climate emergency.</p>

Object	I think it is absolutely disgusting that you would make a proposal to put parking restrictions in our area. The residents are already struggling with the council tax increase and cost of living there are plenty of elderly people who also live in this area. WE CANNOT AFFORD TO KEEP GIVING TH COUNCIL MONEY just for the sake of it. This is not fair! We do not need parking permits...this is adding extra financial burdens on house holds that are already struggling. The tiny little posters you have put out is also unacceptable the council has not done right by notifying tenants of this proposal. There are people who have vision impairment or even dyslexic a a poster attached to the pole typed in font 10 is not good enough notification. This parking permit proposal must be stopped!
Support	I support reducing car traffic and use within the area for environmental reasons, as well as general well-being and the purpose of having a walkable city.
Object	I wholly object to these proposals. They are ill thought through around the Rossetti and Stubbs Drive area especially. I am especially concerned the impact the roadside restrictions will have on the private residential parking spaces in the area. I also consider the timing of restrictions from 8.30-18.30 too long with an especial impact on people with caring responsibilities and people with disabilities. It is not current residents' problems that Southwark council has approved disproportionately new housing developments in the area. The impact on traffic and transportation is something that holistically should have been considered by the authorities, including ensuring adequate parking spaces as part of these new developments and new public transport such as the long promised overground station and the extension of the Bakerloo line. This is a failure on your part and current residents should not be punished for this with overzealous parking restrictions in adjoining roads that will make life for current residents more difficult. For this reason I wholly object to this ill-conceived scheme.
Object	Does not go well with the cost of living. Too expensive for local residents and disable residents
Object	With many high rise developments in the area. Local transport can not keep up with the demand of the residents. Free Car parking is essential in my neighbourhood to allow visitors to visit the elderly and carers to visit patients. There is no need for this permit money making scheme.
Object	I would like to make an objection to the proposed changes. Reference TMO2223-037 CPZ OKR.  Namely in reference to the areas 'DD' around Stubbs dr and Rosetti rd. These are residential areas quite a proximity away from OKR. I don't imagine any overflow from the restrictions on OKR will impact parking in this zone. It penalises local residents who require off street parking
Object	This area does not need restricted parking . The residents and visitors will have to pay for parking to swell the coffers of Southwark Council. Enough is enough there must be otherways to bring in funds. It should not be at the expense of the poor, especially with this current cost of living crisis.
Object	This will be crippling for local businesses at a time that local economy and community need all the support they can get form Southwark Council.
Object	XX

Object	-
Object	In an area extremely underserved by public transport adding parking restrictions is going to further add to the cost of living crisis and quality of life in the area. There is currently no parking issue in the area, and bringing in these sort of restrictions is purely another money increasing council revenue at the expense of those worst off.
Object	I wholly disagree with this proposal.
Object	<p>IF you must publish my letter please REDACT (DELETE or COVER UP) my personal information.</p> <p>If my objections are similar to other residents it does not mean that we should have to submit one objection with multiple names and addresses. We were consulted individually and have the right to respond as we see fit.</p> <p>I am writing to object against the proposed Old Kent Road CPZ for the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Your consultation letter states that the "notice" is published online at <a href="http://www.southwark.gov.uk/trafficorders">www.southwark.gov.uk/trafficorders</a>. No obvious sign of something for Old Kent Road was available on that webpage between 11 March 2023 and 16 March 2023; although there is something entitled OKR. How is a person meant to connect OKR with Old Kent Road if they are dyslexic or otherwise neurodiverse? You have failed to make proper accommodation for people with disabilities; in contravention of the Equalities Act 2010.</li> <li>2. The Public Notice published on the Southwark website states that the proposal would provide only one long-stay disabled parking space on Varcoe Road. If true this would greatly impact visitors with blue badges and mobility needs requiring the use of a vehicle. But you have failed to consider the needs of visiting disabled people; who are usually poorer than average because of the high cost of medicine, equipment and cost of energy to maintain equipment.</li> <li>3. The document on the Southwark website does NOT include a map and it is not made clear in the 09 March 2023 consultation letter that one must navigate to the appway website to view a map online; and the requirement to request paper copies of plans or appointments to view in person is buried on page 11 of the notice. Despite this lack of transparency it is obvious that the "Proposed Map Document CPZ OKR - Proposed Order - Maps" and a list version of bays per road weirdly entitled "Notice of Proposal - CPZ OKR - Proposed Order - Public Notice" include seven disabled parking spaces in the northeast of the zone - more than the one mentioned in the Public Notice. Which documents are to be believed - the Public Notice or the map/list on the appway website? Surely this discrepancy makes the public consultation unsound. Even if there are seven disabled parking bays it is noted that those proposed are NOT near the business or transport hubs within the proposed CPZ - does the council have no regard for blue badge holders who need to use vehicles but want to acquire goods and services or split their journeys between private public transport.</li> </ol>

It isn't good enough for the council to dismiss such errors as human and solvable by bringing forward yet more TMOs or statutory consultations.

4. The June 2022 Cabinet Report's Equalities Impact Statement implies residents on lower incomes will not be able to afford the permits but then suggests that no particular community group will be disproportionately affected. Given the ethnic and socioeconomic of the residents in the northeast of the borough, plus the fact that only one long-stay disabled bay is proposed in the CPZ, means that various community groups with characteristics protected by the Equalities Act will be disproportionately affected by the proposed CPZ.

5. The Statement of Reasons attached to the Controlled Parking Zone 'OKR' (notice dated 9 March 2023) states

"Following overall support at the informal consultation stage on the proposal to implement a new controlled parking zone (CPZ) in the Old Kent Road area, the Cabinet Member for Leisure, Parks, Streets and Clean Air approved the following recommendation, in June 2022".

Yet the self same 08 June 2022 Cabinet Report states

"The public consultation yielded 139 returned questionnaires from a total of 3,534 sent out, representing a less than 5% response rate. This is a less than average response rate when compared to similar consultations in Southwark and other London authorities ...

12. Analysis of the responses shows that 65% do not support the introduction of

a CPZ, while 35% are in support of the proposals."

These two statements are mutually exclusive. - 139 of 3,534

questionnaires were returned and most of those who responded did NOT want a CPZ. Surely putting lies in an official document renders that document invalid.

6. The June 2022 Cabinet report states that the opinions of respondents should be ignored because vehicular traffic counts for nothing and also there will be no opportunity to compel future housing developments to be car-free. If the council wish to build high density housing in areas with limited parking spaces then surely the council should expect people to be able to make self-deterministic decisions on car ownership based upon the resources available to them - if there is no space then presumably new occupiers will NOT buy a car.

7. Looking at question 9 of the Questionnaire Summary Report attached as Appendix A3 to the June 2022 Cabinet report it seems like my property was not the only property to NOT receive either the questionnaire or the drop-in session leaflet. If I had received either of these I would have responded as I am doing now. Surely the fact that most residents were not actually aware of the council's plans renders the entire consultation process invalid.

8. With respect to failing to incorporate the Equalities Act 2010 your proposed signs for each bay will increase street clutter making it harder for those with mobility issues to navigate the very narrow pavements on the streets to the northeast of the proposed CPZ - those around Varcoe, Credon, Bramcote and the like.

9. Given that no traffic analysis report has been referenced to justify such

	<p>a long period of operation, and questionnaire respondents made it clear that there is never any problem with parking I consider that the council's determination to make the entire borough of Southwark a CPZ (as outlined at point 5 of the June 2022 Cabinet Report) a breach of its duties under both the Human Rights Act and the Equalities Act. How does the council imagine that disabled people who hold blue badges and need to use vehicles will be able to walk or cycle? Why did the briefing note referenced in point 8 of the June 2022 Cabinet Report state the Cabinet member was to pay no heed to residents' concerns and to focus only upon the hours of operation of a potential CPZ?</p> <p>10. With respect to the hours of operation they are excessively long and onerous. A two hour restriction at a key point in the day would be enough to deter commuter parking or the acquisition of cars b the occupants of new residential units that will not be ready for some considerable time.</p> <p>11. I believe that the CPZ would lead to displaced parking and cause parking stress in neighbouring areas. Paragraph 18 of the June 2022 Cabinet report makes it clear that the council have the same opinion. Yet their statement that "However, this cannot be entirely pre-empted until the proposals have been implemented and the effects observed " is at odds with the boast at paragraph 4 that the report draws upon parking enforcement experience and good parking practice.</p>
Object	<p>While I understand the requirement for parking. No consideration has been made to those now living on the Ilderton Road main road. I live in xx Ilderton Road (xx House). As it is a main road, there is a barrier preventing anyone from parking directly outside our property. In addition, the developers promised 2x parking spaces for our building and fair access to the building (specifically also for disabled access). No such parking has been provided and they have failed to offer this promise as part of the original planning permission to build this building. The closest road that anyone can park on is Stockholm and that is always busy and has yellow lines anyway. At the moment, we can park, guests, delivery people or contractors when visiting Milli house have to park on Verney road and hope there is an available space someone down that road. There should be available parking provided, even if it is through parking permits to the residents who live on Ilderton Road.</p>
Object	<p>I do not agree and this is unacceptable and unfair</p>
Object	<p>I don't agree with the purpose parking or traffic restrictions, as this will mean our permits &amp; other charges will also go up, there is a cost of living crisis, going on presently &amp; the councils timing, hasn't taken this into consideration.</p>
Object	<p>I strongly rely on family and friends for childcare, socialising and my general menta wellbeing. These parking restrictions make these very hard.</p>
Object	<p>I don't feel that a CPZ in this area is needed and it will penalise those of us who live in affordable housing without private driveways or parking spaces, and the lack of public transport in the area would be detrimental to residents. In my building, we are unable to apply for a permit – I don't currently own a vehicle, but I don't want my future self and my neighbours to be forced to sell their cars or pay exorbitant fees to park in</p>

	the middle of the cost of living crisis without having alternative transport readily available.
Object	This would destroy all the local long-standing small businesses in the area. There is currently no need for change simply to fill the council's coffers. 100% object.
Object	Hi there, I've spoken to a few of the local businesses here. I do see that there will need to be a solution for the parking in the area due to the new developments, however it seems very clear that this proposal would only damage the existing businesses - many to the point where they would likely have to leave. Lots of the tenants here do not have £600/year to spare for parking of one vehicle. Also the one vehicle system simply won't work for tenants in my building (recording studio - their clients would differ each week with their own vehicles).  I hope you'll consider holding a meeting where local businesses can be heard on this. Thanks
Object	-
Partly Support	As residents with one car and a private parking space we do not need to purchase a permit to park in Argyle Way for the periods stated (from 1 month to 1 year), However, we would like to be able to purchase Day Permits for visitors. We cannot locate this option within the documentation. If this option were available we would fully support this proposal.
Object	In reference to Sherwood Gardens there is no need. It will cause my problems and resolve nothing
Object	I voice my objection to the proposed permit parking, especially on the Argyle Way development where I live. My view, and that of many neighbours that I have spoken to, is that we do not want permit parking on the public highway sections of our estate. I wish for it to be left as it is. I do not wish for me or my neighbours to incur financial costs by having to purchase expensive permits and visitor permits, and for parking to generally become more restricted for us and our visitors. This would also make it more difficult for tradespeople undertaking work for the residents. I also fear that this could encourage the other local residents who currently use the free on-street parking, to instead unlawfully use allocated resident bays. E.g. Chevron apartments and the several hundred flats on Rotherhithe New Road who, as I understand it, would not be able to purchase permits due to the buildings only having been built in the last few years, and would be forced into trying to find alternative parking. We already experience problems with those residents persistently parking there without permission, and this would only make it worse. This could cause chaos and stress for the residents on my development, and would again inflict even further financial costs on us residents if we need to instruct our management company to install mitigating measures e.g. parking enforcement, gates and key fobs for access etc, as well as the administrative / legal costs that are likely to arise in dealing with offenders abusing our individual parking spaces assigned to us through our property deeds.

Object/Multi	<p>Please note I have already submitted a objection to this proposal. However I would like to add further comments.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As of this time of the day 4:40pm, most roads have at least 5-10 car spaces available for parking. Which suggest local residences are able to find parking.</li> <li>2. Requesting all local to have a parking permit is also unfair. With cost of living becoming a wider issue to all residences around the country such as food costs going up, electric bills, council tax and even service charges all increasing. Asking residence to pay up to additional £300 annually (depending on the vehicle) for parking their vehicle locally is expensive.</li> <li>3. For some unqualified properties which are a car free development cannot purchase permits. Which potentially means more outgoing expense will be applied to those car owners. Ie finding private car spaces. Which is also very unfair, due to these local owners have been parking in the area historically and now to take this privilege away causes a lot of inconvenience. Noting, public transport isn't the best in the area especially during the night as well as crime rates are also pretty high with bikes and phones being constantly stolen. Being a car user, I feel a lot safer in car when I travel rather than using public transport.</li> <li>4. Car park charges proposed is also very high. Nearly £5 an hour. As previously mentioned, with cost of living crisis, everybody are stretching their £ as far as they can. Charging nearly £5 an hour is pretty unfair for this local area. Noting there are no tourist attractions nor any entertainment places nearby to cause parking disruption during the day.</li> </ol>
Object	<p>In the beginning, I thought I understood right that the proposal presented by the council to install parking measures in this area were clear, after the consultation meeting in June 2022, that the council made the decision based on the flow of traffic in the area created by issues like having millwall stadium close by and on match days creating congestion, but after reading the times suggested on the letter dated March 9th 2023, it looks like it won't affect or make any difference for the the mid week and weekend matches. Also if your plan is to deter people driving through the area to park and head to the station it seems unlikely, because as a resident I can tell you that, the majority of car owners are residents too, some families with no parking space but the streets. So it doesn't make sense to me the idea of charging residents more money for living in the area, and paying higher council tax on the top of it.</p> <p>If the council is so keen to invest in the regeneration of Old Kent Road and surrounding areas, I suggest to have a better look at Commercial Way Road and Asylum Road in Queen's Road Station, Peckham, which are way more congested areas than others in the borough and don't have any traffic, parking control measures in place and I personally can't see any traffic warden around there, and I travel around very often. Another suggestion would be when you make agreements, deals with the private construction companies you are selling the land to, to build in basement, underground parking, for a better use of the space. You are supposed to sell the plot not the access to it.</p> <p>So these are my points of view why I opposed to the controlled parking zone plan in my neighbourhood.</p>

Object	This is not needed for the area plus there is poor public transport in the area
Object	The idea is ridiculous, we have no issues with parking around the area, money making scheme