

Dulwich Village Phase 3 Consultation Responses

Streets for Communities

To what extent do you think these measures achieve the 'Streets for Communities' objective? - how much does this achieve the objective

Comments for 1 (not at all)

When you have children who are homeless in Southwark, to spend the tens of thousands on this one junction is obscene.
This area needs no more meddling by the Council - you've already created a nightmare with your LTNs
You need to stop putting buses into car lanes as it is causing people to take longer to get to work cycling is fine in bus lanes and is pushing people off the buses
I think it's a waste of public money considering this junction has had several revamps. Money is better invested elsewhere
It blocks access and affects local local shops and businesses.
You are simply repeating the same mistakes as before. You cant polish a turd. This is and always has been, a busy junction. Its a place where people need to move freely, this isn't some imaginary idealistic world where people dont work, and just sit about on dutch bikes sipping oat lattes. This is a busy junction in a capital city with businesses, commuters, parents, services all trying to get about their day. This plan ignores all the previous concerns raised. Get real.
Less people will come to Dulwich and Independent shops will close as a result
Crossing has become dangerous with cyclists coming through at high speed and confusion about to what extent the areas is pedestrianised....need traffic lights at the end of carlton avenue and court lane for cyclists and pedestrains (not that cyclists take any notice of the lights).
Court Lane/Carlton avenue should be open to traffic outside of school hours...it has created more traffic on surrounding roads and I now avoid going into the village altogether if I can - which is a shame for the local shops...its just become an area for tourists not residents.
Closing this road without any consultation during Covid was insanely unjust and the amount you are spending on this junction is disgusting. Just stop and think what else you could do with that money you bunch of closed minded, incompetent people who don't represent the people in the area - the amount of pollution you have now pushed past Harris Primary on Lordsship Lane as you have essentially given all the rich Dulwich village residents private roads. As apparently their voices will be heard more than the masses who have to suffer increased congestion and pollution on other roads. I'm sure this is also just to try and ensure when the government tries to unwind this closure it's more difficult. Deceptive as always.
You are asking questions based on a closure that is not supported in the first instance.
So my response of 1 not at all does not mean I want improved measures that you are proposing- I do not want to Closure at all.
This junction needs to reopen to all traffic immediately. The traffic displacement is outrageous on East Dulwich Grove, Croxted and South Circular. De facto racist and elitist.
In order to be for the whole community, including the elderly who can't cycle, I think the junction should be a timed closure the same as other streets in the Dulwich area, instead of a permanent closure.
In order to be for everyone who lives in this community, I think the junction should be in keeping with the heritage feel of Dulwich ie. remove the tacky bright colours on cheap wood which are more suitable for teenagers or a kindergarten. Dulwich is renowned for white picket fences, white posts with chains, elegance, beauty, Georgian houses.
Please remove this gateway. It causes traffic to be channeled solely on to East Dulwich Grove and and Dulwich Village road which causes excessive traffic, more car idling and more pollution. This makes it more dangerous for all users (pedestrians, cyclists and motorists) using East Dulwich Grove. Please put out a survey with questions to ask whether people want this junction and to get feedback on the effects it has had in the area on all aspects of life- not just whether these updated "improve the look and feel" of the corner of Carlton Avenue.
I can not drive into Dulwich Village anymore because I am afraid of getting charged. Due to physical disabilities it is too far for me to walk or cycle to.
I used to use the village a lot before LTNs, restrictions and road closures were introduced. I have not been able to support any of the local independent businesses in Dulwich Village since the introduction of these unfair restrictions.
The village used to feel like a real community but is now deserted and feels like a ghost town.
The roads should be opened again to cars

<p>It has been catastrophic for local business and has caused traffic to be diverted to already congested roads such as the South Circular, East Dulwich Grove and Croxted Road, with the result that pollution levels have noticeably increased and it is a misery getting anywhere both by car and by bike and walking, because of the deterioration in air quality. Carbon emissions and particulates have probably gone up too because a) drivers have to drive further and b) cars emit more per mile at low speeds.</p>
<p>The current space looks ugly is badly designed and splits Dulwich in two</p>
<p>Please explain to what benefit this is to anybody that operates outside of this junction that you are obsessed with. The carnage of displaced traffic in the area and pollution everywhere on those displaced roads is a disgrace and what is intended to be done about it please? These measures will not calm traffic through the village north or south.</p>
<p>Streets for people should allow all forms of transport through the Village. This still creates a barrier between one side of the Village and the other for anyone in a car.</p> <p>And even if that wasn't the case, the junction was only re-modelled a very few years ago at great expense. This budget would be better spent on real priorities ie refurbishing schools and other public buildings. This is a vanity project and a total waste of money.</p>
<p>I object to all these measures, and as a cyclist I find they are dangerous and put us into conflict with pedestrians, I would like to see them all reversed and the roads restored. We do not need these so called community spaces, we have 3 large parks in the area, plus Dulwich Picture Gallery grounds</p>
<p>We do not want or need a "community space to socialise and play" in the middle of Dulwich Village. We already have Dulwich Park, Belair Park and Sunray Gardens. What we need is a thriving retail environment where we can stroll, particularly at weekends, without a long, stationary queue of cars through Dulwich Village caused by Southwark Council's bogus LTN</p>
<p>The proposals still fail to consider an alternative for vehicular traffic eastbound along Calton Avenue. The levels of vehicular traffic is displaced onto neighbouring roads and creating exceptional levels of standing traffic through the village before and after the timed closures. These proposals do not deter car usage and the lack of traffic is exacerbating current issues. The levels of displaced traffic and residual, permanent effects on air quality should be considered.</p>
<p>These measures will achieve absolutely nothing. People living in the Dulwich Village area do not want them. The proposed measures are merely virtue signalling and a total waste of taxpayers money.</p>
<p>They will just transfer more traffic on to Burbage Road and Half Moon Lane.</p>
<p>They do not do anything to stop cyclists speeding and ignoring red lights which is a big problem for me as a pedestrian.</p>
<p>This is an ill-thought-through scheme that is bad for all road users, bad for businesses and divisive in the community. Slightly more pavement space is gained at a terrible cost. A few white privileged middle class busybodies have spearheaded this ridiculous project with the collusion of a council desperate to bring in green initiatives. The result has been more pollution in more built-up areas.</p>
<p>Dulwich is endowed with massive alternative areas for play and socialising and no evidence has been produced that there is any demand to turn a busy crossroads right in the middle of the busiest junction in the village into a community space. This is simply a cover for those who live in or close to that junction to live in a traffic free zone while the rest of us in the non protected areas of Dulwich are forced to shoulder the burden of the very heavy rates of displaced traffic from this zone.</p>
<p>This area will always be a symbol of the inequity at the heart of this project. You have created a haven for some and hell for others. This is not an appropriate project unless and until the inequalities and unfairnesses baked into the traffic system imposed on us during Covid are put to rights. So no it does not achieve street communities as you are only helping a tiny part of the community and ignoring the needs of the rest. We in Burbage have been telling you for a long time.</p>
<p>Since the introduction of the Dulwich Village road closures chaos has happened compounded by the bicycle lane at the North end of Dulwich Village. Never before in the 50 years I have lived in Turney Road has Dulwich Village been nose to tail with traffic through the village even at weekends. The bicycle lane is barely used, it has debris from trees and other rubbish gathers there, no wonder cyclists choose not to use it as they are highly likely to get a puncture. How come you support Healthy travel option when we drive a totally electric car but we are not allowed as pensioners to drive through Dulwich Village during LTN restricted times. It's time you thought about the older generation instead of focusing on young fit people</p>
<p>Completely not necessary the village has ample benches and green spaces - does not need a garish village 'square'</p>
<p>The Council has constantly ignored residents' views</p>
<p>The proposed measures, will bring about more problems for local residents. It will cause a knock on effect with regards parking to surrounding roads and a negative effect on local business. LTNs have had a detrimental effect in the locality since being introduced.</p>
<p>We have two excellent parks already in the area .</p>
<p>It will make no substantive difference to the existing measures which are already opposed by the majority of local residents. Further narrowing the junction will make it harder for emergency services vehicles to use it</p>

Please reopen the road. Please don't waste more taxpayers money in this area stopping us using our roads as we want to use them. Reopen Calton Avenue.
I am an elderly resident in Woodward Road unable to cycle. My husband [REDACTED] is unable to walk very far at all. A car is therefore an essential means of travel for us to get out and about, visit friends and family etc. We use buses where we can but the bus routes are limited. The closure of Woodward Road has therefore added countless hours of travel and energy use to our lives and we believe ignores the views of the majority of residents in the streets where we live. The 'consultation' exercises undertaken by Southwark seem to us to be paying only lip service to local democracy while Southwark continues to steam roll through its own agenda.
I am an elderly resident of Woodward Road and cannot cycle. My husband [REDACTED] has mobility problems. He cannot walk far at all. A car for us is therefore a necessary way of getting out and about, seeing friends and family etc. The closure of Calton Ave in Dulwich Village has added countless hours fo travel and enery use to our lives. It has severely added to congestion on surrounding roads including the South Circular. Southwark have persistently refused to listen to the needs of elderly and infirm residents, and has instead relentlessly pursued its own agenda. We feel very let down by the Labour Group in Southwark.
The proposed scheme was rejected in phase 2 consultation and revised plan does solve any of the huge issues caused to the wider area.
It's a dogs dinner. I nearly got flattened by a bike at the crossing only yesterday - it's completely confusing and a nightmare for the elderly or disabled.
The plan fails to provide reasonable access for the frail, elderly and those with disabilities who are dependent on cars for their mobility.
Static traffic build up is so huge on village way, this idyllic image will never happen. This was wholly rejected by the community years ago and you still plough on regardless. Local schoolchildren's health is being adversely affected.
I think these measures completely ignore interests of local elderly, local businesses and such. They're benefiting a few, but letting down so many
Ignores feedback from residents.
Changes are discriminatory- disabled, frail, against people from low socio-economic backgrounds Please improve buses and trains first! Not everybody wants to or can jump on a bike! Bus routes have been cut, frequency of buses reduced and some buses now no longer go a far. Your measures are pollution inducing - increased journey times, more time in traffic jams especially outside multiple schools and low socio- economic housing (where they are already known to be a health disadvantage!) Open up the junction again Tougher measures on cyclists who continue to run down pedestrians, cut corners and run red lights Most cyclist also seem to not wear hi vis vest which are also stated in the Highway code.
This scheme is only beneficial for a small group of Dulwich residents - i.e. those with children at local schools and those who cycle. It ignores the needs of older or disabled residents and make local traffic congestion much, much worse
Blocking off this by junction is detrimental to my mother's health and well being. It makes caring for her very difficult because if increases journey times for all those visiting to meet her care needs and my time if I have to take her to appointments. She is not able to walk or use a bicycle.
You have utterly ignored the community who have rejected these plans. Your outdoor space offers better air quality for a tiny number of (very expensive!) houses and displaces traffic onto surrounding roads, forcing cars to idle for longer, increasing journey times and pollution.
This is an extension of the current failed closure which causes mayhem on East Dulwich grove and well beyond. It's a doubling down of the closure without sensible mitigation to the benefit of residents on Calton Avenue, Court Lane and especially Gilkes Crescent. There is no need to keep the closure at the bottom of Gilkes crescent which would allow some resilience in the system there and be safer than cars having to 3 point turn there.
I must emphasise that the community rejected this 24/7 closure in the original consultation and that the wider area will continue to suffer, not benefit, from it.
All this is doing is to move traffic on to neighbouring roads
As a Southwark pensioner this "Streets for Communities" provides nothing of benefit to me. I cannot get to East Dulwich hospital anymore easily or visit friends in the Court Lane area. There are no bus or tube services from the South of the Borough to Dulwich. Car is the only option and this is being demonised. Your plans are for the few not the many.

<p>Consulting on this design is like asking someone how they would like their arm to be cut off.</p> <p>I'd rather not have my arm cut off, thanks.</p> <p>The vast majority of LOCAL residents consistently object in massive numbers to closure of this junction during the original consultation.</p> <p>Since the closure of the junction, the community is now more miserable, poorer, less safe and more unhealthy.</p> <p>A complete failure.</p> <p>The design here resembles failed GCSE project, unless the brief was to create a design that will destroy the economy and quality of life while maximising cycling accidents and street crime, in which case it's an absolute triumph.</p>
<p>The community rejected the 24/7 closure of the Calton Avenue/Court Lane junction at the outset, at the original consultation. We were ignored.</p> <p>The wider area will continue to suffer, not benefit from this phase 3 either</p>
<p>These changes completely ignore the wider community. This 24 hour closure was initially rejected. Since these changes traffic has increased enormously on Croxted Road increasing pollution for us, affecting particularly children and the elderly.</p>
<p>The community rejected this 24/7 closure in the original consultation, and yet we continue to suffer from it. You are destroying quality of life for working Dulwich residents and council tax payers. Through the distress and pain created the plan you are failing in your Public Sector Equality Duty.</p>
<p>Cycling has decreased on roads which have taken the displaced traffic. Publish traffic and air quality data for all streets in the Dulwich area.</p>
<p>At the DV/East Dulwich Grove junction you state that the "existing cycling wand segregation to remain". This cycle lane is a disaster causing tailbacks through DV at peak times increasing pollution for schoolchildren and residents. The traffic here needs two lanes in order to flow smoothly and reduce pollution from traffic waiting to turn right into East Dulwich Grove - the majority of whom have been forced down this route by the closure of Calton Avenue.</p> <p>Your road planning officer should be shot.</p>
<p>Traffic is terrible now, impacting many. It is hard to travel by bus. Roads that have schools on and children walking along to get to school are heavily impacted - there is a huge increase in pollution for the children. The only benefit is to those who live on the blocked off street, at everyone else's expense. No proper consultation, residents and local shopkeepers views ignored.</p>
<p>Having ignored the comments and opinions of the large majority of respondents and with years of experience now showing the closure of this junction has had only a negligible impact on traffic and "active travel" in the immediate vicinity, whilst having severe knock-on impacts on surrounding areas, especially highly residential boundary roads, this is just more of the same ineffective, poor value for money dogmatic policy making.</p> <p>There is nothing "experimental" or "consultative" about something which is going to happen anyway, regardless of what anyone says in this so-called consultation, much like the previous "consultations".</p>
<p>For those with mobility and other health problems the loss of ready access to other parts of Dulwich is damaging</p>
<p>These proposals have already been rejected the 24 hour closure of Calton Avenue in the original consultation. This suggestion will continue the trend of negative impact on the local area and population.</p>
<p>The layout created significant amount of confusion with drivers, cyclists and pedestrians and I have witnessed numerous close calls at the junction. An extraordinary amount of money has been spent on this junction that has resulted in worse traffic than before these interactions took place.</p>
<p>Looks like it will continue to act as a parking lot for Royal Mail, Parcelforce, Amazon etc.</p>
<p>No upkeep on planters at present - so this will look even worse</p>
<p>No access for emergency vehicles (currently permitted in there)</p>
<p>Will continue to ensure businesses, other than coffee shops, go bust</p>
<p>No need for it</p>
<p>The results of the Phase 2 public consultation appear to have been ignored - the key objectives the majority of local people supported were not the councils but for the Council to reduce displaced traffic, provide access for key workers, and provide equality of access for disabled people.</p>
<p>the traffic congestion in surrounding roads which this and other blocked junctions have caused is being ignored</p>
<p>The Community did not agree to this junction. It has been forced on them</p>

<p>The community rejected this 24/7 closure in the original consultation, and the wider area will continue to suffer, not benefit, from it.</p> <p>Traffic is still being displaced on to surrounding roads where families live and where children walk and cycle to school.</p>
<p>The consultation shows the majority were against this project.</p> <p>Closing through traffic from Turney road to calton avenue has made local congestion much worse hence increasing pollution in several areas</p>
<p>The closure of the Dulwich Village junction at the end of Calton Ave has only achieved traffic displacement and congestion, leading to more pollution in other areas within Dulwich Village. I would strongly favour a timed closure with tomes such as Townley Road timed closure and keep the junction open otherwise.</p>
<p>The majority on previous consultations opposed the closing of this space to traffic-it should be reopened to reduce unacceptable congestion</p>
<p>I am not a fan of Dulwich Square as the price that the arterial prads have had to pay for this 'square' is too high.</p>
<p>The local community have already rejected the plans in previous consultations. The wider Dulwich area will continue to suffer as displaced traffic is forces onto boundary roads where there are schools and health centres.</p>
<p>I DO NOT SEE THE POINT AT ALL IN THIS SPACE - IT IS DISASTROUS - LOOKS SO BAD</p>
<p>BY THE WAY - I WALK EVERYWHERE (NOT A CHOICE ON YOUR QUESTION NO. 6)</p>
<p>PLEASE DON'T BOTHER MAKING ANY CHANGES TO THIS - IT IS ALREADY HORRIBLE</p>
<p>Yes. there is far too much hard landscaping; no consideration has been given to achieving climate resilience - where are the rain gardens, and why is there no shaded seating? Haringey Council have been adding rain gardens to street closures and corners very successfully. Where is the consideration to / provision of SuDS? The opportunity to create a relaxing, shared space is being totally missed, with no seating arranged in ways suggested by "Make space for Girls' - most people, not just teenagers need to be able to sit in groups, in semi-public spaces.</p>
<p>Personally I hate these changes as I feel it has split our village into two. I have lived here for over 40 years and worked locally to as a GP.</p> <p>Burbage Road where I live has had a huge increase in traffic as an "unintended consequence" of these changes but absolutely nothing has been offered to mitigate it.</p> <p>I am very sad about these changes and wish they had never happened.</p> <p>I am told it is what the local population wants so so be it.</p>
<p>The community space is more like being seated on a busy roundabout. It is not attractive or inviting and it seems to be very rarely used at any time of year. The displaced traffic causes major traffic roadblocks, particularly at the corner of Dulwich Village and East Dulwich Grove and on Croxted Road. I am sure that air quality has significantly deteriorated in these areas as well as causing delays.</p>
<p>It has to be really clear if it is a space for pedestrians or a cycle path. It is really dangerous if it is not clear as cyclists can go very fast and children and parents are playing in the area assuming it is safe to do so. It must be clearer what the purpose of the area is otherwise it is an accident waiting to happen.</p>
<p>They have resulted in displaced traffic with increased queues and pollution.</p>
<p>The measures just seem designed to ban cars totally from the area.</p> <p>Access to Village is harder. Cyclists travel fast and do not always observe traffic signs.</p> <p>Traffic is pushed into nearby residential streets and must travel much further (causing queues, increased pollution) to access some roads.</p> <p>Street furniture adds clutter. Street signs hard to read.</p>
<p>I am not a Dulwich resident, but am a carer for an elderly relative and must use a car to to visit several times a week (as they are not mobile) and to take them on errands (opticians, shopping etc). life is made much more difficult with all the road restrictions, and parking is now more difficult in surrounding streets especially where there is little offstreet parking.</p>
<p>Bikes now have no awareness of pedestrians. Very dangerous junction for children and the elderly</p>
<p>Only benefit certain streets and make it much worse for others</p>
<p>The community has not been listened to. 2/3 people disagreed with 24/7 closure to traffic.</p>
<p>These measures were rejected by the community in the original consultation and the wider area continues to suffer, not benefit from the proposals.</p>
<p>I hate the bus gates with a grand passion. For every single person who does not live in the golden mega rich houses of dulwich village but has the misfortune to have to get to the other side every day - you have made our lives a living hell. Shame on you.</p>

<p>The closure of Carlton Avenue/Dulwich village junction and similar local closures has forced traffic onto surrounding roads - Lordship lane and south circular and also forces local people to make much longer journeys by car as they can no longer go the most direct route. A car journey to take shopping to my immobile father in law in west dulwich used to take 5 minutes through the village and now takes 40 minutes and is 3 times the distance. The closure of established routes has caused a disastrous increase in pollution and congestion on all neighboring roads. It has also caused a considerable increase of traffic on my road as vehicles try to cut out the now horribly congested Lordship lane by driving longer distances around it.</p>
<p>Frivolous waste of council taxpayers money on inessential items. Blockage of vital road junction for Emergency Vehicles, Blockage of access by residents to local Healthcare Facilities & GP Practices within the latter's 2013 designated areas. Blockage to NHS staff & Home Carers who are required to visit patients at their homes, thus wasting valuable time of NHS staff. Ignoring the needs of groups protected by reason of age, disability, &c. Hypocritical displacement of vehicle traffic from Dulwich Village Area thus increasing traffic congestion on surrounding roads that are more densely populated. Trees should be encouraged for parks, gardens (subject to protection of buildings from subsidence during drought), and sidewalks; but not for roads and road junctions. Childrens play areas are in parks, open areas, and gardens (if available), not on roads and road junctions; teaching road safety to children is primarily a parental and childcare duty.</p>
<p>This is permanently blocking a road. It won't get rid of traffic, but simply push it on to the already busy peripheral roads like Lordship Lane, the South Circular and East Dulwich Road. It would be far more sensible to investigate a one way option that still allowed traffic through Dulwich Village to the schools at Carleton and Turney. They generate masses of traffic and all this is doing is pushing it out of the village.</p>
<p>Further expenditure on Dulwich's pristine streets - is absurd.</p> <p>Just drive to the next town - where poverty is pervasive.</p> <p>Southwark and Dulwich should be ASHAMED of spending MORE money on that intersection - when there are CHILDREN in London who do not have shoes - let alone - any interest in that stupid intersection.</p> <p>What a WASTE - have you not spent enough. Your BUSINESSES are dying. NO ONE wants to visit your town because - it is expensive to RISK the visit. No money is getting spent in you closed economy.</p>
<p>Spend money in repairing roads . Clear manholes to avoid flooding of roads. Reopen closed roads under pretext of LTN and remove APR cameras that you installed to enforce them and you ise as cash cows to justify your positions and salaries.</p>
<p>Calton Ave has been closed to traffic for a couple of years and it's clear to me that it has only caused shifting of traffic, and hence major congestion, to the surrounding roads. Limiting traffic through Dulwich Village has made East Dulwich Grove a nightmare, and very dangerous for pedestrians and bicycles.</p> <p>Your decision of closing Calton Ave was completely arbitrary and unfair as it only benefits (allegedly) the people living in those surrounding roads as traffic is calmer for them. But for us who need to drop off small children to schools, this also means more stress and finding ways around these restrictions which doesn't really help. Roads should be open to everyone. If you want to encourage active travel, add cycle paths, do not close roads!</p>
<p>more ways to screw the driver</p>
<p>The majority of Dulwich residents, including myself, rejected the 24/7 closure of roads in dulwich village in the original consultation. The wider are will continue to suffer as a result of this new measures. The displacement traffic onto East Dulwich Grove is totally unacceptable. Myself, my family, my children and all the children attending the numerous schools along the East Dulwich Grove route continue to breathe in dirty and toxic air as a result of displacement traffic on this road. As a council, you said you would keep this in review but NOTHING has happened.</p>
<p>I don't feel that closing this Junction is in line with people being able to connect. In fact, it divides two communities (East Dulwich and Dulwich village). Instead focus should be on re-directing a local bus to go through court lane or calton avenue - thus connecting East Dulwich with Dulwich village and west Dulwich and bringing communities closer together. Not everyone can and wish to bike. There should be more focus on local transport. As it is now, any buses going through East Dulwich grove get stuck in traffic. And anyone wishing to drive out of East Dulwich through the village and beyond get stuck in traffic being re-routed the longer route through East Dulwich grove affecting bus times even more!</p>
<p>Rather like the LTN's which have completely destroyed the Village atmosphere, these will be the final destruction of what used to be a lovely area to live in</p>

<p>They push traffic onto particular displacement roads which become congested whilst others have no traffic on them which is unfair to those on the roads that have all the traffic</p> <p>The congested displacement roads are on main bus routes so bus journeys are slow (I have had to abandon bus journeys for this reason)</p> <p>They cause longer journeys which increases pollution</p> <p>They prejudice the elderly and disabled who have no choice but use cars to get around</p> <p>Many cyclists are inconsiderate to pedestrians and appear to feel they have licence to speed through junctions and crossings without regard for pedestrians</p>
<p>Artists view is misleading because it is making the area feel wider than it is!</p>
<p>No access for blue badged holders in proposals</p>
<p>the proposals do very little to improve overall air quality in and around Dulwich Village.</p>
<p>The community rejected this 24/7 closure in the original consultation, and that the wider area will continue to suffer, not benefit, from it.</p>
<p>Closing the junction (against the wishes of the local community in the "Consultation") has had completely the opposite effect to Southwark Councils objectives. More congestion, more pollution and appalling traffic displacement for the poor souls who live just outside the fake "LTN"</p>
<p>Open Calton Avenue again</p>
<p>The system serves only a small privileged section of the community.</p> <p>There should be restricted access at certain times during school start and finish hours (like Townley Road) Outside that there should not be restrictions.</p> <p>The present system: Discriminates against the elderly and the disabled Privileges cyclists (I am a cyclist) Restricts the liberty of people living in the area Increases car emissions and car journeys by causing traffic jams Displaces the traffic to other areas Creates an unsafe space, particularly at night The benches there are ugly</p>
<p>Other than that it is a great system! Not sure who is actually benefiting form the system other than a small number of people</p>
<p>Am I disabled 85 years old and my only visitors come by car and your measures will stop them coming and so I will be isolated</p>
<p>There's no need for extra space at the bottom of Calton Avenue. It will fill up with horrid chairs and tables and even a market. The traffic that used to come down Calton Avenue/Court Lane now goes up East Dulwich Grove and produces lots of pollution and difficulties for disabled/elderly and very young children. You are discriminating against the disabled and elderly. Isn't that against the law?</p>
<p>i don't agree with the concept - my experience of the changes has been that a) all parents rush to get to the village before 8am to get their kids to school, creating traffic jams through the village (when before there were multiple routes in and out) and b) traffic is diverted to Croxted road, creating jams and pollution there (including for the buses!). The traders in the village don't like the LTN and it seems unfair that the richest part of the area has traffic routed away from it (in principle, in reality it creates traffic)</p> <p>I also believe that the council is using this LTN to fund raise - how much money do you make from the restrictions through fines?</p>
<p>Streets and footpaths taken over by cyclists</p>
<p>Yes. Privileged corner for privileged minority. Drivers just have a longer route around - the problems still exist. Monies should be given to other communities not here where life is already rosey in the Village with the park.</p>
<p>Just stop wasting money on these endless 'consultations', reopen the roads so that you stop favouring the most expensive streets and wealthiest residents of the borough, and reduce the terrible congestion which has resulted from the LTN</p>
<p>Please stop messing around with our streets. I cycle everywhere all these changes are making the roads more congested for me having to move alongside stationery cars chugging out fumes. These were not here before you closed a number of roads. Also, the junction in duliwch village is now dangerous as children and running around in front of bikes, and lots of bikes TOTALLY ignore the traffic lights - the semblance of adhering to the rules of the road have gone out of the window - I have many times seen Dads with cargo bikes with children in them jumping the lights.</p>
<p>The junction should be opened up - the closing off of the junction has been a complete failure and causes significant increases in journey times for local residents - increasing traffic on small residential streets when Court Lane is a wide open road that is now under utilised - thus pushing traffic and congestion elsewhere</p>

<p>The space is too dangerous for pedestrians - the cyclists ignore all the restrictions currently and there is no reason to think that will change. Cyclists should be required to dismount throughout the entire area and there should be cameras to enforce this.</p> <p>The junction should be reopened for blue badge holders to end the discrimination against them, and residents generally. That is what the majority of residents voted for.</p> <p>The area is only used by children after school in term time; it is ok to prevent the old and disabled using the roads then, but not at other times. This would also reduce pollution and traffic on the displacement roads.</p>
<p>Dulwich Village must be one of the greenest areas in London. Do we need additional spaces to connect and socialise; No. Do we need additional spaces to connect and socialise to the detriment of local businesses; No. Do we need to be wasting our taxes on this transformation with no real tangible benefit: No. The traffic around the village has become horrendous ever since this junction was shut down. It was an important junction.</p>
<p>The Dulwich community rejected this 24/7 closure in the original consultation and so me and my neighbour continue to suffer.</p> <p>Safety at night is a particular concern now for those using public transport returning from bus stop or North Dulwich train station. Court Lane is now so errily quiet that do not feel safe walking back at night. neighbours feel similarly. In the past you knew you could flag down a car or that cars would see any attacks - not the case now. Personally just saved from an encounter with a youth circling me on an e-bike when a couple emerged and I was able to walk a few paces behind them.</p>
<p>What about Southwar'ks participation in national EVAWG initiative? (End violence against women and girls)</p>
<p>This proposal is a complete waste of money. We don't want to "sit" or "socialise" at the Calton Avenue junction. There is an enormous park 5 minutes walk away which is where we go to sit. What the community wants is for you to reverse the horrendous traffic congestion and pollution you have created by closing local roads. It is now very unpleasant to walk or cycle in Dulwich due to these traffic problems, and our children have to walk to school choking on traffic fumes. Public transport gets hopelessly delayed in the traffic congestion. Rather than this pointless scheme can you please listen to the community, reopen Calton Avenue and other roads to return our part of London to its previous pleasant state. I say this as a pedestrian and cyclist and not as a regular car driver.</p>
<p>You have cut Dulwich Village in half. See your original consultation - only you the Council wanted this.</p>
<p>Long traffic queues longer time to get from A to B more emissions more petrol used very crowded roads dangerous for cyclists dulwich traders struggling to survive as the village is inaccessible and hostile to visitors disrupted buses - little dependability - considerably extended journey times very hard to get out of dulwich to get to work very hard to get in to dulwich when returning from work hugely anxiety inducing for hospital visits and very extended and unpredictable travel times went to hospital in an ambulance this week - took double the necessary time as ambulance driver confused by road closures and wouldn't go through the carlton road/dulwich village road block and all the other roads were chock full due to such limited travel options. Terrifying.</p>
<p>Does not cater for resident access or parking and caused longer journey times and congestion</p>
<p>Not cater for residents. Causes congestion on school street - more dangerous for children and more pollution.</p>
<p>The road should be re-opened so accessible to all & doesn't cause displacement traffic on adjacent roads</p>
<p>It is not met any aims. Nobody uses this area - it is a most bizarre concept to sit in the middle of a road, while cyclists whizz by you having jumped all the red lights (not for them, the road-rules!) - Happens all the time and it is dangerous.</p>
<p>You should re-open this road in a safe manner - perhaps as one-way traffic only. That would make sense.</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The plans do not allow for access by the emergency services: this must be included. 2. Phase 3 ignores that in Phases 1 & 2 as many as 64% of your respondents opposed the Village/Calton Avenue junction. 3. The 24/7 closure is unacceptable. 4. If there is to be any, it should be limited to times access as at, inter alia, the Townley Road/East Dulwich Grove junction. 4. The proposed conversion of western end of Calton Avenue into an open space is opposed for the reasons stated in my previous submission, to which please refer.

I do not want this junction closed, all it does it push traffic on to other surrounding roads which are residential and have schools. These are also bus routes which then slow the buses and cause delays
the community rejected this 24/7 closure in the original consultation, and the wider Dulwich area will continue to suffer, not benefit, from it.
Just pushes traffic to neighbouring roads
This junction should never have been closed
This is a complete waste of public money. We need better resources for local police rather than wasting money on this sort of initiative.
Closure of Carlton Avenue has made Dulwich Village one big traffic jam at times and causes untold pollution
I do not see the advantage in the Local Authority plan except to waste yet more of our money on schemes which cause congested traffic and misery for motorists
Southwark are creating a problem by removing parking spots.
Some of the impacts of the removed parking spaces below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - fewer parking spaces will result in more traffic in Boxall Rd and surrounding streets as people do laps looking for parking spots (irrespective if there is controlled parking or not). - teachers from the local school park their cars on the street. More difficult for them to find a spot. - local businesses will be further impacted by potential customers finding it difficult to park and taking their businesses elsewhere.
None of the original objectives have been met. There is far more pollution in the area than before the changes were made, caused by the traffic displaced onto surrounding roads where families live and where there are schools. The Council did not listen to the views of the majority of residents and are still ignoring them. The junction is still closed to all but emergency vehicles and this prevents access for the frail, the elderly and those with disabilities who depend on their cars for mobility. Traffic is still being displaced on to surrounding roads where families live and where children walk and cycle to school.
it serves part of the community and creates 'pollution free spaces for some 'more wealthy residents' while pushing traffic out onto half moon lane - so no this is a benefit to a very select part of the community and a bigger detriment to others
Why is the transport mix just referring to cars? You should counting Taxis as advised by TfL. Taxis have a distinct legal status and should be considered within monitoring plans. Where a monitoring plan is collecting road user data, TfL recommends that a fully classified approach is taken in order to be able to understand the benefits/impacts of a scheme on taxi journeys. Where taxis are likely to be impacted, flow, classified turning count data that distinguishes taxis from other vehicles will show the scale of these impacts. Public surveys should seek to understand the outcomes of a scheme on taxi passengers, particularly older and disabled people.
The only objective it meets is to make it accessible for those who are not suffering the knock on traffic or in the traffic free areas ergo the small minority in Court Lane who lobbies for Dulwich Square so this is not inclusive and accessible for all which is should be.
The majority of Dulwich Village residents did not ask for these changes. They have been mandated by the Council, choosing to ignore that majority position both of residents and traders in the Village. Our views have been expressed on numerous occasions, and the initial LTN was a mistake - both rushed and without any merit, other than to satisfy the Council's minority interests.
To claim that the "new community space" is suitable for "play, in a safe and pleasant environment" is misplaced and frankly potentially dangerous. With the 'square' open to bicycles, electric bikes (which in a lot of cases are akin to mopeds) and electric scooters, whether legal or not, this is not a safe place - many of their owners/riders have no knowledge of the Highway Code and ignore the traffic lights.
There is no need to have children playing next to a busy road. The park is less than 10 minutes away where children can play freely and carelessly without having any cars nearby. Not to mention, cyclists zooming in the middle of their play area.
Shops and services (Parks, churches, libraries, Doctors practices, hospitals, schools, friends in locality) and fair access to them, make a community. Not over designed village squares. We have a fair few parks for entertainment and art installations.
I was charged £65 because the restriction signs are invisible. I had two heavy parcels of books to post and could not carry them so far. This is not streets for people.
Yet another ridiculous proposal. The area has lots of green spaces for people to rest but relatively poor public transport. Car use is limited by the LTN The end result is that those with disabilities and older people are disadvantaged.
There should be access for emergency vehicles. Not sure why encouraging people to spend time near an overly busy road due to the road closures is a good idea. There are many parks and public spaces very close by. I would much prefer it if the funds from this project were invested in something more meaningful such as health or education.
It will be an annoying and loud space for children to run, scoot and cycle around whilst their parents ignore them (as it is now). It will make it less likely that I will use the local shops. Cyclists currently rule the road at this junction, ignoring lights and failing to give way to pedestrians, the proposed design doesn't solve this dangerous issue.

<p>1. It is unwise, uncomfortable, unsafe to 'socialise and play' on roadways or streets designated 'King's Highway, which are proposed to remain open to cycling and scootering (powered or otherwise) and to emergency vehicles requiring access unobstructed by 'gateway features'.</p> <p>2. As a Southwark Taxpayer I do not wish to underwrite the Council's moral or financial liability for foreseeable accidents consequent on its actions.</p> <p>3. 15 years ago Southwark Council installed quality paving in tree-lined Court Lane & nearby streets; this has lately been subject to a countless poor quality unsightly repairs with piecemeal removal of paving stones due to 'lift' of paving by growing tree roots. The Council proposes to locate paving and trees at Calton Ave / Court La junction; has the Council learned nothing; are they reckless with Taxpayers' money; is this short-termism (cf Aylesbury Estate &c)?</p>
<p>Although I am all for narrower streets, wider pedestrian crossings, but the driving should still be allowed on the narrower stretch. With these so called LTN's cars have to go a bigger distance and stand in long queues, causing more air pollution. People who live on the busy roads, like East dulwich grove or Half Moon lane have more traffic becuse of the LTN's. It is only for the few lucky ones that like in a super quiet road.</p> <p>Also there has been no real consultation to implement the LTN's, and the opinion of the majority has been ignored.</p>
<p>That junction has never been particularly busy, even at peak times and its closure has meant that car traffic is now concentrated onto fewer and now much busier roads. The pavements are wide and more than ample to deal with foot traffic, well before the road closures.</p> <p>I pity anyone that lives on East Dulwich Grove as that is now the main route in and out of the Village and is much busier and more polluted.</p>
<p>This plan excludes the elderly who need access to their car.</p>
<p>It is a smoke screen, intended only to reduce space for cars, and not to achieve space for community for, as everyone here is only too aware, we have an abundance of space for community within Dulwich Village, an embarrassing amount when compared with East Dulwich for example.</p> <p>And, because we as a village have vigorously opposed this environmental apartheid, we are being picked on by those with personal agendas and vendettas of their own imaging, convinced that their 'religion', their 'philosophy of life', (being the right one), should be enforced, taliban style, on others.</p>
<p>Complete waste of space. It looks awful and barely anyone uses it. The wood structures are poorly made. There is a massive great park. Who wants to sit at a junction??</p>
<p>I do not think these proposals are helpful or necessary. Dulwich does not need a square in this location.</p>
<p>As mentioned in the Phase 1 consultation, these do not meet the objectives because the majority of people living and working in Dulwich rejected the closure of the junction. 64% wanted it scrapped. In the Phase 2 consultation the main comments from the public was that they did not support the Council's objectives and, instead, wanted the Council to reduce displaced traffic, provide access for key workers and provide equality of access for disabled people. None of these measures has been addressed.</p>
<p>You should listen to residents and not put in these LTN's...clearly it is just a case of raising funds for the council but against the wishes of all of us that live in the area.</p> <p>I have been mugged and my car stolen since the road restrictions have been put in place. This never happened when there was a flow of traffic through Dulwich Village!!</p>
<p>My family will NOT be voting for the Labour Party following your terrible decisions...please reconsider. [REDACTED]</p>
<p>This is not an area where people socialise, meet and play. They do this in cafes, bars and parks.</p>
<p>Southwark will destroy the businesses in Dulwich village. The proposals are flawed and are simply a money making scheme for the council. The council have ridden roughshod over the views of the majority of people who voted against the initial proposal.</p>

Streets are for CARS on the ROADS and People on PAVEMENTS
WHY ARE SOUTHWARK TURNING ROADS INTO PAVEMENTS?
A CAMERA system would have sufficed at this junction Closing the Junction to all vehicle traffic only PUSHES traffic onto other roads
This is an appalling waste of council money and it has resulted in DIVIDING Duwich in TWO /
Those who live on the WEST side of Dulwich park and those who live on the East side
Why is Southwark DIVIDING the community ?
This was also done in the 70s on Rye Lane and it destroyed the community there
Now Southwark want to destroy the community in Dulwich Village too!
Dulwich Park is close by. Council should not be spending money on vanity projects
I still disagree with sending excessive traffic onto East Dulwich Grove (due to this LTN and others). I don't understand why closing this junction is so important. I use this junction every day taking my child to school and feel unsafe with cyclists swerving every which way. It doesn't feel safer to me!
I, together with the majority of the people living in Dulwich Village rejected the 24/7 closure of this junction in the original consultation. Living with the closure has further entrenched my rejection of the closure of this junction. Journey times when using a car, which is often essential, are longer and displaced traffic causes congestion and increased pollution. The elderly and disabled are disadvantaged and importantly there is no still provision for the disabled and key workers which is a failure of Southwark Council's Public Sector Equality Duty.
What is the matter with you people?! Our area is absolutely fine. What is with your war on motorists? I just don't get it - it's like you have nothing else to do, bored beurocrats filling their time with harmful ideas
The closure of this junction was rejected by the community in your original consultation
These proposals ignore the results of all previous consultations. For example, in phase 2 of this specific consultation, the majority of local people did not support the Council's objectives, and said that their main objectives were for the Council to reduce displaced traffic, provide access for key workers and provide equality of access for disabled people. Your proposals, therefore, are not responding to what this local community wants. It is shameful that you have made no accommodation for those who are frail, elderly and have disabilities, and who rely on their cars for mobility, forcing them instead to make much longer and more painful journeys. It is also shameful that you have made no accommodation for those who care for these people, including GPs, community nurses, and carers, or for midwives attending home births, all of whom need to provide urgent help to the most vulnerable.
Stop closing roads and junctions with the pretext to save us from doomsday. These are your pet project only. Mere money spin operations to justify your ineeded positions and high salaries inside tge council. Listen to the majority of people and stop taking us as fool. Stop working only for a tiny minority. You are our servants , we elected you and you keep disregarding what the majority wants (no ltns no road closures). You are mocking democracy and act as tyrants.
Cutting the two sides of the village apart in this way will damage community cohesiveness in the long term.
As a community we filled out forms and went through previous "consultations" and our voices were completely ignored. Considering the needs of one group and completely disregarding how this would affect others.
The councillors I have spoken to totally ignored my comments and said we will make all dulwich a CPZ.
I'm not sure what the point of this so-called consultation is since you've steadfastly ignored any comments or objections in previous consultations and gone ahead with your pre-decided measures. The majority of respondents did NOT want this junction closed, but you closed it anyway, since you're in thrall to the cycling lobby and concerns for disabled people, local shops and displaced traffic obviously did not come into consideration. I suspect you're about to do the same with the so-called consultation on the proposed Controlled Parking Zone in Dulwich Village. It may look as if you're ticking all the right boxes regarding consultations, but those of us who have tried to engage with you in the past have come to realise it's a waste of time. Still, one more attempt can't hurt...
lived here for nearly 20 years not needed not asked for total utter waste of money totally fails on all your 'objectives' your do not live here - we do not want this i know this will be ignored but there you go

<p>The community that lives and works in this area have rejected all the proposals from the start so if this is for the community it fails completely. Instead of "Improving the feel and look of the area"</p> <p>Cycle only routes mean fast getaway route for muggers and drug deliverers. We already have a problem with these preying on young people in the area. Vigilante style parent groups have had to be set up to protect local kids because the council is making the area easier to access by lawless individuals intent on preying on the community and harder for the police and ambulance services to do their jobs.</p> <p>Parklet outdoor seating areas soon become areas where people fear to walk as drug addicts and dealers alike use them as their waiting rooms. Residents feel insecure at night. This was explained to councillor's at the recent Herne Hill meeting. From experience to date areas like these have soon been vandalised and become an eyesores and a blight on the community.</p>
<p>The closure of the junction was rejected by the community in the 1st consultation</p>
<p>All streets should be reopened for the good of the community</p>
<p>Get rid of LTNs</p>
<p>these changes are not wanted by majority of residents</p>
<p>You must not ignore the comments from community groups.</p>
<p>These measures make it difficult to access Dulwich Park, Dulwich picture gallery , local shops , cafes pubs, with a car. For some of us 'older generation' we do not cycle and cannot walk long distances. Also anyone with a mobility disability is affected and these people are not always in possession if a disabled badge. The buses are inadequate to cross from one side of the village to the other.</p>
<p>In restricting car access along Carlton Avenue you have forced excessive traffic through Dulwich Village which is frequently blocked at essential times when vehicles need to turn right up Red Post Hill towards JAGS or Alleyns as the road there is only single lane so cars turning right block all the traffic behind them.</p>
<p>The schools are MAJOR parts of community in Dulwich. Parents and staff need to be able to get to the schools for many reasons; to collect children after school, often with bags, kit, instruments etc, to attend events, visit sports fixtures, pick up sick children during the day etc etc</p>
<p>Streets are for the flow of goods, services and vehicles, not for 'play' or 'trees' both of which are ridiculous things stated in Southwark proposals for Dulwich's streets.</p>
<p>I have repeatedly set out my objections to this work in all your previous consultations, and I believe you have ignored my and my communities objections throughout</p>
<p>The council are not listening to the majority of people with regard to the junction and associated developments. Please listen. We do not want these interventions.</p>
<p>You are reminded that our community rejected the closure of the junction in the first, original consultation</p>
<p>Dulwich Village is a conservation area and the amendments already put in have destroyed its historic charm. These need to be reversed</p>
<p>There are plenty of parks and green spaces in Dulwich where people can meet and socialise. i would never choose to sit at the bottom of Calton Ave, let alone let my grandchildren play there. Bicycles don't respect pedestrian space, and this situation has been made worse since the introduction of LTNs. Before then I always felt completely safe as a pedestrian. Sadly, this is no longer the case.</p> <p>This has already been said over and over by the majority of residents.</p> <p>PLEASE LISTEN TO THE RESIDENTS' VIEWS THIS TIME AND ACT ACCORDING TO OUR WISHES.</p>
<p>Sets out to achieve exactly the opposite of the supposed intended effect. Makes the area much less liveable through suppressing parking places essential to local commerce, residents, visitors etc. It would increase parking stress and doubtless result in a contract with one of the many discredited outsourcing providers (Seco, Capita etc) that already receive a huge percentage of the net revenue of such schemes. Under no circumstances should anything remotely like this be considered. Given the council is under financial pressure it is frankly incredible that it should seek to waste funds on such harebrained 'improvements'. If you wish additional evidence see the clearly visible adverse effects of previous 'improvements'</p>
<p>Destroys traffic route. Unfair to blue badge holders. Creates unnecessary strain on other routes. Create noise pollution elsewhere. Boundary routes affected e.g croxted road, South circular.</p>
<p>You have consistently not listened to the feedback from your local community on this junction and ignored the results of your own earlier consultations.</p> <p>By Councillor Rose's own admission your alterations have produced "unintended consequences" to the area especially in Burbage which is supposed to be a residential road.</p> <p>You have failed to provide fair and equitable traffic management in the area.</p>
<p>The community did not want this - you ignored the results of a consultation that showed two-thirds of people did not want this junction closed. The resultant traffic displacement is still causing problems on the nearby roads.</p>

<p>The suggestions do not take into account the needs of the vast majority of the local residents, and the needs of residents in surrounding areas. The current junction and the timed accesses already makes residents in Court Lane virtual prisoners in our own street. I have physical conditions that mean I need to use my car, and these restrictions significantly increase the distances I have to drive and therefore the emissions I generate. They also increase traffic in the surrounding areas (e.g. Lordship Lane, Croxted Rd) affecting bus times and negatively impacting the quality of life for people living on/near those roads. The changes already in place were overwhelmingly opposed by people in Court Lane and yet were still implemented. I absolutely reject any attempt to waste further funds on yet another redesign of the junction, unless it is to re-instate the junction as a minimum for disabled drivers.</p>
<p>I was never in favour of blocking off Calton Avenue, it was first proposed as a school street, and the subsequent closures have caused havoc and serious pollution on the main school road East Dulwich Grove. The current refusal to allow disabled drivers through is wrong. There is no demand from local residents for this extra space.</p>
<p>How do Emergency vehicles access all areas quickly?</p>
<p>The first consultation for the LTNs completely ignored the vast majority wish of the local population which wholeheartedly rejected the proposals including the closure of the junction.</p>
<p>The Council continues to ignore the impact of traffic restrictions on businesses and people living on boundary roads, as well as the difficulties that disabled and other vulnerable residents are forced to endure.</p>
<p>The LTNs have not achieved any of the goals - we are suffering from displaced traffic, delayed buses, reduced public travel options, closed businesses and increased pollution outside schools on boundary roads.</p>
<p>The profoundly undemocratic imposition of the LTNs against the views of the vast majority of residents is disgraceful. The waste of public funds on these expensive measures against the wishes of the residents is obscene and unnecessary.</p>
<p>We already have a space at this junction which is more than adequate for anything anybody might want to use it for. There are thousands of more important ways for Southwark to spend its money.</p>
<p>And this will do nothing to stop (a) risk from speeding bikes and (b) poor access in the LTN for the disabled and their carers.</p>
<p>Sadly the junction has been ever-changing and still remains a rather unattractive space with incongruous, even tatty, outdoor seating that is not inviting.</p>
<p>Boxes, bollards, lots of concrete ridges, cluttered signage that confuses and is visually ugly makes the space feel an artificial construct that is soulless and off putting.</p>
<p>The local community rejected the closure of the junction in the original consultation</p>
<p>There are many other spaces available for community events. It used to be a junction allowing people in motor vehicles to get where they were going</p>
<p>I have increasingly severe mobility problems and the changes to the junction at the foot of Calton Avenue, which were rejected in the original consultation, have not improved my situation one iota - the idea that the changes improve matters for drivers is a fiction. They do not. As a pedestrian, walking from the disabled parking place at the end of Gilkes Crescent to the Post Office, for example, I frequently have to walk on the road as the pavement is taken up with tables and chairs and often largish groups of people. As the Council has repeatedly disregarded feedback from members of the community it is difficult to have any conviction that one's comments will be taken account of.</p>
<p>Loss of parking spaces</p>
<p>I am disenchanted with this process, as you failed to respond to the feedback that you got from the Community in the first place, and your original tinkering has as we all know produced unintended consequences.</p>
<p>This scheme has made a nightmare of using the area, and it was rejected by the community in your consultations. The whole junction should be completely re-opened for all traffic.</p>
<p>This seems a blatant disregard for local residents and local businesses. Your consultation fails to inform local residents and local businesses that these plans involve removing over 20 parking spaces. Disgraceful but expectedly.</p>
<p>Reverse and return to original</p>
<p>A massive waste of money. You already spent a fortune to redo the junction and now you are looking to waste even more money on it. Shame on you!</p>
<p>By reducing the car parking we'll have more traffic congestion through the village with motorists circling the local streets for spaces. The closure of Carlton Avenue and Court Lane has already clogged up the Village. These proposals will make it even worse.</p>
<p>I regularly go into the village and this space is rarely used. The pavement outside of Harold George is already very wide and people sitting outside of cafes are usually on the pavement. It is a space where you can sit and watch the traffic queues outside of the school caused by all the local road closures</p>
<p>Only serves Cycling "Community" and increases Southwark Councils funds through unclear signage resulting in vehicles still driving through.</p>

<p>This is not realistic - where are the cars and parking facilities? We live in the real world, not Disneyland. The shops and businesses need parking spaces for their customers.</p>
<p>The closure of the junction has led to much worse traffic in many places and much longer journeys.</p>
<p>These proposals, just like Phases 1 and 2, will discourage local residents from using the Village and its amenities and will make things even more difficult for residents to access essential local services.</p>
<p>this intervention has made the lives of people on Croxted Road in particular a misery so no, it hasn't achieved measures proposed</p> <p>and has increased anxiety and social isolation for those vulnerable members of society who are car dependent - the elderly and those with mobility issues</p> <p>it's been made very clear that unless you are fit, young and a bike owner you're not welcome in this area of Southwark</p> <p>and that Southwark chooses not to take on board any other perspective</p> <p>and in the midst of all this takes no steps to improve public transport, which might provide some kind of mitigation</p>
<p>Cycles zipping about in this ppublic area seem a very difficult obstacle to safe passage on foot.</p>
<p>Streets, came about for the purposes of traffic - and yes, connection. They were never intended for socialising & play. That is a ridiculous sepia tinted notion that is entirely false. What you have done by closing this vital junction is disastrously degrade connectivity between all parts of Dulwich as well as make life a lot more inconvenient for residents, business owners and their visitors/customers. Being a resident for > 30yrs, I know that Southwark's interventions at this junction have unerringly made things worse on each & every occasion. When it comes to socialising and play, we are fortunate in Dulwich to have several fantastic parks & facilities nearby much better suited to that purpose than a former road junction. I would like to remind Southwark that the majority of the Dulwich community rejected the proposals to close the CA/DV junction at the original consultation. When can we expect the Council to actually listen to the community that it is here to serve?</p>
<p>Traffic has been moved on to other roads and congestion is terrible.</p>
<p>This is one very small corner of a road, with a cycle lane running through it that cyclists ride on far too fast, so it is an inconsequential development in the scheme. Current it is certainly not used as a "community area" and these changes are not going to make a material difference.</p>
<p>Streets, came about for the purposes of traffic - and yes, connection. They were never intended for socialising & play. That is a ridiculous sepia tinted notion that is entirely false. What you have done by closing this vital junction is disastrously degrade connectivity between all parts of Dulwich as well as make life a lot more inconvenient for residents, business owners and their visitors/customers. Being a resident for > 30yrs, I know that Southwark's interventions at this junction have unerringly made things worse on each & every occasion. When it comes to socialising and play, we are fortunate in Dulwich to have several fantastic parks & facilities nearby much better suited to that purpose than a former road junction. I would like to remind Southwark that the majority of the Dulwich community rejected the proposals to close the CA/DV junction at the original consultation. When can we expect the Council to actually listen to the community that it is here to serve?</p>
<p>This creates much more traffic and more pollution on main roads.</p> <p>Buses are gridlocked. Along the S Circular, Croxted Road and by Brockwell Park there may be over 20 buses in a row sitting in traffic not moving, just pushing out pollution.</p> <p>It destroys the lives of people, small businesses and self employed workers and others like carers.</p> <p>It makes life imoposible for elderly who depend on cars to go to shops, doctors and hospitals.</p> <p>These proposals have been rejected several times by large majorities. Time to scrap them.</p> <p>The proposals are damaging to the community.</p> <p>Few people have bikes</p>
<p>Not achieving goals. By cutting off Court Lane /Carlton Avenue to cars, there's therefore a huge build up of traffic on Dulwich Village attempting to turn at Easty Dulwich Grove, and to immense pollution.</p> <p>A better scheme would be to fully cut of Carlton Avenue, but STILL allow cars to access Court Lane. This is out preferred option.</p>
<p>They are unnecessary. LTNs increase pollution and crime</p>
<p>There is a generous park and high street area for the local community to use. This measure will unnecessarily divert money from other much needed project such as tackling crime in the area.</p>

<p>The Village had always been an attractive and accessible place prior to existing LTN measures as well as the proposed measure. I don't think people will spend more time in that junction whatever improvements are made. There are abundance of shops and cafes as well as large green spaces within short walking distance so would have negligible impact on communities connecting and socialising. Certainly this would not be a good value for money. Public money should be on enhancing areas where there are lack of easy access to public green spaces and where there are few leisure shops or cafes (e.g. A205 and Lordship Lane junction where a local pub has been closed for years) to serve communities who are less affluent.</p>
<p>As a member of the local community, these measures block my use of the streets according to my reasonable needs. When travelling by car from the south to my home in Woodwarde Road, I have to take a long detour either via the A205 adding 20 minutes pollution or via East Dulwich Grove adding 5 minutes pollution.</p> <p>Provision needs to be made for local residential access to roads adjacent to and including Court Lane/Woodwarde. This could be by a 'permit regulated gate' with a one way alternated traffic signal.</p> <p>The community space would be much better moved along Calton Avenue, away from blocking the end of Court Lane and away from the junction with Dulwich Village. This would allow limited residential access to Court Lane as described above.</p>
<p>Very polluting [REDACTED]</p>
<p>community not in support of closing calton avenue to traffic</p>
<p>bicycles should dismount through proposed route as they frequently flaunt rules and present a danger to pedestrians</p>
<p>The Council has consistently ignored community feedback on the problems associated with the closure of this junction. The current configuration is an eyesore and a mess, creating more problems than solutions and further fiddling of this kind will not help.</p>
<p>The Council has not taken account of the clear majority of respondents in the original consultation who did not want this junction to be closed</p>
<p>Return the junction to its pre Covid layout, removing traffic restrictions.</p>
<p>The Council has still not taken on board the clear majority of respondents to the original consultation who said that they did not want any of these measures</p>
<p>What is the problem that the reconstruction of Dulwich Village junction is the solution? The community rejected the closure of the junction in the original consultation, and have proceeded with this vanity project at our cost. The Council is simply not listening.</p>
<p>Waste of time and money. Who wants to sit in a busy road when there is a park a few metres away. Especially in the cold. What is the point? There is already outdoor seating at some restaurants here & along the road. Pointless</p>
<p>The junction closure was rejected by the community in the original consultation. Streets for Some People would be a great slogan for you to use. People outside of the closure now have worse traffic congestion, air pollution and noise: High Traffic Neighborhoods. created by you.</p>
<p>These measures further destroy what was once a popular area to visit, shop and socialise in. They do not encourage people to connect, socialise and play. Measures already discriminate against car users. Traffic is forced to use a small number of already busy roads. This increases journey times, pollution on these roads and go against the objectives of these schemes.</p>
<p>Council has implemented these plans in the face of overwhelming opposition from local residents. Very few people wanted this interchange modified at all, and council has been very reluctant to move off its original position or take further input about access for emergency vehicles or blue badge holders. Dulwich Village cannot thrive if it is only a haven for bicycle riders!</p>
<p>Will only benefit a small section and vonsfetably disadvantage many more</p>
<p>There are already several large parks in the Dulwich are, why create an area that is actually a danger to epeople and then try to eliminate that danger by forcing cyclists and cars to share smaller road space</p>
<p>The community previously rejected the closure of the junction in the original consultation.</p>
<p>The street tables and chairs currently block the path through for pedestrians.</p>
<p>I disagree with the measures already taken.</p>
<p>I am really astonished to see that Southwark have nothing better to do with their time an money than make an already privileged part of London even more privileged. Spend the money on people that need it.</p>

Extremely dangerous to allocate a "play area" in the middle of a road junction. A child could easily run into Dulwich Village road traffic. It cuts our community in half and does nothing for the elderly who need to access Court Lane, Woodward or Carlton via a car. Restricting access for GP and health visitors etc is detrimental to residents. The original traffic flow worked now we have clogged up adjacent residential streets with dangerous emission levels. Totally counter productive in what is trying to be achieved.
The pavement should not be considered a play area - Dulwich has a perfectly good park. Encouraging play & cycling in a multi-function pedestrian area risks pedestrian accidents and is a dangerous development. Elderly & less able pedestrians are at risk of being inadvertently knocked into or over, thus risking potential life changing injuries (e.g common injuries in elderly fallers include fracture hip & wrist, facial & head injuries). Young children on cycles & scooters on the pavement are a risk to pedestrians as they are not as aware of the dangers of cycling close to others, who may not appear vulnerable, but are indeed relatively unstable. There are no pedestrian crossing points in this area. Furthermore, there are no signs to say that this is a pedestrian area and cyclist must give way to pedestrians. In addition, there is still a risk of high-speed cyclists coming down Carlton Ave and entering this area at speed. this area should be a compulsory dismount area.
This junction closure has cut some residents off from Dulwich Village, dividing the community. Dulwich does not need another "community area". It has a beautiful large green park with facilities for all and the village is full of places to stop and enjoy a coffee or a meal. This development is purely there to justify and to ensure remains closed to commuting residents.
Diverted traffic has caused unacceptable levels of pollution and congestion on roads with schools and essential services eg East Dulwich Grove which has seven schools and the Tessa Jowell Health Centre.
The first consultation resulted in overwhelming objection from residents to the 'temporary' closure of the junction. None of the Council's objectives were achieved -
By closing off Court Lane and shutting the junction, congestion, traffic displacement and pollution have since increased dangerously as residents said they would. Traffic has not 'evaporated' Shops have lost huge footfall.
The junction is quite out of keeping with the 'look and feel' of Dulwich and will be made even worse by the new plans.
Almost all cyclists fail to observe the lights.
Open the junction. This LTN is, and continues to be, a dangerous failure. Go back to the drawing board.
The original consultation was overwhelmingly voted down by a Dulwich residents.
The junction LTN is a dangerous failure. Go back to the drawing.
From the pictures it looks like there are 5 chairs, this space is wasted for purported events based around one or two local businesses, instead of the large community that uses the space. It also completely ignores the requirement for more space on the other side of the road outside the school where parents often congregate showing a complete lack of understanding of how the space is currently used.
The junction is not safe as cyclists travel through the junction at speed ignoring all the traffic signals and pedestrians. The area is also left with litter from gatherings so there are often empty beer bottles, disposable vapes
The "square" is ugly. Why are there covered traffic lights? Speeding cyclists are a hazard. The measure has displaced traffic onto other roads, causing jams, pollution and much longer journeys. Travelling in the morning has become extremely difficult.
Nothing in the proposals prevent the current practise of cyclists, scooters and e-scooters, e-cyclists bulldozing their way through pavements full of pedestrians to avoid the junction and even just shortcutting the crossing places.
Yes- you are disconnected from reality. Majority of people will never walk or cycle to this area. They need at least £1 million to live there. it is not served by a tube station so the only alternative is to drive there. It's a nice neighborhood leave it alone. You have ruined it already with the ltn and this will make it worse. people with cars have more flexibility to travel despite terrible weather conditions. if your reliant on public transport your likely to stay at home and spend online just stop doing this, focus on real issues on the area like crime, homelessness, cleaning up Peckham high street, drug dealing
I hate this junction being closed. Its closure (and the whole LTN) has made traffic worse, not better. It has cut the village in half making it MORE difficult to circulate, especially for elderly people who don't bicycle or walk far. We now drive our car much more, not less.
You claim you are listening to people but you are NOT; in the first consultation the scheme was rejected.
It is hardly safe! You take your life in your hands crossing as a pedestrian, particularly with a buggy, as cyclists hurtle through in packs, often ignoring restrictions. The area doesn't look attractive: it looks cheap. The painted planters were fine as part of an installation in the Gallery grounds, but I wasn't expecting to live on a Playschool set. Those with buggies or mobility scooters can't use the pavements for furniture.
Through your personal mission you have literally divided rather than brought the community together. A village should not be divided. What's more you have pushed road traffic into other people's areas.
So I do not feel that you have achieved your Streets for Communities objective at all.
The current space unsightly and out of keeping with the surroundings.

Where is the access for people with protected characteristics? Where is your assessment of the impact on them? How do emergency vehicles access this safely?
This ought to be removed and the roads opened up again
Constant tinkering with this road has wasted millions of pounds already and improved nothing.
This iteration is going to be no different and benefit nobody. Total waste of tax payer's money. Even if it were to fix a problem, it fixes a problem the council created for themselves at a huge cost to tax payers only a few years ago.
You show the junction between CA and DV- one of the primary connections of the Dulwich traffic network, connecting "Area B" (~1k residences) with the rest of Dulwich and on West, North continuing to be blocked. Note your objective: "Improving journeys for those who have to use their cars or public transport" Under Traffic Management Act 2004 this part of your statutory Network Management Duty: to secure the expeditious movement of traffic on your road network However The blockage of the junction contravenes your NMD and your objective above. This directly contributes more congestion both northbound and elsewhere, longer journeys, more energy use more pollution, CO2 . Furthermore the layout of the junction between CA and CL is defective in itself and impractical for emergency/rescue permitted traffic. The corners are too sharp and misaligned, the widths too narrow. 8This plan must be rejected until proper connectivity is restored.
It only allows for some sections of the community and penalises others
These measures have continued despite a clear majority being against them from the bus gates to road closures. Please stop or at least stop pretending these consultations are considered.
Totally against proposal
It bears repeating that the response from the Dulwich community to the first consultation in 2021 was clear and decisive; "reopen our roads" they said and the response from groups to whom Southwark owed a duty under the Equality Act 2010 was overwhelmingly so. Cabinet members and their officials have continued to plough on, however, with sideshows such as this, showing contempt for the views of the majority of Dulwich residents whose lives have been and continue to be severely blighted by these road closures. The Council has also created great division in Dulwich by fly-tipping motorised traffic from already quiet streets onto streets which already had lots of traffic; streets which are home to schools, nurseries, health centres and families with young children. "Streets for some People" in other words. Councillors who have done this (and who continue to maintain that it is "good for us") are clearly not of sound mind. Their actions warrant serious investigation.
Southwark Council has failed to consult in an unbiased way on the redesign of traffic flow in Dulwich Village. It has also failed to provide independently-reviewed evidence that its planned benefits from the proposed redesign are being achieved. The Phase 1 public consultation showed that the majority of those effected are not in favour of the closure of the Calton Avenue/Dulwich Village junction. This fact has been ignored in the Phase 2, and this, consultation process. The proposed redesign is a divisive issue in the local community, since it has benefited a minority to the detriment of the majority. For some the detriment has been significant. Southwark's Councillors have failed to act fairly and openly, via persuasion, explanation and cooperation with the those effected by its proposals. Instead they continue to impose concepts which are significantly biased towards the objectives and views of minority interest groups.
It make no sense but it does increase pollution
It's rubbish, and the Council knows full well that a majority of us in the area did not want it. It has created a shambles for buses and traffic in neighbouring roads. OPEN THE JUNCTION!
The local community rejected the closure of this junction in the first consultation. Why did you ignore their views?
I fundamentally disagree with any street closure in Dulwich village. as Local residents we have repeatedly asked for the all the streets to be reopened with no timed closures. The impact on croxted road and the number 3 bus is horrendous. Queuing traffic on boundary roads with increased air pollution. It's simply not acceptable for a small number of streets to be closed off and the impacts pushed elsewhere.
The community rejected the original Permanent closure of the road and the community was ignored.
This reuse of space has had a significant detrimental affect on displacement of traffic, health and community
We really don't need this. Southwark in one of the boroughs with the highest levels homelessness, this is not a priority. We have plenty of community spaces in Dulwich, including parks and green spaces. We have been told it will cost £1million pounds and there is not budget for its maintenance. It is waste of money and does not meet needs of residents or businesses.
I disagree with the closure of this junction and hate the knock on impact on flows and access in the surrounding area

<p>The consequence of the measures taken at Dulwich Village and Calton Avenue are that Burbage Road (amongst others) has become a less safe and less healthy street, which it is unsafe and unpleasant to cycle on, meaning that people cycle on the pavement at hazard to pedestrians, at certain times of the day it is very polluted to walk along, and traffic speeding makes it unpleasant and noisy to live on and walk on, although large numbers of children and adults walking in cycling on Burbage Road daily. What is the policy rationale or benefit to make one Street a pedestrian space thereby making other streets nearby less healthy?</p>
<p>The closure of this junction ignores whole sections of our community - disabled, elderly and other vulnerable residents who depend on their vehicles for mobility, nurses, midwives, GPs, carers, first responders, and elderly parents who are dependent on their children for daily support. It is shameful and unacceptable the way such groups of people have been treated and, when they have tried to raise their situation with their councillors, their MP, the Council itself and with the leader of the Council, they have been shunned and ignored. It is a scandal and the Council must hold itself accountable.</p>
<p>Displacing cars to other roads is ok for some but not for those in roads which bear the brunt of the traffic congestion</p>
<p>The closure of this junction has split the community into two, and has caused serious congestion on other local roads</p>
<p>The community does not need this as much as it needs more money in its schools and healthcare</p>
<p>I was happy using Calton Avenue on bicycles with my family every weekend (this included my wife, 5 year old & 8 year old children) when it was opened for use by cars and never agreed for this to be closed. Further to this I have objected to the closure and was expecting this to be opened back up as the diverted traffic is causing more congestion on other roads, thereby extending travel times and adding even more pollution to neighbouring roads along with the south circular.</p>
<p>I am looking forward to a re-design that can incorporate all forms of transport, whether that be by foot, bicycles or cars.</p>
<p>This was not what the community wanted</p>
<p>The community rejected the closure of the junction in the original consultation. By closing this junction you have displaced traffic elsewhere. In so doing 1. You have increased the journey time (and fumes) for many other pinch points 2. You have caused congestion elsewhere</p>
<p>Didn't want the junction closed in the first place</p>
<p>This isn't something that I want in place it just cuts off the two great sides to Dulwich. People wishing to easily travel to friends and family. Mass traffic outside school rather than offer relief on the main roads. The New Dulwich residents that have moved to the likes of East Dulwich / Peckham have all moved in with their vehicles and flooded the streets. These new cars just flood main road causing so much more pollution than if it was spread. These plans haven't achieved your goals as I see more irrationally driving in the main roads with dangerous manoeuvres due to plans.</p>
<p>A waste of money which may meet councillor's social engineering ambitions and feelings of self-worth but represent a further obstacle in the way of individuals and the community continuing to develop and grow the area organically to fulfil the needs of people who live, work and pass through this junction. Heritage lamp posts indeed!</p>
<p>Traffic is forced onto fewer roads due to the road closures at Dulwich village. Traffic jams are created on the remaining through roads which is very detrimental to all. This is exacerbated when one of the key through roads are closed or have roadworks. This scheme is only beneficial to the few with homes in the roads which benefit from the junction closure. It's not fair for all.</p>
<p>Dulwich Village benefits already from many open spaces, greenery houses with gardens and its park. The proposals for this area near the shops offers no real extra benefit for socialising and access in comparison to costs versus more needed investment in Southwark, the negative impacts on the access across east and west Dulwich that have been introduced due to the closures, and concerns for emergency and police services. It is an out of control or at best, pet project, without costed rationale in the context of investment for our area. It ignores Borough wide investment in Southwark's critical services and demands, and in short it is a shocking example of disproportionate spend and focus for our community.</p>
<p>They have not achieved your previous objectives. You appear to respond to each problem that arises by new alterations to the previous plans, firefighting instead of good planning. You have not yet published the results of surveys and previous plan effects. We can all see the slow queuing traffic in front of James Allen's School, and congestion at the junction, caused by the first and altered original plans. Now we need to answer this survey so that can be dealt with! Just as happened on Croxted Road perhaps?</p>
<p>The community rejected the proposal by two thirds.</p>
<p>Pointless, useless waste of space and money. Nobody sits on the benches provided currently apart from a few mothers at pick up time during the summer months.</p>
<p>A big empty space with ugly and uncomfortable seating, no additional greenery, confusing cycling and car restrictions (it doesn't specify that emergency services and blue badge holders can drive through), unnecessary traffic lights that nobody pays attention to, no new pavement and lights.</p>
<p>There plenty of green spaces. An old road is not even green.</p>

<p>The community rejected the closure of this junction in the original consultation. The only people this junction seems to benefit are cyclists. As a pedestrian I feel more vulnerable than I used to when the junction was open to all traffic given that cyclists assume they have overruling right of way and seem to ignore the traffic lights. The additional pressures put on lordship lane and the south circular by closing this junction have led to poorer air quality for residents on those roads and increased congestion for all road users. If there is any improved air quality, the only people experiencing this are the Uber-wealthy residents of Calton and Court Lane.</p>
<p>At the very least, the junction should move to timed closure similar to the bus gates nearby.</p>
<p>You did not refer to the residents comments and feedback at all</p>
<p>Closing this junction to traffic exacerbates congestion around the village, and increases pollution. The closure of the junction was rejected by the community from the original consultation. As well as increasing pollution the closure wastes time, causes costs, diminishes usage of the village shops.</p>
<p>There are many parks in the area that provide a community space, this is a waste of out tax.</p>
<p>This junction should never have been closed in the first place; all it has done has pushed the traffic back onto Dulwich Village, Croxted Road and East Dulwich Grove, taking far more traffic past schools than previously</p>
<p>The community rejected these measures in the original consultation, and therefore in the view of my household, this space should still be a working junction.</p>
<p>The closure of the junction was rejected by the majority living in the impacted streets and has caused absolute chaos in the area. Southwark Council need to respond to the Parliamentary review that was meant to take place of LTNs which were not supported by neighbourhoods rather than forging ahead with an unsupported scheme costing an excessive amount of money. This junction should not be permanently closed but have carefully thought through timed closures during weekdays.</p>
<p>I don't support the measures taken by the council - I do not believe the consultation has been honest or fair and the views of local residents have not been listened to. I feel local residents have been corralled and that facts have been manipulated by the council so as to be presented as it suits. I would have been happy to support changes but not in this way.</p>
<p>Waste of valuable resources, open up the LTNs the local Dulwich Village shops are struggling thanks to this vanity project</p>
<p>It's like a donut. Nice for pedestrians and cyclists in the centre but a nightmare for us on the South Circular, Lordship Lane and East Dulwich Grove. The traffic is logjammed. I needed carers 4xday after a bad accident and they kept ringing to say they couldn't get to me. They also suffered several fines till they worked out the new system. Why have a Consultation and not listen to the responses?</p>
<p>Restrictions to drive through the village are forcing traffic on other roads to que and increase pollution. These should be removed.</p>
<p>It bears repeating that the response from the Dulwich community to the first consultation in 2021 was clear and decisive; "reopen our roads" they said and the response from groups to whom Southwark owed a duty under the Equality Act 2010 was overwhelmingly so. Cabinet members and their officials have continued to plough on, however, with sideshows such as this, showing contempt for the views of the majority of Dulwich residents whose lives have been and continue to be severely blighted by these road closures. The Council has also created great division in Dulwich by fly-tipping motorised traffic from already quiet streets onto streets which already had lots of traffic; streets which are home to schools, nurseries, health centres and families with young children. "Streets for some People" in other words. Councillors who have done this (and who continue to maintain that it is "good for us") are clearly not of sound mind. Their actions warrant serious investigation.</p>
<p>I am against this road closure, the impact on East Dulwich Grove residents is unfair.</p>
<p>The community rejected the closure of the junction in the original consultation, so what will ensure that this consultation is received and acted upon according to the local communitie's wishes?</p>
<p>Our public roads are for the public to use their vehicles on. The spaces you sre making sre not being used and tge resident's dont want the changes we sre being dictated to The money would be better off spent on bring rates down and stop increasing them for stupid schemes that people dint want</p>
<p>i don't understand why more money is being spent on a very small area which has already been developed into a car free zone. i live on landcroft road and my child goes to a school on lordship lane. we need speed bumps, parking restrictions, bus stop moved from outside the school. i cycle to most places and so do my children so i agree with ensuring roads are safer and less polluted but is extremely selective and i think outrageous that more money is spent on the same affluent space when others are left worse off</p>

<p>There is absolutely no need for this - if you have to spend money on "Streets for Communities" do it in an area of Southwark which is in more need. This is one of the most affluent areas of Southwark which has already had a huge amount spent on it. Dulwich Village does not need another community space - a lot of people living near this space have gardens bigger than this space! Please spend our money where there is an actual need and to benefit the wider community.</p> <p>At a time when most councils are struggling for funds and there is real hardship being experienced by people who live in Southwark, this seems a complete and utter waste of time and money.</p> <p>The changes made to this area to date have already been controversial but Southwark Council seem intent on continuing to make more changes which are unwanted and unnecessary.</p>
<p>The Dulwich Village community rejected the closure of the junction in the original consultation</p>
<p>I'm not sure why you're pressing ahead with these plans when the closure of the junction was rejected by the community in previous consultations. All it has achieved is lots of traffic in Dulwich Village at weekends resulting in more traffic idling in the Village. The South Circular and Croydon Road are also very congested as a result every day of the week. My journey to care for my elderly mother has been made so much longer due to the lack of access to Court Lane meaning I produce more emissions and use more petrol.</p> <p>Also Dulwich Village is lucky to have Dulwich park a 4 minute walk away which provides a much better green space to connect, socialise and play.</p>
<p>My main mode of transport is by bicycle. Many of the changes so far have just made traffic worse for everyone. For some reason the council appear to take no notice of the conclusions of the consultations on this.</p>
<p>You have already blocked the road to traffic this cutting Dulwich Village in half. This proposal changes nothing in reality, just cost</p>
<p>Original consultation rejected changes-why are you asking for my time yet again</p>
<p>The scheme is pointless. It has increased journey times simply in getting round Dulwich and caused congestion as a result of displacement to other roads. It does nothing to improve the lives of anyone but vastly increases fuel use and is environmentally unfriendly on that account alone.</p>
<p>The Council hasn't listened to the local community as it has ignored it's stated opinion as expressed in the results of previous consultations</p>
<p>I do not agree with the closure of this junction. I have said so at every meeting you held in the past before covid, at every consultation, and am appalled that you have consistently ignored local people's opposition to your scheme.</p>
<p>Southwark has not listened at all to the wishes of residents. I was and still remain firmly against closing the junction.</p>
<p>Increasing limitations doesn't conduce to ease of use. It ceates hostility within the community and ultimately will lead to those who are constantly disenfranchised from the process to vote for populist retrograde administrators</p>
<p>Dulwich was a relatively calm, safe area before the council started to interfere with the movements of local residents. For the last three years there has been an endless stream of road closures, rerouting, fines, garish street furniture, traffic light phasing and rephasing. These have disrupted local life, made life hell for residents on boundary roads, wasted public money and caused division between individuals and communities.</p>
<p>Closing Calton Avenue, which very few wanted, has created a ghetto in the Court Lane area, extending journey times for access, with consequent extra pollution and traffic congestion, which the scheme was meant to address. The claim to reduce pollution outside schools has failed because of the traffic jams outside the schools and diversion of traffic has passed the problem on to additional schools. The lack of consultation with tfl has resulted in longer bus journey times and reduction of bus services</p>
<p>yes its a complete waste of £1,000000 million pounds plus that southwark does,nt have which would be much better spent on more important issues!</p>
<p>Your suggested revised plans still do not address at all the central vital majority objections to the permanent blocking of Carlton Avenue to carers, local residents who live near the blockage and are forced when they need to use their car to drive for miles on a very circuitous route just to get to their homes. We have strongly objected to the imposition without any consultation of this blockage put in under cover of darkness and using emergency legislation never intended for that purpose. We want access for carers, visitors to the elderly, public service vehicles and local residents especially those who live in the affected roads. You use number plate recognition technology to collect millions in fines - you can surely register local residents in the system which would allow them to pass through when really needed. Local government should be for and by the people.</p>
<p>They have distorted traffic patterns to the detriment of most residents. Cyclists through the junction are cavalier and for the most part, totally ignore traffic regulations. The surrounding streets have seen an increase in traffic. So no it has not worked!</p>
<p>I cannot see my friends and family (in Herne Hill) as easily as I could before the junction closure</p>

<p>I feel that these changes have caused displacement of traffic unto the main roads, its very unpleasant travelling in Dulwich now as a pedestrian, cyclist or car user. The blocking off for traffic from Calton Avenue into the village has been ghastly, it also looks very unattractive with the shoddy seating. A sense of community has been lost and alas the only way forward is to re-open the road. It does not feel any safer now as traffic travels through and becomes heavy going North.</p>
<p>The council seems to have totally ignored the community feed back submitted from the beginning of these proposals. Despite ann overall majority continually submitting objections, these continue to be ignored.</p> <p>The increased pollution and traffic congestion in the surrounding area- especially lordship lane and croxted road, and complaints of those residents are also totally ignored.</p> <p>So much for cleaner greener roads - far more people are being subjected to deteriorating traffic congestion and air pollution despite the majority protests.</p> <p>So much for a democratic vote.</p>
<p>The CPZ installed in Tell Grove has already prevented me from visiting my daughter who lives there.</p> <p>I am nearly [REDACTED] and cannot walk long distances. I feel increasingly isolated since friends are now reluctant of visiting me in Dulwich where they are met with obstacles and fines at every turn.</p>
<p>The proposal have a very negative impact on the community. It has negative impact on the service people. Because of the traffic manufactured by the LNT they can do fewer jobs per day as more time is wasted on unnecessary travel. That has financial impact on both customers (the prices of the services were increased in the LTN neighborhoods) and the serviceman (fewer jobs and prices increases don't fully cover lost income). It also have mental health impact on me. I work from home and drop children to school by car. My journey is each direction is about 15min longer because of the road closures. That's 1hour per day and i need to use the time otherwise spend with my family or sleep to catch up with work.</p>
<p>very few people use the space and if it reverted to as it was, there is enough pavement space for chairs outside the cafe</p>
<p>As an elderly pedestrian the changes introduced so far have made me feel vulnerable.</p>
<p>It's unfair for other road users and not needed</p>
<p>It's not safe - I feel very anxious cycling through this area as no one looks at the lights any more, people just walk out in front of you - even cyclists who ignore the traffic light for cyclists.</p> <p>It's not pleasant, it is messy.</p> <p>It is not for the community - all this expense and disruption the supposedly indulge the small number of people living around with with nice houses and gardens, and now you want Council tax payers to pay for flower beds!</p> <p>It is fanciful and imagine that people in Dulwich village need space to connect, socialise and play - they've nearly all got gardens and nice house to do that, plus there is a lovely park and orchard.</p> <p>Dulwich felt like a heritage space before the Council starting messing around with signage and bollards and built-out areas. There would have been no need for 'heritage lamps' if it had been left how it was.</p>
<p>In what sense are you reclaiming anything? It is not even claiming; it is definitely not reclaiming.</p>
<p>The impact on other roads is obscene. And with not one suggestion for main roads this remains a select and elitist project</p>
<p>The original aim of this temporary closure was for COVID reasons then there became the LTN plan to protect pedestrians and cyclists travelling to and from schools The council ignored all consultation and permanently closed the junction. The roads that this traffic has been displaced to are either gridlocked and polluted or have become race tracks 24hrs a day. These are the very roads where thousands of pedestrians move through Dulwich to get to over seven schools. Make it a timed situation under the LTN in order to protect the school children.. The motor vehicle accidents on displaced roads (you never include the South Circular) are due to highly frustrated vehicle users not. I have lived here for over thirty years in various roads in Dulwich, it scares the life out of me every day watching the school run. I have personally witnessed seven accidents on EDGmany of those wont be in your statistics as Police weren't aware. It is a failed scheme and is destroying Dulwich area.</p>
<p>There is already choc a bloc traffic on Croxted Road. This will seriously impact that situation and compound it exponentially</p>
<p>This runs against the views of local residents</p>

<p>This is a totally one sided approach. Does anyone in Dulwich really appreciate what is happening to our area in SE24 ? If I could invite the residents of sleepy Carlton Avenue to see the effects of this measure has on our roads at these peak LTN times. They would not be so happy. Surely! Our children are walking to school through the standing traffic fumes which we have alleviated you from. How fair is that for cleaner air and traffic flow? It is a totally one sided move. Life in our side of Herne Hill is now hideous at these times. We are all London suburbs. Who thought that remaking parts of Dulwich as a Cotswold village was in any way fair. It is utterly miserable. I love London. I love Herne Hill. I love Dulwich. But what is this rerouting of our traffic flow really achieving any improvement. I just feel fury that no one in SE21 seems to appreciate our decline in clean air. We are all part of Dulwich. It is unfair in the extreme.</p>
<p>I believe the treatment of this junction to be of highly dubious merit - it is simply anti-car. This 'consultation' is merely a box-ticking exercise as Southwark routinely ignore similar.</p>
<p>Waste of money. Local residents live nearby and socialise in their houses or at local pubs or coffee houses or restaurants or the Park.</p>
<p>The "square" (besides being an absolute eyesore) and its consequent impact of blocking off of any efficient route between West Dulwich / West Norwood continues to negatively impact residents living on boundary roads and those where traffic is now directed. Ongoing congestion, increased idling traffic, frustrated drivers completing u turns or other dangerous manoeuvres blight the lives of those who don't enjoy the privilege of living in Dulwich Village. Bus travel times - especially at morning rush hour - have demonstrably increased (see TfL records), businesses lose passing trade etc.</p>
<p>This scheme has not been helpful. It has pushed traffic to other areas greatly to their detriment. Everyone I speak to would rather Court lane/Calton were still open to access by cars. It is my understanding that this view was expressed in the last consultation and the majority was ignored. I am a cyclist and cycle to work every day, so I am not anti-cycle or pro-car. However, the traffic disasters that are now seen every day on East Dulwich Grove, Townley Road, and the South Circular attest to the fact that this has been detrimental to the borough. Yes, Dulwich Village is more pleasant, but there is a very significant cost to this.</p>
<p>The Objective, as stated above, does not take into account the needs of the vulnerable and less well off in our Community. The proposed removal of the road access in/around the closed junction of Court Lane, Calton Avenue and Dulwich Village would result in continued unacceptable congestion on Dulwich's so-called "boundary roads", increasing bus times, emissions and increasing danger for cyclists.</p> <p>The Council ought to take into full amount the detrimental impacts of the proposed changes (as opposed to re-opening the closed junction) on vulnerable groups including the disabled and the elderly and also the impact on health and public security to the extent that access for emergency vehicles, carers, midwives and other important public service workers may be impacted.</p>
<p>The seating is a mess- at least 3 different styles and totally out of keeping with historic ambience. Pavement kerbs are of different levels in many places and represent a hazard esp to elderly and those with poor vision. The bollards, planters and plastic red and white blocks are just a shambles- look an absolute mess esp the red/ white blocks. It is def not an attractive area</p>
<p>LB Southwark ignored the communities views to retain the junction. There are 2 parks and an orchard in close proximity to enable 'attractive and accessible places for all to connect, socialise and play, in a safe and pleasant environment - rather than a concrete corner.</p>
<p>I think crossing Court Lane and Dulwich Village look more dangerous. I don't see this improves public transport through Dulwich Village. We have parks in Dulwich; why turn a street into a park???</p>
<p>These are not streets for all people. It is only if you are mobile and can ride a bike or walk. This is not inclusive for disabled people. I can't even walk down our pavement with my son in a wheelchair because it is too bumpy. You won't fix it and spend millions on 1 intersection in Dulwich Village again.</p>
<p>The Council has ignored the response to the Phase 2 consultation in which the community rejected the 24/7 closure of Calton Avenue. Consequently, the wider Dulwich area, in which I live will continue to suffer from this decision.</p> <p>With regard to the specific proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All possible measures should be taken to separate cyclists and pedestrians and to reduce the speed of cyclists. Introduce green verges, posts and chains to separate people from traffic. - Introduce tight bends to slow cyclists and set back street furniture to allow a clear swept path for emergency vehicles. - Reduce the width of the cycle lane at the Dulwich Village end to 4m. - Heritage materials in line with Dulwich Village's unique character must be used.
<p>Protected cycle lane don't met LTN 1/120 .not accessible to three wheeled bikes.</p>

Blocking off any road sends traffic down other roads; these other roads then carry more traffic than before, and the increased traffic and the pollution make life worse for the residents of these roads. You do not mention this in the above blurb under Calton Avenue.

As you are well aware, the LTN in Dulwich has sent more traffic down Croxted Road and Rosendale Road, and probably Norwood Road, thus making life more unpleasant and less healthy for the residents of these roads, and of my road.

Comments for 2

Personally I have seen minimal usage of this avenue . Not sure if it required in the first place . We already have a huge gorgeous Dulwich park within few metres , with all the amenities- outdoor seating / cycling / safe / socialising / cafe / washroom etc. Maybe we need to create awareness on using this existing park and its facilities .

shutting off more and more off the area risks making it a dead zone; I think this is too much

The alleged square is ugly with the traffic lights and road markings still in place and some rubbish wooden furniture. I remain unconvinced that the problems it created are counterbalanced by the benefits. Either turn it into a proper square, above all removing the traffic lights (and therefore prevent cyclists and emergency vehicles getting through) or not. It is an ill-conceived hotch potch imposed in a totally undemocratic fashion.

We are blessed in Dulwich with a wonderful wood, fantastic park and playground and lots of trees. We do not need the junction of a main road through Dulwich to be turned into a half hearted playground. Send the children to play in green spaces in the wood and park not in a major traffic jam area caused by the LTN and its closure of Calton Avenue and Court Lane. It is ridiculous.

There needs to be sufficient space for emergency vehicles to pass through.

1. Prefer motorised access to Court Lane and Carlton Avenue for disabled and elderly people.
2. Assume access through this area for ambulances and emergency vehicles?
3. Don't consider this a safe 'Play Area'.
4. What is cost of this plan? Seems waste of money when there must be more 'needy areas.
5. Should do something to help congestion and improve air quality in Croxted Road and South circular Road.

By further restricting parking on Turney Rd opposite Dulwich Hamlet Primary School, you are causing a parking problem for teachers at both the Infant and Junior schools who rely on their cars to get to work. This has a detrimental knock on effect to surrounding roads such as Boxall, Aysgarth, Pickwick and Burbage. This will also increase the negative trading pressure to the shops and restaurants who's trade had already been severely affected by the current alterations to the Turney Rd / Calton Ave / Court Lane junction. Witness the closure of Biff (a valuable and essential shop supplying shoes and kit for local school children). The reason for the closure was the loss of trade due to the reasons above.

They stop local commerce which is the lifeblood of our community

Due to current bad signage, this section is currently quite precarious. I saw a car driving through that didn't see the traffic ban. I would not let children playing freely in this crossing.

Shouldn't be 24 hours closing

Improved look to Dulwich Village but at the detriment to air quality and congestion outside three schools by diverting traffic along Dulwich and East Dulwichc Grove. Major inconvenience for residents in Court Lane who have to drive three sides of a square to get into their road. I am an ex-resident and I would not have been able to continue living there as I was oncall for medical emergencies.

I completely support the idea of Streets for Communities but this plan lacks any creativity. Too much space is allocated to the cycle lane. There must be a way of creatively keeping access for the emergency services whilst it not looking like a permanent road? We need more space where events could be held and for seating. It needs to be a place for people to gather.

We are too restricted in moving locally for car journey's when necessary. Prevents access to using shops in East Dulwich as unable to carry everything on a bike! Equally it prevents people from accessing the village local shops which are closing and all being replaced by eateries/cafes. Concerned the landscape of the businesses will be forced to change so that there are fewer affordable essential shops/businesses and equally we will not be able to access those in East Dulwich.

Current cycle lanes narrow the car lanes and cause congestion and pollution. These need to be re thought to provide free flowing traffic away from schools and the public spaces that you intend for us to use! More deliveries will result if we are unable to access shops. Current bus routes do not link the local areas of Herne Hill, West Dulwich, Dulwich Village, East Dulwich to facilitate the reduction in the use of vehicles and therefore access to local amenities.

Whilst the measures do provide a space for pedestrians in the centre of Dulwich, I do not think that the original introduction of a blocked junction has helped the Dulwich community and therefore I do not believe that the proposed measures meet the wider goal of providing streets for communities

<p>The appearance of the junction layout is better than the current rather piecemeal approach. I do however feel that this makeover will be costly and represents a relatively poor use of stretched council funds for very limited benefit to the local community. This will not solve the traffic displacement issues created by the scheme in the first place and thus will have little or no impact on pollution in the general Dulwich Village area.</p>
<p>I am 100% supportive of the closure of the junction to traffic and the creation of a new piece of public realm in the heart of Dulwich, "attractive and accessible and pleasant environment". Disappointingly your proposals are failing in some respects. It is evident that as highways engineers, as opposed to place-makers, you have prioritised the creation of a route for cyclists passing through the junction rather than creating 'a place' for the community "...to connect, socialise and play, in a safe and pleasant environment".</p>
<p>Your proposals should address the Council's stated priorities. Your proposals need prevent rogue cars, van and lorries being driven through the 'Square' either intentionally or unintentionally, as happens too frequently with the current widths and sweeping curves of the road.</p>
<p>This is minimally achieved at the expense of those for whom a car is essential, which is most of us at times. It's not possible for children to play safely, as whimsically shown in the images, as cyclists still need to be allowed to use the area.</p>
<p>Communities are not built by making big paved spaces at road junctions for people to "play", "connect" or ride bikes. It may be desirable in more urban or central locations but will do nothing to enhance the environment of Dulwich Village.</p>
<p>Traffic flows diverted onto peripheral roads are deeply unfair for residents & pedestrians living there. Cyclists continue to ignore traffic signals & other guidance in Highway Code. Rental e-cycles & e-scooters are dumped willy nilly - in blatant contravention of LBS's regulations, which appear to be scarcely enforced.</p>
<p>As with most Council proposals there is a concentration on cyclists at the expense of other users. The proposal is centred on the cycle lane whereas the emphasis should be on a place for people to socialise and host events. The width of the cycle lane should be reduced at the Dulwich Village end. The ability of pedestrians to cross the space should be prioritised. At the moments accidents between pedestrians & cyclists are just waiting to happen.</p>
<p>The design highlights the cycle lane and does not achieve a pleasant space for people to meet and sit or take part in events. More separation of pedestrians from cycles is needed - currently the pedestrian is in constant danger from speeding and inconsiderate cyclists. The planters and seating are a tatty mess and downgrades the area. Something must be done to slow down cyclists and encourage them to give way to pedestrians. Would a pedestrian crossing over the cycle way be helpful to encourage this?</p>
<p>Blocking car access to/from Calton Avenue, Court Lane and Woodward Road inconveniences people living in those roads who have responsibilities in, for example, Christ's Chapel and the Picture Gallery, and who may need to transport equipment through the Village. I know of people who were forced to drive long distances via Lordship Lane and the South Circular, creating more pollution and wasting their time.</p>
<p>It also causes complications with parental cars at school times, especially at the bottom of Court Lane, which sometimes resemble a dodgems area on a dangerously small scale.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed design is centred on the cycle lane, whereas it must be designed as a pleasant place for people, to socialise and host events. Phase 3 suits the rigid requirements of emergency vehicle movement – not people - The proposed design lacks creativity and vision. The council needs to engage an artist or public realm specialist - The irregular space should be formalised by forming an urban square defined by paving and trees. As proposed, trees reinforce the alignment of the cycle lane rather than the Square - Reduce the width of the cycle lane at the Dulwich Village end to 4m (there is no need that the cycle lane would be the widest at the square ie: inviting cyclists to speed up coming down from the hill into the square) - Introduce a central feature but ensure sufficient space for events
<p>The gateway is a good idea because I have witnessed a number of cars turning right from Dulwich Village (coming north) into Calton Avenue. They appear to know or believe the camera isn't working</p>
<p>These objectives could be achieved without eliminating parking spaces in the village centre and Turney Road, which makes the space less accessible and is damaging for local businesses.</p>
<p>It causes traffic congestion so more pollution; dangerous for pedestrians and cars as cyclists shoot past and don't respect the traffic lights or Highway Code.</p>
<p>I very much doubt that I will connect, socialise or play in this area. It is certainly not, in my view, an area to encourage play.</p>

Shops are suffering from the lack of footfall. It's a downward spiral; The lower the footfall, the less revenue the shops make and the more close, then the more people go elsewhere for services and then further the lower the footfall etc. This is detrimental to a community not additive.
Seating areas in streets can be hubs for drug dealing, electric scooter dumping and hanging around after school in larger numbers. They sound nice but do they really have a positive impact? Where is the evidence?
What return on investment (%) does the council expect from its investment or is this just spending for the sake of spending?
There are some parts of the community who are ignored by this scheme, especially e.g. blue badge holders, key workers and others with protected characteristics. There is no reason to exclude them from access. This could be done in a completely safe way.
By focusing on this small area, the scheme also ignores the impact, by displacement, on the nearby roads, especially East Dulwich Grove and Croxted Road.
As a cyclist and pedestrian who uses the junction regularly, it is not at all clear how cyclists will be encouraged to slow down, especially those coming down Calton Avenue. We now have e-bikes moving at vehicle speeds, including heavy cargo e-bikes. This does not seem to be taken account of.
It is unrealistic to expect pedestrians to wait at traffic lights when only cyclists are coming through. Many of them ignore the lights anyway, especially to turn left from Calton Ave into Dulwich Village/College Road. Why can't you use a zebra crossing?
Too much clutter of lines and signs. There is no need for Double Yellow Lines - this has been enforceable since the Traffic Management Act 2004, so for twenty years!
There should be more Sustainable Drainage and other infrastructure to adapt to a changing climate.
The scheme should design in the 35%+ reduction in car use by 2030 committed to by Streets for People. For any sections where not currently possible (e.g. failure to include modal filter on Turney Road) then temporary materials should be used.
Why do Southwark keep spending money on this It has divided the vilkage
I can see that the look and feel of the changes to the public space on Calton Road will be improved and that cyclists coming down the hill will need to slow down. I don't see it as a place to socialise, except outside the deli/cafes on Calton Avenue. I certainly don't see it as a place to play and think it would be dangerous for children to do so next to a road and cycle lane.
It ignores the needs of many in the community such as older and less mobile residents
The design of the square is a huge improvement, from what it was and what it is currently. However, I think it could be greatly improved by the involvement of a person experienced in the design of public pedestrianised spaces. The proposed design seems to focus on emergency vehicle access through the square, which happens extremely rarely. It also seems to emphasise the cycle lane and this also makes the space appear as if it is primarily there for the cycle lane rather than a space for people and events. The cycle lane appears unnecessarily wide and stands out which will encourage cyclists to go faster. If the focus was on the area that has been allocated for people to relax and enjoy themselves the design would be far more pleasing. This could be achieved by additional planting of trees, green verges, posts and chains in keeping with the heritage appearance of the village. By softening the hard surfaces visually with additional planting the square would appear attractive.
At present the mixture of cyclists, scooters, and pedestrians is highly unsatisfactory and indeed dangerous. The notice regarding priority for pedestrians is placed where no cyclist, speeding or otherwise, will see it. I am an elderly pedestrian and feel extremely vulnerable in this area. the pavement on one side is full of cafe chairs and tables and on the other side has low overhanging branches, thus pedestrians are encouraged to use the same road area as the cyclists. Guess who comes off worst.
Electric cycles make it just as fast and dangerous as when cars were there, drivers are frustrated and angry, it puts me of even trying to cycle. It went to far and made to many people unhappy.
Please don't further reduce the use of cars in Dulwich village. Given a lot of roads are blocked, it is leading to continuous increase in traffic on Lordship Lane and Dulwich Common. It is having a significant negative impact on the quality of life for residents living at Dulwich Common given increase in traffic, congestion and pollution.
how are cycles being slowed down? how are the pedestrian areas signalled?
Like to see more design formality - an urban square - in support of people rather than tending wholly to prioritise the cycle lane above the convenience of people's ability to congregate in the new space. This would suggest engaging some consultant skilled in designing public spaces. Serious chicanes for cyclists to slow them down on the Calton Road hill.
Do not use the area. Fear cyclists at speed there and cycling on the pavements, especially at he other end of Calton Avenue despite cycle lane; and I hate the crawling traffic and fumes going through the area (passed schools).

The graphic makes the area look huge - when in reality they are cheek by jowl - so much smaller! My main concern is that you have pedestrians and cyclists, and by making it look inviting for pedestrians - they will forget that there is a cycle lane running through it. There will be an inevitable conflict or accident.
It really hasn't done that. It's created tension between the hard core cyclists and the rest of the community, it has also divided geographically our community in two. For instance it used to take me no time to get to the football club of which I am the chairman so I was there a lot to support as a volunteer my community. Now it's actually a real chore to get myself and the football gear I need to the community club of which I am chairman and head coach.
Too much space is dedicated to the cycle lane, encouraging people to ride too quickly through the area making it dangerous. The cycle lane should be narrower and with tighter bends. More space (away from the pedestrian space) should be allocated to bike parking including the larger cargo bikes. Improve the safety for children by introducing verges between the space and Dulwich Village where the traffic will mainly be. Maximise the space where people can meet and greet and gather for events.
They do nothing to prevent cyclists and motorcyclists travelling at speed, endangering pedestrians.
You say that you have taken on board the views of people expressed in the previous consultations, however you've actually ignored the main views, which were not to "reclaim space" but rather were to return to a situation where traffic is not being displaced to other roads. There was no support for a 24/7 closure.
It's impossible to enjoy this so-called "community space" due to the congestion that the road closures have caused. Traffic is travelling more slowly leading to more pollution and not less. Sitting on a bench next to traffic is no fun, and considering we have Dulwich Park, the Gallery space and Belair Park so close by, I think this whole enterprise is totally misguided. A better balance needs to be struck between pedestrian users of the area and motorized transport users.
It looks more dangerous that the original junction if cyclists behave as they currently do. I have had two contacts, painful, with cyclists with the new junction; I never had an issue being hit by cars. Car drivers obey applicable laws and regulations.
What in the new plan is going to : keep cyclists off the sidewalk and get them to comply with red lights and improve the damaged bus service?

Comments for 3 (partly)

I can't see anything that is going to curtail the speed of cyclist. It does however make it much clearer where pedestrians are which is the big problem there as it's a bit of a free for all for everyone and to my mind, more dangerous than it's ever been. I've had a few near misses myself.
This helps only the parts of the community that live locally and don't have the need to travel through dullish village in both directions at peak traffic times...so this serves only part of the community
Dulwich Village remains a busy through road for cars and it is not pleasant to sit by a main road and too noisy for decent conversations. The idea that this is a village square is ill conceived
Cycling down from Red Post Hill into the Village is quite hair-raising. It'd be good if we could separate motor traffic from cyclists more - perhaps convert pavement on one side to a cycleway & pedestrians other side?
Why are you obsessed with this area? Who wants to come and spend a lovely few hours next to a main road? Rather remove the road closure on Carlton and allow traffic to move through the area rather than sitting traffic jams up and down Dulwich Village
This still looks unsafe for pedestrians trying to cross, particularly those with reduced mobility, as cyclists will be travelling through/alongside the pedestrian area.
I am not clear how this would help create an area to connect, safe and play. It would seem that creating areas on the pavement with "protected zones" that clearly demarcate car, bike and pedestrian zones would be helpful. However, for bike / scooter users to be able to connect and socialise then a key part is for safe, secure and accessible spaces to leave bikes and scooters.
The current seating is ugly and out of place within the village environment. There are strict requirements residents have to adhere to, to protect the look of village, via the Dulwich Estate guidelines. The outdoor seating should reflect these requirements and not be painted multicoloured or look like something from a primary school...
Concerned re displacement of previous traffic (eg Croxted Road, Lordship Lane, East Dulwich Grove now taking more traffic). Essential emergency vehicles must access at any time. Provision for care workers etc to access to avoid impossibly circuitous journeys to patients Concerned this apparently pedestrian project actually does not have full support of local shops some of whom oppose the plans thus far. Better seating needed, current fixtures not look good

The cyclists need to be separated better from pedestrians at the bottom of Calton Avenue. Currently cyclists zip through the area without reference to the lights and it's very dangerous for pedestrians. The diagram above looks like you're separating the cyclists better.
My main concern is safety on two counts – firstly there is no regulating the cycle/pedestrian right of way so at this junction it becomes a bit of a freefall. Secondly, the streets that are restricted generally have become crime hotspots due to the quietness – it is well known that Court Lane has a Drug dealing area that is regularly used now that the road is quiet
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Two closed roads Calton Avenue and Court Lane mean too much traffic diverted to other roads. This includes Dulwich village and is contrary to your stated aims. 2. The traffic northwards on Dulwich Village shows severe congestion at peak times. This is due to the cycle lane at the east Dulwich Grove junction, installed as part of the allegedly traffic reducing methods and this result is again contrary to your stated aims. 3. I would like to see evidence that the volume of northbound cycle traffic at any time justifies this cycle lane. It reduces north and right turning traffic, already increased by the Calton Avenue junction closure, to one lane where two lanes would help clear the junction more quickly. 4. The more pedestrian traffic there is at this junction, the worse the clash between pedestrians and cyclists. An accident is bound to happen if the crossing is not better controlled.
I think the space needs some reorganisation to make it look better but my overall objection is that what we need more than anything is a bus to connect North Dulwich with West Dulwich. I would rather the money that is about to be spent on this project was moved towards a bus that picked up the people no longer able to drive anyway that can't or don't want to cycle.
Access to our road (Court Lane) is extremely limited
I think there should remain a physical barrier to stop cars etc being able to pass the junction and a camera to catch the many mopeds that pass through.
It is better than it was, but still causes very unwelcome damage to neighbouring streets, especially Burbage Road and Croxted Road
In the summer people do sit in the area, However Cyclist now think they own the road and ignore their traffic lights. I walk around the village most days and the cyclists using the Calton/Court junction are more aggressive now they have a designated lane.
I have concerns that congested traffic leads to poorer air quality outside the Village School
There is absolutely no need for a cycle lane on Dulwich Village - it creates a traffic backlog and thus creates danger to cyclists by having frustrated drivers. It also creates far too much pollution from standing cars.
I would think that the plans fit your Streets for Communities objectives. Considering the original closure of Court Lane/Calton Avenue was put through in Covid and as it seems that the LTN closure will not be reversed despite subsequent surveys indicating that the majority would have liked the junction re-modelled rather than completely shut, it is obvious that the current state of the junction is not fit for purpose with cyclists whizzing through and mostly ignoring the lights and the ramshackle furniture that has been installed. In this light the plans seem applicable.
My biggest issue of concern is excessive speed by cyclists, especially those on electric bikes and their total disregard for crossings, red lights and other road users.
I wouldn't waste public money creating lots of outdoor seating when there is already quite a lot in the area. People don't come to Dulwich Village to sit around (they might go to the park to do that). I am very concerned overall however that there hasn't been meaningful consultation with local businesses about these proposals. I know many are struggling - and with all the displaced traffic, Dulwich is becoming a no-go zone for people who need to use cars to get around (despite the views of the council, public transport isn't always the answer). I'm not sure how these proposals improve the traffic chaos and constant pollution from cars sat with their engines running in the area - something that wasn't an issue before all these expensive 'experiments' started. My personal view is that this junction should be a timed junction with restrictions only at certain times of day.
You have spent a lot of money already on this junction and this is perhaps the third attempt at improving it. The blockage causes me to travel 0.9 miles from home to junction in the car rather than 0.3 previously. This does not help air pollution or petrol consumption at all!
Like the new design but am concerned about how emergency access will be retained as this is not shown clearly and was a welcome modification to the original scheme. Assuming it's still retained I still believe that vehicle access should also be given through this junction on a limited basis to vulnerable residents who are car dependent (eg blue badge holders) or Allied Health workers visiting the housebound (eg carers, physiotherapists).
Apart from the introduction of 2 disabled parking spaces the plan for the village junction doesn't appear to be very different from now.
I would support more benches and more trees. The current striped furniture is not very attractive as the paint effect has been "distressed" which just makes it look old and in need of painting!
'Streets for communities' is an idea, not an objectively improved reality. A CPZ will not improve quality of life and just make life harder for residents and their visitors. And with all the OSP there is no room for the architecture of controlled parking.

Sadly these initiatives whilst on paper look ideal, they will economically impact on the village and people will simple avoid it as in any case there isn't much there to encourage one to visit the village and now ith the additional costs, it will be best avoided..
An improvement on the first attempt, which is a hodgepodge of random elements, however restoration of the original junction and opening it to traffic again would be more beneficial to the wider community by reducing traffic displacement and congestion on e.g. East Dulwich Grove.
A lot of traffic has been displaced by the measures and has created new bottlenecks. Traffic is often static and thus pollution has actually increased in places. The traffic through the village is much worse, particularly at the Red Post Hill junction and along the south circular. Journey times are slower.
I cycle this route daily to take my kids to school. 1) Currently it feels dangerous as cycles on Calton Avenue approaching the junction cut the bend, hence are very close to cycles going the other way. Some cyclists stray onto the wrong side of the carriageway. Better markings on the bend would help improve this - none are shown. 2) Pedestrians tend to mill across Calton Avenue which can make cycling with kids feel dangerous. A planting scheme to direct them to the crossing would help. This has been somewhat fulfilled in the picture but the main problem is at the bend in the road, where people walk from the shops to Court Lane, where there is no planting shown. 3) When exiting Calton Road, the bike lights change so you think you can cross the junction and progress into Turney Road. However, the pedestrian crossing across Turney Road at that point shows a green man, so there is a conflict where cyclists think they are being given priority but could hit a person on the crossing.
This is a great proposal and works well with the existing restrictions in Dulwich Village on the shoulders of school hours. The issue is that it still requires a right-hand turn across oncoming traffic (which is not restricted when heading south) when travelling through Dulwich Village and turning right to go up the hill. This is both a dangerous and advanced manoeuvre for children - I am not sure how the scheme can be modified to address this.
Not 100% sure that closing off this road improves the quality of air for those who live where the traffic has now been forced to go, especially past all the schools in the area that now have more traffic queueing by them and school entry and exit times
Not seeing how cyclists are being controlled. I walk my children to school and a number of times electric bikes are going at speeds higher than any motorist! Not to mention the theft of snatch and grab that has been occurring. That corner at night is badly lit especially up court lane.
I don't have a strong view on this, but I'm not sure that space urgently needs a makeover. I doubt it's the best use of your limited budget.
If you want to make streets better for communities, how about starting with basics and swiping the leaves off the pavements? Right now it's an absolute disgrace, e.g. Half Moon Lane pavements are covered in an inch deep-mass of wet leaves which are left to rot. It looks horrible and creates a real hazard for kids on scooters and bikes as well as pedestrians, as wet leaves are very slippery.
To deter vehicles completely, there really should be a rising bollard at the Dulwich Village/Calton Avenue junction. Leaving it open to trust has not worked to date and is a weakness in the plans to protect pedestrians and cyclists.
Concern for play are children already playing football I witness many times the ball kicked into path of cars. Children scootering and cycling in way of pedestrians concern for elderly and blindc
Pedestrians cannot safely cross anywhere because of cyclists who jump all the lights. Are you going to have traffic cameras that will record this? Hope so. Emergency vehicles route is not signed on Court Lane. Does that mean all will be re-routed to go up Calton Avenue to gain access to this very large area of Woodwarde Rd, Court Lane, all side roads in between, and Eynella Road? Is there a clear plan for this? And are non Fire vehicles going to be allowed the access via Calton Avenue? These emergency vehicle access provisions could mean the difference between life and death.
The road closure is completely shutting off Dulwich and creating a rich ghetto
I object to the widening of the footpath on Turney Rd and I object to the removal of parking spaces on Turney Rd. If other parking spaces are being removed to implement the scheme then i also object to them being removed. I use the footpath on Turney Rd everyday and it is already a generous width - there is no need to widen it. Removing existing parking bays must be avoided. It impacts local businesses and local residents. Is Southwark trying to remove existing parking bays in an attempt to justify the controlled parking scheme (which i also object to). It is misleading for Southwark not to make it clear in the consultation that they propose to remove existing parking spaces.
Its not a centre of the community it was supposedly designed for
Cheap seating - an eyesore
You are putting in the positive changes with negative ones inviting a single comment on both.
The posts, bricks, trees and good.
Interfering with parking spaces is not required, or not to the extent you are doing so.

The speed of cyclists on calton Avenue needs to be addressed to make this a safe space
Need more police presence. There have been a lot of muggings and bicycle thefts in the crossing under consideration
Local people want to retain good access to work/ leisure. Few have time to walk everywhere.
Encouraging play by a busy road is counterintuitive and not one medical professionals/ parents would want to promote
I am really concerned by the high likelihood of children running out in front of cyclists.
Re: greater support of younger people proposals = less likely to have mobility problems, more likely to have children. ?This demographic also reflected amongst council officials. Needs of people with disabilities are protected in law to ensure not over-ridden Need to see this in action. (Blue badge holders can walk < 50m + need carers)
How much money has been spent on this tiny part of south east London? By all means add greenery but no more tables & chairs.
Only partly because they ignore those over 60 and with disabilities who rely on cars as there is inadequate public transport...and none additional since the restrictions have been put in place.
The pavement in front of the existing shops is wide enough to be able for this to be done without the disruption to motorists
I like the clearer road and bike markings and doing away with central island. Could do with more seating. I like the lamps. Looks in keeping with rest of village
The junction closure is not supported on neighbouring roads where lots of traffic has been displaced and now cause huge traffic problems.
I believe an allocated slot or easier access and travel through Dulwich for bus drivers and other modes of public transport would encourage more usage of it and push drivers to possibly try it.
The new scheme still does not address the fundamental issue arising from cyclists passing (at speed) through the Carlton Avenue/Court Lane and Village Way junction. I have witnessed many instances of pedestrians, having been lulled by a false sense of security by the community space look and feel of the junction, have failed to notice cyclists passing through the junction. One solution would be to require cyclists to dismount from their cycles when passing through the junction.
maintaining the echelon parking gives far too much space to parking vehicles, change these to inset parallel bays.
the scheme will do nothing to reduce traffic volumes on Dulwich Village
How will stop parents and small kids walking into the road without looking. Other cyclists speeding like crazy or those hiring bikes. Cyclists jump a lot of lights. Pedestrians walk in front of bikes which when you're carrying your child is extremely dangerous for both parties.
Make it impossible for cars to park right at the bottom of Court Lane and Calton Avenue as it's so dangerous.
I think there needs to be a barrier/ fence between this space and the road to keep children safe.
I disagree with restricting the road to ONLY bikes and emergency traffic
If this has to be a bike only road then this looks much safer than the current state, which has a large planter half way through one of the cycle lanes putting bikes on a head to head course, which is stupidly dangerous and been in place for over a year
Also currently it just looks like a closed road and parents and children just wander in the road, there have been several close misses with bikes that I have seen with people not aware this junction is closed, so this new design would help avoid that
The green spaces need to be adequately maintained. The current planting and seating that was put in place following the (unwanted) LTN being made permanent is very unattractive and often looks neglected and shabby.
Dissemination of information has been very poor. The preamble could be an extract from a fairy tale. The downsides are not on the balance sheet; more traffic/pollution through the village; diversion of traffic, therefore pollution to surrounding roads; almost certain prolongation of journey time and the consequences: obstruction of emergency vehicles. Could we see a schedule of potential "FINES" and the money they might raise? Could we see the results of air quality analysis before and after existing changes were made? Please circulate results of questionnaires about these matters.
You have to consider the cost and consequences of achieving objectives. Increasing journey times and segregating East Dulwich residents from West Dulwich residents is too high a price for a bit of extra community space in an area which already benefits from enormous open space whilst funneling traffic to other parts of the borough where residents already suffer from higher pollution and less space is nasty.
You are pushing pollution and road traffic to other roads, giving favours to wealthier Dulwich Village at the expense of others. Shame on you!
I understand these changes will remove a number of parking spaces which will damage local businesses.
This looks tidier than the current mess.

<p>The proposed design is centred on the cycle lane, whereas it must be designed as a pleasant place for people, to socialise and host events. Phase 3 suits the rigid requirements of emergency vehicle movement – not people</p> <p>The proposed design lacks creativity and vision. Engage an artist or public realm specialist</p> <p>Use appropriate materials in Heritage Specification Areas (Dulwich Village)</p> <p>As proposed, trees reinforce the alignment of the cycle lane rather than the Square</p> <p>Reduce the width of the cycle lane at the Dulwich Village end to 4m</p> <p>Introduce green verges to separate people from traffic</p> <p>The cycle lane should have a minimal visual impact – indicated only with a change in paving layout texture and/or colour</p> <p>Introduce tight bends to slow cyclists and set back street furniture to allow a clear swept path for emergency vehicles</p> <p>More cycle/cargo bike parking in gateway areas & Gilkes Crescent so as not to clutter pavements</p>
<p>The reduced parking spaces and extensive yellow lining will make it much harder for a wide range of people to access the proposed community hub in Dulwich Village, particularly older people.</p>
<p>This should, first and foremost, be a relaxed pedestrianised space. Pedestrians MUST have physical and psychological priority over cyclists. The design should make all cyclists travel at a sedate pace and there must be no possibility for them go round corners too fast or to race through. In your proposed vision the cycle route dominates the total space available and looks too much like an open road which will be too tempting for motor vehicles to use, thus endangering both pedestrians and cyclists. The most prominent feature of the design should be a square formation of trees with seating and low maintenance planting. It should be a flexible space for events and activities for all age groups.</p>
<p>This will make travelling by bus or car through the area far worse. No further changes are needed and roads like Court Lane should be reopened to make transport fair for everyone and not just make the expensive roads quiet. Reopening will also reduce the horrendous congestion on Lordship Lane and East Dulwich Grove.</p>
<p>The speed at which bikes travel through a pedestrian/ semi-pedestrian area means that these areas are not safe. Pedestrians must be alert at all time and therefore it is not a relaxing space for communities. Access to the post office and other shops is made difficult to individuals with limited mobility.</p>
<p>I regularly cycle down Carlton Ave and turn left into Dulwich Village, but, the cycle traffic phasing is rubbish and I am made to stop at the white line before the pedestrian crossing on the Dulwich Village arm (of this wide junction). The drawings show this white stop line at these signals removed. Please check that is really happening.</p>
<p>There is insufficient priority given to pedestrian safety for the two pedestrian crossings over the Carlton Avenue cycle tracks. Cyclists need to be made more aware of where crossings are, and clarity given as to WHO has priority as there is no clear signage otherwise. Maybe use painted bricks to show pedestrian crossings (over the cycle track) as a minimum.</p>
<p>It looks better than what is currently in place. However we object to the whole closure of roads that is causing so much congestion at other places and completely against the targeted clean air for all moto.</p>
<p>The proposed cycle way through this space is too wide and appears to invite cyclists (and motorists making an error by turning into this route because of its apparent width) to speed, ignore pedestrians especially the young and the elderly and literally destroys the appeal of the potential open space it could provide.</p> <p>The solution might be</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To require cyclists to DISMOUNT from their cycles, provide cobble-stones on the cycle route and build a traffic hump at either end of the area to act as a warning to speeding cyclists. 2. The public space could be extended to all of Calton Avenue in this area and the resultant wider space designated as a SHARED SPACE for both pedestrians and cyclists.
<p>The cycle lane at the junction is too wide. Priority should be for the square. The cycle lane needs to be the minimum to allow a fire engine to use both cycle lanes and no more. Too much street clutter in the centre. This space needs to be flexible to allow events and activities to take place. There is no need for traffic lights any more. Ideally install a Tiger crossing from the school across the road. Align the cycle part of the Tiger crossing with the cycle lane towards Calton Ave/Court Lane. Install dedicated cycle lane along Village Way next to the shops. Sequence to be pavement, cycle lane/parallel parking for loading/unloading and a few short term spaces for cars. Makes it safer for cyclists. The Tiger crossing will give priority to pedestrians. At other times it reduces the start/stop times for vehicles. Throttle the width from Turney Road to prioritise cycles and extend the pavement area to help the children from the school have a safe entrance to the school.</p>
<p>I cycle all over Southwark and other local boroughs. These schemes have increased traffic on the direct routes that I use on my bike. They also increase pollution on these streets from diverted traffic. The Brandon LTN still fills my street with diverted traffic about 2 years after its implementation- traffic evaporation is a myth.</p>

<p>I like the Square having no traffic: it's a really good place for me and my friends to meet.</p> <p>I don't like the people on bikes going so fast and thinking they can go anywhere they like. I think they should only be allowed to go round the edge of the Square and be made to go slowly, somehow.</p> <p>I like the wide crossing but I think it's in absolutely the wrong place. I think the Square should feel kind of safe and closed and having one side all open completely spoils it. Why couldn't the crossing be by the hairdresser?</p>
<p>The paving and gateway 'features' are very welcome.</p> <p>The proposal, however, lacks an overall integrity and remains merely an irregular space with a wide road running across it. The trees should define a formal square not vaguely follow the cycle lane..</p> <p>The cycle lane should run outside the east and south sides of the Square with tight bends to reduce speed.</p> <p>The cycle lane should be as unobtrusive as possible and be only the required width for a double cycle lane with a clear 'swept path' for very occasional emergency vehicles.</p> <p>The Square should provide a safe, tranquil and enclosed space for pedestrians to meet, chat and gather for events, but this is not possible when on the west side it is wide open. Traditional Dulwich grass verges (with posts and chains) would visually and physically shield it from the traffic on Dulwich Village.</p> <p>The crossing should instead follow a natural alignment with the pavement in front of the Calton Avenue shops.</p>
<p>There are lots of signs and it still feels confusing</p>
<p>The separate bicycle lane on Turney road is problematic for cyclists because it isn't clear which way you can go e.g. can you go straight up, or only left. On top of that, when the bicycle traffic light is green, you turn left, but the next traffic light is always red so you have to wait a bit before it goes green. Therefore, really, the problem is signage, the traffic light timing, and the reason for having a separate lane from the cars but just adds more confusion.</p>
<p>Good for certain residents, say those who cycle, and difficult for others, particularly those who commute by car and have to endure heavy traffic as a result of road closures and changes in Dulwich Village.</p>
<p>Currently there is a severe camber on the pavement in front of number 1/1a/1b shops which is very difficult for wheelchair users - it is not clear whether the proposals include work to reduce this and flatten the walkway which is very much needed along with control of the tables and chairs and display furniture from the cafe and cheese shop which impede wheelchair and mobility aid users currently. Likewise adequate space is required around the proposed tree pit.</p>
<p>SO good to see it PAVED and the 'gateways' are a great improvement.</p> <p>BUT we were promised a pedestrian 'visually impressive, aesthetically pleasing local asset'.</p> <p>What is proposed is just a road running through an indeterminate space. It is the vision of a Highways Dept., when what we need is the comprehensive vision of urban landscape designer. E.g. additional trees should define the shape of the square, not the route of the cycle track.</p> <p>The 'Square' is a shared space where the needs of pedestrians are the first priority (cf. the Highway Code). The cyclists' route should be along the edges of the Square, - not through it - so that corners, and appropriate other measures to ensure safe speeds, make cyclists aware that their use of the square is conditional.</p> <p>The cycle routes should have as little visual impact as possible and their potential occasional use by emergency vehicles can be provided for by unimpeded space to the side(s) of the dual cycle track.</p>
<p>i am concerned that the measures proposed will reduce parking availability which will further damage the business of local shops - the proposals should not be taken forward if this is the case.</p> <p>More generally, i should stress that responding to this questionnaire about the Calton/Turney junction does NOT imply that i no longer consider that further action is needed to achieve fair traffic measures in Dulwich: in Burbage Rd no mitigation has been offered in spite of the Council recognising that traffic has significantly increased here following the junction closure in 2020.</p>
<p>The "square" is barren and isn't providing any utility to the community. It doesn't encourage personal mobility. There are no bike/scooter rental areas; there is no seating area for alfresco drinking and dining. There is a bench situated in the middle of a possible table area and too much street furniture further up Carlton Avenue.</p> <p>The cycle path curves at an unpleasant angle meaning cycling down Carlton Avenue towards the junction means pedestrians are crossing out of view - this is unpleasant and arguably unsafe for pedestrians and cyclists as there are people crossing at the end of Court Lane with no visibility of cyclists coming downhill on Carlton Avenue.</p> <p>I would have preferred to have more of a public square where businesses can offer services - the area currently and will have no clear purpose with the present and planned design.</p>

As a resident of nearly 40 years I have noticed that the closure of Calton Avenue to cars 24/7 has altered the quality of connectivity between the two halves of the village horribly.
reducing cars coming through the village (through traffic) would have been my preference rather than divide the village for the residents.

The area that you have created around the heart of the village has much to be admired but that is in isolation of the way the residents go about their day to day lives. We doing all sit and have coffee or have children to play etc etc.
People have said that the area os so difficult to negotiate traffic wise that they don't want to move here to live. Together with this where is the data for the displaced traffic that is polluting the surrounding roads.
I still think that partial closure of Caltion is the best solution for us residents as a whole. Timed access.

The current benches and colouring of street furniture in 'Dulwich Square' are tatty and reduce the quality of the environment and are an eyesore. The hard furniture aspects of Dulwich Square currently reflect very badly on whoever designed them and thought them adequate or appropriate for this setting.

While I support the objective of improving the space in Dulwich village for pedestrians and cyclists, I am concerned about traffic displacement into Burbage Road (a residential road which bears the brunt of increased through traffic as a result of restrictions since 2020 on motor vehicles in Dulwich Village and traffic jams down Croxted Road). The ever rising traffic volumes in Burbage Road must be curbed as part of this scheme.

There is a HUGE opportunity being missed here for a more creative and interesting approach which could really elevate the space. Dulwich Picture Gallery is down the road after all and there is a really vibrant artistic community in the area.
Re current design: it is all about facilitating emergency vehicles and cycles and NOT about the actual community space. Space for people should be the focus and maximised.
- There is reference to a community space but nothing to make it so - what about a defined square? Something actually to draw people in. A large public work of art that could be clambered on by children?
- It needs to be greener - green verges - grassy areas. Given how important our green spaces are - just adding a few extra trees in a rather thoughtless way is unforgivable.
- It should continue the Dulwich theme of white posts and chains also.

I like the paving a lot and the gateways are a good idea.

I think there's too much in the middle of the square, where we really need space: it seems as if the road takes up half the square and I think the trees should be round the edge so there's maximum room for different sorts of events in the middle.

The cyclists can be a real pain and they need to have a clear route round the edges of the Square with corners, rumble strips etc. to slow them down.

I don't think the pedestrian crossing is in the right place. What makes the square a good place to meet is that it feels safe and tranquil. A wide crossing on the west side would make it feel exposed to the noise and fumes of traffic, whereas trees and planting/grass would help to seal it off.

I am really pleased the Square is going to be paved: it will make it much nicer.

It's a good place to meet friends but at the moment the cyclists just go anywhere and I think they should have a clear route round the edge of the square and leave everybody else in peace. If they have to go round corners they will have to go more slowly.

I don't like the huge crossing because it would make the Square all open and what I like about it is that it feels safe and separate from cars and buses and quite peaceful. The crossing is fine where it is, but it just needs to be wider.

Trees to mark the edges of the Square would make it feel more permanent - up to now it has kept changing - and also be good for climate change

The trees as shown limit the flexibility of the space for events (markets, live music, other uses). They also form a barrier to larger crowds as seen in large community uses of the space, such as the Church carol concert events, where the cycle way is occupied temporarily.

The urban design should be in keeping with the traditional character of the area, and in line with Southwark streetscape design (Section 5, page 66) requiring appropriate materials in Heritage Specifica0on Areas (Dulwich Village). Also, the area should feel like the heart of the Village, not filled with urban clutter, including excessive tree planting or inflexible bolted down single chairs (as shown in the diagram). The use of an urban design consultant experienced in heritage work should allow the creation of a space that looks like it has always been there.

I would like to see improvements to the existing pavements in the Dulwich area. Especially on nearby Lordship Lane.

A community is for all the people who live in it - including those who want/need to drive. Your determination to stop driving in this area is not listening to all of the community. I still object to the fact that this junction was closed without sufficient consultation, and many of the LTN's have been scrapped as they didn't work.
Lots of traffic pushed elsewhere to the detriment of other users.
I support proposals produced by the Friends of Dulwich Square offering some adjustments to Southwark's proposals. Keep existing traffic controlled junction across Dulwich Village N where it is maintaining the existing pedestrian movement lines. This allows for the creation of a public square not directly on lines of pedestrian flow which can be used for other purposes without impeding movement. Recognise existing boundaries of the 'Square' and put in new manor waste at the east end of the Square on Dulwich Village. Emergency vehicles need to be able to pass through square - on tightened cycle route. Keep new square free of furniture and other fixtures - but provide ground socket and power outlet for the Christmas tree. Use trees to define edges of the square and set rules on positioning of all street furniture and zones. Use high quality materials to match the palette agreed with Dulwich Estate for frontage to parade of shops. Respect views of Burial Ground and keep free of clutter.
The use of quality materials is great but there is too much space and attention on the cycle route. There is an issue with the speed that cyclists come through the junction and there are motorists driving through at high speed. The section dedicated to cycle lanes needs to be much narrower to avoid this. If there needs to be access for emergency services (and is this really important) then they will be comfortable "mounting the kerb" as they drive on a route that is "visually" narrow but for which planting/boundary posts are set far enough back to leave them with space. There will need to be a "kerb" of some type as there will need to be something to stop the cyclists from straying from their narrower route and to slow them down with tighter bends. The area should also be designed to be in keeping with the rest of Dulwich, perhaps better, but not markedly different. Grass verges with white posts and black chains are, for instance, a key feature of much of the rest of the village.
Whilst this is fine for those who live in the vicinity it does not address the issues of the those living outside of the village who are experiencing extra traffic and pollution It feels elitist!
Yes. My only concern throughout has been safety: especially, safety of pedestrians of all ages. There is no indication in the artist's impression of the square that cyclists and motorised scooters will be prevented from straying on to the 'pedestrian' spaces. So, continuing hazards.
Would be nice to see the square as more of a "shared space" than a "road for bicycles". The cycle lane seems unnecessarily wide. I also think it needs something (bendy bollard?) to prevent people driving through. Many do in error but some also cover plates. Appreciate the need for emergency access but there must be a way of allowing that while still preventing misuse by drivers.
The materials associated with the cyclists area are a vast improvement on tarmac but this area is way too large. It will continue to encourage the cars that race across this space to continue to do so and it will also not slow down the cyclists that make it dangerous for us to play in the rest of the space. The space for cyclists should be much narrower and should have a sharper bend in it so they can't cycle so quickly.
1/ We are concerned about an increased crime in the area since the closures, as Court Lane, Calton Avenue, Woodwarde Rd. are all very empty in the evenings/nights when the traffic is blocked. Also I haven't seen police cars driving around on our roads in the night after the closures. However, I agree that the prior to the closures traffic on this junction was high in the rush hours and some partial closures / changes were needed.
The traffic has increased on East Dulwich Grove as if we need to drive within the 8-9am and 3-4.30pm, when exits via Townley Rd are not permitted, we have to drive for 15 mins extra around via Lordship Lane to avoid penalty charges. We do feel cut off from the village.

Comments for 4

Heritage lamps: improved lighting would be great thank you! The whole of Calton Avenue is very badly lit, surprising given how many children use it. Good lighting will enable more children to travel independently. The paving materials make it all look a lot lighter and less like the road, that's good. If you need to use railings anywhere perhaps they can be sympathetic to the burial ground gates - it would be nice to have a link to that, since it's inevitably separated from the people part of this space by the cycle path and emergency vehicles space. Or use wooden materials that give a nod to the iconic finger posts of Dulwich? And can we have a notice board like the ones in Herne Hill? Thanks!
I know all the grumbly old people hated the idea, but it would be great if we could close off the end of turney Road too :)

<p>This looks excellent. It will be interesting to see in relation to CPZ plans as the knock on effect is to create heavy parking at the lower end of Court Lane which is narrow due to the flower beds between road and pavement. There are also lots of dangerous maneuvering as people do the school drop and get stuck down the end of Court Lane.</p>
<p>Looks very good. Would be better with more restrictions on through traffic along Dulwich Village.</p>
<p>the new public space proposed is not very inviting with single isolated chairs. The current layout with benches near each other, on an L-shape, promote interaction and are used for play by children. I think more thought should be given to such valuable open space</p>
<p>Concern that the slightly different grey pavings and kerbs will all blend in wet/low light and not look distinct from the tarmac road, leading to drivers continuing to drive through the cycleway.</p>
<p>I think this looks very pleasing. Will there be something in place to ensure that cyclists observe the highway code as per vehicle users?</p>
<p>The public square is an attractive feature which we are all now used to and enjoy. The hard and soft landscaping will provide a clearer demarcation of space between the different users which currently is unclear leading to cyclist and pedestrians (sometimes even cars) in the wrong place.</p>
<p>I am supportive of the original closure. I think it does tidy up what is there at present. However would prefer it to be fully pedestrianised so cyclists have to slow down or get off their bikes.</p>
<p>i think that physical blocks eg the current large plantar boxes are needed to stop cars and lorries entering restricted areas- without these some careless and sometimes dangerous drivers will enter these roads or ways</p>
<p>It looks much less cluttered. Many cyclists jump red lights so they are somewhat irrelevant.</p>
<p>I supported the closure of Turney Road but unfortunately this wasn't a popular option. I think this is probably the best that can be achieved given the strength of feeling locally.</p>
<p>It's a waste of money to keep changing this junction, whatever you do someone will complain. Make a decision and stick to it.</p>
<p>While they achieve the objectives they are still very inconvenient for residents on Townley Road.</p>
<p>You must include expected costs to do this work. This will be coming from our taxes so we need to know how much you are proposing to spend on the work, and how well a competitive tender will be run. It is well known that government agencies are not able to run a competitive tender process - maybe this needs to be outsourced to people who work in commerce?</p>
<p>It is essential that the cycle path through the junction does not look like a road. Otherwise it will attract cars that will be danger to the public using the space for its intended purpose.</p>
<p>Please keep it simple. Currently there are too many signs and signposts, and too many planters and differences in paving and levels. It is a mish mash and very ugly and an eyesore. Need more bike racks.</p>
<p>I am broadly in favour of the plans. But I have one issue which is the speed of cyclists coming through the junction. There are large numbers of pedestrians, particularly children, using the junction and already there are issues of cyclists going through at speed and not giving priority to pedestrians. I would like to see measures which force cyclists to slow down when approaching the junction.</p>
<p>Get rid of the current multi colour seating that is tacky and an eye sore</p>
<p>These designs are great. There are two concerns: 1. Speed at which cyclists come through Calton Avenue, most times they don't even stop and it is unsafe 2. The village space doesn't become a hangout place for the rowdy, or folks enjoying congregating and drinking at night, and thereby making our kids feel unsafe. Needs to be well lighted, CCTV</p>
<p>What is the plan to help with the above?</p>
<p>The biggest danger at this junction at the moment is cyclist racing across the bottom of Carlton Avenue/Court Lane from both directions as if they always have priority and right of way. I am not clear how the proposals will ensure this is controlled. It needs to be very clear when cyclist have the right to cross the junction and when it is safe for pedestrians. I believe the proposals include measures to reduce the speed of cyclist in this area and this is essential.</p>
<p>More grass in the area would be good - it would be nice if it felt a bit more like a little park</p>
<p>Would be nicer if there was more grass</p>
<p>The plans look very good. An existing and occurring problem is potential accidents between cyclists and pedestrians; the speed that bicycles descend Calton Avenue towards the Calton Avenue/Dulwich Village junction seems to be the root cause of this. In addition to traffic/speed calming measures, might a 'dismount bike and wheel through' policy through the section adjacent to the community space eradicate any potential accidents?</p>
<p>Some cyclist/pedestrian issues have also occurred at the crossing point on Turney Road (just off Dulwich Village) as the pedestrian 'green man' seems to coincide with the green cyclist signal at the Calton Avenue/Dulwich Village junction. Might this be rectified?</p>

<p>We still have problems with traffic congestion in and around Dulwich, especially during the school run times, and this is noticeably much worse when private schools are open. During the times when the state schools are still open but the private schools are on holiday there is a significant reduction in traffic congestion.</p>
<p>There's no space for the Royal Mail van. Currently the van usually stops roughly where the new footway for the crossing is. Due to the frequency of the visits of this very much necessary service, there should probably be a dedicated space, possibly where one of the diagonal car parking spaces is.</p>
<p>Concerned about pedestrian safety in the bike lanes</p>
<p>As far as it goes, the redesign appears functional. But streets for communities should also include drivers of cars in the calculus. You consistently appear to ignore drivers needs within the overall context.</p>
<p>Looks somewhat sovietic i.e. a council solution from a common playbook. Could a place be found for more individuation e.g grass with the white posts typical of the streetscape elsewhere nearby rather than the inevitably vandalised flower beds? I realise this may be to ask a lot but it seems challenging the current plans is worth attempting since the Council has, I believe, tried within reason to respond to residents' views.</p>
<p>No comments. The plans appear to be more attractive than the current arrangements.</p>
<p>Great to see two new blue badge car parking spaces. Have you planned for secure cargo & other non-standard cycle parking as part of the scheme (with many affluent families in the area, the number of cargo cycles is likely to start being a regular sight, and with Wheels for Wellbeing down the road, increasing numbers of Disabled cyclists are using the square, so I would suggest 3 large cycles spaces need to be provided for, over and above a good number of standard Sheffield stands to service the rows of shops on both Dulwich Village and Carlton Avenue).</p>
<p>Yes, it is good if it is clear that it is a cycle lane as sometimes the children cross without looking. I am assuming from the plan/visual that cars will not be allowed up this section, which is good.</p>
<p>Cyclists can come down Calton Avenue to the junction at excessive speed, appearing unexpectedly.</p>
<p>I would suggest speed bumps and warning signs on the road approaching the junction coming down Calton Avenue, and straightening out the boundary of Ash Cottage to allow pedestrians to see bicyclists and get out of their way in time.</p>
<p>I think you shouldn't allow cyclists to cycle here. Much better if they had to dismount and push through the square. They are dangerous to the pedestrians and it wouldn't be a big deal for them to dismount for a few metres. Whole square would then have a better feel.</p>
<p>It's important to keep a space for performances - choirs, bands. These activities encourage a community feel. The area has the opportunity to be a real meeting point and hub for community activity. Also a noticeboard would be helpful to advertise events in the area. The lamp columns and paving look great. I'm not a fan of the movable chairs, though. They can look untidy and be stolen. The fixed bench seating is preferable.</p>
<p>Like the community space with more seating and greenery. It would be good to include planting and bug/wildlife habitats to increase biodiversity.</p>
<p>More planting would be even better</p>
<p>worried about cars cutting through without physical barriers.</p>
<p>I disagree with spending money on these measures. Dulwich Village is what it is. Thanks to the traffic management policies introduced since the pandemic access to and from my area is very poor. Making some super square is just some vanity project by the Council. If money is available to spend, spend it on measures that allow residents to access their homes, including by car.</p>
<p>A great improvement overall, but some problems:</p> <p>The Dulwich Village southbound cycle route still has a terrible pinch point just south of the junction. Cyclists are stopped at the lights and then pull away with the traffic. They then have the pinch point at the bus stop where cyclists have to pull out into the traffic, or slight further south where parked cars again push cyclists into the traffic trying to get past. Dulwich Village northbound has a protected cycle lane up to the junction, but the real problem today is the pinch point as you continue north over the junction where it goes to one lane at the traffic lights by the school. The removal of the metal railings would help, but this really should have had a separate cycle lane put in as with the southbound lane to prevent these dangerous close passes. Moving the whole junction slightly to the east would allow space for this, taking away a little space from the square/flower beds on the east side of the pedestrian crossing.</p>
<p>The graphic makes the streets seem much wider than they actually are. Given the restricted nature of the space, it might be an idea either to add a yellow box junction to the cycle lanes or a chicane, in order to make cyclists more aware of pedestrians, and to give way to them.</p>
<p>The cycle facilities on Court Lane and Calton Ave are excellent, but Dulwich Village (main road) and Turney Road aren't up to par. A chain is only as strong as its weakest link - please upgrade Turney with modal filters and consider fully protected cycle lanes for Dulwich Village instead of car parking.</p>

It's not clear to me how the proposed layout would prevent cyclist collisions at the 3-way intersection of Calton Avenue and Court Lane. It seems like cyclists coming down Court Lane towards Calton Ave would have limited visibility of cyclists coming through the village junction and could be travelling at speed from the downhill section to join the junction
I like the new scheme. Please can we also do more to limit car use in the local area?
It is unclear what the impact will be on local businesses
Would also like to see a speed camera installed to catch speeding motorists
I love this. I would love to see more segregated infrastructure getting to and from this junction as well to enable 100% protected trips for citizens.
I love the idea. Really makes a difference.
A bike lane on calton avenue going to Townley Road
Great improvement! - please can the crossing on DV be wider as this gets so busy with kids at peak times - consider small measures to reduce speed on the cycle lane in the bit as the occasional cyclist is a bit fast e.g. signs that entering pedestrian area; subtle lines of cobble stones every 2 metres (as in Liverpool Grove in Camberwell) - as much greenery as possible please! SUDS? - be brilliant to have a cycle lane up Calton too!
The build quality will be key to whether the space is attractive. The design has the potential to enhance the area.
It seems harsh to businesses which are wonderful to have in the village so I'd keep parking free for out of towners/visitors which relates to this permanent change you're making because traffic is reduced. It's good - but hard for businesses and locals want the businesses to thrive and not be collateral damage for this lower pollution cause (which I agree with).
Completely different feel from previously in a positive way and have noticed a lot more families cycling as well as cyclists in general. I feel more confident cycling with my son. Ideally the street parking around the shops before the junction would be normal side parking rather than reversing into the road as I have observed this is dangerous for cyclists.
Don't believe enough is being done to prevent unauthorised vehicles from using the pedestrianised area on Calton Ave as a short cut
Love having a safer more enjoyable alternative to the snarling traffic that occupied this junction before. Would be so much nicer for us with a young family to feel our kids can move to and from school more safely and enjoy the community space together
In order to preserve the Dulwich integrity, good quality street furnishings that have been professionally designed are critical to how the area will look. The current street furniture is cheap and looks like a school project. It is not fitting of Dulwich and its heritage.
Am very much in favour of any measure which creates better social space and/or reduces traffic (particularly 4x4s.....)
Poor pedestrian visibility crossing Calton Ave. Needed: a raised continuous footway (which will slow cyclists) to indicate pedestrian priority. Crossing Court Lane: raised, continuous to indicate pedestrian priority and slow cyclists.
Loading bay will force vehicles three point turns in pedestrian/cyclist zone: danger. Use for sustainable delivery and put loading bay for vehicles on Gilkes Crescent. Raised continuous crossing for Gilkes Crescent to protect pedestrians, indicate pedestrian priority.
Cycle parking should not intrude on pedestrian space.
Northbound yellow hatching on Dulwich Village to remain to keep pedestrian crossing clear. Fencing around the pavement outside the school to remain.
Loading bay on Dulwich Village front of shops to discourage delivery vehicles parking across entrance/exit to Calton Ave.
Surface materials to give strong visual indication of public space, not a road so that motor vehicles do not drive in.
There is still a significant risk that drivers will drive into the square especially from Dulwich Village. This could be addressed by a collapsable bollard.
Put more barriers to stop cars going through
Deterrence is rarely enough. Drivers will go anywhere they can
The changes are good, but there could be more greenery.
Need to make sure the cycle/motorcycle lane deters dangerous driving which will otherwise lead to a vulnerable person's death
I think it could be clearer that motorists cannot use the road. I am unclear if there was is a proposal to allow buses access. If this is the proposal I would be concerned if it includes school buses as they would be using the road at exactly the time children are crossing
I am not convinced that the gateway features will deter drivers from entering the junction.

I'm really in favour of making Dulwich Village more cycle and pedestrian friendly
As many trees as possible please and stop cutting down mature trees or pollarding when there are nesting birds
This cannot be a one-off and the other surrounding areas and roads need to have interventions too, in order to have a more organic strategy for the area.
Looks Much nicer than now
1 Don't like fixed seats as these could interfere with flexibility of space eg for Maypole dancing or jazz band or Christmas carols or yoga class... 2 VERY disappointed that On foot is excluded as one of the means of travelling around Dulwich. Lip service is paid to pedestrians on health and environmental grounds but quasi ignored in terms of serious planning considerations - too few pedestrian crossings, lumpy pavements where trees are built up, etc etc and yet think of all the CHILDREN and elderly disabled; non drivers like me, trying to get around safely
I think the layout at the moment is pretty good. It's great that vehicles are prohibited and it is reserved for bikes and pedestrians. Although more trees are always welcome I don't think the layout needs changing
Cyclists can come through very fast
Changes are generally positive
I'd prefer if the junction reopened to traffic and then calming measures were put in around it.
Please ensure good cycle parking for larger family e-bikes bikes (higher points for locking up against)
There are still too many cars travelling through Dulwich Village. It is still a "rat run" for vehicles leaving the South Circular heading for Central London. It would be better to have more restrictions on traffic moving through Dulwich Village than is already in place.
I
The Square is brilliant and will be a great improvement. I would prefer the design that has been proposed by Friends of Dulwich Square. Care needs to be taken in choosing the cycle slowing measures. I am not in favour of the rumble strips. I would prefer not to have seating and planting along the northern kerb of the cycle path between Calton Ave and Dulwich Village. Leaving it open enhances the openness of the Square and particularly the vista of the Burial Ground from the main pedestrian part of the Square. I would prefer to see the DV zebra moved a bit North (to where it is currently) and have a rain garden along the DV edge of the Square between the zebra and the entrance to the cycle path. This prevents cyclists taking a short cut and thus allows the cycle path to be raised to the pedestrian level (with demarkation and differentiated surface) and this then clearly marks this cycle path as alien to motorised vehicles.
This looks much better and will help avoid confusion for cars which may not know about the road closure.
The proposal looks very encouraging! The only thing I'd suggest would be more planting on what looks to be a large paved area in front of the shops on Calton Avenue.
The proposed 'gateways' on Calton Ave and Court Lane are a good idea, to try to reduce the number of drivers entering the junction. Please consider adding a collapsible bollard or other markings to really ensure drivers know it isn't a road on the turning from Dulwich Village. Planting needs adding on the pavement between the road signs and burial ground to make the width less than a car to prevent driving over the pavement to avoid ANPR cameras.
Too much like a road still - please discourage fast cycling and welcome people.

Comments for 5 (completely)

Great design with space for community events . Would have liked a couple of outdoor chess tables especially to encourage children from local schools to play and enjoy.
I think you will require better signs indicating the motor vehicles cannot enter the junction.
Excellent improvement
I fully support the closure of Calton Ave and Court Road but recognise its not perfect and is confusing for pedestrians cyclists and some drivers who are not familiar with the area. I think these improvements would be extremely helpful for all, and the designs look lovely too

These changes need to be “permanent” and look distinctive and different from the surrounding (tarmac) road surfaces. It is important that this gets quickly accepted by the whole community.
This will creat more space for pedestrians while reducing the risk to less confident cyclists.
Any measure to reduce car use in the are is good
Looks good
A clear separation between the pavement area and ambulance road is essential
I love the proposals. They look great. The space it creates for local pedestrians, particularly those on the school run, is a real improvement.
I assume bike speed calming is achieved through the texture of the bricks? The planting would need to be low enough so that cyclists can see oncoming bikes at all points through the space. Without marking the two way nature of the cycle track, there may be greater incidence of cyclists cutting corners, hence the importance of being able to see ahead (no blind bends).
Looks unreal. Incredible improvement.
Looks fantastic - really positive development. Can't wait to get this all into practice
i use a bike to go up Calton Avenue to Sainsburys at Dog Kennel Hill. I love the traffic free environment on this road. The public space created in your plan is a good use to everyone. it is so pleasant having it traffic free.
The plans look great. What a lovely square for the community. If there is not a gardener regularly funded to maintain the square, look into drought resistant shrubs instead of flowers. Shrubs still flower and have a scent and will attract pollinators.
Consider a glass rain / sun shelter for people in wheelchairs (body temperature falls very fast) can be in shade beneath an evergreen tree. We will see high heat and flash floods, so SUDs are essential as well as trees that can withstand drought - olive trees are hardy - probably best to consult with the RHS?
Rumble pads? Cyclists may look left and right across the main road and rush across. Double red lines? 5 mph speed marking / 'Slow Children Playing'?
I know 'push down posts' are expensive as they can only be used once - is it worth finding out if this design fault has been resolved as it would stop the cars/ prevent mistakes.
The design is great. Look forward to it being created.
Please make sure that the traffic lights are in sync. It is tricky for pedestrians and cyclist at the moment.
It looks fantastic. What a massively positive change this traffic filter has been.
Trees planted should be large when mature (not little cherries), to provide shade.
please don't make the opening to the cycle/emergency access too wide otherwise rogue vehicles will continue to use this opening.
This is a positive move towards improving the local streetscape
Rising bollards that can be operated by any emergency vehicle would prevent drivers accessing the square. I'm concerned that the plan will not make the junction safe.
I am concerned that the gateway features denoting the cycleway will not be sufficiently obvious to drivers. The signage above is essentially the same, but less prominent, than the status quo. Could cycle marks be painted on the tarmac at the mouth of the cycleway, or could the cycleway use blue-coloured tarmac or brick?
A wonderful improvement on what was a desperately dangerous set of junctions for pedestrians and cyclists.
This looks like a sensible and safe way to separate traffic, bikes and pedestrians
I think this is an excellent compromise of competing needs and views on the Dulwich Square space.
Really great to see the road surface changing at entry to the square.
Do you really needs pedestrian signals to cross the cycle track?
I love the trees, the wider crosswalk by the school and the additional space for pedestrians. It looks very inviting.
Looks much better than before the changes
can the cycle track be less wide and more space for pedestrians? Can there be shady seating at the bottom of the court lane end?
Can we have some kid-friendly play options built into the pedestrian space
Looks very nice
Please ensure the planting is maintained going forward

<p>These plans completely ignore the fact that by closing this junction to motorised traffic you add to the pollution on other roads by redirecting traffic on to East Dulwich Grove and Lordship Lane. Motorists are now forced to spend more time and petrol to get to their destinations and are greatly increasing the pollution on these roads. There are often long traffic jams and both roads have schools very close to the road i.e James Allen Girls' School, and Charter School in East Dulwich Grove and an infants school in Lordship Lane.</p>
<p>This is a good plan which creates large, green area for all resident. It is well planned and increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists.</p>
<p>This is a great scheme and will significantly enhance the area in terms of pedestrians using footpaths, families travelling to and from schools and people enjoying Dulwich Village in terms of the park and shops.</p>
<p>Great that the junction has been adjusted for emergency vehicles</p>
<p>Ensure there is adequate seating/benches</p>
<p>Love it.</p>
<p>Love this space, looks great. Improved greenery will be a massive bonus.</p>
<p>There might be a case for even more seating. Will the cafes be allowed to provide seating for thier customers? (continental style) - that woud be amazing.</p>
<p>The new space is excellent.</p>
<p>I thinks its a great initiative. Reclaiming our spaces for walking and cycling.</p>
<p>love the large public space</p>
<p>This area has improved such a lot since the changes were made to this junction. This next phase I think will make it prettier and more welcoming. I particularly like the introduction of more trees. SO important for shade, cooling, wildlife and of course carbon capture, as well as making the area look prettier</p>
<p>Great to have as much car free space as possible, and great to have play-friendly areas</p>
<p>The temporary arrangements in place have transformed the area and made the centre of Dulwich a much more attractive place to visit. I now use nearby businesses much more frequently as well as visiting for other reasons eg to volunteer at the local Parkrun.</p>
<p>Much better designated spaces for pedestrians and bike use, for example. More attractive than current, temporary feel.</p>
<p>I very much like the revised proposal Wonderful idea to add some more trees and like the fact that disabled parking has been added near the community place to make it really inclusive.</p>
<p>Additional trees very good feature. Meeting areas bring the community together.</p>
<p>Please have child-friendly play options in the pedestrian space</p>
<p>These look like fantastic plans. The LTN's have been a huge positive benefit to the area, not only for people who live in or close to them, but also for people who travel to Dulwich Village for leisure. Thes plans improve them further</p>
<p>Need to ensure no cars can access the area or park up temporarily, alongside. Is a common problem. Needs cameras that will issue a ticket when this happens.</p>
<p>The echelon parking outside the parade of shops is really dangerous. Replace with fewer parallel spaces and turn the space over to a wider pavement</p>
<p>It would be better if the echeleon parking in the village could be removed - this can create some dangerous situations as people cycle past and cars are reversing back blindly.</p>
<p>Great to make the most of this lovely public space and reduce illegal driving</p>
<p>Well done, could be pretied up a bit, maybe some shelter for adverse weather.</p>
<p>Very good proposal. I am very supportive. But the garish, temporary seating furniture that is in that space at the moment must go as quickjy as possible. The place needs attractive, heritage style seating furniture in subdued colours.</p>
<p>I really like the look of the new Dulwich Square. I cycle home from school this way, and it looks great!!!</p>
<p>I like to play with my friends after school in Dulwich Square so I'm happy to see there is still space to do this. It's a good place to get a doughnut or cake as a treat and sit outside.</p>
<p>The current design is much better than t What was previously in-place, but these proposals make that even better.</p>
<p>It's great to see you're trying to 'design-out' the problem of drivers dangerously entering Dulwich Square with the new gateways on Court Lane & Calton Ave.</p>
<p>I love the look of Dulwich Square, so many great public realm improvements!</p>
<p>In changing junctions, consider enforcement measures (cameras, officers), even if temporarily so that inconsiderate behaviours - cars using cycle advance areas, cars ignoring single turn lanes, running red lights - are minimised. The pedestrian area in the village is very welcome.</p>

Implementation needed
Looks great
I would like to see some low level barrier between some of the seating area and the cycling area as some cyclists go very fast through the square and children need to see some kind of barrier so they know the play space is separate to the cycling space and not to cross into it
Here at last following rigorous consultation is a plan that supports our safe and living streets. The flagrant abuse of previous trial schemes by car drivers will stop and my daughter and I can cycle safely without fear and hence building confidence in a human scale
Little kids are now used to play in that area, which is lovely. Sometimes though they run after each other not realising they are crossing a road where bikes go fast on it (and unfortunately sometimes moped too). It would be great if in the implementation of the area with benches and flowerbeds it was made much prettier much impossible for little kids to run into the bike lanes.
Thank you for all your work on this! The space to park the bikes at school times in the morning is almost at full capacity, the scheme as implemented so far has already transformed the area for the better!
A good set of improvements, which will make the junction much more pleasant and safe for pedestrians and cyclists.
You need to make sure cars don't think they can turn into Calton Avenue - this picture looks as if drivers think they can go through again
When cycling northbound from Dulwich Village and turning right into Calton Avenue I think there should be a marked turning box for waiting cyclists.
I think this is brilliant - it aligns really well with Southwark's stated objective - and has been carefully thought through to balance the needs of all demographics.
The plans look good, presenting a more unified and elegant space, looking more finished than the current environment. It will mark a very welcome transition into a great asset for the community, away from the former hazardous area choked by traffic and daily road rage on display from drivers rat running up Calton Avenue.
Really positive scheme that would make a big difference to the area. These sorts of schemes are needed more widely like on Half Moon Lane outside Judith Kerr school to deal with the growing menace of bad driver behaviour.
The area has already become far more popular for people to gather on foot/cycle with the initial changes, I'd hope for even more such improvements with these additions
This looks great!
I love it, it's so good to see wider pavements and proper separation for cyclists, and separate phases of the traffic lights for cyclists. Shortening crossings as well is great.
Fantastic design that would transform junction, in my view.
I'd personally go for more substantial change in the streetscape but I'm completely supportive of these plans going ahead rather than being watered down any further.
More space for people and less space for cars please
Love it!!! Just one comment - it would be good to have a collapsible bollard here to stop cars from DV turning into the square. This has been an ongoing problem and needs to be fixed. Great to see wide cycle lane but need to prevent cars from turning in.
Looks brilliant!
I really like it.
Great, keep the road closure in place.
Really support this. The area has become much more community oriented since it was closed to traffic - let's continue the good work and make it even better for people who live here.
I like the trees and they are good for wildlife. It will look much nicer and be safer to walk and play in there. A lot of kids and families come here after school and go in the shops, get snacks and play, and this will give them space. It will help people on bikes to so they know where to go.
Great improvements for safety and amenity.
Fully applaud the measures, especially opening up the space as a public amenity.
I think this looks more organised and boundaried. There are clear designated spaces for seating, shade and for cyclist. I had a terrible bike accident 6 months ago because the lanes are not clear and a person jumped out of nowhere on the street while I was coming down on my bike. I now and seeing a neurologist and have regular migranes since this happened. I would hate to think if it was a child this happened to!
It seems a great idea to make the traffic reduction at this junction permanent. However the proposals permanently seal a large area - it would be great to see more free-draining planted area in this proposal

I'd like to see more cycle parking at every entrance to the square than currently reflected within this design. I love the mature trees and also the green restrictors along court and calton. Please can the council ensure that materials and final designs continue to send the visual message that this is a place for cyclists and pedestrians.
Really great to have this space for the community. I travel through on foot or bicycle daily and it feels safe and social.
the area has already been improved with the seating areas and closure to most traffic at the end of Calton Avenue and this will further improve the public space for walkers, cyclists and provide seating areas for socialising.
Segregated bike lane is really positive.
Safer to cycle here with my young son on my bike.
I strongly support the proposed works to Calton Avenue. It is important that the public space is properly protected by hard infrastructure. The proposed trees and seating are appropriate for the neighbourhood.
The expansion and relocation of the pedestrian crossing is important. At morning and afternoon school peaks, it is very busy due to large school crowds.
I am a pensioner who regularly picks up and drops off grandchildren from the school. The proposals are needed not only to improve safety in the area but also to encourage social interaction (particularly in good weather) and to promote mental health.
Excellent!
Cyclists must be made to slow down and use any dedicated lanes, this should also apply to scooters.
Looks great! There is a lot of paved area on the corner in front of the hairdressers - could there be more greenery here? Also, we have had a lot of rain and will have even more - I would like to see more SUDS in every design
This is a beautiful design which would do a huge amount to increase the live-ability of the area. I look forward to enjoying many happy hours sitting in the squares with books and/or friends!

Streets for Journeys - Dulwich Village / Calton Ave

To what extent do you think the measures at the Dulwich Village/Calton Avenue junction achieve the 'Streets for Journeys' objective? - how much does this achieve the objective

Comments for 1 (not at all)

You are squeezing the road unnecessarily - I am a cyclist and a car driver - this is unnecessary
It is putting cyclists over other forms of transportation such as public transport. Not everyone can cycle also need to put cameras up to each cyclist and scooters running through red lights and over zebras crossings it is dangerous and is a matter of time before someone gets killed
Waste of public money. It also looks like you are getting rid of parking space on Turney road to widen the pavement on the other side. That seems like another sneaky thing to do and will lead to less parking available for customers and residents as well as teachers and parents dropping kids. You are getting rid of about five parking spaces to make room for pavement but this will have a negative impact on the community
How are you proposing to reduce northbound traffic through the village? There is no detail of your plan here? Since closing the junction three years ago the traffic at peak times (outside of camera restrictions) and every weekend is dreadful. Idling cars funnelled onto one road made worse by the cycle lane at the red post hill junction. I cycle commute daily and find the cycle lane unnecessary and restrictive for car traffic. Will you be removing this as part of your plan? Evidence and details please, not an ambiguous multiple choice question!
Current signage for road use change is very unclear, be it for school roads, LTNs or cycle and pedestrian space. Signs need to be large - the traditional no entry signs, with small exceptions underneath so it is very clear for all. Currently it is too confusing and appears to be a cynical way of raising revenue, London wide, not just within Southwark.
Marginal areas don't represent the whole infrastructure that gets badly affected when you unnecessarily broaden pedestrians walkways / introduce cyclist lanes on already narrow roads . Better to create awareness courses on using / utilising pedestrian walkways . Yes better lighting / better clarity on marked areas is good so that drivers can see such from a distance . What is required urgently is speed camera along Turney , Burbage , Dulwich Village roads as people definitely speed through.
You are just making this a place where all vehicle types clash.... and pedestrians will be most at risk from cyclists moving too fast.
Not at all. Cars are forced to make longer journeys to access East Dulwich, and there's barely any cyclists using Carlton Road.
Has made congestion on surrounding roads terrible and congestion along Lordship lane is terrible.
Closing this road without any consultation during Covid was insanely unjust and the amount you are spending on this junction is disgusting. Just stop and think what else you could do with that money you bunch of closed minded, incompetent people who don't represent the people in the area - the amount of pollution you have now pushed past Harris Primary on Lorldship Lane as you have essentially given all the rich Dulwich village residents private roads. As apparently their voices will be heard more than the masses who have to suffer increased congestion and pollution on other roads. I'm sure this is also just to try and ensure when the government tries to unwind this closure it's more difficult. Deceptive as always.
Again - the closure could still be open to cars with a cycle lane . No need for a closure. If there must be times for no vehicles it should be term time only - Monday to Friday- only at drop Off and pick up times
How do you think congestion will be reduced if you take away roadspace?
In order to minimise pollution, I think the junction should not be a permanent closure, but only closed at certain school times, like other streets in Dulwich. That would allow shorter journeys at off-peak time and lessen pollution and congestion and grid lock in the main roads (eg. South Circular).
Keeping the current blockade on Carlton Avenue will not "improve traffic movement along this corridor" and I'm not sure how adding more benches and trees will. You can open the road back open to cars and have a single flow motorist lane coming from Carlton Avenue on to Dulwich Village road with a counterflow bike lane which would allow you to keep the increased curb size for seating and keep better walking routes for pedestrians but would also provide a safe route for cyclists and cars to reduce traffic in the village. Please consider this proposal as I believe it works for everyone...
doesnt make any difference to bike or car journeys. streets for journeys would be possible if carlton avenue was open to cars
These so called 'improvements' cause traffic congestion on the roads leading to Dulwich Village. This causes delays for cars and buses. These delays means vehicles have to spend longer on the roads and journeys take longer. The longer time spent on these roads concentrate any pollution caused to roads that have many schools on them. This totally contradicts the reason given for restricting traffic in order to protect children from pollution.

It has been catastrophic for local business and has caused traffic to be diverted to already congested roads such as the South Circular, East Dulwich Grove and Croxted Road, with the result that pollution levels have noticeably increased and it is a misery getting anywhere both by car and by bike and walking, because of the deterioration in air quality. Carbon emissions and particulates have probably gone up too because a) drivers have to drive further and b) cars emit more per mile at low speeds.
Traffic is already congested going through the Village - this will make it worse.
As above stated it is a vanity project for a few people slowing the entire rest of the area down to virtual standstill
Totally unnecessary. I cycle and have never found this junction difficult. As a pedestrian it is perfectly possible to cross safely. This is a waste of money and public sector resource at a time of great need in other areas (eg school buildings).
The pollution and traffic congestion caused by that road closure leading to displacement of traffic is a threat to health. It has made travel in Dulwich terrible, travel to surrounding areas terrible and caused serious health hazards as a direct result.
The village end of Court Lane is not cleaned of leaves and debris and dangerous for cyclists
Your mocked up photo of Dulwich Village is entirely bogus. Assuming this is a pleasant summer day, there would be a queue of stationary cars stretching from the Dulwich Picture Gallery to the North Dulwich/East Dulwich Grove junction. The wonderful P4 Bus would also be jammed in the traffic
They will just transfer even more traffic on to Burbage Road and Half Moon Lane.
They do not do anything to stop cyclists speeding and ignoring red lights which is a big problem for me as a pedestrian.
How would the residents of Calton and Woodward like it if we made the Burbage/Turney junction a play and seat area? This project hugely favours one section of Dulwich at the expense of the other half. It is unfair and inequitable.
It is not a community project but more a make the house prices in Calton and Woodward higher as they have no pollution when Burbage has camera hours and very high increases in traffic level and pollution levels at peak hours. How can this be fair and this project sold to us as benefitting the community when other areas are bearing the impact of the redirected traffic. It only benefits a very small section of the community and should never have been allowed to proceed in isolation.
You have divided a previous Village community with the closure of Court Lane and Carlton Avenue. The displacement of traffic from these roads has impacted disastrously, East Dulwich Grove, Lordship Lane, Dulwich Common, Croxted Road are now nose to tail with cars, what about the emissions for the poor people who live on those roads
1. No provision for residents of Calton Avenue, Court Lane and all the roads off these who may be unable to walk or cycle to access the Village easily. 2. Think money could be far better spent on other areas in the borough with worse pollution and no local, easily accessible parks and open green spaces.
How are you reducing north bound congestion at Dulwich Village by Red Post Hill?
These measures just make traffic worse by displacing it to Lordship lane etc
The village is unique in that it has a large number of schools with many school children passing through - it's just a fact that at certain times of day roads will be busy - during school holidays the village traffic is perfect
It has benefited the very few whilst penalising the majority of residents
The Village is more congested than ever with cars idling by the school. The small cycle lane at the Red Post Hill/ East Dulwich Grove junction prevents cars wanting to go north as many cars are turning right. Removing the small cycle lane would alleviate the traffic backing up to Turney Road and fewer idling cars by both schools in the Village. The cycle lane could be repositioned in the green space adjacent to the existing cycle lane as there is plenty of room for it and pedestrians. This would prevent the bottle neck currently happening.
It causes more displacement of traffic and traffic fumes.
PLEASE !!!!! STOP MESSING AROUND WITH THIS AREA
LEAVE THIS AREA ALONE
YOU HAVE MESSED IT UP ENOUGH
It will make no substantive difference to the existing measures which are already opposed by the majority of local residents
We do not want Southwark council to stop local people getting on with their lives. Please stop these endless schemes and consultations. Leave the roads as they are. No more taxpayer money on changes to roads, more signs. Leave us alone!
As per comments in 7
The plan fails to provide convenient access for the frail, elderly and those with disabilities who are dependent on cars for their mobility.
Static traffic build up is so huge on village way, this idyllic image will never happen. This was wholly rejected by the community years ago and you still plough on regardless. Local schoolchildren's health is being adversely affected.
Traveling through the area has become more difficult, even on a bike - some streets are in a standstill most of the day
Access for some inequitable

The results of the Phase 2 public consultation appear to have been ignored - the key objectives the majority of local people supported were not the councils but for the Council to reduce displaced traffic, provide access for key workers, and provide equality of access for disabled people.
The right turn into Turney Road from the north can be very misleading and cars see the 'cycle' divide as a road divide and therefore think that they just have to keep left of it - and head straight into the cars coming out of Turney Road.
The community rejected this 24/7 closure in the original consultation, and the wider area will continue to suffer, not benefit, from it. Traffic is still being displaced on to surrounding roads where families live and where children walk and cycle to school.
this plan completely divides Dulwich village by stopping traffic from Turney rd to calton avenue. Previous consultation results have been against this and seem to be ignored. It sends vehicles onto other roads to pollute them Handicapped people blue badge holders banned from using this space-why. Expensive vanity project
See my comments above, leading to more pollution as cars have to take longer journeys.
the space should be reopened to improve traffic flow through the south london area
If restricted blue badge holders should have access
It is fine if you walk or cycle but terrible if you are disabled or a key worker who can't afford to take the long way around and be stuck in traffic for a long time. Based on the picture above you are also going to have cars and mopeds going through this junction - chancing their luck.
I thought Southwark has no money and is in massive debt so why are you wasting all this money on this fantasy junction? Photos of the traffic chaos in Croxted Road and East Dulwich Grove and Townley Road should be put next to these graphics.
Vulnerable and disabled people are still not able to drive through the junction in the new plans. This is illegal .
IT IS THE WORST IDEA YOU SOUTHWARK COUNCIL HAVE EVER HAD
IT IS AN EMBARRASSMENT
DO NOT MAKE ANY CHANGES TO THESE ROADS
Stronger measures and design features should clearly demonstrate cycle and pedestrian only routes and spaces.
I suspect that the cyclist only signal phase will only lengthen delays at the lights on the crossroads, increasing pollution in the village. Personally, I feel less safe on the road now as cyclists and electric scooter riders sometimes come very quickly (and practically silently) down Calton avenue and Court Lane, making hazardous to step off the kerb.
Journeys are severely negatively impacted by the closure to traffic of this intersection. I do use my bicycle as often as possible but there are evenings, especially in the winter, where at age ■ it is not feasible to do so. If I want to get to East Dulwich I go by bus or car and it can take 30 minutes or more to do so because of displaced traffic, especially on Croxted Road and East Dulwich Grove.
Cyclists are going dangerously fast and the flowerbeds and benches give the impression that it is a pedestrianised area.
It will make pollution and congestion worse on East Dulwich Grove and Red Post Hill
Traffic is more congested in surrounding streets as it is pushed out of the expensive Dulwich Village area. Village is already congested with unpleasant street furniture and signs. Cyclists do not observe traffic lights I care for a non-mobile elderly relative who lives in Dulwich and must drive to visit them/take them to appointments. Queues in neighbouring roads are longer, pollution increased as cars are forced out of the area and must travel further to avoid.
Cyclists are not following rules and causing serious issues for pedestrians and cars
only benefit certain streets
The community rejected the 24/7 closure of this junction in the original consultation and wider area continues to suffer, not benefit from, the proposals.
The Carlton Av/DV junction used to be excellent for all journeys - I cycle and I drive. Now it is closed to cars and so it is of zero use to drivers - causing massively increased congestion and pollution on neighboring roads and increasing my journey times and the traffic on my road immensely. Spending more money messing around with this terrible design is madness. It needs to be restored to a fully functioning road for all vehicles.
Blockage of main routes and junctions delays and lengthens necessary journeys. Walking and cycling for short journeys, say <1 hour, should be encouraged as socially responsible in those who are fit and able to do so, not imposed by authoritarian restrictions imposed irrespective of peoples ability to do so. Bus journeys are fine, but only two routes that are useful serve the Dulwich Village area.

<p>You are forcing traffic to go straight on at the junction pictured whilst also acknowledging that a lot of cycles will be turning right - to go up Carlton to get to school. Looks dangerous and congested to me.</p>
<p>Your computer generated image - is embarrassing. Public Policy is supposed to plan for the 'bad' 'complex' moments - not fictional hyper control.</p>
<p>When it is your child, parent, friend - who dies because an Ambulance or Fire Truck is stuck in the traffic caused by road closures (exemplified by DULWICH) then which of your PUBLIC POLICY staff is going to step up and take responsibility.</p>
<p>Isolated streets - isolated communities and pollution pushing to really vulnerable areas of London is what these very poorly designed policies achieve.</p>
<p>Your objectives are not balanced - or objective.</p>
<p>Spend money in repairing roads . Clear manholes to avoid flooding of roads. Reopen closed roads under pretext of LTN and remove APR cameras that you installed to enforce them and you use as cash cows to justify your positions and salaries.</p>
<p>Calton Ave has been closed to traffic for a couple of years and it's clear to me that it has only caused shifting of traffic, and hence major congestion, to the surrounding roads. Limiting traffic through Dulwich Village has made East Dulwich Grove a nightmare, and very dangerous for pedestrians and bicycles.</p>
<p>Your decision of closing Calton Ave was completely arbitrary and unfair as it only benefits (allegedly) the people living in those surrounding roads as traffic is calmer for them. But for us who need to drop off small children to schools, this also means more stress and finding ways around these restrictions which doesn't really help. Roads should be open to everyone. If you want to encourage active travel, add cycle paths, do not close roads!</p>
<p>Displacement traffic onto East Dulwich Grove - see my previous comment.</p>
<p>A major problem for Court Lane residents who need to use cars for work or have a disability</p>
<p>Makes travel to the Village extremely difficult for the elderly and less abled</p>
<p>They push traffic onto particular displacement roads which become congested whilst others have no traffic on them which is unfair to those on the roads that have all the traffic</p> <p>The congested displacement roads are on main bus routes so bus journeys are slow (I have had to abandon bus journeys for this reason)</p> <p>They cause longer journeys which increases pollution</p> <p>They prejudice the elderly and disabled who have no choice but use cars to get around</p> <p>Many cyclists are inconsiderate to pedestrians and appear to feel they have licence to speed through junctions and crossings without regard for pedestrians</p>
<p>Traffic is being displaced there roads such as Lordship Kane which have worrying levels of pollution.</p>
<p>Vast sums of money have been wasted on previous schemes and the proposals do very little to improve overall air quality in and around Dulwich Village.</p>
<p>The community rejected this 24/7 closure in the original consultation, and that the wider area will continue to suffer, not benefit, from it.</p>
<p>The "artists impression" is completely fake. There should be a queue of cars in all directions along Dulwich Village</p>
<p>Reopen the Calton Avenue and make the road two lanes again at the traffic lights by North Dulwich</p>
<p>The system serves only a small privileged section of the community.</p>
<p>There should be restricted access at certain times during school start and finish hours (like Townley Road) Outside that there should not be restrictions.</p>
<p>The present system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discriminates against the elderly and the disabled Privileges cyclists (I am a cyclist) Restricts the liberty of people living in the area Increases car emissions and car journeys by causing traffic jams Displaces the traffic to other areas Creates an unsafe space, particularly at night The area has become ugly and benches look ramshackle Other than that it is a great system! Not sure who is actually benefiting form the system other than a small number of people
<p>It should also be noted that at night the area has become a very quiet and feels unsafe to walk there. My car was vandalised close to the junction on Court Lane. Without it being so quiet and dark I don't think the vandalism would have happened.</p>

You have made travelling by car impossible with all the road closures in the village adding significant time to all my journeys in the car to hospital appointments and the shops
Can't see any improvement, unless disabled people and carers, ambulance, etc can drive up Court Lane. It's so bad that you are only interested in cyclists who are "king of the road". They don't consider pedestrians and other road users at all. They ride on the pavements, they skip red lights. They are making the whole of Dulwich much more dangerous for pedestrians. From what I can see on the picture pedestrians crossing will have to wait for two green lights or even three while cyclists will happily ignore the red lights as is their wont.
This is not needed, there was no problem with this junction at all. There is also now more housing on the site of the old garage so i don't see what benefit this brings to an already very leafy and sociable community. These efforts should be spent in other communities which lack the greens spaces and local shops - we already have all the things you are trying to achieve.
Just stop wasting money on these endless 'consultations', reopen the roads so that you stop favouring the most expensive streets and wealthiest residents of the borough, and reduce the terrible congestion which has resulted from the LTN
It is going to make things worse if you limit the traffic at the red post hill junction. This is now congested because you have removed access to a road, so there is of course massive funnelling of traffic causing the whole of dulwich village main road to have cars trailing back to pizza express.
I can only assume your ultimate aim is to shut the whole village down? get rid of the all the small shops and cafes? Not sure if you are aware but the british high street is in a dreadful predicament - massive increases in cost of sales, rent, utilities - if you stop people from getting into the village, it will all shut down? I suspect you do not actually care, but us, who live and work in the village, do!
This design makes it significantly more dangerous for pedestrians as it does take any steps to prevent the current dangerous and uncontrolled cyclist behaviour.
A little stroll into the Village will show you that the new "Dulwich Square" is hardly ever used as dreamt by remote councillors. It is usually a dead space. Everything in life is a compromise. We must have moving traffic as well as moving people.
Currently bike right of way - green cycle at bottom of Court lane coincides with green man for pedestrians - lots of near misses as both in the right
See previous comments. This is an enormous waste of money which should be spent on creating segregated cycle lanes around Dulwich and installing more electric car chargers.
Cut Dulwich Village in half. Sending traffic with all the extra pollution in large circle - wasting time - negative economic benefit.
travel to hospital by ambulance recently terrifyingly long - no access through village traffic jams pollution pouring from unmoving cars unreliable bus arrival and journey times dulwich traders struggling to survive dulwich effectively shut to visitors hugely lengthened travel times in and out of dulwich divisive miserable needs a major rethink and honest reflection from southwark
It makes my daily commute to work as a resident on calton avrnr a nightmare. Cyclist are as already Seperate from motorists at the junction. Stop wasting taxpayers money
The changes are making my daily commute a nightmare. I have to use my EV car and the changes force me to queue in traffic 20-30 minutes daily. One of my offices also is on a school street and I am able to have a permit via the parking app ringo to allow me to use the street. This is what should be allowed for residents that live on the affected streets.
Now that the Calton Avenue/Dulwich Village junction is closed parents drive their children to school and drop them off in Gilkes Crescent. The then back out into Calton Avenue which is dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians. The children don't walk any more because they are driven to school in cargo bikes!
The roads should be re-opened
Cyclists don't seem to use traffic lights particular to them at present. Why will they change their behaviour at this junction moving forward
It may give a nicer cycle experience for the privileged few but for the rest of us (the majority) it makes things much worse. I do not want it closed.
The measures that have been introduced already in Dulwich Village have made journeys, particularly for the elderly, less able and disabled more difficult, leading to missed medical appointments and also greater isolation. Data shows most cyclists are male and under 44 years of age. Journeys are for everyone.

The changes to this junction alongside the timed entry from south of the Village has resulted in more traffic on other roads particularly East Dulwich Grove, South Croxted Road, Lordship Lane.
The village is losing its soul and a division between residents has been created, unnecessarily.
If we want places for children to play we have a wonderful park less than half a mile away!
See above. The objective has not been met at all.
how do I get from herne hill to dulwich libray easily in car with elderly resident?
Continue to push all traffic into surrounding areas damaging these and crearing traffic and pollution outside of schools.
Continue to completely disregard voice of community and push ahead with plans for an area that the community will not use.
It's still busy with cars trying to drop their children to school. Sometimes, car do dangerous u-turn to avoid getting caught by the LTN cameras.
Have you measured the traffic and pollution from displaced traffic on roads such as Croxted Road, Herne Hill, Half moon lane, Lordship lane, East Dulwich Grove , and our section of The south circular . The traffic has condensed on these roads.
Cyclists routinely ignore all traffic lights, junctions and road markings. There is no enforcement of rules. Cyclists routinely ride illegally on the pavements in this area. You have done nothing about this and your plan will encourage further misbehaviour.
As previously another silly proposal from.sthe Streets for People team. You seem to exist solely to promote your own existence at cost to taxpayers.
Your proposals disadvantage those with disabilities and older people at the expense of the young and git.
The road has become harder to cross as some cyclists using the junction cycle quite quickly. I am really not sure what the point of making any further changes which won't make thins materially better. Money should be invested in the area wisely. Why not spend the money on extra teachers for Southwark schools.
One of the stated objectives is to improve journeys for those that have to use cars but the closure of these roads has led to a build up of traffic elsewhere (e.g., Lordship Lane, the South Circular, East Dulwich Grove etc.). As a household, we rarely use our car but when we do journey time has increased massively, but walking, public transport is not an option for the places we need to go when using the car. Cyclists are the biggest problem at this junction.
You have 'encouraged lower speeds' with your 20mph speed limit; have you made 24 hour weekday survey to see if it works? You have blocked through-vehicular traffic on Court Lane; has it stopped cyclists & scooterists using sidewalks thereon, often at speed?
Are your sidewalks & street crossings not already safe for pedestrians to walk; if not, why not? Do all pedestrians find it 'easy to walk'? If so, why were Disability Badges introduced?
Do all cyclists and scooterists adhere to the 20mph speed limit; are they all able to stop within safe distance of crossing pedestrians eg Eynella Road to Dulwich Park (Court Lane)?
Do you think yet more expensive traffic measures will resolve the issues?
I recently saw three young people approx age 7 playing hide and seek on the roadway in Court Lane; I discouraged them, explaining risk from passing traffic.Do you think public including parental education, has a part to play in pedestrian and cycling road safety?
as above, LTN's are a farce and are criminal, they have been brought in without consultation. And just to let you know I do cycle to work every day.
This arrangement does not accommodate car users, who need access to journeys by car.
Streets for journeys must include cars, too. There are other ways of cutting the amount of motor traffic and the amount of its pollution other than this ridiculous blanket ban at the Village/Carlton Avenue junction. Timed passage and the very sensible introduction of electric cars as soon as possible, nationwide. What is happening here is desperation with a tight window ... why? The only people who benefit are the road builders, who are asked again and again to re-dig the flower holders, move the curbs, and re-paint the signs, while the council fine motorists, especially those not so aware of these flip-flops as we locals are. A brazen two-faced use of fines (eye-watering in their total amounts) to line the pockets of said road works. Their will be an accounting, one day!
I have referred above to the difficulties faced by residents in Woodwarde Road, Calton Avenue and Woodwarde Road in gaining motorised access to the Village when they need it, for example to carry loads to destinations in the Village - Christ's Chapel, Picture Gallery etc.
As mentioned in the Phase 1 consultation, these do not meet the objectives because the majority of people living and working in Dulwich rejected the closure of the junction. 64% wanted it scrapped. In the Phase 2 consultation the main comments from the public was that they did not support the Council's objectives and, instead, wanted the Council to reduce displaced traffic, provide access for key workers and provide equality of access for disabled people. None of these measures has been addressed.
As above...rubbish idea!ll just make traffic congestion even worse..
Cyclists ignore lights, cycle on pavements etc, and this is just plain dangerous

Roads are for Cars bicycles and other vehicles
Pavements are for People
The Cost of all this is incredible
It wasn't broken it just needed a slight change to reduce traffic flow at peak hours
Southwark is KILLING the life in Dulwich Village
You divert traffic to other streets thus causing traffic chaos and pollution
Congested since you have closed calton Avenue - you should reopen it
Why displace pollution, creating congestion and 'pollution zones' elsewhere, and why spend an excessive amount of money changing the existing infrastructure? I don't understand why cars shouldn't use this junction? What about Ambulances? Is it sensible to block all vehicles? I am not convinced. I use this junction every day and I still don't understand why it's closed. Bikes are extremely dangerous to pedestrians!
See response to Q7.
If you truly want to make it a safe pedestrian area then shut the road off - don't leave it open with a camera to catch out motorists with signage that isn't clear. You disgust me
The closure of this junction was rejected by the community in your original consultation
No one locally wanted the first phase. No one listened to locals.
As above. Traffic speed can be controlled without having to eliminate cars completely. And the needs of those who are totally dependent on cars are being ignored in this so called consultation.
Again, the changes have affected Dulwich in the worst way possible. Traffic is not reduced and only displaced. It has not improved pollution for Dulwich, it may have improved pollution for a certain section but most certainly now for all. This is completely unjust and after taking time to fill out previous forms it's a shame that the council are doubling down on not caring how bad LTN's a failing and are discriminatory. Our voices seem to mean nothing and pollution is rife now More than ever on my road. This needs to be reviewed and a better solution needs to be proposed.
I'm not sure what the point of this so-called consultation is since you've steadfastly ignored any comments or objections in previous consultations and gone ahead with your pre-decided measures. The majority of respondents did NOT want this junction closed, but you closed it anyway, since you're in thrall to the cycling lobby and concerns for disabled people, local shops and displaced traffic obviously did not come into consideration. I suspect you're about to do the same with the so-called consultation on the proposed Controlled Parking Zone in Dulwich Village. It may look as if you're ticking all the right boxes regarding consultations, but those of us who have tried to engage with you in the past have come to realise it's a waste of time. Still, one more attempt can't hurt...
just stop
The community that lives and works in this area have rejected all the proposals from the start so if this is for the community it fails completely. Instead of "safer, easier and convenient to walk": Cycle only routes mean fast getaway route for muggers and drug deliverers. We already have a problem with these preying on young people in the area. Vigilante style parent groups have had to be set up to protect local kids because the council is making the area easier to access by lawless individuals intent on preying on the community and harder for the police and ambulance services to do their jobs. Local outdoor seating areas soon become areas where local people fear to walk as drug addicts and dealers alike use them as their waiting rooms. Residents feel insecure at night. This was explained to councillor's at the recent Herne Hill meeting.
It has made cycling to work more dangerous because it has dispersed traffic. Car traffic is so much worse in the surrounding areas and therefore terrifying to cycle. I was cycling much more before and now feel safer in the car which has the opposite effect
Reopen all streets to traffic
majority of residents are against these changes. People should be able to move freely in cars
I do not agree that this will help traffic flow. With the current restrictions it is now difficult to get to Herne Hill from East Dulwich .
I have repeatedly set out my objections to this work in all your previous consultations, and I believe you have ignored my and my communities objections throughout
You are reminded that our community rejected the closure of the junction in the first, original consultation
The amendments already in place have reduced the journeys to shops and other services, and made life impossible for many of us. Please reverse what you have done already, and do not add further barriers to normal life in the Village.
Cyclists ignore red lights, speed limits and other traffic calming measures. This is socially unacceptable, potentially dangerous and should be made unlawful.
Clearly achieves the exact opposite.

See comment before.
You have consistently not listened to the feedback from your local community on this junction and ignored the results of your own earlier consultations. By Councillor Rose's own admission your alterations have produced "unintended consequences" to the area especially in Burbage which is supposed to be a residential road. You have failed to provide fair and equitable traffic management in the area.
Disagree strongly
There is no understanding of the need for central islands for residents and children at the cross roads.they must not be taken away. The aim to speed up cars is v dangerous. You never consider the way cars race away onto East Dulwich Grove, where thousands of school children walk and scoot. There are frequent accidents, no 20 mph signs.
The Council continues to ignore the impact of traffic restrictions on businesses and people living on boundary roads, as well as the difficulties that disabled and other vulnerable residents are forced to endure. The first consultation for the LTNs completely ignored the vast majority wish of the local population which wholeheartedly rejected the proposals including the closure of the junction. The LTNs have not achieved any of the goals - we are suffering from displaced traffic, delayed buses, reduced public travel options, closed businesses and increased pollution outside schools on boundary roads. The profoundly undemocratic imposition of the LTNs against the views of the vast majority of residents is disgraceful. The waste of public funds on these expensive measures against the wishes of the residents is obscene and unnecessary.
You've already done all that you can, this won;t add anything except more expenditure. Cyclists completely ignore their signals at the moment and will continue to do so.
The closing off of so many routes has seen more queues and idling through Dulwich Village.
Cyclists often ignore their own traffic signals and crossing the junction is not stress free for any pedestrians especially the elderly,infirm or parents trying to keep their children safe.
Northbound congestion has been augmented rather than reduced
As in box 7
This scheme is wholly counterproductive and has been rejected in consultations. It adversely affects all users of the area and should be scrapped immediately
Now you want to remove car access from this junction. It's unbelievable, your lack of local use.
As a cyclist I appreciate the separation but my experience here is the waits are so long that pedestrians, cyclists and even cars & vans jump the lights.
As a cyclist I think the junction is dangerous and to be fair it was much better when the traffic was allowed through it Your living in an idealised world where whole families cycle everywhere. This doesn't happen in every day life. Families cycle together at weekends but not in the week where time pressure and weather often limit families ability to do the school run or shopping etc by bike
There are far too many yellow lines - my concern is for the shopkeepers. If streets are supposed to be for people, this should include car drivers who wish to park to visit the local shops.
Pushes traffic onto surrounding bus routes causing jams
Too many yellow lines.
See above. Also, the constant stream of bicycles through the "seating area" is very dangerous - there is no obvious control on their speed.
the proposed changes here do not meet the objective Making healthy and sustainable travel the safest, easiest, quickest and most convenient choice unless you are young and fit enough to walk or cycle in all weathers, and to avoid cyclists who jump lights or ride on pavements
Walking does not seem easier - if anything more dangerous with poorly controlled cycles moving about (see my previous comment). Efforts to improve congestion seem only to push the congestion to other (not particularly better) locations.

<p>This objective has been missed by a mile. The measures offer none of the characteristics specified in your objective. Safety - when it was a road junction, pedestrians knew exactly what to expect. Whatever you say, the measures are essentially a mixed mode set up as cyclists tend not to obey rules. Pedestrians don't know what to expect & are vulnerable. Easiest, quickest & most convenient - they make travel around Dulwich more difficult because in the absence of public transport, across the area, motorists have to follow circuitous routes, congested as a result of closing the junction, alongside multiple schools. How is any of that healthier, quicker, easier or more convenient. Stop insisting that black is white when it patently is not.</p>
<p>Traffic is displaced to the road outside the school, JAGS and Judith Kerr. Traffic and pollution are awful.</p>
<p>This is a tiny development that will not create any community benefit or transform the street corner into an Italian piazza, which seems to be the intent, and it is pathetic thinking that it might. Cyclists will continue to be a serious hazard for pedestrians as they ignore lights, go on pavements and are basically a law to themselves. Using "quality paving materials " is just a waste of money and fulfils no objective.</p>
<p>This objective has been missed by a mile. The measures offer none of the characteristics specified in your objective. Safety ? - when it was a road junction, pedestrians and road users knew exactly what to expect. Whatever you say, the current & proposed measures are essentially a mixed mode set up as cyclists tend not to obey rules. Pedestrians don't know what to expect & are vulnerable, especially to fast moving eBikes (what & where are the cycle nigh calming measures?). Easiest, quickest & most convenient ? - they make travel around Dulwich much more difficult because in the absence of serious public transpor across the area, motorists have to follow circuitous routes, congested as a result of closing the junction, alongside multiple schools. How is any of that healthier, quicker, easier or more convenient than before. Stop insisting that black is white when it patently is not.</p>
<p>Currently there's a huge build up of cars and emissions in Dulwich Village, which is not being addressed by your plans.</p>
<p>A much better/preferred option is to allow access by cars to Court Lane, but not to Calton Avenue. This would allay all our objections. Open up again the turning into and out of Court Lane into Dulwich Village.</p>
<p>They are an unnecessary waste of public funds.</p>
<p>Children should feel safe to walk alone from school but if local muggings and crime continue it doesn't achieve the purpose.</p>
<p>On the occasions when I need to use a car, I cannot make my journey in the most efficient, low polluting way.</p>
<p>If I need to use a taxi service eg Uber/Bolt, the drivers often refuse to take the job as access is too complicated and wastes their fuel/time. In addition they don't want to risk potential fines through the 'school access gates.' A driver who did take the job explained that he was local so knew the details of the restrictions but confirmed that colleagues avoided jobs in Dulwich.</p>
<p>Please also see below re East Dulwich Grove in case of emergency closure. I believe it is essential for community safety that the Dulwich Village / Calton Avenue junction should not be permanently closed to road vehicles.</p>
<p>Traffic displacement onto other roads is inequitable</p>
<p>See comments above</p>
<p>Return the junction to its pre Covid layout and remove traffic restrictions.</p>
<p>The Council has still not taken on board the clear majority of respondents to the original consultation who said that they did not want any of these measures</p>
<p>Any further road changes will not make car traffic easier at all. I worry that these changes will make it harder for emergency vehicles and buses to get through. Stop spending money on the same roads. The focus needs to be on other roads that need help- reduce speeding on Barry Road (through average speed cameras and 20 signs on posts) and reduce congestion on Lordship Lane and East Dulwich Grove. Reopen Court Lane.</p>
<p>The junction closure was rejected by the community in the original consultation.</p>
<p>All these measures increase journey times. I used to be able to get to Dulwich Village in approx. 5 mins, this journey now takes approx. 15-20 mins or longer because I am restricted to using main roads. The route I have to take passes at least 5 schools. I now have to endure increased times. I have to use my car more than ever before. There are more traffic jams with vehicles having to spend more time on roads you can use. Vehicles spending longer on roads increases pollution on those roads.</p>
<p>This makes no sense at all and totally contradicts the objectives of improving the environment and increasing air quality.</p>
<p>I do not believe the Streets for Journey's is being achieved at all. Cyclists are zooming down at an alarming speed (knowing that there will be no cars) and I personally had almost been knocked over. Also most cyclists do not observe the traffic lights anyway.</p>
<p>Considerably disadvantage elderly and those with disability or their carers</p>

<p>Most cyclists using this junction would be against the measures proposed, you are forcing them to slow down and be even more observant of pedestrians who might be lulled into a false sense of security around the junction. Why is there this notion that every body wants to travel at the same speed as the slowest road user?</p>
<p>With the exception of slowing cyclists coming down Calton Avenue, I don't see that the changes will actually meet the objective.</p>
<p>I am really astonished to see that Southwark have nothing better to do with their time an money than make an already privileged part of London even more privileged. Spend the money on people that need it. White privilege - totally unbelievable.</p>
<p>The character of Dulwich Village is being ruined. Shops are struggling to survive. To walk in Dulwich Village is stressful during "Rush hours" the traffic is appalling and the quality of the air very poor. I would never choose to sit outside a shop to eat in such conditions . Dulwich has many quiet green spaces and parks. It's fatuous to suggest that this area is needed or of benefit.</p>
<p>Cyclist remain a danger to pedestrians. They should be forced to get off their bikes before entering this area. Sooner or later a little kiddie or older, less mobile person will be knocked over in this area. There are no pedestrian crossings in this area either at the Court Lane junction or at the bottom of Carlton Avenue. Cyclists are still likely to approach and enter this junction at speed from the Carlton end. There are no signs reminding cyclists and electric scooter users that pedestrians have the right of way or speed restriction signs for these road users.</p>
<p>Against the overwhelming objections of local residents, the junction of Court Lane and Calton Ave, the CORRECT name, was closed during the pandemic. This has caused years of traffic chaos in Dulwich. Diverted traffic has led to roads choked with congestion with bus and emergency services being severely disrupted. Journeys are certainly NOT SAFE EASY OR QUICK. The Village junction is a dangerous cycling free for all with bikes on pavements, jumping traffic lights and terrorising child and adult pedestrians. The traffic lights favour cyclists and the elderly and infirm avoid the area. The shops are suffering loss of business and two old established shops have gone out of business due to the lack of footfall. The junction needs to be opened!</p>
<p>Cannot see the need for further changes, the bikes have sufficient safety and their own light phasing already. The pavements are sufficient for pedestrians. With other existing changes, Turney Road is an important artery for cars and if congestion is result of changes the air quality will be worse.</p>
<p>Look at the width of the roads, this is supposed to be a flagship scheme and the roads are still 14m wide at points, for two lanes of traffic. That is not supporting pedestrians. There is no crossing on the desire line at the bottom of court lane, the whole scheme seems to miss the massive potential for complete redesign and pushes pedestrians to the bottom of the pile. It also deprioritises cyclists by adding filters that prioritise cars and motor vehicles at the other sections of junctions.</p>
<p>the cycling fraternity hold no regard for pedestrians - there are many instances where there are near misses with cyclists careering like maniacs on pavements and the cafe extends its tables so the pedestrians have to step into the road - its dangerous.</p>
<p>Good for certain residents, say those who cycle, and difficult for others, particularly those who commute by car and have to endure heavy traffic as a result of road closures and changes in Dulwich Village.</p>
<p>Cyclists travel down Calton Avenue and Court Lane at speed . The junction does nothing to slow them down and they ignore the traffic signals and are aggressive with any pedestrians who dare to get in their way.</p>
<p>The junction has also become a dumping ground for rented bicycles and scooters which are a hazard for people with impaired vision or mobility issues</p>
<p>The new double yellow lines are a terrible idea. This will severely restrict the ability to park and use the facilities in Dulwich Village. A big problem both for users and shopkeepers/coffee shops etc.</p>
<p>It is slower to cycle than to use open roads to drive</p>
<p>again see previous answer, I will never cycle in London as a main point of transport. happy to do it on occasion when the sun is shining and I have nothing better to do. don't waste your money</p>
<p>See earlier answer. It is hardly safe! You take your life in your hands crossing as a pedestrian, particularly with a buggy, as cyclists hurtle through in packs, often ignoring restrictions. The area doesn't look attractive: it looks cheap. The painted planters were fine as part of an installation in the Gallery grounds, but I wasn't expecting to live on a Playschool set. Those with buggies or mobility scooters can't use the pavements for furniture. Through your personal mission you have literally divided rather than brought the community together. A village should not be divided. What's more you have pushed road traffic into other people's areas. So I do not feel that you have achieved your Streets for Communities objective at all.</p>
<p>In addition the restrictions to cars beyond the planter barrier between Court Lane and Calton Avenue means that fewer residents use the road at that point so pedestrians are more vulnerable to crime especially at night.</p>
<p>The emphasis is on 'Streets For journeys' BUT ONLY if you are travelling North to South. But DO NOT ENTER THIS EXCLUSIVE VILLAGE IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO TRAVEL LOCALLY FROM SOUTH TO NORTH, EAST TO WEST OR WEST TO EAST. YOU ARE NOT INVITED. That's seems to be the clear objective by the council.</p>

Bikes are part of the fabric of our city, but not a solution. This has been a junction for 1000 years. It needs to continue to be accessible to the many, not just the few.
Parking needs to be restored to save the shopping centre
As noted in Q7, the design is defective by closing CA/CL to motor traffic; it is failing your statutory Network Management Duty (TMA2004). making journeys longer and more congestion and pollution in DV as well as in East Dulwich Grove, South Circular and Lordship Lane. The gains for pedestrians, cycles are minimal and could have been accommodated with reopening the junction. If the junction is still notionally open to emergency vehicles, then the roadway layout is poor. If it is not, that is against the public interest. This needs rethink. Even just for cyclists it is poorly laid out. The first picture of DV itself shows a complete failure to treat the area holistically. Instead there is a vast open space dominated by light-controlled traffic. The opportunity could have been taken to convert the junction to pedestrian-friendly roundabouts and no traffic lights. and maybe extend the pedestrian area to connect better across the road.
It causes increased congestion on other roads and increases journey times for those who cant walk or cycle.
Unhelpful and displaces traffic unfairly.
You claim to be making sustainable travel the most convenient choice - then adding in extra lanes for driving! What a complete and utter joke. Likewise the claim that "quality paving materials" will slow driving. While you still cover the streets with lines and signs, that you could easily remove by signing the areas around Carlton Avenue with pedestrian zone signs that include a no waiting restriction. There is no info about whether you will change the signal timings for cycling, which currently require people cycling to always stop when going through the junction. Cycling will not be more convenient for driving unless that's changed. This scheme fundamentally fails to design for a third less motor traffic, despite being an aim of Streets for People.
The measures have lead to more congestion on the surrounding roads and caused longer journeys particularly for the old and disabled who can't walk
I refer to my comments in 7. The junction, when it was open to all traffic, worked well and these proposals are a solution in search of a problem, and much the poorer for it. The lack of signage for emergency vehicles and the failure to open the junction to those who cannot walk or cycle simply underlines my point that the Council has only contempt for the Dulwich community and for those requiring urgent medical and social care and those groups to whom it has a duty under the Equality Act 2010. It is hard to imagine a Council more devoid of basic human compassion than Southwark, nor one more addicted to the wasting of taxpayers money on vanity projects.
It's rubbish, and the Council knows full well that a majority of us in the area did not want it. It has created a shambles for buses and traffic in neighbouring roads. OPEN THE JUNCTION!
Start listening to the views of the community. The council cannot continue to ignore our views.
All you've done for the past few years is force more and more traffic away from expensive affluent roads and onto poorer less affluent roads. It's a flagrant and shocking instance of class warfare. I personally benefit from your regressive actions because the value of my house (on leafy, affluent [REDACTED]) goes up whilst the relative value of houses on less affluent roads declines. [REDACTED]
The impact of these street closures on the wider community are horrendous. Please do not go ahead with these further measures. They are not wanted and not needed!
Traffic is now stationary in long jams much of the time. As a pedestrian I have had many close encounters with bikes going through red lights or on pavements. The negative impact is huge.
I cycle, drive and walk in Dulwich Village. None of these measures help me. It is confusing and dangerous.
I disagree with the plans for this junction and hate the knock on impact on flows and access in the surrounding area
Removing the traffic islands will not make it safer for pedestrians to cross the road. Cyclists will continue to run through red lights, a major hazard and perceived hazard for pedestrians. New traffic light phasing will increase congestion and further motivate pedestrians and cyclists to pass red lights, creating hazard, in order to avoid delay to their journeys. Slowing traffic down increases air pollution. Many unaccompanied children and young people use these crossings. The proposed social space for adults older people and children to use is too small for the purpose. The street furniture of the cheese shop and cafe at the bottom of Calton Avenue interrupts the flow for pedestrians wishing to pass through on the pavement and there are no barriers to stop dogs balls and children from running in front of cyclists on Calton Avenue, at a great hazard to both

<p>Many elderly and disabled residents are scared to go through this junction or go anywhere near it because of malfunctioning traffic lights, the removal of refuges, and because of cyclists, e-bikes, e-scooter speeding towards the junction lights, jumping the lights, and riding on pavements. I was nearly knocked to the ground when a swarm of cyclists racing each other mounted the pavement and forced me and other pedestrians to jump out of their way.</p>
<p>The Council has a public duty to keep people safe on its streets and it is failing in its duty.</p>
<p>Please see previous comment, the design should accommodate all forms of transportation including cars</p>
<p>This was not what our community wanted</p>
<p>I have cycled through that junction for years. It was fine before.</p>
<p>Didnt want the junction closed in the first place. This is a waste of taxpayers money.</p>
<p>I see not enough bikes using these schemes or people using them to justify the inconvenience this causes to the local community. It's cut elderly off from being able to move around easily. It's cut families off. I travel around the whole of London in my daily travels and between Southwark & Lambeth. You've destroyed London greatness. London was a busy fast moving city. You've have done nothing but problems and divided a community. You've no real understanding of community of what made Dulwich so great.</p>
<p>Impossible to tell from these images, the main feature of which seems to be signs excluding cars. I have different objectives, I suspect, which is to let traffic flow normally and effectively at good speed as it used to do before the Council started interfering. This is all about controlling individuals and their life not maximising the scope for self-expression and enterprise. Deplorable.</p>
<p>There are no busses from east to west Dulwich. Those with disabilities unable to use bicycles are severely handicapped by the Dulwich village road closures.</p>
<p>This consultation has not explained any benefits for further additional spend in a time of Council shortfall. In this ongoing focus on this junction, Southwark now needs to put the cost of these measures in context and the justification to spend them on these interventions versus other demands across the Borough. The provision for cyclists is already optimised in Dulwich versus pedestrians and other road users. This needs to be rebalanced, these further changes are unwarranted.</p>
<p>Do you see a lot of people walking in those streets? No.</p>
<p>They are spookily lonely at times and frightening for vulnerable pedestrians, including those trying to get home from North Dulwich station. I no longer return that way when daylight is fading, preferring to get off the train at EastDulwich to get on the bus to the Plough.</p>
<p>Improving the lives of the privileged few whilst making the lives of everyone that lives the other side of Dulwich village miserable.</p>
<p>There are no plans for east/west bus routes which are needed to make Tha plan work.</p>
<p>In all original feedback/surveys the local community objected to the introduction of the LTN and the closure of this junction. Originally a temporary measure, the council has proceeded with establishing a permanent closure against the majority wishes of the local community - flying in the face of democracy.</p>
<p>There has been no engaging with local residents WHO ACTUALLY LIVE IN THE AREA! No one listened to our comments and suggestions.</p>
<p>Residents of the surrounding areas are all suffering from the inconvenience of these closures.</p>
<p>It is a very confusing junction for all concerned and blocks access to the area for carers and ambulances.</p>
<p>Journeys are longer because buses are slower due to the jams.</p>
<p>If anything, the junction (for it is still a working junction for cyclists) has become even more dangerous for pedestrians, as there is nothing to regulate cyclists, and they cycle at high speeds down Calton Avenue and through the junction, without any care for pedestrians. And I myself have nearly been knocked over on a couple of occasions.</p>
<p>It just moves traffic to other roads rather than reducing traffic. Invest in better public transport instead.</p>
<p>There are rarely cyclists in left lane at this junction whilst cars are unable to move ahead if some are turning right. It is causing the opposite effect by adding to standing traffic at the lights.</p>
<p>If the road is going to be closed it should be closed completely and become a park with pedestrian / cycle route through it. As a cyclist it is difficult to navigate the pedestrians and dangerous building site adjacent (who think they have full right of way).</p>
<p>I find living with cameras and no access signs everywhere unpleasant.</p>
<p>This whole junction would have been resolved by instructing the school buses not to drive through it, and by instructing the schools to take ownership of a problem they have created.</p>
<p>Living at [REDACTED] my journeys are longer, produce more pollution, and add to the misery of East Dulwich Grove.</p>
<p>The community rejected the closure of the junction in the original consultation, so what will ensure that this consultation is received and acted upon according to the local community's wishes?</p>

You will be causing more pollution and traffic like that what you have done to East Dulwich residents roads turned into a nightmare artic lorries and other over ten ton backing out into lordship lane. Police and ambulances along with the public taking more time to react to emergencies. Thousands of cars and lorries forced onto main roads.
comments as beforep
Reopen the road.
Would be interested to see the impact on road deaths as a result of these measures which appear to be designed to fix a problem that doesn't exist.
Streets are already safe for pedestrians. Ample places and lights to cross road safely at
The Council hasn't listened to the local community as it has ignored it's stated opinion as expressed in the results of previous consultations
I do not agree with the closure of this junction. I have said so at every meeting you held in the past before covid, at every consultation, and am appalled that you have consistently ignored local people's opposition to your scheme.
The number of times the lights, pedestrian refuges, pavements, verges and road surfaces in this area have been rebuilt is an absolute waste of public money. That is a scandal in itself when councils are allegedly so short of funds. But it is also a disgrace to spend so much on very minor road issues when major social problems like housing, poverty and crime abound in Southwark. Diverting traffic from this junction has piled traffic on to boundary roads which have had to endure added congestion and worse air pollution. The volume of heavy road movements to these roads has caused repeated water and gas pipe fractures which in turn have created further congestion and expense for residents and other public and private bodies. To create privileged oases of low traffic at the direct expense of other residents in the same borough is to create two categories of first- and second-class citizens. Divisive and immoral.
yes the junction worked fine before people starting closing roads and meddling.it just creates even more pollution and traffic jams than ever before.
What is your evidence that these proposals 'improve traffic movement'? The LTNs have resulted in more congestion on the roads that surround them.
You have already spent a lot of money on this junction, I don't know how you can justify spending more when school budgets are constantly being cut.
What is the point of regulations for cyclists? Anyone spending 15 minutes at the junction would see that the signage is completely irrelevant for them so why bother with anything new?
I objected to the closure of the junction initially because travel has predictably (of any sort except cycling, which I am too old to enjoy) made travel of any sort much more difficult. I have a right to a life too! The scheme favours those under 50.
This particular area gets very dark due to huge amount of trees, I have seen plenty of cycling accidents here when it is wet and covered in leaves, it will not look like the above as this is not correct at all and not taken into account the ancient trees in the area around here. Its a dark area.
I am afraid that there is no clear area for people to safely crss and it looks rather dangerous this set up.
Cyclist are the safety hazard now. It is also an awkward as a community space
I walk or travel by public transport as much as I possibly can, but the very few car journeys I have to make are now considerably longer than before, i e causing more pollution not less.
Not at all. If anything, it's ironically more perilous as a pedestrian. The bicycles and scooters whip round corners and exceeding the speeding limit. There's little or no indication they are approaching.
The proposal have a very negative impact on the community. It has negative impact on the service people. Because of the traffic manufactured by the LNT they can do fewer jobs per day as more time is wasted on unnecessary travel. That has financial impact on both customers (the prices of the services were increased in the LTN neighborhoods) and the serviceman (fewer jobs and prices increases don't fully cover lost income). It also have mental health impact on me. I work from home and drop children to school by car. My journey is each direction is about 15min longer because of the road closures. That's 1hour per day and i need to use the time otherwise spend with my family or sleep to catch up with work.
It may be healthy and sustainable as it was back in pre industrial times but if the objective is safest, easiest, quickest and most convenient choice thats a big fail. You have made most trips west and North 10-20 minutes longer in time and fuel consumption than they used to be by putting a road block right at a choke point for travel out of the enclave that you have created. This could have been done in a much better way as they do in communities like Chamonix in France and achieved all the other aims

<p>None of it is about choice.</p> <p>It has never, ever been difficult to walk in Dulwich village.</p> <p>It was never difficult to cycle although it is a bit less so since the roads were fiddled around with; now it is unnerving to navigate the junction and the tail-backed traffic along Dulwich Village where the Junction with East Dulwich Grove is constricted makes going along north Dulwich Village by bike feel less safe.</p> <p>I've never had a problem sharing the road with cars; now children and new cyclists cannot learn how to be safe on all roads, which could be to their detriment. They need Bikeability not sectioned-off lanes.</p>
<p>Again. Maybe for a few but not for many</p> <p>The original aim of this temporary closure was for COVID reasons then there became the LTN plan to protect pedestrians and cyclists travelling to and from schools The council ignored all consultation and permanently closed the junction. The roads that this traffic has been displaced to are either gridlocked and polluted or have become race tracks 24hrs a day. These are the very roads where thousands of pedestrians move through Dulwich to get to over seven schools. Make it a timed situation under the LTN in order to protect the school children.. The motor vehicle accidents on displaced roads (you never include the South Circular) are due to highly frustrated vehicle users not. I have lived here for over thirty years in various roads in Dulwich, it scares the life out of me every day watching the school run. I have personally witnessed seven accidents on EDGmany of those wont be in your statistics as Police weren't aware. It is a failed scheme and is destroying Dulwich area.</p>
<p>Cyclists ignore pedestrians, ignore traffic lights and ignore each other - they ride on pavements and are a danger</p> <p>Again, more traffic issues and congestion on Croxted Road due to this. It's currently unbearable. The council has failed us completely and this will be another nail in the coffin</p>
<p>I think my comments in the previous box express my feelings.</p>
<p>Southwark's road schemes seem designed to favour a small minority while treating those who rely on their cars punitively.</p>
<p>These schemes are displaying traffic and causing pollution around schools</p>
<p>The continued reorganisation and beautification does nothing to address the problem of the inconvenience of the present set up. I reckon I spent on average one hour a week in traffic because I can't exit Court Lane.</p>
<p>The assumption that this is possible is pie in the sky. People are not only travelling locally, but also making longer journeys to / from and through the area. The elderly or disabled simply don't have this choice. My view is that the junction has made life much more difficult for the vast majority of people and is driving increased pollution through slow traffic and increased car usage due to longer journeys.</p>
<p>Why have you ignored the results of your previous consultations which were against a 24/7 closure. No amount of fine tuning is going to change the majority opinion that this whole exercise is completely misguided and does not deliver on it objectives.</p>
<p>There is no improvement to northbound journeys (in fact, quite the opposite)</p> <p>Lower speeds through the village aren't the result of "traffic calming" - it's called tailbacks!</p> <p>This whole "consultation" is laughable. Time and time again concerns have been dismissed and those protesting mislabelled as selfish car users. Gross misrepresentation and no genuine community consultation.</p>
<p>See previous comments. The closure of the original road junction has caused traffic chaos and greatly increased pollution in other areas. Feels like the extremely affluent Dulwich Village has benefited whilst the other less well off areas have been damaged by increased traffic and pollution. Please stop spending money on this junction and spend elsewhere where the money is badly needed.</p>
<p>The disabled spot should not be behind the narrow part on Court Lane - this will cause accidents and endanger lives. Make the first parking spot on Dekker road disabled (20ft difference).</p> <p>If the disabled spot was kept on Court Lane, as the cars are doing now they would have to reverse 2-3 times to turn around through a Y turn or even worse reverse back all the way until Dekker road - this will be a chaos and will result in many accident as it is happening now (due to school drop-offs).</p>
<p>You can also make the 2 nearest parking space disabled on the Dulwich Village parking area - you really don't need to put any cars into the deadend zone! Same applies for Calton Avenue.</p>
<p>Apart from wider pedestrian crossings I do not see any benefits proposed for pedestrians.</p> <p>Similarly for cyclists the only proposal seems to be to change the light phasing. However I don't see any evidence presented that the light phasing is a problem.</p>

Your computer images bear no relationship to the present appearance of the Village. Cyclists frequently endanger pedestrians as they do not follow signals. Cars are being slowly removed from Dulwich which is obv what the council is intending but this makes life extremely difficult for elderly and those with disabilities
Cyclists do not obey traffic lights. They are a danger to pedestrians.
Journeys on boundary roads, whether by bus, car or bicycle will be made more difficult due to displaced traffic.

Comments for 2

My experience is that cyclists do not slow down and do not observe traffic signals. The new e bikes can go extremely fast and the lime bikes are often ridden by young inexperienced road users who go too fast and get too close to pedestrians including children and pets. Pedestrians still need to cross the road and this cycle thoroughfare makes it unfriendly to pedestrians
see above. Bad consequences outweigh the benefits
Slightly better for cyclists. Annoying for everyone else. I am mobility-impaired but not eligible for a blue badge.
As answer to Question 7
Cyclists have become become a problem for pedestrians, they speed through without regard for other road users.
1. Cyclists exiting Turney Rd seem presumed to be filtering left. Clarity is required that continuing from Turney to Calton is still a likely option for bikes, even if cars have no option but to turn left across them onto Village.
2. Traffic lights are needed on the Calton side of Village facing Turney so that the phasing is clear and drivers do not use the cyclists lights which are easier to see.
3. Traffic light phasing needs to be adjusted so cyclists crossing from Calton to Turney conflict with the pedestrian crossing phase at the top of Turney. There is no need to design-in conflict between cyclists and pedestrians
4. The traditional white Dulwich wooden signs seem not to be represented in images. They should be retained and represented in context.
5. Extension of yellow lines at the top of Turney will increase pressure on residents street parking.
They may help a little in the area directly affected, but will have an unwelcome knock on effect that will continue to conflict with your objectives in other areas; so far we have heard little or nothing about measures to assist those suffering from these knock on effects.
There is no advantage to closing Calton to Court Lane to cars. This only makes it more dangerous as cars have to do u-turns, and crowd up Dekker Road. Instead a one-way route from Calton to Court Lane should be considered.
It is not clear what protection is provided for cyclists proceeding north at the traffic lights. At present, there is a clear danger as there is too little room for cycle and cars.
The congestion along Dulwich Village northbound makes journeys by bus slower.
All these ill-conceived initiatives do is displace traffic to other areas , consequently causing more congestion and more emissions due to slow moving traffic. A more dynamic approach should be adopted. They cater for those who may be mobile but make it otherwise inaccessible..
It is difficult to believe that overall this will help "those who have to use their cars or public transport"
What traffic calming are you suggesting, it's not clear from the images and it really should be for cyclists. Also pedestrian crossings from end of court lane across to village not just lights, as cyclists seem to think they own the road all the time rather than allow pedestrian's to cross. Not to mention it's a school heavy area with most on foot. Safe is not a word i would use when i go across the carlton avenue road, so to me the objective is not met.
I would strongly object to any narrowing of the space available for cars and buses on key roads like East Dulwich Grove northbound and southbound, through intersections with Dulwich Village and Turney Road. That would result in more congestion - hence more pollution - as well as significantly increased travel times for school kids in the morning and afternoon.
Congestion in these intersections is clearly made worse by the 'improvements' in other parts of Dulwich Village, namely widespread road closures, but I'm sure you know that.
I can't see why this intersection would be particularly dangerous for pedestrians. During school drop-pff/ pick-up there are lollipop people present, and otherwise it's a non-issue.
You consistently ignore the needs of car drivers and appear oblivious to the reality that a certain amount of car journeys are required

<p>There is no clear route through for the rest of the journey to East Dulwich after Dulwich Village section and too few places to leave your bike safely in East Dulwich/Dulwich Village. If we all need more bikes or E bikes there is not safe storage/parking. E bikes are expensive to hire all the time.</p>
<p>I leave my house less now as a result of the restrictions and have to order most things to be delivered so use less local amenities and have much less local social contact which is unhealthy.</p>
<p>From the first image, I don't see a right turn cycle route into Calton Avenue (approaching from the roundabout end of the village) - I use this all the time as a cyclist. Will we have to cut across the traffic. This will be dangerous. Separate vehicle and cycle traffic lighting with wider cycle lanes will lead to further vehicle congestion.</p>
<p>I feel that speeding cyclists are a hazard for pedestrians and have noticed that a significant proportion feel that traffic signals do not apply to them</p>
<p>I don't see how these proposals are going to improve the flow of traffic coming north through Dulwich Village. I use the 201 bus in the mornings to get to Brixton. I am often waiting (despite using city mapper and other apps to monitor when the bus is due to arrive) - it's not clear if the buses are getting caught at the Dulwich Village / East Dulwich Grove junction and / or before coming through Dulwich Village on the South Circular.</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Generally, the proposal will make no difference to the Dulwich Village/Carlton Avenue intersection. 2. Offsetting the pedestrian crossing from the entry to the school on Dulwich Village is an improvement from the existing scenario, thus increasing the spill over area available for children and parents. This is currently a pinch point in the mornings and afternoons and children pick drop off and pick ups times. With the exception of this item, the proposal will generally make no difference to the Dulwich Village/Carlton Avenue intersection.
<p>This is only achieved for cyclists and not for anyone else. For those who can't cycle it makes journeys enormously more difficult.</p> <p>Cyclists make up only a very small proportion of the population and with an ageing population this is not ever going to change.</p>
<p>same reasons as 8</p>
<p>Living very close to this junction and passing by numerous times through the day. The most people I've seen sitting on these benches are 2 to 3 people I do not think it's working and I have witnessed numerous cyclist jumping the red lights. I've spoken to a few of them, and all I have received is abuse, can you imagine what would happen if I was to knock over a cyclist it would ruin my life</p>
<p>Please find a way to improve safety for pedestrians at Red Post Hill without adding more capacity for cars. Adding capacity for cars is incompatible with the council's Climate Emergency / Net Zero policies. Even electric cars aren't net zero compliant until the National Grid itself is.</p>
<p>The LTN combined with the proposed parking restrictions has not removed traffic but merely displaced it to other parts of the local area. To ensure actual removal of cars, public transport services in the area need to be improved. Dulwich and the surrounding areas do not meet the needs of all (for example there is not a supermarket within 15 minute walk of most of the village) necessitating the need of another form of transport and for many cycling is not an option. There are simply not enough public transport journeys on offer through the area.</p>
<p>If motor traffic via say Court Lane is prohibited the surrounding roads will take the traffic. If Southwark (and the Mayor) believe that TOTAL traffic flow will be reduced, (something they claim) they are deceiving us and themselves.</p>
<p>Not everyone can cycle. Also, cycling in Southwark, while safe around the junction, is very dangerous away from it. This works for people who live nearby and can walk or make small cycle journeys, not for those who live more than a mile away.</p>
<p>I regularly cycle Dulwich Village then turn RIGHT into Carlton Avenue and we need a more blended model. Many cyclists (not all) take the general traffic lane on approach when seeing a green signal in advance. Space for cyclists is needed for cyclists who do this. E.g consider a ASL box in addition to the cycle lane. Provide cross over areas over the segregated cycle lane, so cyclists who take the main road can cut into to cycle track. Added a "cycle logo" on the road so it clear where cycle wait is when turning RIGHT into Carlton Avenue.</p>
<p>Some cyclists will miss seeing the the long segregated cycle track as there are often many park cars in Dulwich Village that will obscure seeing it.</p>
<p>We ALSO MUST have drains on the corner of Dulwich Village / Turney Road. This gully is REGULARLY blocked with leaves causing very wide, deep and dangerous ponding. This design forces cyclists into an area that REGULARLY floods.</p>
<p>Cyclists continue to fly past and don't respect cars or pedestrians.</p>
<p>All the measures so far increase congestion</p>
<p>Unfortunately, the councils closure of the Carlton Ave junction has predictably split the village in half and created unnecessary longer journeys for many residents, thus increasing traffic volume and journey times. Tinkering with this junction may have some small benefits, but unfortunately the council closure of this junction and the timed traffic restrictions have resulted in increased traffic through the village and adjoining junctions at certain times. These changes will not demonstrably alter this.</p>

How does this scheme help journeys for the forgotten minorities with protected characteristics? You are well aware of the difficulties that have been caused to people like blue badge holders by not allowing access through the junction. This can be achieved in a safe way, but the Council has never explained why it won't adopt this.
See comment above about pedestrian safety and e-bikes etc.
It is marginally less difficult to work out what is theoretically meant to happen at the junction.
The proposal to widen the pavement at the DV end of Turney Road is completely unnecessary and a waste of money. It won't add any utility but it will take away 8 -10 parking spaces on the opposite side of the road. Several more car parking places will be eliminated between the DV junction and the Crown and Greyhound pub. The Council is aware of parking stress in Turney Road/Boxall Road etc which will be made worse, not better, by this proposal. It is extraordinary that the proposals fail completely to mention this and they are therefore disingenuous. The sole purpose of the proposed cycle lanes seems to be to narrow the road. They are unnecessary and, as a cyclist, I dislike separate lights for cyclists. Advance cycle boxes in front motor traffic are far better,
see previous comments as regards the importance of not reducing parking availability in the Village and the continuing need for fair traffic measures in Dulwich given the substantial increase in traffic in Burbage Rd following the Calton junction closure in 2020.
The junction is unnecessarily large at present and as planned. Why is Turney Rd entrance so wide when all traffic is low speed? I've seen smaller dual carriageway junctions. I don't see any improvements other than for cars. It's not encouraging to walk on or cross - reduce the crossing distances!
Way to dangerous, bikes are too fast
How are cyclists protected on Dulwich Village? Why are there still no cycle lanes on Dulwich Village?
This is not going to improve the bus service, damaged by the LTN.

Comments for 3 (partly)

I think signage on the road, making it more clear that vehicles are not allowed, would help here? the historical road could easily leave visitors with the impression that you can keep driving.
I think that encouraging people to use other forms of transport is a good idea but for some people, a car is necessary for their business. I am a personal trainer and have heavy equipment, too much to carry or cycle with. There are some journeys that just require a car and it shouldn't be so difficult.
These measures don't help people who have more equipment/tools than they can carry on a bike or walk with...again only helps part of the community not all of the community
I am unclear how this will help users of public transport in any way at all? There are currently very limited methods from getting from West Dulwich to North Dulwich using public transport which means that those with limited mobility (ageing population) one of the only options is the use of a motorised vehicle (whether a taxi / uber or own car / shared car). Limiting access to cars in the way described above would necessitate the vehicles being corralled in one road thereby increasing congestion.
It would be much safer for all if the entrance to our school, Dulwich Hamlet Junior School did not come directly out onto the main Village junction. This makes such a bottle neck for all concerned. I would like to see our school 'shifting' so that the main entrance moves onto Turney Road. This, however, would require significant infrastructure change at the Hamlet.
No
Supportive of separate cycleways if there is sufficient space to overtake. Otherwise encourages cyclists into the traffic making it less safe than the existing layout. There should be no attempt to reduce cyclists speeds, the Council should be ensuring that cyclists can cycle as fast as possible to ensure that journey times and ease of cycling is maximised to encourage more cycling.
I have concerns with the proposed crossing between the new public square and DVJS. In theory relocation away from the DVJS entrance could be positive as the existing layout creates a blockage at peak times. However, due to the set back entrance into DVJS there is currently a bigger area for waiting pedestrians. Recommend that the footpath is widened on the DVJS side of Dulwich Village, in place of the proposed wider public square opposite which is already sufficiently sized. As proposed I cannot support and would recommend that the current layout is retained.
Bike traffic lights must be phased. New approach whereby cars turn left with cyclist 'trapped' unseen on their in-side is very dangerous - a bad feature of bike lanes, especially if no lights.
Junction at northwards East Dulwich Grove/Red Post Hill now very bad - congestion - need to reopen the 2 car lanes and remove the uphill cycle lane - this bike lane is not popular with cyclists (too much dead vegetation etc) and is causing huge congestion.
See previous comment re cyclists.
It doesn't address the issue of traffic displacement which means other areas will see heavier traffic as a result. Haven't seen any meaningful objective data to back up LTN objectives.

<p>what evidence is there of cyclists using Court Lane . How amny journeys a day? which days/times. what evidence is ther of cyclists using Calton Avenue? which days/times?</p>
<p>Parents who can afford overpriced cargo bikes drive their children to school by bike. Alternatively, parents have to use public transport that are in permanent traffic standstill (due to road closure) or walk to school, which extend considerably their journey.</p>
<p>I use my bike to cycle a lot - and to be honest, this design for the junction is inviting pedestrians to walk in front of bikes and for someone to get hurt.</p>
<p>SAFETY must be top priority. The cycle path still looks/feels like a pedestrianised street. It's not clear who has priority if entering from court lane on a bike. Children get hit by bikes, bikes have to dodge pedestrians. There are 2 infant schools and 1 junior school very close to this. PLEASE MAKE THE CYCLE LANE very distinct. Perhaps even make cyclist dismount, or put more barriers. The zebra crossing further up Calton Avenue also needs calming measures. Cyclists travel far too fast and I've witnessed at least 2 accidents involving cyclists and children where there has been a collision on the zebra crossing.</p>
<p>Traffic has been displaced and new bottlenecks created. The traffic through the Village is much worse and often static increasing journey times and pollution. The cycle route through the junction is highly dangerous for pedestrians. Better demarcation between dedicated cycle lanes and predestrian areas is needed. Cars should be allowed through the junction outside school run times, though not vans/lorries/coaches. This would improve traffic flow through the village and reduce bottlenecks at red post hill and townley road junctions.</p>
<p>Not 100% sure that closing off this road improves the quality of air for those who live where the traffic has now been forced to go, especially past all the schools in the area that now have more traffic queueing by them and school entry and exit times</p>
<p>Protected cycle lanes in both directions at the junction would be better</p>
<p>An original plan to close Turney Road to vehicle traffic at the junction with Dulwich Village would have gone much further to protecting cyclists moving across the junction. It would also have produced a more pleasant public realm with seating and planting. The current cycle separation at the lights on Turney Road and the proposed separation on Dulwich Village do nothing to protect the cyclist riding into the junction which is where the danger is most prevalent.</p>
<p>Same comments as before</p>
<p>Your illustration is of Court Lane.</p> <p>It seems as if you don't really know where you are talking about.</p> <p>The view is much nicer. There is no protection for pedestrians crossing Court Lane.</p> <p>There is no 'Emergency vehicles only' sign.</p>
<p>See response to earlier question. The closure of the Dulwich Village / Calton Avenue junction was and remains inappropriate in my view. The inclusion of cycle lanes south and west of the junction seem logical, but given the speed of some cyclists may not make it safer, easier and convenient to walk, which seems to be your first objective</p>
<p>Your priorities appear to be confused. In order to comply with stated policy you need to put pedestrians first.</p> <p>The width of the cycle lane entry from Dulwich Village, at 5M, is unnecessarily wide inviting motor vehicle to enter. The entry widths from Calton Av and Court Ln are 4.0M. The delineated cycle-path should be a uniform 3.5-4M wide. The curvature of the cycle path should be a tighter 90 degree, 3M radius bends, to slow down cyclists through, what is, a popular pedestrianised area. (If necessary swept curves for emergency vehicles, wider than the demarcated cycle-path can be kept clear of street furniture and other obstructions.)</p> <p>The more direct pedestrian crossings are welcomed as is the removal of the kerbside railings. The crossings should be constructed as raised tables not dropped kerbs. The north crossing over DV should be kept in the same position to reduce the congestion around DVIS particularly at school times.</p>
<p>Cyclists at this junction in my experience totally ignore the special lights and go anyway. This makes it more dangerous for pedestrians than it was when cars were travelling as at least then bikes stopped at the lights. They also cycle on the pavements with their children despite the roads being closed.</p>
<p>Moved crossing, traffic calming measures are all good.</p>
<p>Redesigning the roads further long are not. Stick to the junction and stop changing the roads where no problems exist, just re surface the pavement and leave the parking bays, removal of bays will have an adverse impact even if you try again to force a CPZ through, it will still have an adverse impact</p>
<p>I am not clear how bikes will turn right into Calton Avenue from Dulwich Village (northbound) since they seem to be pushed over to the left hand side of the road.</p> <p>The lights at this junction are not co-ordinated. As soon as bikes have a green light at the end of Calton Avenue they encounter a red light at the entry to Turney Road or to Dulwich village. This is very confusing and most cyclists seem to ignore the second lights which endangers pedestrians. The lights need to be better synchronised.</p>

As per previous comments re safety
Residents work outside Dulwich. Can't expect cyclist to slow to walking pace Calton Ave Tree plans are safety hazard to pedestrians & cyclists a) leaf fall = slip hazard b) Poor lines of sight when emergency vehicles need access/ pedestrians step out- keep all planting low. c) By GC; Van/ Blue badge need turning circle - replace benches @ 1c with cycle bays; Narrow @ 1d to separate bikes and disabled/ loading bays. Allow clear turning circle by Gilkes crescent + fire brigade access to new development and shops
Turney Rd : 1. Disabled parking bays needed 2. Don't widen the pavements @268 Key cycle route promoting cycling over cars use for all local schools as less congested/safer now than Half Moon lane 3.Current configuration of cycle lane will be easier for people with disabilities/ children for whom light phasing is too short 4. Phase the lights to allow 2 cycle phases for 1 vehicle phases from Turney Rd
See previous comment. The local adjacent residents have made out like bandits and all this scheme doesn't re is highlight the haves and the have-nots!
It may be good for those who can walk or cycle but not for those over 60 and those with disabilities who cannot walk far and will be further inconvenienced. Traffic in the village has got worse, not better as a result of the 'Streets for journeys objective' Worse congestion, longer journey times and more pollution. Also more dangerous for walking as cyclists do not follow highway code or respect , particularly older residents.
There need to be humps to slow down cyclists. I welcome separate cyclists signal phase.
Tourney Road must be kept open to vehicles. Anything to make it safer for pedestrians would be welcome. Despite the changes to the Highway Code a majority of cyclists feel they have priority even through red lights!
The no entry signs for motorcycles and cars are insufficient. Some drivers will not know what they mean. Others will wilfully ignore them. Recently, I witnessed a car driver simply covering up his number plate with a cloth in order to drive past a camera. I believe you need physical barriers such as exist there now.
As a cyclist, there seems to be a vast sea of tarmac when crossing this junction. Could the protected cycle lane be made to run across the whole Turney Rd junction, with only a narrow gap for cars? Or simply ban turns down Turney Road for motor vehicles?
Failing that, some brightly coloured tarmac for cyclists would be helpful.
Open the roads back up. The pavements had more than enough capacity for the amount of people that use the space. The timings of the lights for cyclists and cars are terrible.
I would rather see safer streets for cycling extended before spending more money on improving what is already very good. For example cycling down East Dulwich Grove from the top of Townley is not safe. Parked cars, narrow spaces leading to lots of close passes.
schemes does nothing to reduce existing traffic volumes on dulwich village, 'reducing congestion' will likely mean more cars Again, disagree that this is closed to cars
But if this is cycling only (& emergency vehicle) then it improves the junction
Total waste of taxpayers money. There is no problem today in this area whereas there are enormous challenges across the Southwark area and wider society which need investment. Just because you claim extra funding for something doesn't mean it's the right thing to do
There are still drivers that ignore the signs and they go through the junction via Court lane. Motorcyclists and cars. Some of them avoid penalties by covering the plate numbers.
This objective is only being served by making driving to Dulwich Village an impossibility!
As above, eliminating car parking spaces (which is not referred to in the proposals): is not necessary to achieve this objective.
With no physical barriers for motor vehicles (including motorbikes), this design makes it too easy to drive straight through either intentionally or unintentionally. The signs are above the drivers' sightlines and should be lower. The road surface presents the driver with the impression of a continuous open road that they can use.
Would prefer more clearly demarcated bike routes/ lanes if possible as can get confusing as a new cyclist who bought a family cargo bike to reduce driving but still nervous on the London roads- that junction can be confusing still
Square doesn't look like a square, it needs more benches

<p>The idea is great in theory but is not practical. Two main reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As recently happened in Red Post Hill. When a vehicle breaks down in an error with concrete or other barriers e.g. for cycle lanes it restricts the movement of buses, people and vehicles. 2. Whilst this area is calmer the knock on impact to South East London and the full area between Honor Oak and Gipsy Hill, Crystal Palace to Peckham, all dependent on the South Circular cannot be justified to for the benefits to these two streets.
<p>Just make it safe. Less cars.</p>
<p>This plan appears to eliminate the cyclists' right turn markings (when travelling north along Dulwich Village) which would have allowed them to turn right into Calton Avenue.</p>
<p>get rid of the traffic lights. Not needed at all. This will change the space from being a traffic junction to just a local road junction with priority for pedestrians and cyclists. It gives far better behaviour change for road users.</p> <p>The Court lane entrance can be depaved on either side rather than have double yellow lines. More greenery as you enter the square.</p> <p>Turney Road needs to be narrowed to throttle cars access a bit. Continuous pavement with set-back stop lines for any vehicle.</p>
<p>A separate phase for cyclists at the junction is very welcome.</p> <p>Some kind of cyclist-calming paving at gateway openings is required.</p> <p>The width of the pedestrian crossing is welcome but the crossing is in entirely the wrong place and should be further north to align with the Calton pavement.</p>
<p>Streets feel deserted and less safe at night. Eventually this could lead to more break-ins and higher crime rates. What analysis has been done on the un-intended consequences.</p>
<p>Due to train and bus strikes, I am sometimes forced to drive my children to school through this area. Traffic restrictions through this area are frustrating and narrow-sighted. I will be further inconvenienced if proposed measures are taken because our basic public transport infrastructure is so awful.</p>
<p>The heavy traffic makes it slow and uncomfortable to use buses and bikes. Ideally there would be a way for buses to get ahead at junctions, otherwise you just sit in the same queue.</p>
<p>Currently cyclists do not always use the traffic lights to turn into Carlton Avenue - they cross Dulwich Village on on a diagonal before the traffic lights and mount the east pavement in front of the grave yard taking a short cut and avoiding the traffic light restrictions - there is nothing in the plan to prevent this continuing nor to prevent cyclists using the pavement on the east side of Dulwich Village which is regularly used by adults and older children who are not supervising or accompanying young cyclists so have no excuse and are a danger to all pedestrians particularly older people and those with disabilities.</p>
<p>The pedestrian crossing is in the wrong place: it prevents the square feeling like a quiet, safe, tranquil place and leaves it exposed and joined to a relatively busy road. The crossing (its greater width is welcome) should be broadly aligned to the pavement in front of the Calton Avenue shops.</p> <p>A grass verge (maybe with white posts?) clearly defining a boundary between the square and the road would be a big improvement.</p>
<p>This measure has actually achieved the opposite and increased northbound congestion on Dulwich Village, near junction with Red Post Hill. This has made traffic movement along DV worse.</p>
<p>Removing the staggered crossing at Turney Road is essential as pedestrians do not always know there is no green phase on the cycle lane.</p>
<p>Wider single crossings is a good idea. As is separating cyclists from other road users at junctions.</p>
<p>The retention of diagonal parking spaces outside the shopping parade on Dulwich Village is a concern as the cars often (a) protrude out onto the section of road used by cycles and (b) reverse out onto oncoming traffic with an increased risk to cyclists. Especially if the intention is for more cyclists. As a car driver it is difficult to see oncoming traffic and parallel bays would be safer.</p>
<p>The LTN times 8-9am and 3-4.30pm have already reduced motor traffic through Dulwich Village. No further restrictions should be placed on the consultation area that displaces even more traffic on to Croxted Road and Half Moon Lane where pollution has been much worse since the LTN. Improvements in facilities in the consultation area need to be self contained and not push traffic onto surrounding roads. Outside the very busy times that are inevitable in a great city where all users have to give and take, pedestrians, cyclists and motorists do not have to wait long to cross roads or continue their journeys. Most of the day and evening, Dulwich Village is perfectly manageable for all road and pavement users.</p>
<p>While I support the objective of improving the space in Dulwich village for pedestrians and cyclists, I am concerned about traffic displacement into Burbage Road (a residential road which bears the brunt of increased through traffic as a result of restrictions since 2020 on motor vehicles in Dulwich Village and traffic jams down Croxted Road). The ever rising traffic volumes in Burbage Road must be curbed as part of this scheme.</p>
<p>This is an improvement and I am glad it includes separate signalling for cyclists. I would also like to see a change in the road surface for cyclists to encourage them to reduce speed - especially going down Carlton Avenue into the square. A reduction in cyclists speed could also be achieved by providing chicanes on Carlton Avenue.</p>
<p>Cyclists need to slow down. More needs to be done to ensure this - particularly as kids are regularly using this area to get to school.</p>

Doesn't make any difference to your journey
The cycle way running alongside the graveyard should be reduced in scale to the absolute minimum. Measures are also needed to slow the extremely fast speed of some cycles coming across the junction from Turney Road, alongside the graveyard, and down the hill on Carlton Avenue, opposite the bookshop, who risk collision with pedestrians.
The single crossing from the infants schools on the corner of Turney Road seem to have a restricted line of sight for drivers on Turney Road caused by the now unnecessary island separating the cycles from the road and where the traffic light is placed.
The new segregated cycle path on Dulwich Village shown in the top diagram above does not seem to acknowledge the nature of right turns from the location shown, as cycling north along Dulwich Village and then turning right into Court Lane is done by maneuvering to the centre of the road, on the right side of the traffic.
Welcome the proposed changes at Red Post Hill and Dulwich Village. New cycle gateways welcome though would also welcome granite humps to slow cyclists.
It appears that you have removed/reduced the size of the cycle barrier for cars at the junction of Turney Road and Dulwich Village, that would be great - as currently a car is forced far out into the middle of the road.
Include raised pedestrian crossings on the east side of Dulwich Village at the Calton Avenue junction - would help to reduce speed of cyclists and improve pedestrian experience, especially for wheelchairs and buggies.
Keep existing crossing location of Dulwich Village on north side of Turney Road junction to free up usable public space in the new public square and keep clear route past shop frontages on Calton Avenue. Keep it simple.
As before works for a portion of residents who live in this area and are not impacted by the traffic that has been redirected to other areas
As my explanation provided above

Comments for 4

Looks great and I am very excited for it. Hopefully the change in road surface provides and additional clue for some drivers who seem unclear on what the road signs mean for them.
Again - even in the visualisations all the surfaces look very similar.
Remove the no motors signs and there is nothing that says 'you cannot drive through here'. A central bollard would of course solve this very easily.
Scheme looks great!
Do cycles get a separate phase? If not, then could Southwark consider adding a two stage right hand turn for cycles from Dulwich Village northbound into Carlton Avenue? Without such a facility, it will be difficult to perform that turn, as cycles would need to find a gap between two streams of traffic (these aren't always appropriate but I feel here the delay incurred should be minimal).
Pavement widening is fantastic, but I worry that even two or three motor vehicles waiting at Turney Road would block access to the cycle waiting area. I am not local so do not know the traffic levels, if necessary, could the design be amended to allow cycles to access the waiting area in spite of queuing traffic (I do not know if there is early release, but if there is, then there is even more of an argument to maximise the possibility of cycles reaching the dedicated waiting area).
I am not local, but just wanted to ask about the above. Thanks!
I think the area on the west side of Dulwich Village around the pedestrian crossing will still get congested during school pick-up and drop-off, but I don't see any other solution for this. I think the proposals are very good overall - especially the direct and wider crossings and wider footpaths.
The footpath on the west side of Dulwich Village from this junction up to the junction with Red Post Hill is still very narrow and dangerous at school drop-off and pick-up times, with people having to step out onto the road. The pavement needs to be widened and street furniture removed all the way along this section.
The lights for bikes need to be clearer. Currently the green bike light from Carlton avenue requires them to stop in any direction for a pedestrian crossing that is green from them. This is confusing/frustrating for many and reduces pedestrian safety.
please plant a tree on the corner of Turney and Dulwich village outside the school to help block air pollution and increase tree cover.
Only if the cyclist route is clearly outlined and you can persuade cyclists to comply with the traffic lights.
Making pedestrians and bikes straight through is an improvement.

Costs please
Looks good subject to comments already made about access for emergency and limited other vehicles. Anything that prevents cars still driving to the bottom of Court Lane to drop off / collect school kids is welcome - a major hazard for cyclists. Bit this will need enforcing
As a cyclist, I do not support the separate cycle lane and traffic light phase. I am worried that this will slow down throughput of traffic (which will increase congestion in the narrower sections of Dulwich Village that are risky for cyclists, and worsen air quality). I am also concerned it will create conflict between cycle traffic heading southbound along Dulwich Village and cycle traffic turning right into Calton Ave from Dulwich Village.
I would prefer to see large, properly enforced, and properly marked (with green tarmac) ASL boxes northbound and southbound, and an advanced green light for cycles of 5-10 seconds. This is the model at the other end of Calton Ave and it seems to work well.
as before. The junction feels like a mixed zone with pedestrians and cyclists but this is dependent on slowing down cyclists (it shouldn't be a cycle superhighway).
As my previous response. cyclist are a bigger danger to pedestrians and themselves than cars at this junction. Clear indications of who has priority when and reducing cyclist speeds are essential.
Really great that cyclists get their own signal. Hopefully current design issues with pedestrian crossing outside hamlet will be removed by moving it (currently i see drivers go through the red there as they don't realise it's a seperate signal to the traffic lights
Please see previous comment. These proposals are fantastic, and we love the changes, but there remains a lot of congestion with idling traffic in the village creating a lot of air pollution. This is a major health risk for children and young people walking to school at this time.
Concerned that camera enforcement may not be enough. As a minimum some Community Warden additional enforcement or similar would be required at the start and irregularly during the life of these junction improvements. Som Dulwich residents may view the fines as financially sustainable for themselves.
No comments. Strongly agree with cyclists having their own signal phase (if implemented correctly).
We need a clear marker for bicyclists entering the junction, I suggest with a speed bump at the entrance from Court Lane into the junction or by raising the junction area above the surrounding roads.
For safety reasons, given speeding cyclists and traffic turning right into Turney Road, it would be sensible to retain the pedestrian island for those crossing Turney Road by the school.
This is good for cyclists but I still await further information about improved bus routes / frequency
I don't know if previous typed comments have been lost but I said that it would be much better for pedestrians if cyclists had to dismount going through the "square" of Calton Avenue/Court Lane - safer and improve the square as a community facility - and no big inconvenience to cyclists. Also need to restrict parking more in the build up to the square.
Good but still looks like a lot of road capacity. Opportunities to slim the road capacity futher.
The crossing point from Dulwich Village (Burial Ground) towards the parade of shops still looks dangerous. Pedestrians have to look in so many directions for bikes - not just looking left and right, but also behind them and ahead. Not all cyclists obey traffic signals and some achieve high speeds. The problem is that bikes can approach from 5 directions (Dulwich Village North, DV South, Turney Road, Court Lane and Carlton Avenue.) A pedestrian (zebra) crossing might help.
Like the separation of cyclists.
More buses needed
I disagree with spending money on these measures. Dulwich Village is what it is. Thanks to the traffic management policies introduced since the pandemic access to and from my area is very poor. Making some super square is just some vanity project by the Council. If money is available to spend, spend it on measures that allow residents to access their homes, including by car.
Dedicated seating areas for restaurants and cafes will be a good benefit, along with cycle parking areas.
looks fine
Same as previous
As far as I can tell this will be an improvement for cyclists. It's hard to tell though as this is an extremely wide junction and somewhat scary for cyclists to navigate. I hope these changes will help.
Keeping cyclists separate from pedestrians will make it safer, especially as this area attracts small children to play here, so it will limit accidents. I totally agree with the measures in place here. When the roadway was open, I used to walk my young son to school along the pavement, which towards the Village end of Calton Avenue was becoming so dangerously narrow that I felt it was only a matter of time before an accident happened, with someone stepping or being forced off the pavement in front of an oncoming car or bike, which were often moving at speed.
If the whole junction was limited to 2 narrow car lanes with cycling and walking prioritised that would be a 5.

<p>- Welcome the proposed alterations at Red Post Hill and Dulwich Village although detailed plans not published</p> <p>- The new gateways are welcome but they must include bespoke granite set humps to slow down cyclists</p>
Plans for the junction itself look great, but would like safe routes for cyclists extended beyond the junction in all directions.
Love seeing people walking/ children playing there. [REDACTED] in the school opposite and it's nice for us too- definitely cleaner air
Bus service in Dulwich village needs improving with a Herne Hill/brixton to Dulwich village bus
<p>Big improvement!</p> <p>To improve further:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - blips on double yellow lines so cars can be fined if parked there (otherwise many will at peak times - just for ten minutes but creates road safety danger for all the kids just as they are all there) - cycle lane up Calton - more cycle parking, including suitable for cargo bikes
I especially like the idea that cyclists will be separated from pedestrians as I often cycle to school and the cycle lane goes at the same time as 5e pedestrian crossing
<p>Welcome the proposed alterations at Red Post Hill and Dulwich Village although detailed plans not published</p> <p>Welcome separate cyclists signal phase</p> <p>Welcome the use of quality materials</p> <p>The new gateways are welcome but they must include measures to slow down cyclists</p>
The crossings for pedestrians appear to be an improvement on what's there now.
For cyclists, the most difficult thing I find about the current sequencing is that you get a green light to proceed turning left from Carlton Avenue and immediately meet a red light at the pedestrian crossing on Dulwich Village southbound. This needs to be adjusted.
We are completely out of our car now. So it's good. Busier roads' residents are actually probably having less traffic because so many people can't use their cars now or won't. All good.
Some bikes come through this junction at speeds that exceed 30mph. Can they be slowed down?
There are still some cars and delivery mopeds that cover their number plates and drive through. Anything that can be done to eliminate this would be hugely appreciated.
<p>Keep northbound yellow hatching on Dulwich Village to keep pedestrian crossing clear.</p> <p>Raised continuous footway/crossing on Court Lane to slow cyclists and indicate pedestrian priority.</p> <p>Surface materials to indicate public space, not a road to stop drivers going through (as now). Raised footway crossing will help with this.</p> <p>Pleased to see single pedestrian crossing at Turney.</p> <p>Please remove echelon parking as cars reversing pose a serious risk to cyclists.</p> <p>Please provide a disabled bay in front of shops</p>
Concerns remain re drivers entering the square and the danger of this.
<p>I question the cost versus the benefits of this project. I admit that I don't travel from Turney Road into Carlton Avenue, more the other way around and often not at rush hour. I have not noticed horrible traffic in the area as there used to be in Carlton Avenue. It seems to isolate the Village from traffic from another street, but what would the implication be to South Circular or adjacent streets.</p> <p>Funding is limited, and some years it feel like more than others. I think the neighbourhood could do with more and better areas for the young kids and teenagers to find an outdoor space they can enjoy. I wonder if the money should be spent in other areas: like fixing the playgrounds in the area which are in terrible state (both Dulwich Park and Goose Green), supporting and fixing up the skateboarding park south of Dulwich Park on the South Circular, supporting basketball as an accessible sport in our neighborhood.</p>
I generally think it works really well.
I wonder if the cycle lane could be slightly narrower to further discourage cars from going through?
It would be good to have enough space for cars to do 3-point turns without going onto the pavement (there may be enough space here, I can't quite tell from the picture)
No, except the crossing is in the wrong place.

Improving air quality is of utmost importance. The main road (Dulwich Village) is still too busy with traffic. There is a primary school at the junction, and the children will be exposed to air pollutants from vehicles. Any changes should be accompanied with air quality monitoring installed to measure improvements to air quality.
Same comment as above regarding buses. If the new design will allow buses to pass through (particularly school buses), I think it poses a risk to children crossing
Still far too many vehicles passing through the square. Hopefully that will now be eradicated but I am concerned it will not
It's hard to tell from this, but turning right as a cyclist doesn't look great. Lights for cyclists is ok, but based on the phasing of the existing cyclist light in this area, that means a lot of waiting for our turn.
Could go further, with properly segregated cycle lanes
Cycling safety should be taken into account for the entire area, not only this junction.
No. Looks good
What about children coming to Infants School and Hamlet by car? Is there a Kiss and Go zone for dropping off children?? And collecting?? Looks as if Turney Rd will be very congested at times???
The wider pedestrian crossing, without an island in the middle is a good idea but it is in the wrong place. Its current location, but wider, would be fine.
I'm worried there isn't a cross walk near the book store. That seems to be an area where people cross and where cyclists zoom through.
Make sure it feels safe to turn left onto Dulwich Village by bike from Calton Avenue
I'd prefer to see a default green for pedestrians crossing across dulwich village itself - it currently feels very wide and daunting to cross at this point and the pedestrian wait time is quite long.
There are still too many cars travelling through Dulwich Village. It is still a "rat run" for vehicles leaving the South Circular heading for Central London. It would be better to have more restrictions on traffic moving through Dulwich Village than is already in place.
Having seen projections for cycling in London, I suspect this route will soon see huge numbers of through cyclists. In anticipation, I would like to see some amend which would allow clear right of way to pedestrians wishing to cross to court lane and calton pavements outside the cheese shop. A zebra? Or raised level crossing, perhaps?
Would also like to see a raised level pedestrian crossing at the end of Gilkes (by calton) to send a message that this, too, is an area where pedestrian's needs are primary.
Very glad to see a separate cycle phase for the right hand turn into Carlton Ave.
If it is much shorter than the car green phase you are still going to get bikes using the main lane when that light is green and waiting in the middle for oncoming traffic to clear. In which case it may be safer to keep a marker space for the cycle right turn that is currently there.
All of these components are great, particularly the traffic calming measures and separate light controls for bikes. Please ensure that cyclists passing thorough the area are slowed down.
The broader changes around Red Post Hill etc are a great idea and it would also be great to see the quality of the pavement (particularly on the west side) improved as it is a significant hazard. All traffic calming measures are also extremely welcome and particularly key for two wheeled transport (cyclists but there are also an increasing number of mopeds/motorcyclists coming through).
Physical restrictions to stop vehicle access would be welcomed. Collapsible bollards to allow access for emergency services yet keep users safe from drivers, who simply have to obscure their number plates to pass without risk of penalty, as they do now.
From the illustration, looks far better and less confusing. Another change so soon. More costs for the rearranging of roads and cycle lanes.
Hopefully this will slow the speeding bikes down.
Great to see separate signals for cyclists and quality materials. Bigger/relocated crossing looks fab. Shame to see segregated cycle lane on DV (southbound from Calton) no longer in proposal. Please remove the echelon parking on DV. It is so dangerous! Drop kerb coming southbound on DV towards square to allow direct access to cycle parking outside pharmacy. More cargo bike parking.
For crossing Dulwich Village, all lights should be red at some point so we can cross diagonally as well as straight across in various spots. Calming the traffic down is key particularly as so many of us children cross the road there with schools on both sides of Dulwich Village.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We applaud the proposals for a more direct and significantly wider pedestrian crossing over Dulwich Village. - Protected cycle lanes on Dulwich Village either side of the junction with their own signal phases are a positive addition. - The dangerous echelon parking should be replaced with parallel parking incl. a loading bay and disabled bay/s. There are ongoing reports of near misses here, with drivers reversing out into the path of cyclists. - Recommend continuous pavements are added across the end of Gilkes Crescent to give pedestrians priority across that side street, and reduce the risk of conflict with drivers turning in and out. - The box junction on Dulwich Village northbound should be retained as we anticipate there will still be northbound queues at peak times. - The cycle lane through Dulwich Square seems sufficiently wide for the volume of people cycling. - The short cycle lane on Dulwich Village by the chemist should be protected by wands.
Please discourage cycling on the pavement by using plants or posts and chains.

Comments for 5 (completely)

as a cyclist, I feel that it is excellent
The advance green light for cyclists will need to give enough time for a slower cyclist to bear right across the traffic held to the right, when turning into Calton Avenue from Dulwich Village northbound. There will be adults with children and they will need time for this manoeuvre.
Proposals look great.
Brilliant - looks much safer for all road users
As in previous comments - rumble pads more assertive slow down measures / soft barriers
I can see that the cycle lane is on the left hand side if you are coming from Dulwich Village. Will it still be possible to turn right on a bike so that you can then come up Court Lane?
The first picture still shows a vast expanse of tarmac and no new trees planted
Rising bollards that can be operated by any emergency vehicle would prevent drivers accessing the square. I'm concerned that the plan will not make the junction safe.
Achieves a fantastic community area
I like the dedicated cycle lanes through the village.
Looks much better than before the changes
please extend the cycle lane along all dulwich village in future
please can the cycle tracks be extended all along dulwich village in future work
The plan address current issues where cyclists need to cross the road to turn left to Calton Avenue. It also improves pedestrian crossings. The only area to address is to increase pedestrian safety as cyclist can move too fast when coming down from Calton avenue or Court lane.
Walking and cycling down Court Lane/Calton Ave to access all areas of the village without the speeding tyranny of cars and vans has resulted in an incalculable benefit to both mind and body.
Much nicer. It might be helpful for dumb drivers to have some signs such as "pedestrians and cycles only" or some such. Cycles painted on the road too?
This junction works much better for cyclists and pedestrians now.
Really appreciate these efforts to make active travel as safe and convenient as possible
Where is the question on Turney Road? The proposal there looks like overkill unless traffic is allowed to pass through at non-peak school times
It is very encouraging to see so many more people feeling confident enough to cycle as a result of the measures
As this section looks to provide complete protection for vulnerable road users I believe this does meet its goal.
Bike lane on Turney Road in between Burbage Road and Croxted Road
Needs cameras to ensure cars and particularly mopeds are not abusing it.
Can you also make sure people who cover their number plates are video recorded and prosecuted
Great. The traffic signals for cyclists at the moment are confusing and need sorting out.
It is important to make sure the timings of the cycle lights are properly in sync across the junction. The timings currently mean that immediately after cycling through a green light you have to stop at a read light.
Need to consider how you can get cyclist off the pavement and also accommodate private e scooters
Like it a lot. Very supportive.
The most important measure would be to make the P4 route electric; use electric buses not polluting diesel buses.

I like the new crossing over Dulwich Village to Hamlet school, the pavement will be less crammed at the end of school.
Pleased to see the new wider pedestrian crossing over Dulwich Village, it can be extremely congested at peak times there. Also very pleased to see the new cycle phase / lanes to improve safety - please consider adding wands to segregate properly.
The echelon parking outside the shops on Dulwich Village needs to go, it's very dangerous.
Generally, really pleased - good job!
The cycle lane looks good - wide enough and I'm especially pleased to see it will no longer look like road so should better deter drivers.
Please consider adding a continuous pavement across the Calton Ave end of Gilkes Crescent, to make it clear that pedestrians have priority and reduce the risk of conflict with drivers turning in and out.
Great to see new cycle lanes on Dulwich Village - a separate phase of the traffic lights is essential to improve safety, especially for everyone (many children) turning right from DV into Calton on bike.
The dangerous echelon parking needs to be removed.
Looks great. Bike first traffic lights and separate bike lanes are fabulous.
Just one car infraction through this junction could cause life long trauma if not physical injury. The proposal addresses ably the needs of community, local businesses, pedestrians, safe active travel and most importantly our children
I like the new designs but still have a concern that some drivers will ignore the signage and go through - which I have witnessed several times.
Very good scheme.
Again we need more of them.
I love it! Wider pavements, safer crossings, really prioritising cyclists. Thank you. Does it need dedicated cargo bike parking? Not sure if I missed that on the plans.
More please, all over Southwark. Especially Half Moon Lane and Village Way PLEASE.
Fantastic.
Great to see widened pavement at Turney Road school entrance! Much safer. And good to see parking spaces removed to improve safety.
Brilliant!
It will be great.
Current turning needs improvement for cyclists, I think these proposals will help
It will be good to have a wider crossing outside schooo because it gets really crowded and you get pushed and shoved sometimes on the pavement.
I would have liked to see the section of Turney Road outside the school closed to vehicles as originally proposed. Indeed I would like DV to be an essentially CAR-free zone. We have to reduce the use of private vehicles in the capital.
great to make the pavements wider as these tend to get very busy with children overspilling onto the Road. It would be great if something similar could be implemented outside Jusith Kerr Primary School as well.
Will make journeys much safer.
More space for people to meet and safer for cycling.
I support the widening of the pavement along Turney Road.
I do NOT support the removal of railings on the corner of Turney Rd and Dulwich Village. At school dropoff and pickup times, this section of pavement is very busy with small children, running and tripping. The railings should be retained on this corner.
Since the Dulwich Square improvements, I cycle here regularly to use the shops and cafes and sit outside. Previous to the Dulwich Square and the Southwark and Lambeth LTNs, I always drove.
As someone who enjoys but is nervous to cycle, this would dramatically increase my confidence to cycle and complete errands in my local neighbourhood
The introduction of separate cycle signal phases is critical to this objective being met, especially for cyclists going north and turning right into Calton Ave. There must be sufficient time given to cyclists.

Streets for Journeys – Dulwich Village/Red Post Hill

To what extent do you think these measures at the Dulwich Village/Red Post Hill junction achieve the 'Streets for Journeys' objective? - how much does this achieve the objective

Comments for 1 (not at all)

Again taking roads away from the people and giving it to cyclists that tend to abuse it. Sorry to all the law abiding one because there are some cyclists that do follow the rules
Per my comments on the previous question.
Let the existing infrastructure support smooth flow of traffic . The closure of Courtlane / Calton Avenue has already massively increased congestion in Dulwich Village . The repercussion of closing Calton Avenue / Courtlane towards Dulwich Village has led to tremendous traffic congestion at the DV / Red post Hill junction. Adding cycle lane was the worst decision as cars turning right clog the road and traffic queues up to the DV roundabout . I know there is zero possibility of one way traffic opening up at Calton Avenue but atleast remove the cycle lanes of already narrow roads and it will bring down congestion massively. Unless you widen the existing roads , please do not widen the pedestrian / cycle lanes or anything else .
It's making life impossible to travel in these areas. There's not enough room on the roads for cars and cyclists, which creates havoc and is a HSE issue.
Congestion is worse than ever
Closing this road without any consultation during Covid was insanely unjust and the amount you are spending on this junction is disgusting. Just stop and think what else you could do with that money you bunch of closed minded, incompetent people who don't represent the people in the area - the amount of pollution you have now pushed past Harris Primary on Lordsship Lane as you have essentially given all the rich Dulwich village residents private roads. As apparently their voices will be heard more than the masses who have to suffer increased congestion and pollution on other roads. I'm sure this is also just to try and ensure when the government tries to unwind this closure it's more difficult. Deceptive as always.
Again - the closure could still be open to cars with a cycle lane .
No need for a closure.
If there must be times for no vehicles it should be term time only - Monday to Friday- only at drop Off and pick up times
This junction can't handle the increased level of traffic now the Village junction is closed. The ridiculous cycle lane at Red Post Hill junction limits it to single lane with traffic stacking back by those wishing to turn right. A mess created by our awful councillors.
It will only further increase traffic congestion, delays, restrictions. All these concentrate traffic onto a few roads, increasing journey times and increasing pollution on roads that have many schools. These measures will further affect local businesses as less and less people can use the roads into and around Dulwich Village.
It has been catastrophic for local business and has caused traffic to be diverted to already congested roads such as the South Circular, East Dulwich Grove and Croxted Road, with the result that pollution levels have noticeably increased and it is a misery getting anywhere both by car and by bike and walking, because of the deterioration in air quality. Carbon emissions and particulates have probably gone up too because a) drivers have to drive further and b) cars emit more per mile at low speeds.
The traffic build up in the mornings to go North and East at the Red Post Hill junction tails neck to the small roundabout at the other end of the Village and during the day there is nearly always a queue going North of 20 cars. Removing the cycle lane posts and putting the usual cycle box in front of the car line would enable the traffic to flow much quicker. It is not reasonable to have the children in the local schools VERYnear the toad being polluted completely unnecessarily
All 'streets for journeys' measures are not met on displaced traffic roads in the area and indeed in may road I HAVE TO TAKE SIGNIFICANT DETOURS JUST TO EVEN GET SOUTH OF DULWICH DUE TO TIS CRAZY JUNCTION ROAD CLOSURE THAT BEFITIS JUST A FEW NOT THE MAJORITY. WILL THE COUNCIL BE FINING THE 95% OF CYCLISTS WHO TOTALLY IGNORE THE TRAFFIC LIGHTS PURPOSE BUIKLT FOR THEM? COULD YOU LET ME KNOW HOW MANY FINES HAVE BEEN ISSUED TO DATE?
The creation of a cycle lane at this junction, causing serious traffic jams, was one of the more stupid innovations. It needs to be removed. If you need a cycle lane it would have to come from the green area. We need a separate right turning lane travelling north. I am astonished that planners with all their modelling could not see the obvious consequence of this imposition. I find this diagram very hard to see properly. You might want to make it clearer.
As above. Unnecessary and expensive. Just reinstate the original two lanes, bikes did not have a problem and traffic could turn right. Ideally reinstate the Calton rd route for cars and that would solve the problem of traffic build up at this junction.
This junction is a NIGHTMARE since the cycle lane was added on Village Way reducing the width of the road to 1 car width only. The second lane should be reinstated to allow the right hand lane of traffic to queue turning right and the left hand land to go straight on or left.

Just makes journeys difficult due to road closures to cars, my husband is disabled and we find the restrictions on roads just pushes traffic to the outer routes around Dulwich
As I said earlier, traffic congestion has been exacerbated at this junction .I see no proposals for addressing this in the current proposals.
As a pedestrian I will not feel safe without pedestrian islands.
They do not do anything to stop cyclists speeding and ignoring red lights which is a big problem for me as a pedestrian.
It was fine as it was before.
Always congested - it's a nightmare
Congestion is backing up through the traffic lights as the cycle route blocks through traffic
Makes traffic worse. Displaced traffic elsewhere.
You are changing the aesthetic of the village making it look like Milton Keynes - full of signage and concrete!
See above. Cyclists rarely use their designated short lane at the junction, cycle on the road or if turning left into Village Way use the pavement adjacent to the green space next to the prep school.
The intersection is now dangerous and full of traffic, huge pollution levels and noise.
Again more displacement of traffic causing the movement and journey time of buses being increased and restricted.
STREETS FOR JOURNEYS...? ARE YOU ABSOLUTELY CERTAIN ABOUT THIS NAME..??? OF COURSE, STREETS ARE FOR JOURNEYS (THAT IS WHY WE USE THEM) SOUTHWARK COUNCIL - YOU ARE AN EMBARRASSMENT ALL OF YOUR SCHEMES ARE ILL THOUGH-THROUGH AND PLAIN DAFT. YOU ARE SELF-SERVING, UNLISTENING BUNCH OF BUREAUCRATS
It's not achieving any improvement. On the contrary, it causes more pollution and longer journeys. It's not safer for cyclists either. For instance, I saw a parent pushing a toddler on a bike while cycling himself on Townley Road. I'm a cyclist advocate myself, but I didn't let my children cycle on the road until they were 5 or 6 years old. This false sense of safety is dangerous.
Why get rid of traffic islands? Traffic islands make it safer for pedestrians.
No information has been provided. The link to "More information" does not contain any information on the Dulwich Village/Red Post Hill junction
See above. I do not want you making yet more changes to our local area. Do not change the roads. We don't want it and it doesn't help us. Facilitate instead private companies being allowed to install EV charging in lampposts - it costs Southwark nothing - and this will help us to decarbonise car transport.
As per comments in 7
Static traffic build up is so huge on village way, this idyllic image will never happen. This was wholly rejected by the community years ago and you still plough on regardless. Local schoolchildren's health is being adversely affected.
None of us wanted this You have not listed to your constituents and tax payers Ruining their health- the NHS is struggling enough. Please improve the local bus and train service These LTN measures have already been shown to directly worsen buses.
The lack of two car lanes heading from Dulwich village towards the Red Post Hill junction is causing excessive tail backs and delays.
The reduction of the traffic to one lane at the junction of Dulwich village and red post hill leads to long traffic jams because traffic is trying to turn right and hold up the traffic which was still able to go straight ahead before the cycle lane was put in. The cycle lane is frequently empty but queues of traffic with exhaust fumes are held up at this junction right by the infant school in the village.
Stop interfering in traffic flow. You are making pollution worse. Install more electric charging points instead!
You are harming local stores which when lost will require more car journeys. See poor old Biff Shoes
The community does not want this junction to remain closed.

<p>The cycle lane approaching the junction from the south restricts traffic to one lane only proceeding north with the result that there are regular queues going back to the Calton Avenue, Turney Road junction with Dulwich Village, because right turning traffic into East Dulwich Grove prevents traffic from proceeding forward into Red Post Hill.</p> <p>The result is ever more pollution from idling engines.</p>
<p>This cycle lane could be put along the pathway west of its current position. I have only once seen a cyclist use this lane during numerous bus trips where the bus along with all other traffic has been held up in a queue. And I am talking about off peak travel in the middle of the day. If my destination is North Dulwich I have to get off at the Village School stop and walk from there along the fume filled road. The bus has never passed me!</p>
<p>I do not agree with the objective</p>
<p>The community rejected this 24/7 closure in the original consultation, and yet we continue to suffer from it. You are destroying quality of life for working Dulwich residents and council tax payers. Through the distress and pain created the plan you are failing in your Public Sector Equality Duty.</p> <p>Cycling has decreased on roads which have taken the displaced traffic. Publish traffic and air quality data for all streets in the Dulwich area.</p> <p>At the DV/East Dulwich Grove junction you state that the “existing cycling wand segregation to remain”. This cycle lane is a disaster causing tailbacks through DV at peak times increasing pollution for schoolchildren and residents. The traffic here needs two lanes in order to flow smoothly and reduce pollution from traffic waiting to turn right into East Dulwich Grove - the majority of whom have been forced down this route by the closure of Calton Avenue.</p> <p>Your road planning officer should be shot.</p>
<p>Traffic is terrible now, impacting many. It is hard to travel by bus. Roads that have schools on and children walking along to get to school are heavily impacted - there is a huge increase in pollution for the children. The only benefit is to those who live on the blocked off street, at everyone else's expense. No proper consultation, residents and local shopkeepers views ignored.</p>
<p>You have not said how you will reduce congestion at the junction of Red Post Hill and Dulwich Village. At present the design causes a massive traffic backlog during considerable periods of the day.</p>
<p>Refer back to all the comments you have received from the community. The elderly and disabled - and their carers - have had life made a misery, with increased journey times</p>
<p>The community rejected this 24/7 closure in the original consultation, and the wider area will continue to suffer, not benefit, from it.</p> <p>Traffic is still being displaced on to surrounding roads where families live and where children walk and cycle to school.</p>
<p>Since the closure of Dulwich Village this junction has become chronically congested.</p>
<p>There is not enough room for the cycle path and 2 rows of traffic. I don't think the data supports a cycle path here and this should be taken out. Then we go back to the junction the way it was pre pandemic before you ***** it up and caused all the associated traffic and pollution.</p>
<p>IT HAS CAUSED A MAJOR TRAFFIC JAM</p>
<p>YOU CLOSING OFF THE LANE AND BUILDING A CYCLE LANE (THAT NO CYCLISTS USE!!) AT THE TRAFFIC LIGHTS NEAR NORTH DULWICH - HAS CONTRIBUTED TO MASSIVE TRAFFIC JAMS AND IS BAD FOR THE ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>YOU NEED TO LET TRAFFIC FLOW FREELY.</p> <p>CLOSING DOWN LANES IS NOT GOING TO REDUCE TRAFFIC!!!!!!!!!!</p>
<p>TRAFFIC CONGESTION IS DREADFUL SINCE YOU INTRODUCED THE CYCLE LANE (THAT NO CYCLIST USE!)</p>
<p>IT IS AN ABSOLUTE JOKE</p>
<p>The cycle lane is hardly used, but it clogs up the road for those going North from the Village causing tailbacks and increased congestion of traffic</p>
<p>This is a disaster area and a huge problem. Putting more white lines on the road will not solve anything. The traffic at the junction heading north frequently backs up through Dulwich Village as far as Gallery Road roundabout. Just a long queue of cars belching out fumes.</p> <p>This is caused by the narrowing of the road on Dulwich Village as it gets to the junction with Red Post Hill/East Dulwich Grove. As there is only one lane then any cars turning right onto East Dulwich Grove causes the huge tailback. Should revert to two lanes here so there can be a right-hand filter and cars going up RPH or turning left can do so at the same time.</p> <p>Also, ban SUVs in Dulwich Village</p>
<p>This junction is a nightmare. If anyone travelling north on Dulwich Village wants to go straight ahead you often get stuck behind cars turning right onto East Dulwich Grove. Since there is only one lane, you can wait for several traffic light changes before you get through. I am sure the air quality in this area has significantly deteriorated and it can take at all least 15 minutes or more to get through the intersection.</p>

The junction is a disaster. Traffic now backs up a long way along all roads. Progressing through the junction is very slow. Journey times have increased and static traffic, near schools, has increased pollution substantially. There needs to be two lanes at the junction going north from the village to North Dulwich Station allowing a left turn/straight ahead lane and a right filter traffic light
Impossible to drive through the lights and turn right onto East Dulwich grove due to bikes taking up the road
Still a terrible and dangerous crossing for cyclists turning
The community rejected the 24/7 closure of this junction in the original consultation and wider area continues to suffer, not benefit from, the proposals.
I see no benefit in these type of endless road changes
Slower and more congested than necessary. Adversely affect no less than 6 nearby schools.
I watched a - father - place his cycle in the broad front area - when he could have easily stayed to the left. But no - he blocked the school bus - filled with children. Are you kidding me. That is profoundly selfish - righteous - arrogant and showy. HIS cycle made it through the light - but not the 50 students. Shame on DULWICH and Southwark public policy obsession with cycles.
Algorithms and computer generated images - are only as good as the HONESTY of the DATA and the criticality of humans willing to question the 'exclusive' group think.
Have you sat in the 'close road' generated traffic - you talk about pollution - your policies cause pollution. Have you listened to the Ambulance sirens cry in closed road traffic - as cycle lanes remain empty while cyclist weave into vehicle lanes to gain a metre. Your maths is wrong.
YOU SHOULD MAKE PUBLIC HOW MUCH YOU HAVE SPENT ON ROADS IN THE LAST 10 YEARS.
Spend money in repairing roads . Clear manholes to avoid flooding of roads. Reopen closed roads under pretext of LTN and remove APR cameras that you installed to enforce them and you use as cash cows to justify your positions and salaries.
Calton Ave has been closed to traffic for a couple of years and it's clear to me that it has only caused shifting of traffic, and hence major congestion, to the surrounding roads. Limiting traffic through Dulwich Village has made East Dulwich Grove a nightmare, and very dangerous for pedestrians and bicycles.
Your decision of closing Calton Ave was completely arbitrary and unfair as it only benefits (allegedly) the people living in those surrounding roads as traffic is calmer for them. But for us who need to drop off small children to schools, this also means more stress and finding ways around these restrictions which doesn't really help. Roads should be open to everyone. If you want to encourage active travel, add cycle paths, do not close roads!
Displacement traffic onto East Dulwich Grove - see my previous comment.
Needs protected cycle lanes the junction
This just shows that the council know that there is more traffic going through this junction and therefore needs two lanes to speed it up! This is a result of closing Calton avenue.
They push traffic onto particular displacement roads which become congested whilst others have no traffic on them which is unfair to those on the roads that have all the traffic The congested displacement roads are on main bus routes so bus journeys are slow (I have had to abandon bus journeys for this reason) They cause longer journeys which increases pollution They prejudice the elderly and disabled who have no choice but use cars to get around Many cyclists are inconsiderate to pedestrians and appear to feel they have licence to speed through junctions and crossings without regard for pedestrians
Currently, pedestrians often cross to the island partway through a traffic light cycle, and continue in a gap, because the cycle is so long and crossing times are short. Removing the islands is explicitly prioritizing cars over pedestrians and so is completely at odds with the "streets for people" objective.
Additionally, the advanced stop boxes are borderline worthless. Because of the large gap on DV, cars will pull through to wait for a turn in the yellow box, then get stuck there.
A weekend walk from Sunray Gardens to Dulwich Park means walking past half a mile of traffic congestion. Stationary cars create pollution
Traffic is worse than ever, pollution is terrible. Cyclists and ebikes are dangerous to pedestrians.
It will make it so difficult for pedestrians. Only cyclists will benefit. I cross this road frequently. How will I get from the bottom of East Dulwich Grove to Village Way? Or to North Dulwich Station, Or from either side of East Dulwich Grove or Village Way. Why are you so pro the cyclists and so anti the pedestrians, bus users and people with disabilities? Buses and pedestrians will have to wait much longer to cross with several crossings.

You are solving a problem that does not exist. This was put in place during Covid...why is it now stretching beyond that period?
Just stop wasting money on these endless 'consultations', reopen the roads so that you stop favouring the most expensive streets and wealthiest residents of the borough, and reduce the terrible congestion which has resulted from the LTN
As above - anything that restricts the flow of traffic is going to worsen the congestion that your plans have caused
This will result in more congestion and more traffic. it will slow public transport times and unfairly pick on the elderly, the poor and disabled.
Why are you not putting protected cycle tracks at all junctions? There is lots of space with multiple lanes for general traffic.
The only good thing I see here is the two lanes coming out of Dulwich Village, so that straight-on/Left turning traffic wont be stopped by right-turning traffic; a bit of shortsightedness when this junction was "upgraded" a few years back. However, the sharpening of the junction corners will mean that larger vehicles (delivery lorries etc) will have to take a wider berth, and then there will be contention between left-turning traffic out of Dulwich Village and right turning traffic out of Village Way. Same with East Dulwich Grove and Dulwich Village. This will have the effect of slowing the traffic down.
The cycle lane needs to be moved into the middle of the green space on the west side to separate complete from traffic.
Two lanes of north bound traffic is very much needed to reduce the significant congestion and air pollution created by the closure of Calton Avenue. Traffic needs to be able to turn right without impeding traffic (in particular the P4 bus) from going straight ahead or left.
The best solution would be to also reopen Calton Ave to all traffic.
Really makes me fum - driving electric with vehicles around me chucking out extra exhaust which you don't seem to measure care about. Clogging up South Circular with extra traffic which is a national trunk route but you are using for extra displaced local traffic.
Although this does seem to make the junction safer for all Road users
Dreadful traffic jams dangerous polluting hugely lengthened journey times unreliable bus alternatives
DO NOT WIDEN THE FOOTWAY. IT IS DANGEROUS. GET RID OF THE CYCLE LANE AND MAKE THE DULWICH VILLAGE ROAD A TWO-LANE (AS YOU ARE PROPOSING) DO NOT TAKE OUT THE ISLANDS - WHY ARE YOU PROPOSING THIS ????!!!!!
THERE IS NO NEED TO REMOVE THESE - IT IS MADNESS. LEAVE THEM THERE!!!
If you remove the cycle lane on Dulwich Village which is rarely used, you will then allow 2 lanes northbound without all this unnecessary work (and money) which causes enormous disruption for the area. I do not see the benefits of the changes you propose.
Streets for journeys is a meaningless phrase
Your objectives fail to consider the needs of ALL people who need to make journeys, they serve cyclists,but fail to consider the complex needs of the elderly, less able, those with young children who need to access multiple locations in a short period (schools etc.) or other vulnerable residents
It is unlikely that the tweaking at this junction will make a significant difference to the queuing traffic and the pollution caused.
This is a total waste of money. This junction is a major bottleneck. Instead of improving its appearance, you should consider ways to remove congestion.
Changes have already made it more difficult for those who cannot walk long distances due to age or disability.
This seems to make it worse.
Dulwich Village will become a ghetto where few can enjoy life as they used to...other than cyclists. Why are they prioritised over other users of the paths and roads, it is insane.
The LTN increased the pollution on Dulwich Village/Red Post Hill junction due to constant traffic jam.
Fume pinch point, because of the displaced traffic needing to use Village way and East Dulwich Grove.
Your plans for this area are bizarre and deeply unhelpful
As previously unwanted proposals that add nothing to the area which has a lot of green spaces but disadvantage many people with protected characteristics under the 2010 Equality Act

It is difficult see how this will change anything significantly. The area is congested because of road closures. Public transport between north and west Dulwich is not good. Not everyone can walk or cycle. Spending significant amounts of money will not significantly change anything.
As above. I walk everywhere that I can but preferred waking and felt safer doing so when the junctions were open to cars etc. Cyclists are a nightmare here and my daughter and I have had narrow misses with them when they ignore the lights, road markings etc. Also been repeatedly ridden into when walking by young children on scooters and bikes.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Widened footways at all 4 corners will compromise ability of long vehicles to safely negotiate corners without swing out to opposite side of the road. Have you consulted with your refuse contractors, with tfl 37 & 42 buses (re NW corner)? 2. Have you adjusted your pedestrian crossing 'countdown times' following removal of traffic islands, to allow for pedestrians who do not find it 'easier to walk'? 3. Advanced cycle stoplines may be difficult to incorporate together with 3 lanes of traffic on East Dulwich Grove and on Village Way
I think the leap from "clean Air" to street for Journeys" is ridiculous waste of money, has created major pedestrian safety issues. Rewind to when Southwark Council showed us the "creating places to be protected from the Sun!!!" Too many too count Dulwich residents do not need or approve of ANY of Southwark Council's "Street whatever "Sfj's"" spin. All we see and hear are more of the same theme: Southwark Councils agenda: profit before Dulwich drivers, and pedestrians!
as above, LTN's are a farce and are criminal, they have been brought in without consultation. And just to let you know I do cycle to work every day.
The cycle lane has resulted in significant delays due to right-turning traffic on Dulwich Village obstructing traffic wishing to cross ahead or left into Village Way. The filter light has helped with this but resulted in long tail-backs on the north-bound side of Red Post Hill. I have witnessed numerous examples of dangerous driving - running red lights, obstructing the box junction etc - presumably by drivers frustrated with the delays. As everywhere a significant number of cyclists & scooterists ignore the lights - whether by running red lights (even when the pedestrian lights are green) or by riding illegally on the pavements.
The elderly do not feature in your provision.
They will not reduce the amount of traffic flow onto East Dulwich Grove. They will not reduce the amount of pollution. They will make cosmetic improvements and provide the chance for the residents at that particular corner to have less idling traffic ... but it is a drop in a bucket, providing more scope for pulling the wool over our eyes.
As motorist, cyclist and pedestrian, the measures already in place cause more problems than before. The fenced-off cycle lane at the traffic lights at Village Way and East Dulwich Grove force cars into a single line, so RH turning traffic unavoidably prevents other traffic from going straight ahead or turning left. All the restrictions oil north-bound traffic cause more problems than they solve. These views were put forward in a previous survey, but apparently not taken on board, hence, for example, the congestion on Croxted Road, including buses.
Cycle facilities at this junction are far below an acceptable standard.
this scheme is nearly all about improving traffic flow. add segregated cycle lanes on both village way and east dulwich grove and a dedicated cycle phase, or at least early release for cycles at the junction
The removal of traffic islands would be incredibly dangerous. People already cross the junction when the pedestrian lights are red when they are rushing for a train or for a bus. They will continue to do this. so not having a refuge midway across these roads will make it even more dangerous.
There is no room for three lanes and for the cycle wand segregation to remain in Dulwich Village. If you have a P4 and a lorry side by side at the lights in Dulwich Village and a P4 coming the other way, they will not be able to pass each other safely.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - i see no improvement (beside the pedestrian countdown) in the proposed layout - removing existing traffic islands is not advantageous as it currently helps children and elderly
Will make congestion worse!!
What is the point of this ?
Is it to kill visits into Dulwich Village?
I expect you will completely ignore any comments as I am sure that this is a PR exercise and the decision has already been decided
Very concerned over the removal of the island at East Dulwich grove. As parent of young kids travelling on foot it is very useful to have an island to stop on in the middle of the road.
I disagree with retaining the existing cycle lane wand segregation and cannot see how two lanes can be provided for traffic travelling north if it is retained. I disagree with the removal of the traffic island. I believe it can only put pedestrians at greater risk and in no way can make them safer.
Your LTN measures have added extra time to journeys, have made the air more polluted because cars have to drive for longer. For me to get from Dekker Road to Turney Road now takes a mile for what used to be a 200 yard journey. Literally your team is the scum of the earth

The closure of this junction was rejected by the community in your original consultation
Again, the changes have affected Dulwich in the worst way possible. Traffic is not reduced and only displaced. It has not improved pollution for Dulwich, it may have improved pollution for a certain section but most certainly now for all. This is completely unjust and after taking time to fill out previous forms it's a shame that the council are doubling down on not caring how bad LTN's a failing and are discriminatory. Our voices seem to mean nothing and pollution is rife now More than ever on my road. This needs to be reviewed and a better solution needs to be proposed.
I'm not sure what the point of this so-called consultation is since you've steadfastly ignored any comments or objections in previous consultations and gone ahead with your pre-decided measures. The majority of respondents did NOT want this junction closed, but you closed it anyway, since you're in thrall to the cycling lobby and concerns for disabled people, local shops and displaced traffic obviously did not come into consideration. I suspect you're about to do the same with the so-called consultation on the proposed Controlled Parking Zone in Dulwich Village. It may look as if you're ticking all the right boxes regarding consultations, but those of us who have tried to engage with you in the past have come to realise it's a waste of time. Still, one more attempt can't hurt...
Another waste of Council Resources to create unnecessary changes that will not make the area any safer healthier, easier, quicker or encourage sustainable travel.
This was rejected by the community at the first consultation
All thorough fares should be reopened to all road users
Majority of people are against these changes
I don't think these measures will help...but will make congestion worse.
I have repeatedly set out my objections to this work in all your previous consultations, and I believe you have ignored my and my communities objections throughout
You are reminded that our community rejected the closure of the junction in the first, original consultation
Clearly achieves the exact opposite
Same issues.
Difficult to quantify as You have not said how many car parking spaces will be lost in the village centre with these plans and how this will impact traders livelihoods. Living as I do on Burbage I have thought that the DV/Red post hill junction issue as an active contributor to the " unintended consequence" of traffic in Burbage. I find it peculiar that you have offered no traffic analysis in support of your plan as to what two lanes North will do to traffic flows in this scheme. Could it make the traffic worse? You have been monitoring traffic with additional tracsis cables since September 22 and you have published no reports since then. Are we heading to another unintended consequence?
Disagree strongly
Cyclists use pavements, electric bikes lie randomly abandoned on footpaths. The increased traffic and dangerous levels of pollution created on East Dulwich Grove needs to be properly monitored by the council, not ignored. You are playing around with fancy schemes, not facing up to the fact your schemes are v faulty and don't consider air quality on EDG
The first consultation for the LTNs completely ignored the vast majority wish of the local population which wholeheartedly rejected the proposals including the closure of the junction.
The Council continues to ignore the impact of traffic restrictions on businesses and people living on boundary roads, as well as the difficulties that disabled and other vulnerable residents are forced to endure.
The LTNs have not achieved any of the goals - we are suffering from displaced traffic, delayed buses, reduced public travel options, closed businesses and increased pollution outside schools on boundary roads.
The profoundly undemocratic imposition of the LTNs against the views of the vast majority of residents is disgraceful. The waste of public funds on these expensive measures against the wishes of the residents is obscene and unnecessary.
The cyclists that benefit from a clearer run do not offset the extra peril for pedestrians. There is also an obvious increase in pollution from motor vehicles stuck idling in traffic while others travel further around the council's designated boundaries to get where they are going
Again, at many times of the day there is a build up of traffic with a long tailback from the Dulwich Village/Red Post Hill junction adding to air pollution.
Pointless cycle lanes that cars will just get into if no physical barriers are provided
As in box 7
Southwark's policy is completely based on a hatred of motorists and achieves nothing for its so called "objectives".
I don't agree with the proposal

The same as above - too many yellow lines and a vendetta against car users. This will kill off our local shops and make Dulwich even more prison like.
This junction is quite awful as a direct result of your measures
See first comments above.
Only re-opening streets which have been closed off would actually make car journeys easier.
These measures would not be necessary if the Calton Avenue/DV junction had not been closed. These particular measures may improve on the current situation a bit, but overall they are still part of the problem of not using the infrastructure optimally for the benefits of residents, business owners or visitors to the area.
It is always congested here and bikes - cars etc are sharing a very narrow space and the volume of cars due to the timed road restrictions and roads being cut off permanently make me feel very unsafe on my bike. Also people visiting me find it very difficult as they are concerned re the congestion/ traffic restrictions and the worry of travelling when restrictions are on and getting fined.
Removing the traffic island will make waiting times longer for pedestrians. The added traffic lane could help reduce queuing out, but without wider roads to move onto, I doubt it will work in practice. There will still be lengthy queues on East Dulwich Grove. So no thought is being given to the surrounding areas.
These measures would not be necessary if the Calton Avenue/DV junction had not been closed. These particular measures may improve on the current situation a bit, but overall they are still part of the problem of not using the infrastructure optimally for the benefits of residents, business owners or visitors to the area. They will probably move the congestion problem faround the corner onto East Dulwich Grove. May I remind you that the closure of the CA/DV junction was exactly the wrong thing because (a) it went against the wishes of the Dulwich Community and (b) it clearly contradicts the stated rationale off improving congestion, safety and pollution.
Hopeless, the scheme ensures, encourages an unacceptable build up of traffic in both Redpost Hill and Dulwich Village - particularly traffic heading NORTH now being forced to turn RIGHT at this junction from Dulwich Village into East Dulwich Grove. The traffic queues are horrendous.
This is completely unnecessary and will lead to more congestion for no reason. Please leave these roads be.
Children should feel safe to walk alone from school but if local muggings and crime continue it doesn't achieve the purpose.
See comments above
The Council has not taken account of the clear majority of respondents in the original consultation who did not want this junction to be closed
Return the junction to its pre Covid layout and remove traffic restrictions.
The Council has still not taken on board the clear majority of respondents to the original consultation who said that they did not want any of these measures
We are deeply concerned about the removal of the pedestrian refuges. They are heavily used by pedestrians to cross all four sides of this junction in two stages, given the long wait to cross and short crossing time.
Distances to cross remain long. On the south side, pedestrians must cross one cycle lane and three lanes of traffic. This cannot be a short distance.
How long will pedestrians wait to cross? Will this waiting time be extended outside rush hour? How long will they have in order to cross? Has TfL agreed the timing given bus routes on both roads?
Council policy is to reduce motor vehicle journeys and prioritise active travel. This design does the opposite: prioritises motor vehicles over people walking. It is contrary both to the Streets for People objectives and the Highway Code hierarchy of road users and we strongly object to it.
This will make it worse for cars and buses. Stop making changes to Dulwich Village and sort out the speeding on the other roads in Dulwich instead. Barry Road needs 20 signs on posts and average speed cameras. Reopen some roads to reduce the congestion on East Dulwich Grove and Lordship Lane.
The junction closure was rejected by the community in the original consultation.
See previous comments.
Restrictions cause delays, delays mean vehicles have to be on streets for longer, journey times are increased, traffic jams are increased, pollution is increased.
These measures will have a knock on affect for surrounding areas so will increase problems for other areas aswell as Dulwich/Red Post Hill.
You may think it arrives at *your* objectives, but these are not the objectives desired by the majority of local residents, who have given negative feedback consistently the past three years about these failed plans.
If you are referring to the the junction Dulwich Village/East Dulwich then it is easy to see how much traffic it is causing due to the fact that there is no space to allow on-going traffic to move when cars ahead are turning right. Even on weekends the traffic can be quite long, sometimes all the way to the centre of the village. It is not working at all.

The junction with Red Post Hill is a nightmare for cars, bicycles and pedestrians. It is now too congested and the traffic backs up on half moon lane and onto village road.
It's already a terrible junction, being the only way through the village and this will make it worse
I cycle there regularly- all your measures so far have made it worse. It must be awful for those living around this now very busy junction.
I disagree with the direction of travel of the council's apparent agenda regarding cars and personal freedoms.
I am really astonished to see that Southwark have nothing better to do with their time and money than make an already privileged part of London even more privileged. Spend the money on people that need it. White privilege - totally unbelievable.
Bike Lane is a waste of space and slows traffic which means more noxious emissions. Reducing north bound traffic at this junction to one lane has been counter productive. East Dulwich Grove is now badly congested and all traffic has to wait regardless of wishing to turn right or drive straight on. Children walk to school through DV and along EDG breathing in polluted air. The bike lane ends and so achieves nothing
My son has stopped travelling across the village to get to football training. The traffic either by car and tight time schedule means he cannot get across the village after school in time to attend. If he goes after school by bike, traffic is very unsafe and he is too tired by the end of the night after a full day of school and has recently developed asthma - static traffic pollutes the atmosphere plus pedestrians mingling with static traffic and bikes - it's chaos. Even with separate lights for bikes, would not reduce idling.
Traffic congestion will be made worse along Dulwich Village as the road will be too narrow and turning right into East Dulwich Grove will take longer. Bikes hardly use the bike lane so it should be removed to restore the two lanes. Priority MUST be given to the hundreds of schoolchildren who use the refuge every day to cross the road. Do not remove the refuge - for the sake of our children please. Ask the school patrol officer, they will confirm that it must remain.
The cycle bands create significantly greater numbers of idling cars through the Village and up to the intersection.
What objectives do you think this meets? No increase of space for pedestrians, no enhanced safety options for cyclists, still two lanes at the end of east dulwich grove that makes passing cars dangerous and scary.
This will only lead to increased heavy traffic in these areas and more frustration.
Removing the traffic islands will encourage vehicles to travel through the junction at greater speed and will make it more difficult for pedestrians to cross the road safely especially for those with mobility issues
The cycle lane has caused a major problem. Typical blind, doctrinaire thinking. Anybody can see the cycle lane means right turning traffic blocks everybody else. Look at the traffic jams! And removing the pedestrian islands is a non-starter for safety reasons.
The standstill traffic affects everybody
no changes needed, remove the ltn
see comment 7
The emphasis is on 'Streets For journeys' BUT ONLY if you are travelling North to South. But DO NOT ENTER THIS EXCLUSIVE VILLAGE IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO TRAVEL LOCALLY FROM SOUTH TO NORTH, EAST TO WEST OR WEST TO EAST. YOU ARE NOT INVITED. That's seems to be the clear objective by the council.
The surrounding roads are a nightmare now. I have stopped cycling in this area as its no longer safe.
There is so little space for bikes on village way. It's all very well having a box for bikes by the traffic light but it will be so hard to reach as the cars always block the way! It's a very crowded, unsafe junction for cyclists.
it has divided the community both literally and figuratively
By providing extra lanes for drivers, you will increase driving rather than meet your target of reducing it or making sustainable choices the best option. A complete joke.
Half of the ASLs will remain difficult to access when cycling due to the lack of a lead-in cycle lane. This is a terribly poor junction design unfit for the 2020s. Start again.
The Council concedes (in its small print) that these proposals have not been properly assessed for safety and (I assume) other measures of viability making this consultation yet another waste of time and taxpayers' money. This glaring omission also breaches the Gunning principles in that it is asking for comments and feedback from consultees without providing them with the all the critical information necessary to enable the community to provide fully informed comments and feedback.
The pictorial representation of two vehicular lanes AND a dedicated cycle lane is grossly misleads respondents into thinking there is considerably more space at this junction than actually exists and this deliberate error (it is hard to conceive it was accidental) is another breach of Gunning rendering this section of the consultation invalid, illegal and wide open to judicial review.
My comments have been truncated by Southwark's 1000 character limit - see complaint

It's rubbish, and the Council knows full well that a majority of us in the area did not want it. It has created a shambles for buses and traffic in neighbouring roads. OPEN THE JUNCTION!
I disagree with plans for this junction and hate the knock on impact on flows and access in the surrounding area
Introducing a right hand turn lane on Dulwich Village northbound is obviously a good idea to reduce the unbelievable tailbacks during the rush hour on Dulwich Village. But it this cannot be at the price of removing the traffic Islands from the junction for the reason the stated above and for the protection of cyclists and the avoidance of head-on collisions due to the role of traffic islands in keeping cars and cycles on the left-hand carriageway.
The proposal to remove the pedestrian traffic islands at this junction will make crossing here less safe, and it is already dangerous. The proposal to fit a cycle lane, two northbound lanes and one southbound one into the current space is laughable. Again, cyclists are being given priority over pedestrians. This has to be reversed.
Please see previous comment, the design should accommodate all forms of transportation including cars
This is terrible. The junction was quite busy before, but now the back up of traffic along East Dulwich Grove is horrendous.
I think you're wasting money for your own person gains. This isn't what the Dulwich community wants.
The image is a fantasy and not worthy as a realistic consultation. Please see comments in preceding box.
This scheme creates traffic jams through the village and main remaining roads which is detrimental and does not improve people's journeys in any way
It has forced huge amounts of traffic on to one of the worst sections of the south circular and east Dulwich road. It makes journeys round the area much more difficult with long waits at the traffic lights. Increasing pollution.
Stationary and long queues of traffic show how it does not work
Residents have been completely ignored. It is no longer a nice or safe area to live in
They make it hard for cars to turn right into E Dulwich Grove
I don't support the measures taken by the council - I do not believe the consultation has been honest or fair and the views of local residents have not been listened to. I feel local residents have been corralled and that facts have been manipulated by the council so as to be presented as it suits. I would have been happy to support changes but not in this way.
As stated above. This action has achieved the opposite of its stated aims
There is now more very slow moving traffic backed up northbound along Dulwich Village than before the cycle lane 'wands' were installed. Traffic trying to turn right blocks out any straight on traffic and the residents of Dulwich Village have more stationary traffic chugging out pollution than they ever did before. A complete nonsense as there are very few bicycles to be seen in the cycle lane.
this junction is completely grid locked now, day and night, and worse than ever to navigate on a bicycle. the knock on effect of the road closures is unfair on the residents.
Tailbacks on the northbound side of Dulwich Village are horrendous, partly because of the reduction to one lane by adding in a cycle track.
Just pushing traffic to another area. No brainers
as before
The Dulwich Village community rejected the closure of the junction in the original consultation
We need solutions which work for all people not just pedestrians.
The Council hasn't listened to the local community as it has ignored it's stated opinion as expressed in the results of previous consultations
I do not agree with the closure of this junction. I have said so at every meeting you held in the past before covid, at every consultation, and am appalled that you have consistently ignored local people's opposition to your scheme.
In addition to all the points at 8 above: as a resident of East Dulwich Grove within a hundred yards of the Red Post Hill junction I see daily the congestion and anger caused by the council's irresponsible roads policy. Huge queues build up going both north and south; these delays cause anger and rows, loud hooting and often accidents; concentrated fume emissions on all four roads that damage the health of residents and children, of whom thousands attend schools on our road; serious delays to the journeys of people going to work and attending appointments; drastically reduce visitors to local shops, of whom some have already closed and all are experiencing loss of trade. Why should all this be imposed on us just so a few privileged people on Calton Avenue can have a quieter life?
All tghat junction is now is a traffic jam which it never used to be before.
Have you seen the backed up traffic at the lights? The health of children at the infants school has been sacrificed to appease neighbouring streets and that cannot be right.
the jounction is badly designed causing long queques of cars that are polluting houses near that road. the traffic was displaced from other roads to that jounction and it must be very difficult for the people leaving there.
The changes have increased traffic congestion and pollution.
Bicycles are small you can cycle regardless of extra late etc or not

<p>The tail-backed traffic along Dulwich Village where the Junction with East Dulwich Grove is constricted makes going along north Dulwich Village by bike feel less safe.</p> <p>As before, walking here was never at all difficult. People just use their legs, they cross at crossings; there was never any impediment to that.</p> <p>I've never had a problem sharing the road with cars; now children and new cyclists cannot learn how to be safe on all roads, which could be to their detriment. They need Bikeability not sectioned-off lanes.</p>
<p>Impact of children at NDC will be bad</p> <p>The original aim of this temporary closure was for COVID reasons then there became the LTN plan to protect pedestrians and cyclists travelling to and from schools The council ignored all consultation and permanently closed the junction. The roads that this traffic has been displaced to are either gridlocked and polluted or have become race tracks 24hrs a day. These are the very roads where thousands of pedestrians move through Dulwich to get to over seven schools. Make it a timed situation under the LTN in order to protect the school children.. The motor vehicle accidents on displaced roads (you never include the South Circular) are due to highly frustrated vehicle users not. I have lived here for over thirty years in various roads in Dulwich, it scares the life out of me every day watching the school run. I have personally witnessed seven accidents on EDGmany of those wont be in your statistics as Police weren't aware. It is a failed scheme and is destroying Dulwich area.</p>
<p>Southwark's road schemes seem designed to favour a small minority while treating those who rely on their cars punitively.</p> <p>As above</p> <p>Making healthy and sustainable travel the safest, easiest, quickest and most convenient choice.</p> <p>The assumption that this is possible is pie in the sky. People are not only travelling locally, but also making longer journeys to / from and through the area. The elderly or disabled simply don't have this choice. My view is that the junction has made life much more difficult for the vast majority of people and is driving increased pollution through slow traffic and increased car usage due to longer journeys.</p>
<p>Since the blocking of Calton Avenue, the timed restrictions and the narrowing of boundary roads, all that seems to have happened in that the community has become divided, journey times have increased and pedestrians now "enjoy" walking past idling traffic and breathing noxious fumes</p>
<p>A build up of traffic turning right, so many cars jumping the lights, cars trying to get past to drive straight ahead, mayhem. Dedicated cycle lane not in full use.</p>
<p>The above commentary does not explain how northbound traffic at the Dulwich Village/Red Post Hill junction would be achieved nor identify any potentially adverse impacts. In particular, if the light phasing will be changed, this will increase traffic on other roads at the junction. East Dulwich Grove and Red Post Hill already have very high levels of congestion.</p>
<p>Journeys on boundary roads, whether by bus, car or bicycle will be made more difficult due to displaced traffic.</p>
<p>1/ The closure of East Dulwich Grove for any reason would necessitate detours via Denmark Hill or A205 if the Village junction is closed permanently. This could have serious consequences.</p> <p>2/ I worry that by removing existing traffic islands, this junction would be more dangerous for pedestrians, specifically so many children crossing this junction every day.</p> <p>3/ I agree only with new advanced cycle stop lines</p>

Comments for 2

<p>Southbound journeys are horrible & dangerous. Northbound is better until you get to Red Post Hill. Cycleways on Village Way would be good and help restrain motor traffic from excessive speed</p>
<p>There are not cycle lanes on the red post hill. This is where they are most needed.</p> <p>The rest of the scheme is nice to have but not essential</p> <p>Try cycling along there - it is very scary .</p>
<p>The cycle lane should go. I live on that junction and have never seen a bike use it. Why would one when Calton is a massive bike lane leading through Greendale to Denmark Hill. Once cars get to that junction at East Dulwich Grove they have had enough sitting in horrendous traffic caused by displacement of traffic. They drive aggressively. If you keep Calton closed why on earth would you encourage bikes to use Village Way by putting a bike lane. It also causes horrendous tale bakes Jami g traffic by those turning right. The road isn't big enough for bike lane and 3 car lanes to be safe.</p>
<p>Will still be congested</p>
<p>This won't reduce the existing long tail-backs at the intersection.</p>
<p>Support is given for the one new advance cycle stop lane.</p>
<p>They will just create greater tailbacks... have you not noticed the tailbacks.</p>

<p>I would strongly object to any narrowing of the space available for cars and buses on key roads like East Dulwich Grove northbound and southbound, through intersections with Dulwich Village and Turney Road. That would result in more congestion - hence more pollution - as well as significantly increased travel times for school kids in the morning and afternoon.</p>
<p>There is no congestion on Dulwich Village northbound into Red Post Hill, I'm not sure what you are trying to address there. It's irrelevant as all the congestion on East Dulwich Grove straight (both ways) and between Red Post Hill and East Dulwich Growth (both directions).</p>
<p>Congestion in these intersections is clearly made worse by the 'improvements' in other parts of Dulwich Village, namely widespread road closures, but I'm sure you know that.</p>
<p>You'd have to be pretty mad to cycle across this junction in either direction, before or after the proposed changes. The existing wand separation northbound on Dulwich Village does not provide sufficient protection for cyclists riding into the junction. And once you have crossed the junction from any direction there is no protection at all. ASLs do nothing if they are not tied to protected infrastructure.</p>
<p>Improvement in terms of two lane approach and cycle lane to reduce traffic. Does this reduce parking and therefore have an impact on the local community in terms of being forced to have to pay for permits in surrounding village roads? Permit parking and reduced parking in village will again impact local businesses. Also being forced to pay for permits for family/friends visits/social care and house services/deliveries causes again increased restrictions on our social behaviour already having been restricted by the timed road access. Do not see why we should ultimately pay for Southwark Road improvements as it removes adequate parking. We have no parking issues at the moment, but this could impact. The pay for parking in Dulwich Park has impacted both Gallery Road and College Road.</p>
<p>I don't think this junction is safe for cyclists.</p>
<p>ASL is good, but not much of an improvement.</p>
<p>The improvements for pedestrians are good and the addition of ASLs is welcome. However, I think it's very likely that traffic volumes on all four arms of the junction exceed TfL's limit of 500 per hour for mixing vehicles with cycles, so opportunities for protection for cyclists, or alternative parallel routes need to be explored.</p>
<p>Trying to squeeze buses, lorries motor vehicles and cyclist into such a small junction is exceedingly shortsighted. Push the vulnerable people, i.e. cyclists to the other side of the green area.</p>
<p>Terrible on all levels.</p>
<p>The traffic lights crossing time is ridiculous and extremely dangerous.</p>
<p>ditto</p>
<p>Again, you are creating an enclave while pushing pollution and road traffic to other parts of Dulwich. This furthers inequality. If you want this to work, make the public transport system work smoothly and create temporary LTNs, not permanent ones</p>
<p>I think this mantra is a guiding principle: "Paint is not protection". "would I let my 10 year old cycle through this junction unaccompanied?" No.</p>
<p>If this junction is being refactored, please integrate completely segregated cycle routes (like at the Sydenham Hill/Fountain Drive roundabouts).</p>
<p>I think the vision has to be enabling fully protected / safe routes end to end. This will give people more confidence.</p>
<p>IF this layout means that northbound cars can turn right into east dulwich grove and go straight on simultaneously that would help ease the huge blocks back up Dulwich Village</p>
<p>BUT removal of traffic islands in all four arms is a concern as there is currently not enough time to get pedestrians across the junction</p>
<p>This junction has caused massive tailbacks at various times of day, not only traditional rush hour times because it is taking all the additional traffic from the closure of the Calton Avenue/Dulwich Village junction including local residential users accessing Court Lane/Woodwarde and adjacent roads.</p>
<p>An additional consideration should be that any disruption on East Dulwich Grove (accident/road works/water repairs etc) means traffic including public service busses would need to be redirected via A205 or Denmark Hill which are substantial detours on already busy roads. This scenario should be taken seriously *before* it happens. As we have the benefit of the large green space of Dulwich Park, there are limited alternative traffic routes.</p>
<p>Always queues at this junction and cars/buses/cycles/mopeds coming at you from all angles. Dangerous to children and older people in particular.</p>
<p>Another waste of money, there are hardly any ppl using this junction, be it by bike, walking or car</p>

<p>Great idea to remove the barriers that exist at the Dulwich Village/ Village Way and East Dulwich Grove. Flexible solutions that accommodate a range of street and pavement users is sensible.</p> <p>The current backlog caused the cycle lane / barrier in Dulwich Village causes significant and unnecessary traffic congestion, statis traffic and pollution. Great to see that the new design is focused on movement and flow of traffic along essentail routes for buses, emergency vehicles and other road and pedestrian users. Buses are an efficient way of moving large numbers of people distances for commutes (school, work) and other business including hospital visits. Minimising obstacles and congestion for buses and other traffic is important. There is very little information about pedestrian crossings on these diagrams.</p>
<p>As a cyclist it is more dangerous. Drivers often frustrated and pull out suddenly when trying to get around vehicles queuing to turn RIGHT into East Dulwich Grove. The iron works in the cycle track (Dulwich Village) is VERY slippery as it has rutted metal edges in its design. Cycle track often has mopeds.</p>
<p>In morning AM and PM peaks very large number of cyclists. Suggest add ASL on all arms of the junction.</p>
<p>Work with the Dulwich Estates to provided a cycle track through the green area next to Dulwich Village. This will improve the flow of general traffic and reduce pollution.</p>
<p>I am not convinced that, with keeping the segregated bike lane on Dulwich Village, there will be enough road width to have two lanes for vehicle traffic at the lights. Has this been properly measured / surveyed? Why is there no graphic to illustrate this like there are many graphics for the Dulwich Village / Turney Way / Calton Avenue junction?</p>
<p>The increased traffic following the councils closure of the Carlton Ave junction has created unnecessary longer journeys for many residents, thus increasing traffic volume through this junction and increased journey times. We welcome the re-instatement of the formal designation of two lanes heading north from Dulwich village.</p>
<p>These measures are not likely to change congestion here significantly. Road closures and timed areas have increased congestion at certain times of the day.</p>
<p>I am concerned about the crossing of East Dulwich Grove . The pavement on the north side is very narrow at that corner with limited space for people to wait and is difficult for wheelchair users to naviagate. Removing the central reservation prevents any phased crossing so numbers will build waiting at this point which is aggravated by the proximity to bus stop and train station.</p>
<p>If Calton Avenue had not been blocked to motor vehicles, there would have not been the same level of northbound congestion. This is almost entirely caused by the blocking of of CA, making it necessary for all traffic heading towards AreaB to have to go round through EDG. Reopening CA at least to local traffic should be the first measure of traffic improvement However the situation was made worse by reducing the N-bound route at the DV/RPH junction to single lane by intro of the wanded cycle lane . I therefore welcome the realignment to give 2 lanes. But a much better arrangement would be to convert the junction to mini roundabout and no traffic lights.</p>
<p>Too much motor traffic at that junction. Need more restrictions on motor access.</p>
<p>Unclear how this improves traffic flow at Dulwich Village / Red Post Hill. By creating the bike and car filter at the lights, this has cause mayhem but creating traffic jams for anyone turning right at East Dulwich Grove or wanting to go straight on past North Dulwich station</p>
<p>How are commuters encouraged to cycle or use public transport instead of driving?</p>
<p>This is a dreadful area to get to now if you live in Dovercourt Road and have had to drive around the area to get into Townley Road. Our journeys are intermittent and at different days and times in the week coming back from outside of London.</p>
<p>Have you noted that people (who don't know the area) go up the inside just before the junction to turn left without realising that there is a green area.</p>
<p>It would be great to have the two lanes from Dulwich Village heading to Red Post Hill put back, but why do you need to widen the footways at each corner?! There is already a good deal of space for pedestrians who want to cross at this junction - people just stand back - you don't want to encourage them to crowd around at the curbs</p>
<p>Removal of pedestrian sanctuary at this junction will endanger lives of pedestrians</p>
<p>The build up of traffic trying to turn on to East Dulwich Way is not addressed by this proposal.</p>

Comments for 3 (partly)

<p>The segregated cycle lane should be removed from Dulwich village and replaced into the greenery on the side. Good that there are two lanes again. Traffic has been bad but with the cycle lane I think the lanes will be too narrow considering there are buses going through the junction</p>
<p>Not clear how congestion/danger will be eased around the dulwich village / East Dulwich junction</p>
<p>These measures dont help people who have more equipment/tools than they can carry on a bike or walk with...again only helps part of the community not all of the community</p>

<p>This junction is in dire need of change- ideally you would repeat what has been done at East Dulwich grove/Townley road here. The most terrifying part of this junction is sitting in the hatchet box on a bike - trying to turn right from east Dulwich grove into red post hill or from village way right into Dulwich village, with cars and buses all around you. The junction lighting feels very dark and it's not cyclist friendly for people coming down East Dulwich grove. There are bike lanes and wands for the other directions but this one is diving with death for bike users especially with so many aggressive drivers</p>
<p>The ASLs and feeder lanes are to be welcomed, however big junctions like these can still be quite scary for cycles (left hook risks present, large junction to traverse). For highest level of service, innovative junction design such as CCS or Cyclops junctions are preferable, although I understand they are not yet widespread, and there may be other factors at play here which preclude this option.</p>
<p>unknown as this is not shown.</p>
<p>It appears that the existing cycle wand is full of leaves and is not used much. I would question the value of having it at all. Need to include usage in your traffic survey.</p>
<p>The single cycle lane by the junction of East Dulwich Grove and Village Way causes enormous congestion as it does not allow traffic to go straight ahead and turn right at the same time. This causes the back ups and terrible pollution.</p>
<p>The restoration of the two lane approach to the junction along Dulwich Village to reduce vehicle congestion is welcome, and overdue. I can't see how it can be done without some reduction of Clarke's Green, although if this is done, it would be to part of the Green that is not used.</p> <p>The removal of the pedestrian (not traffic) islands is not going to make the junction safer for pedestrians. This is a junction used by a great many young pedestrians and you need to be very careful.</p> <p>I'm unsure of the need for widening the footways, other than at the corner of East Dulwich Grove and Red Post Hill.</p>
<p>I worry that the width is not enough to accommodate 2 lanes and a cycle lane. Could the area of greenery be narrowed to allow for this?</p> <p>Also- will there be a right turn phase of the traffic lights?</p>
<p>See previous comments on traffic displacement and lack of data</p>
<p>The segregated wand cycle lane is useless and fills with dirt and leaves making it even more dangerous for cyclists. I welcome the 2 lanes for cars however as the congestion in the village caused by this intersection is often ridiculous.</p>
<p>1. Relieves congestion with extra lane travelling north on Dulwich Village but I cannot read captions and assume traffic lights have filter for north bound traffic to turn into East Dulwich Road. I suspect a box in middle of traffic lights may hinder right turning traffic into East Dulwich Grove, similarly other traffic turning right on other roads.</p>
<p>These are an improvement on the current changes that were made which severely increased pollution with constant traffic jams through Dulwich Village because the cycle lane on Dulwich Village junction with Village Way restricted the width so badly that traffic waiting to turn right on to East Dulwich Grove blocked progress of traffic needing to go North on to Red Post Hill. The improvements do not address the horrific increased pollution caused by the displacement of traffic due to all the local LTN's. This defeats all the arguments in support of the LTN's in the surrounding area with more traffic fumes being pumped into all the local schools including Dulwich Hamlet Junior and Infant Schools, Judith Kerr Primary School, Jags & Jags Pre Prep, Alleyn's and both Charter Schools. The movement of buses also severely restricted thus increasing journey times and negating the move to put people on to public transport and out of their cars.</p>
<p>Some improvement, especially restoring the second northbound motor lane, but the removal of the four traffic islands/pedestrian refuges will make the crossings less safe and more daunting especially for those who are slow walkers through disability or old age.</p>
<p>There has been a substantial increase in Traffic on Burbage Road, and it is not clear how current proposals will mitigate this</p>
<p>The restoration of two lanes and the removal of the fixed cycle lane would seem to improve the flow and is much needed.</p>
<p>Changes seem negligible.</p>
<p>Need to recreate 2 lanes Northbound towards North Dulwich station</p>
<p>Re opening calton avenue and court lane from the village would be more effective and cheaper</p>
<p>very few cyclists use this junction improving the right turn a good thing</p> <p>Even better to reopen "Dulwich square!"</p>
<p>It's difficult to envisage. If the northbound arm is wide enough to allow two cars then I agree with the proposals. The congestion is often caused by a car turning right along East Dulwich Grove, with cars wishing to turn left onto Village Way or continue north to Red Post Hill being unable to pass the turning car as it waits for a gap in oncoming traffic from Red Post Hill.</p>
<p>It just takes one wider vehicle eg a lorry to block the lanes so it is flawed at best.</p>
<p>Recreation of the previous two lanes for northbound traffic should help reduce congestion created by previous intervention, however has the effect on southbound traffic been considered since the southbound lane on Dulwich village will now be significantly narrowed? Removal of traffic island on East Dulwich Grove is not an improvement as this is the main route for flow of pedestrians between Dulwich village and North Dulwich station and the island assists pedestrians crossing.</p>
<p>Boxes for cycling at front of light on all approaches is a good idea</p>
<p>2 lanes on Dulwich Village is a good idea.</p>

Not 100% sure that closing off this road improves the quality of air for those who live where the traffic has now been forced to go, especially past all the schools in the area that now have more traffic queueing by them and school entry and exit times
I think the filter right lane turning from Dulwich Village to Turney Road acts as a bottleneck for the traffic that is trying to go straight on to Red Post Hill. I think the cycle barriers are useful, but contribute to the bottleneck (certainly the final one). It would be useful to consider ways to ease the flow northward.
Hopefully it will reduce the long tailbacks of north bound traffic, but as much of it turns right and has to await the right turn filter the queue along Dulwich Village will probaly still be lengthy
Streets for Journeys- so long as you want to go north!
The northbound Advanced Stop Line should be much closer to the junction. This far back will mean a higher proportion of motor vehicles stopping in the advanced stop line area meant solely for bicycles. The east and west sound ASL's are perpendicular to the pavement not sure why they're not parallel to the pedestrian crossing routes - the ASL would be a regular rectangle but it would place some cyclists further forward aware from motor vehicles which would be a good thing.
Anything will be an improvement on the current state of the junction. However I am perturbed by the red printed 'subject to....' warning.
I don't understand the positioning of the tactile paving at the 4 corners in relation to dropped kerbs. Other than the short stretch of Dulwich Village with wands, no protection is afforded to cyclists going on from the junction, onto roads that are heavily used by very large SUVs, coaches etc. Especially if 2 lanes of traffic are going to squeeze into one as they get into Red Post Hill. Any cyclist there is going to feel very intimidated!
I'm not sure what these measure are. I have noticed that the traffic backs up a lot outside the schools now that there is only one lane and a bike lane rather than 2 lanes. This can't be good for air quality but it is good to have a cycle lane so I don't know what the solution is. Could the road be widened perhaps or something done to stop traffic backing up?
Restoring the lane for the right turn into East Dulwich Grove will assist in reducing the northbound congestion in the Village, however the continued closure of the Carlton Avenue junction means this will not be as effective as it might have been if the junction had been reopened
Very hard to tell. HAVING 2 lanes from Dulwich Village going north should help.
Your proposal is welcomed to some extent to reduce driver frustration with delays caused by right turning vehicles but it should not encourage more or faster moving traffic. There needs to be a commensurate reconfiguration of the traffic lights to allow more time for pedestrians to cross with the introduction of a 'Shibuya Scramble Crossing' to address the movement patterns of school children and commuters heading for the railway station and the bus stops.
There needs to be an improvement to the visual appearance of the 'wands' by their removal and replacement with an up-stand kerb like that shown in your illustrations for the Dulwich Village / Turney Road junction and the Dulwich Village / Calton Avenue Junction. Any improvement to the appearance and condition of Clarke's Green is welcomed.
Having right hand turn lanes that also go straight on has caused huge car stand offs in the past
Removal of the traffic islands will increase time taken to cross the junction which is currently flexible ie you can cross the road in 2 stages today and in future you can only cross the road in one stage. Sometimes the pedestrian crossing is phased to come on only every other time so the wait time for the green man can be very long. I prefer the traffic island remains on the east side (crossing south to north) for those rushing for a train - otherwise accidents are likely
Having two lanes coming from Dulwich Village to turn right to edg will improve traffic floe and congestion by allowing traffic going straight to get past cars turning right.
Having 2 lanes travelling north from dulwich village would be a major improvement. Removing the traffic islands trvelling east and west would be dangerous for pedestrians and vehicles. Will cause more collisions with east/west traffic as cars travelling east use turn right lane to jump the queue of traffic and go straight ahead. Measure are needed to stop this.
As long at it doesn't then cause any delays to other roads adjacent
Can you really fit 2 lanes of traffic going north from the Village? Not convinced you need the cycle lane there ... I think much safer to keep the mid road protected areas for pedestrians - loads of children crossing there.
This proposal improves the junction which has been significantly affected by the traffic movement onto East Dulwich Grove from the changes in Dulwich Village. They would not be necessary if you removed the changes in the centre of the village.
The green corner Village Way / Dulwich Village could be improved for walking. Given how busy the road along E Dulwich Grove / Village Way / Half Moon Lane is a cycle lane would be more appropriate. Cycling along here with smaller children is terrifying and will be avoided by many. Improving this would make a real change to how children can travel to and from school. The cycle infrastruaction which is excellent along Greendale is completely isolated and desperately needs connecting - this area would be the first step and connect schools but also Dulwich Park / Brockwell Park etc.
Please don't get rid of the islands here

Consider having diagonal crossing phase at the Village way/ 1/2 moon lane junction to reduce crossing times.
Its hard to see that these proposals will have any impact on congestion northbound
Traffic pushed onto half moon lane / dulwich village has adversely impacted this junction for all but especially increased the hazard for cyclists, prolonged journey times for those using buses and worsened pollution for schools/ households living there
Reducing parking spaces along Dulwich village adversely impacts local trade.
I don't think it ultimately does. It really is divisive.
Please tidy up area by the Jags Junior School. It is currently messy and uninviting. The other end of the road by Half Moon Lane has a very attractive and welcoming people space. The journeys prioritised are by cycle not on foot!
Although this will help northbound traffic flow, and improve pavements, this does nothing to improve cycling safety at this dangerous junction. There is parking on EDG east and west that could be use to create protected cycle lanes, and space on DV north and southbound, to add cycle tracks to prevent cars from close passing. Until real cycle infrastructure is added here, this will remain a dangerous junction that cyclists should avoid, especially children.
This is better but there is still too much traffic flowing through this junction causing huge tailbacks. This is all due to the closure in dulwich village.
Same as first comment
It would be great to see more marked and protected cycleways at this junction.
Can we get protected cycle lanes down the entirety of Dulwich Village?
It's hard to see the detail on my phone but it looks like the junction will still be rather intimidating for all but the most confident cyclists given the need to mingle with vehicle traffic
I live on Lordship lane and I have seen a considerable increase of traffic on Lordship lane and the 205, which runs right past a number of schools, nurseries and LOT more people (like mine) live on Lordship land than the whole of Dulwich village Outside of school hours being able to go through the village without being pushed to the 205 or the lights on East Dulwich Grove (now also considerably more congested) is a significant benefit we no longer enjoy, even though there isn't an impact to the schools at this time
So I think more people do walk etc... (we as a family always have) to the school, I think the objectives could be achieved without closing any roads and just having time limited access
I am not sure, I can't tell what has changed! I use this junction quite frequently, but I don't understand the changes properly or what the issues were in the first place, so it is difficult to comment!
Removing traffic islands is a great idea and light countdown will be useful. Also good to have ASL's added. However, beyond that 3 out of 4 arms on that junction will still be very difficult to navigate on a bike and I will still have to avoid that junction.
This junction and road doesn't feel safe for cyclists. Separate cycle lanes and lights timed for priority cyclist access at this junction and along East Dulwich Grove would make a big difference.
Good to have the separate right turn lane from Dulwich Village.
Cyclists need to be taken off the roads, perhaps by using a space next to the pavement/green areas. The roads are too narrow and the wands are an eyesore in a conservation area. I agree that we need two vehicle lanes back at the junction.
Removal of pedestrian island on Village Way a backward step. But reintroduction of dual northbound lanes on Dulwich Village is good move.
I think the cycle pods have caused traffic to back up. Maybe that causes people to use other roads?
Creating two lanes going north is necessary to relieve congestion. I think that getting rid of the pedestrian traffic islands makes it more, not less, dangerous for pedestrians,
Northbound congestion is very bad during busy times.
The current pedestrian crossing countdown is extremely fast, not enough time to cross as a fast able bodied person. Hopefully the countdown changes will improve this
Getting to the junction from Red Post Hill is not changing, still a bottleneck. Are there other options available considering Village Way and Half Moon Lane?
Not really sure what you have done.
Just make it safe. Only less cars will be safe.
The cycle lane needs locating in the green space on the west side of Dulwich Village/Village Way junction.
Continuous pavements with setback stop lines needed.

the new two lane segregation is a great improvement as the current impediment to petrol/diesel vehicles is not great for pollution on Dulwich Village.
Reinstating a second lane going north will alleviate tail backs at the junction - particularly frustrating whe on the P4 bus. It does not look as if there is sufficient width to keep a cycle lane?
It doesn't look that different. Maybe giving cyclists a headstart at the lights makes turning right easier?
Segregated cycle lanes would improve pedestrian and cyclist safety.
The enforced cycle lane with the bollards cause confusion and queuing traffic
Once these changes have been made the traffic restrictions between 8 & 9am and in the afternoon should be removed
Hard to tell what the new measures are.
Cycle lanes on East Dulwich Grove ASL will help for bikes turning right but without cycle lanes they will be difficult to get into. Wider pavement - so many school kids in the morning. Diagonal crossing for pedestrians.
Removing the centre islands will be catastrophic. The road is too wide not to have them, and near to a station and schools makes it even worse.
The closures at Carlton ave increased the amount of traffic turning right at this junction so you are solving a problem that you created.
I don't see any benefit for pedestrians trying to get to N Dulwich station in the morning. The traffic island at the North is used by a lot of people trying to cross the junction.
The restriction of the northbound traffic from Dullage Village to Red Post Hill was an error in the last implementation. Returning Dulwich Village to two lane vehicular layout at the junction with Red Post Hill northbound and Village way is an improvement on the current problems. However it is not clear that the space exists, given the cycle barriers that are currently in place. It is not shown as intended on the diagrams. but there is plenty space to create a cycle path through the green area at this junction and direct them to the top of the two lanes of cars. Otherwise , the proposal is without space to implement and is unrealistic. The detail of impact is missing. If a cycle priority is created, what does this mean to timing across the junction for both pedestrians and traffic, all already suffering by the concentration of movement at this junction as a result of the existing Council interventions and their associated traffic displacement.
Could introduce a separate cycle lane turning left from Dulwich Village onto Village Way
We await to see how they work. There is the issue that the displaced traffic comes along East Dulwich Grove and Half Moon Lane. The timing of the lights makes a big difference to traffic flows.
If you have two lanes north bound for cars which would help the traffic, there needs to be adequate room for the cycle lane and south bound traffic
While I support the objective of improving the space in Dulwich village for pedestrians and cyclists, I am concerned about traffic displacement into Burbage Road (a residential road which bears the brunt of increased through traffic as a result of restrictions since 2020 on motor vehicles in Dulwich Village and traffic jams down Croxted Road). The ever rising traffic volumes in Burbage Road must be curbed as part of this scheme.
Can't tell from your proposals. Seperate bicycle lights are only useful if they are as quick as the car lights, rather than waiting there for ages. Most cyclists do not wait for the green light as it is not needed as there is not that much traffic anyway.
The additional northbound lane turning right will reduce traffic jams at the lights, but the additional traffic caused by the closure of Calton Avenue makes this a more dangerous junction. I am concerned at the proposal to remove the central pedestrian islands at this junction.
Please please! Ensure that it feels safe for bikes and cars turning right into Dulwich Village from Village Way. Either a staggered red light for turning or a right turn green light. At the moment I find it quite scary to turn into the village on my bike due to the angle of the road and buses tuning onto Red Post blocking my view for cars going straight on. The traffic light phasing seems to prioritise traffic coming from the opposite direction and feels very unsafe at the moment.
Will right turns have a dedicated traffic light? This is a very dangerous junction for turning right on a bike from any direction as it is always very busy and bikes have to wait in the centre of the junction for incoming traffic to pass. I am a cyclist and often concerned about my safety here.
The pedestrian waiting time at this junction is currently very long - a shorter waiting time would dramatically improve the pedestrian experience and increase safety as pedestrians wouldn't be tempted to cross while the signal is red.
There should be more parking restrictions at this junction especially at school drop off/pickup times. It is dangerous cycling through here at these times. Large vehicles opening doors into traffic, cars crossing the opposite lanes in front of cycles to secure parking pots. Village Way ought to be a no parking zone during these times.
I sometimes have to wait in the island in the road - if these are removed it might be more dangerous

Traffic signals required to have straight ahead and right turn lights (red & green) to help manage and avoid bottle necks and risks when vehicles turn in front of others going straight ahead
I'm pleased with the countdown timers. But tfl will control crossing times and likely prioritise bus timetables over pedestrian needs. This junction sees 1000's of pedestrians cross—particularly school children crossing independently.
I would strongly advise that the pedestrian refuges at this junction be retained to enable pedestrians to safely cross this wide road regardless of what decisions the tfl make in future re signal sequences and timings.
Mixed views hence the 3.
The changes make motorised traffic flow better but cars are at the bottom of the priority list.
The removal of the islands is negative for pedestrians. If they are to be removed the pedestrians need to get a longer phase in the lights and also to get a turn at each rotation (currently only alternate turns outside certain hours).
Pedestrians along the south side of Village Way could be routed through Clarke's Green rather than along the kerb. This would be better than widening the pavement.
Consideration should be given to allowing some space on Clarke's Green for a phone mast as an alternative location to the Square (which is wholly inappropriate).
Am not able to read the comments on the diagram and don't know how to enlarge. If the cars exiting Dulwich Village are stopped further back in the Village that would make it safer for pedestrians crossing East Dulwich Grove towards the Village and less likely for right turning traffic to knock over a pedestrian
Again will this create problems in adjacent areas
Cycle lane does not allow a lane to go forward at East Dulwich Grove if cars are turning right unless the right turn is speeded up
I hope that there is sufficient space left for cyclists travelling South on Dulwich Village. The current road layout is congested with parked vehicles; and the proposal above seems to show the Northbound lane(s) encroaching on the current Southbound lane.
If the traffic islands are removed from each of the four arms of the junction, it is imperative that the green lights for pedestrians give a much longer period of time than at present for slower walkers and disabled people to cross the roads in safety.
The revised design of this junction is critically dependent on the phasing of the traffic lights and pedestrian signals. It is not clear how cyclists can safely turn right (into East Dulwich Grove) when going north in the proposed design.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Good to see pedestrian countdown timers and advanced cycle stop lines added to this busy junction, these are long overdue. - We would ask the council to look into adding advanced release for cyclists at all 4 signals. - Whilst the existing traffic islands are being removed from all 4 arms of the junction, the footways are widened on all four corners and the pedestrian crossing appears wider also. - We would urge the council to ensure there are improvements / better prioritisation of pedestrians through longer phases for pedestrians to cross. It is currently a rush. - We would ask the council to explore adding a diagonal pedestrian crossing, similar to that at the Townley/East Dulwich Grove junction. - Will buses be able to turn around the north-east corner if the pavement is extended?

Comments for 4

Although traffic is significantly reduced on Carlton Avenue, there is still relative high usage from cars in the mornings, creating a dangerous confrontation between young cyclists going to school and cars (local residents coming via Woodwarde Rd and turning right into Carlton Ave and also people using these streets for drop-off points into Alleyns & JAGS). Carlton Ave is not a school street but is perceived as one, given the restricted entry point from Dulwich Village, and gives gives cyclists a false sense of security. Maybe consideration should be given into turning it to a school street
The (current) lack of a right hand turn significantly increases the build up of traffic in Dulwich village
making 2 lanes on northbound of dulwich village is crucial to allow one lane for straight ahead and another for right turns. this is causing tail backs all through the Village all day long
Support cycle waiting areas. Pedestrian islands should be retained and not removed.
Comment in box is illegible. If this is showing the REMOVAL of the current bike lane and restoration of the double car lane on Dulwich Village Northbound then that will be a huge benefit. The current single car lane is inadequate and causing huge congestion/engine idling. Not clear from map whether the current north bound cycle lane is redirected or just removed

I like the proposals but they do not resolve the problem of cyclists safely approaching the junction westbound from East Dulwich Grove. With two lanes of traffic, there is no way around to get to the proposed advanced stop box. Too narrow for a cycle lane plus two traffic lanes?
see my comments above re need for blocks / plantar boxes
The yellow box and cycle boxes are an improvement. Two lanes northbound are also an improvement.
I don't know why the lane to turn right onto East Dulwich Grove from Dulwich Village was removed in the first place. It's good to see this is reinstated.
The pavement widening is welcome - the corner with Red Post Hill and East Dulwich Grove is especially bad and there is a dangerous slope to the road. Can the road level not be raised in order to level the pavement? Would it be possible to move the traffic light posts so they are not in the middle of the pavement?
Reintroducing two lanes towards Red Post Hill is a good idea and will help reduce stopped traffic outside schools on Dulwich Village if it permits traffic to queue and turn right up East Dul Grove.
Separate green light with sufficient time for cyclists to clear the junction are very important for younger and inexperienced cyclists
will there be enforced ways to keep speeds down on Village Way / Half Moon Lane which is a speedway at the moment?
I think removing 'traffic islands' from each location proposed would increase my sense of vulnerability when crossing at this junction. If possible I would like to see diagonal crossings, as installed at Oxford Circus, together with increased pedestrian timings here.
Costs please
Still a messy junction.
Having two car lanes here is much better. However, segregating the narrow lane for cyclists (which is often full of leaves and muck - and too narrow for the road sweepers to get down) is a waste of time. Bikes don't use it and will cycle in the left hand car lane.
Welcome 2 lanes for traffic northbound as will reduce congestion including for the P4 bus. However, not clear where or how the segregated cycle lane (wands) are to be retained which is essential for cyclists. Please clarify.
If you can get the 2 lane approach in here to reduce queues of cars that would be much better
This all hinges on getting the phasing of the lights right to ensure vehicles are not delayed longer than necessary. This causes driver stress which then in turn, will impact cyclists and pedestrians as vehicles try to push through amber or red lights.
The current position results in long lines of traffic idling behind cars waiting to turn right into East Dulwich Grove. Creating more space for traffic to move freely through the junction will be a big improvement in terms of reducing congestion and air pollution.
The ASL for cyclists are a pointless exercise as the existing ones are rarely observed by drivers. Ideally cyclists would have separate lanes at all approaches to this junction. South down red post hill is particularly hostile for cycling with children
I think it is helpful to have more space for pedestrians waiting to cross. I'm not sure what else could be done.
There needs to be measures to reduce traffic from private schools during school run.
This is tricky and the diagram seems to have abolished the cycle lane and its protection to the south of the junction.
Strongly agree with the additions of pedestrian footway widening and new advanced cycle stop lines. Also strongly support the retention of existing cycle wand segregation on the exit from Dulwich Village which greatly improves road safety on the approach to the junction.
I suggest bring the traffic "stop" in Dulwich Village nearer to the traffic lights.
Not obvious why the pavement needs to come round Clarke's Green south from the DV crossing - this looks dangerous.
Cameras needed to reduce "jumping the lights" at this junction.
If land is being taken from Clarke's Green to allow widening the road in Dulwich Village, the bushes etc lining the Green need to be reinstated.
1. The addition of a right turn lane from Dulwich Village to East Dulwich Grove will be an improvement and help to improve traffic flows across the intersection. This is a significant existing problem with traffic backed past Boxall Rd in the mornings and several other times during the day. The right turn lane must be long enough to allow several vehicles to queue and not impede the traffic turning left or continuing to red post hill.
When leaving the village and turning left you are making the corner harder to turn for cars, leaving leaving the softer turn will improve traffic flow
Great that you're planning two lanes for cars coming from Dulwich Village at this Junction. Thank you!
Please allow longer time for pedestrians to cross, also please allow diagonal crossings

Resolve the drainage issues in the north east corner of the Red post Hill/East Dulwich Grove junction which pools in heavy rain
Pavement on north east corner is in a poor state of repair.
The re-introduction of the right hand filter lane on Village Way onto East Dulwich Grove appears to be a welcome change, though it's unclear how this will be possible if the north-bound cycle Lane is being retained.
The addition of a turn right lane northbound at Red Post Hill is very needed as the current configuration does not work.
It remains to be seen if it works, but if I understand this correctly, it is highly beneficial to have 2 lanes approaching the crossing Dulwich Village to Red Post Hill as currently the tailback is generated by cars wanting to turn right into E. Dulwich Grove and holding back those that want to continue straight onto Red Post Hill.
Very important to have two lanes going north into the crossing.
The only sensible suggestion to ensure there are two lanes running north to ensure that there is less unnecessary congestion.
Given the space restrictions is a good plan
Generally supportive of the proposed alterations
Consider cycle lanes on Village Way
I'm not sure the removal of the traffic islands will make it easier to cross.
Making sure the pedestrian crossing isn't green when the cycle light is green- sometimes when I cycle from Court Lane to Turney Road I have to stop to let pedestrians cross despite the cycle light saying green
Removing the pedestrian refuges must come with increased crossing time for pedestrians. The current lights phase is too short and moving the refuges will mean pedestrians still crossing whilst the lights change back to green for cars.
Also current light phasing is such that there is a very long wait for ped phase during off peak, this should be addressed.
You need accompanying actions to dis-incentivise car use
You need to stop people using cars
Make sure there is ample time on cycle only green light to get away from traffic / out of the middle of the junction
On East Dulwich Grove and Village Way it is good to see the new ASLs added, however there should be feed-in lanes marked to allow access to the ASLs when there is queuing traffic which is common.
It was a mistake to make a single lane for vehicles going north at the junction with Red Post Hill, and I am pleased to see that the Council proposes to rectify that. I don't see the necessity to get rid of any existing traffic islands which are useful for the many pedestrians who won't wait for the lights to change before crossing.
I don't understand why you've taken the crossing islands away.
Segregated cycle lanes are often not maintained. They are filled with broken glass and other debris that cause punctures. Fallen leaves make cycling unsafe in wet weather.
Two lanes going north are long overdue.
I think it's a shame to take away the islands on the west and east arms, because those roads are wider than the other two and the islands are reassuring for children and slower pedestrians.
Really like the idea of two lanes approaching the junction from Dulwich Village
It's great and a long time coming - having wider pavements, shorter crossings with islands removed and countdown timers will help with the many journeys that kids do through here.
Could there be more bike parking though, to help parents who are using cargo bikes to get to school?
I wish you had included a separated cycle lane along Village Way, to truly improve that crucial corridor for active travel. Village Way is SO WIDE, why not reduce parking and put in a bike lane?
I am concerned the bottom of Red Post Hill at the junction with East Dulwich Grove is being neglected. The addition of cycle advanced lanes is good but I would suggest advanced cycle traffic lights. The whole junction is regularly backed up Red Post Hill and it is very unsafe for children in bikes, of which there are loads due to North Dulwich Charter and JAGS. It's all well and good concentrating on central Dulwich Village but the surrounding area is very important and it is regularly overwhelmed by cars around school pick up/drop off times and rush hour. There are diesel buses and significant congestion. Something needs to change there .
Cycling here continues to be quite dangerous, in particular for children.
I'd add more cycle lanes to the Red Post Hill junction
I feel like the pedestrian improvements are great but as a cyclist I would worry that this would remain a very car focused road layout, advanced cycle stop lines are good but difficult to use if you cannot get to them which is often the way on Village Way and East Dulwich Grove. I would feel this would be more effective if cars were penalised for trespassing on the boxes too which they often do
There should definitely be two lanes for traffic heading north from Dulwich Village which has become very congested as a result of the cycle lane and bollards. I think advance cycle boxes are also a good idea
Looks like a vast improvement. 2 lanes northbound much needed

The elimination of the turn right space for traffic going north in 2020 has led to serious traffic queues and delays in D.Village which, in turn, has led vehicles to divert down Burbage Rd. But is it clear that the measures proposed will improve northbound traffic flows as proposed? For example, reducing the duration of the traffic lights green phase could actually make traffic flows worse and will the new two lane northern section that is envisaged be long enough to allow traffic to travel north/east without hindrance?
It's a bit of a quick crossing timer for pedestrians. Am concerned that removing islands will make it even harder for pedestrians to cross before the lights change.
Two lane segregation for cars on Dulwich Village will help to reduce congestion. The combination of widened pavements, timers and removal of pedestrian islands is a good thing.
Right turns from Dulwich Village onto East Dulwich Grove will remain difficult for cyclists.
The clearer road marking illustrated and I suggest better traffic light phasing for pedestrians could be helpful. At present, every road and pavement user has a good turn and no doubt that can be further improved in the way that you suggest in the illustration.
The proposed alterations are an improvement. I would like cycle lanes on Dulwich Village and Village Way. The pedestrian timing at the cross roads is far too short and needs to be lengthened - preferably with a timer.
Please note the already narrower entry into Red Post Hill when coming from Dulwich Village can result in cars shifting to the right in ways that may be problematic. The dimensions of the road must be considered here. Similarly, the right turn from East Dulwich Grove into Red Post Hill and from Dulwich Village left onto Village Way need to consider the nature of vehicle turning. Please also note that East Dulwich Grove has two lanes of traffic that merge into one lane on the other side of the junction at Village Way, and hence narrowing this further may increase risk of collision. While additional pavement space may be welcome, better coherence of traffic flow across all routes through the junction should be considered. A half hour observation at the end of the school day can show the nature of vehicle movements, which often include dangerous near collisions.
I'm not sure what the objective is all I can do is give you my thoughts on what you are proposing.
It still feels unsafe to make right hand turns on the junction as a cyclist.
This junction is a nightmare and the 'green man' lights change too quickly if you have small children with you. The proposed improvements would help this but including longer times to cross the road on foot would also help
A general welcome, thank you. Extend cycle lanes to Village Way?
The pavements around the JAGS drop off sites get very congested. There are always lots of big cars parked on village way There are lots of very fast moving cars driving up and down village way Could we make the crossing time longer? Lots of kids use this crossing and it can be tight to get across in time if with very small children
Priority here must be pedestrian safety. Increased crossing times for pedestrians are essential. Also it is disappointing not to see segregated cycle lanes on Red Post Hill and East Dulwich Grove - there are large schools on these roads and children must have safe routes to school. These designs make no provision for these.
Generally supportive. Would be good to add diagonal crossing (like at Oxford Circus). Some pavement repairs needed and would be good to build out the north east corner to be larger pavement if possible. It gets v congested. Appreciate might not be possible with buses turning there !
Suggest adding safer cycle left turn lanes rather than building out pavement at corners.
Two lanes going northbound may help get the P4 through more quickly. It still gets held up on the South Circular due to LTNs.
Rephasing the lights at Red Post Hill is a good idea to relieve the congestion in Dulwich Village as is creating a right turning lane to stop the right turning traffic blocking all the straight on traffic. The pavements in that area also need to be repaired as they are all in a very poor condition particularly on the west behind the green area at the Red Post Hill junction.
Please make this junction safer for cyclists with a long advance green cycling light.
Please make this junction safer for pedestrians by giving us a long green person light to walk in any direction, including diagonally.

Comments for 5 (completely)

Love this solution to ease the queues.
Real improvement and great for pedestrians and cyclists
It is a good idea to have two lanes so that cars going up red post hill can get through the junction, even if several cars are queuing to turn right in to East Dulwich grove.

Was totally ridiculous ever to have only one lane of traffic here and all this does is return the road to the previous position. The logjams in Dulwich Village are terrible due to the one lane only and it was crazy ever to change the old position. So yes great to put it back to the way it was.
Looks good!
1) This diagram should be made available with the other mockups and diagrams on the front page of the consultation minisite, here: https://consultations.southwark.gov.uk/environment-leisure/dulwich-village-phase-3-design/
2) It is important that the ASL boxes are properly marked, sufficiently long, and properly enforced by cameras and wardens/officers.
This is a key element of the design as this will hugely reduce traffic in Dulwich Village and those travelling up Burbage Road to avoid these queues. This has been needed for the last two years, but we are very grateful to see it. Thank you.
The northbound approach to the junction on Dulwich village is awful at present. Stationary, idling traffic causing pollution for hundreds of metres. A better right filter lane is essential
as a frequent train user and pedestrian, the time given to cross the road is not very long, so a timer would be good.
Looks much better than before the changes
I like the increased pavement space
please can the cycle tracks be extended all along dulwich village in future work
North bound traffic at the Village Way/ East Dulwich Grove traffic lights would be less congested with two lanes instead of the present one lane
But with active controls to reduce pedestrian/cycle/scooter conflict including enforcement
Very important that the dedicated right hand turn lane has been re-introduced
A good improvement.
Two lanes of traffic to turn right onto East Dulwich Grove is essential, whilst maintaining the separate cycle lane.
Completely if I understand this correctly, namely allowing cars to use 2 lanes going from Dulwich Village onto Red Post Hill, as currently the congestion happens due to some cars needing to turn right into E. Dulwich Grove delaying those that need to go straight onto Red Post Hill
Parallel bays would be a much safer option than echelon parking on Dulwich Village, with a loading bay evidently required for business deliveries and collections.
Only if the two northbound lanes are wide enough (ie the southbound lane is narrow enough)
Bike lane Dulwich Village
Great to make space safer for active travel
Looks like a good solution.
Make sure the phasing of the traffic lights is appropriate; there needs to be a much longer green phase for northbound traffic turning right into East Dulwich Grove while the southbound traffic has a red light.
I like that the pavement is wider at the junction, it's always felt dangerous to wait there before.
Pleased to see ASLs added and the pavements widened. The countdown timers have been needed for a long time, so this is positive but need to ensure the green phase for pedestrians is long enough.
Pleased to see the addition of ASLs on the east / west arms of this junction. Pedestrian phase needs to be long enough (currently too short).
See earlier comments - especially a problem (actual and potential) here.
I think this is the best solution.
It would helpful to have the traffic lights for bikes go green slightly before (~10 seconds?) the lights for cars. This will allow them to safely turn across the traffic (e.g. turning right from Dulwich Village on to East Dulwich Grove) without being stranded in the middle the yellow box - a benefit for both cars and bikes.
It is really important to retain the cycle wand segregation - before it was introduced it was extremely dangerous to cycle on that part of the road.
Re-introducing two lanes including one for traffic turning right will be a welcome improvement
Thank goodness for the two lanes at the lights coming back. Having only one lane for cars has meant lots of traffic and more pollution next to a school.
A long overdue improvement.
Good to see a MUCH NEEDED longer green light phase for pedestrians at Red Post Hill with so many school children using this busy junction.
Good to see this junction being made safer for pedestrians.

I hope it will be better for pedestrians as I walk to school this way.
It's good, You have to wait too long at the moment.
I am not entirely sure that the DV/Red Post Hill measures will work as well as I would ideally like, but still stand by my 5 above.
It will be better for walking and cycling in the area
The pavement area between the proposed "Square" and Red Post Hill particularly on the west side of the road is in a very poor state of repair.
Segregated bike lanes are really positive.
The advanced stop lines must be clearly marked in a contrasting colour and monitored by cameras if they are to be effective.
Cycle lanes along Dulwich Village may also help with the traffic passing through the village.
This is currently a very poorly organised junction. The improvements are needed.

Streets for Nature

To what extent do you think these measures achieve the 'Streets for Nature' objective? - how much does this achieve the objective

Comments for 1 (not at all)

It's not been made clear how you will reduce idling and congestion. It will just be the same, traffic jams every day outside the Infants and Hamlet.
There is not enough trees in Southwark it's a bit silly sticking them in the middle of the road for some cyclist might be interested in their phone to ride into. Just need more parks
Once again, you have provided no detail of the proposal to reduce idling and congestion so this is an impossible question to answer.
However "clean" why sit in the middle of a road when there are green spaces everywhere? How does blocking routes ease traffic flow?
It has created more traffic and pollution...policy has been poorly thought out from the beginning with no genuine engagement with local residents.
Closing this road without any consultation during Covid was insanely unjust and the amount you are spending on this junction is disgusting. Just stop and think what else you could do with that money you bunch of closed minded, incompetent people who don't represent the people in the area - the amount of pollution you have now pushed past Harris Primary on Lordship Lane as you have essentially given all the rich Dulwich village residents private roads. As apparently their voices will be heard more than the masses who have to suffer increased congestion and pollution on other roads. I'm sure this is also just to try and ensure when the government tries to unwind this closure it's more difficult. Deceptive as always.
The closure has created long traffic tail backs running north to south that do nothing beneficial for air quality
Adding a few trees will not make up for the amount of increased pollution caused by the intense congestion and increased pollution caused by the closure of Carlton Avenue to motorists.
Total nonsense! All these measures have to opposite effect. They reduce traffic flow, increase congestion and idling times thus increasing pollution. Before LTNs, road closures and restrictions, I used to be able to drive from Dunstons Road to Herne Hill in less than 10 mins. It now takes at least 20 mins. So I am using my car 50% more than before. This applies to the majority of journeys I take. This increases pollution, congestion, journey times and traffic jams.
By all means plant trees etc but I don't think this addresses the problems as outlined above.
SEE PREVIOUS COMMENTS AROUND A CENTRALISED HUGELY IMPORTANT JUNCTION THAT IS GRADUALLY DESTROYING THE SURROUNDING AREA DUE TO DISPLACEMENT OF TRAFFIC AND DISALLOWING OTHERS TO FREELY TRAVEL. JOURNEY TIMES ARE EXPONENTIAL IN THE OVERALL AREA AND I SEE NO CONSIDERATION EVER OF THAT
Trees are great but how do they improve traffic flow?
very pretty but reduced visibility which will make junction unsafe.
The pollution caused in East Dulwich Grove is ridiculous and a health hazard. The council has caused that. The closure of Calton Avenue and Court Lane significantly displaced traffic. Instead it's looking at putting trees where it's banned traffic and not where it's caused horrendous traffic pollution- logic?
We have parks, we do not need more street trees and leaf litter
Southwark's imposed street plans have increased pollution everywhere except in Court Lane and Calton Avenue which are closed
These measures will not make the air any cleaner. Once again I say they are merely virtue signalling. These measures are designed by people who do not live in Dulwich Village and have no idea what it is like to live there.
By favouring one area of Dulwich and making a small section green and more pleasant and allowing them no traffic and refusing to do the same to other roads which are bearing the brunt of the redirected traffic you are simply looking after one section of the borough and ignoring the needs of others. You are baking inequality into the borough by these measures. Traffic has not evaporated, it has gone elsewhere and is making the lives of adjacent streets far less green and pleasant. Why are you allowing this to happen? Why do you constantly favour Calton and Woodward and the eastern side of Dulwich over the west side?
It is a terrible blind spot in the Council's policy .
How are you aiming "to improve the flow of traffic, reduce congestion and idling which will reduce pollution" by planting trees?
I'd love more trees but you haven't explained how this changes the traffic!
Hard to tell as there are no specific proposals
Park serves this well. As does the countryside.

The proposals will result in the opposite - more congestion and pollution
Too few plants/ trees. The plants that are there look sparse, an afterthought and often the wrong type for the space. The raised bed looks unsightly and needs more mature low growing plants which are evergreen and I hope bulbs have been planted too so that there are spring flowers.
The multi coloured seating should be replaced with proper benches and seating otherwise it looks like a children's playground. Currently Parents do not supervise their children and I foresee a cyclist knocking over a small child.
STOP WITH YOUR GREEN-SHAMING, WILL YOU !!
IT MAY COME AS NEWS TO YOU - BUT WE HAVE HAD GOOD AIR (UP UNTIL YOU MADE THE TRAFFIC COME TO A VIRTUAL STAND-STILL)
Again, having a false sense of safety with loads of trees and a space for children to play might lead to children running on the street by mistake. There is enough space in the park nearby to play freely.
Please STOP wasting our money on yet more schemes and consultations. Please leave our roads alone, let us get on with our lives without your constant interference in believing you know best which roads we can and can't use. I do not want any of these schemes.
As per comments in 7
Why don't you listen to local people?
How does the plan improve the flow of traffic and reduce congestion and idling?
Static traffic build up is so huge on village way, this idyllic image will never happen. This was wholly rejected by the community years ago and you still plough on regardless. Local schoolchildren's health is being adversely affected.
Streets are for people... traffic gets merely pushed out to adjacent streets.
The entire Village area is parked up with cars over weekends, local buses (P4) can't get through
This not improving climate change ! It is worsening it!
You are deluded!!!! Somebody is telling you some serious lies or you are being paid some serious money to keep your mouth shut about the truth.
Putting a few trees in a square will not no solve the climate crisis
Reducing traffic congestions and journey times will - LTNs have caused this!
Improving bus and trains services will - LTNs have already affected many local bus routes e.g 3, 40 to name a couple.
As before - your proposed scheme does not take into account older residents and those who are in any way frail or disabled, and it increases local traffic congestion
Traffic is held up most of the time in the village due to one lane being taken out for a cycle lane which is often empty.
As ever, the benefits are small and local. The air pollution you have already exacerbated is affecting residents' lungs. You are almost certainly directly responsible already for more strokes and heart attacks. You should be ashamed.
There is a park and a churchyard within hopping distance. The biodiversity net gain here is minimal and fanciful to justify the plans. What about the pollution caused on East Dulwich Grove?
It looks pretty but all it does is to move traffic to neighbouring streets - politics not common sense
Any improvement to three roads is to the great detriment of all other neighbouring roads
The community does not want this junction to remain closed.
Again the only people being served by extra greenery are the young and fit.
No help for the elderly or disabled who cannot access the area without a car and are denied access because of the 24/7 closure of the junction.
You state an aim to "improve flow of traffic, reduce congestion and idling, which will reduce pollution".
I see no mention of how you plan to do this and from past experience of the council's attitude to the most vulnerable in our community, I believe you have no decent plan. If you had, you would make the junction accessible to the frail, the elderly and those with disabilities, who depend on cars for mobility, and to carers and key workers.
How can you speak of biodiversity when you merely spread the pollution to surrounding areas?
This is a joke. Aim to improve the flow of traffic? It has been made significantly worse. On the rare occasion I need to use my car, journey times have been significantly increased which has led to increased pollution for pedestrians, with idling and congestion worse than before the measures were introduced.

<p>The community rejected this 24/7 closure in the original consultation, and yet we continue to suffer from it. You are destroying quality of life for working Dulwich residents and council tax payers. Through the distress and pain created the plan you are failing in your Public Sector Equality Duty.</p>
<p>Cycling has decreased on roads which have taken the displaced traffic. Publish traffic and air quality data for all streets in the Dulwich area.</p>
<p>At the DV/East Dulwich Grove junction you state that the “existing cycling wand segregation to remain”. This cycle lane is a disaster causing tailbacks through DV at peak times increasing pollution for schoolchildren and residents. The traffic here needs two lanes in order to flow smoothly and reduce pollution from traffic waiting to turn right into East Dulwich Grove - the majority of whom have been forced down this route by the closure of Calton Avenue. Your road planning officer should be shot.</p>
<p>Traffic is terrible now, impacting many. It is hard to travel by bus. Roads that have schools on and children walking along to get to school are heavily impacted - there is a huge increase in pollution for the children. The only benefit is to those who live on the blocked off street, at everyone else’s expense. No proper consultation, residents and local shopkeepers views ignored.</p>
<p>I dont understand how this will better the flow of traffic.</p>
<p>The increased congestion along Dulwich Village has made the environment more unpleasant to be in than before.</p>
<p>Have seen no data to support</p>
<p>The flow of traffic is not improved on the 'displaced streets' but increased congestion & idling which in turn has increased pollution</p>
<p>Absolutely hideous 'multicoloured' street furniture has been added. Not only did it look entirely out of place from the word go (and would even have looked sad in a 1960's children's playground), but it quickly looked chipped, old, and tired. It positively DETRACTS from the area.</p>
<p>The community rejected this 24/7 closure in the original consultation, and the wider area will continue to suffer, not benefit, from it. Traffic is still being displaced on to surrounding roads where families live and where children walk and cycle to school.</p>
<p>More pollution than ever since closure of Dulwich Village junction.</p>
<p>YOU HAVE NOT CUT DOWN ANY TREES SO THAT IS A GOOD THING</p>
<p>ZERO EFFECT</p>
<p>NO DIFFERENCE CAN SEEN OR FELT.</p>
<p>EVERYTHING IS EXACTLY THE SAME AND THERE NO BENEFIT</p>
<p>See previous answer re. absence of climate reliance, SuDS, successfully shaded seating (at least until the trees mature) and totally inadequate provision of soft landscaping, plus rain gardens. What about play on the way?</p>
<p>This looks like greenwashing to me.</p>
<p>The closure of this intersection is causing major access problems for everyone and especially the disabled and those needing care as a major detour is required to access the area. This is causing displaced traffic to add to the congestion on Dulwich Village, Croxted Road and South Circular. In addition the area has not been landscaped attractively and is very rarely used as a community space from my frequent observations. The only people benefitting seem to be the residents of Calton Avenue due to much less traffic but there are likely access issues for them too for carers, elderly residents, etc.</p>
<p>Please just make it clear where cyclists are supposed to go and where the areas for children to play are. It’s next to two primary schools and the area is swarming with children at certain times. One of them is going to be hurt if it isn’t made clearer who is supposed to go where...</p>
<p>It will make pollution and congestion worse on East Dulwich Grove and Red Post Hill</p>
<p>See previous comments..... The closure of the junction for disabled drivers/ carers etc is a great inconvenience to those of us who need easy access to all parts of the area. You have ignored the views of the majority of residents who did not want this closure to be permanent.</p>
<p>Trees could still be planted without all the disruption to traffic flow which is fairly light in Village anyway, due to the fact it has been forced elsewhere. Traffic restrictions can add to pollution. Public transport insufficient, expensive and slow. Traffic is pushed to neighbouring areas which suffer.</p>
<p>The community rejected the 24/7 closure of this junction in the original consultation and wider area continues to suffer, not benefit from, the proposals.</p>
<p>The changes you're proposing will have an infinitesimally small impact on "Cleaning our air and reducing the impact of climate change by increasing biodiversity". I think you should do them aesthetically but being disingenuous or delusional just damages faith in this process.</p>
<p>this road closure has simply increased pollution on all neighboring streets - bad for nature and for people.</p>

Trees, shrubs, and greenery are for parks, open areas, gardens, and sidewalks; but not for roads and road junctions; is that not obvious?
Traffic jams and congestion do not provide cleaner air. You need to keep everyone moving. Creating pockets of less traffic whilst increasing it on other roads is not a solution.
You have HUGE green space - my god the number of parks. Shame on your community to argue to do not have enough already. Spending money on roads in the name of 'nature' is a joke.
This kind of waste of resources all in the claim be being a better community is - at the expense of other areas which need better schools, policing, hospitals, garbage collection.
Southwark should look at the really at risk neighbourhoods - and not extend any money to Dulwich. You waste of precious tax payer resources on absurd road controls.
Walk to a few communities beyond your closed community. Those residents would give their anything to have some cash to renovate buildings and provide JOBS.
NO MORE SPENDING ON DULWICH ROADS or DULWICH 'GREENERY'.
Spend money in repairing roads . Clear manholes to avoid flooding of roads. Reopen closed roads under pretext of LTN and remove APR cameras that you installed to enforce them and you use as cash cows to justify your positions and salaries.
Calton Ave has been closed to traffic for a couple of years and it's clear to me that it has only caused shifting of traffic, and hence major congestion, to the surrounding roads. Limiting traffic through Dulwich Village has made East Dulwich Grove a nightmare, and very dangerous for pedestrians and bicycles.
Your decision of closing Calton Ave was completely arbitrary and unfair as it only benefits (allegedly) the people living in those surrounding roads as traffic is calmer for them. But for us who need to drop off small children to schools, this also means more stress and finding ways around these restrictions which doesn't really help. Roads should be open to everyone. If you want to encourage active travel, add cycle paths, do not close roads!
greenwashing
Displacement traffic onto East Dulwich Grove - see my previous comment.
Objective: Cleaning our air and reducing the impact of climate change by increasing biodiversity, making our streets greener and more resilient to extreme weather - WHAT ARE YOU DOING ABOUT THE POLLUTION ON EAST DULWICH GROVE???
As with LTN's it will increase dramatically congestion, pollution and idling. You just have to stand in the Village to see this.
They push traffic onto particular displacement roads which become congested whilst others have no traffic on them which is unfair to those on the roads that have all the traffic The congested displacement roads are on main bus routes so bus journeys are slow (I have had to abandon bus journeys for this reason) They cause longer journeys which increases pollution They prejudice the elderly and disabled who have no choice but use cars to get around Many cyclists are inconsiderate to pedestrians and appear to feel they have licence to speed through junctions and crossings without regard for pedestrians
Mostly hard landscaping which adds nothing to 'nature'
the proposals do very little to improve overall air quality in and around Dulwich Village. they may provide improved air quality for some but not for all. The ULEZ scheme will be and is far more effective. How will you exclude the effects of ULEZ from your analysis?
The community rejected this 24/7 closure in the original consultation, and that the wider area will continue to suffer, not benefit, from it.
I am sure the measures have been pleasant for the inhabitants of Calton Avenue at the cost of misery for everyone else
Re-open the roads and stop the enormous pollution caused by rerouting traffic to sit at a stand still on neighbouring roads.

<p>The restrictions privilege a small number of people and displace traffic to other less privileged areas. It also has made the area less safe at night. Would be worth doing a survey of whether there is increased crime in the area.</p> <p>The system serves only a small privileged section of the community.</p>
<p>There should be restricted access at certain times during school start and finish hours (like Townley Road) Outside that there should not be restrictions.</p>
<p>The present system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discriminates against the elderly and the disabled Privileges cyclists (I am a cyclist) Restricts the liberty of people living in the area Increases car emissions and car journeys by causing traffic jams Displaces the traffic to other areas Creates an unsafe space, particularly at night The benches there are ugly
<p>Other than that it is a great system! Not sure who is actually benefiting form the system other than a small number of people</p>
<p>We live in an area with an already high proportion of green spaces and parks / not necessary.</p>
<p>Stop wasting money</p>
<p>No people with disabilities, no ambulances, carers, wheel chairs, people with walking sticks or motorised buggies in your pictures. You are discriminating in a grossly unfair way against these people affected by the above. You have ruined Dulwich Village enough already. Please take away those horrid striped chairs and allow blue badge drivers through.</p>
<p>It's one of the greenest areas in London already! There is a conservation zone and strict planning rules all around the area due to the Dulwich Estates programme.... this is not needed.</p>
<p>Just stop wasting money on these endless 'consultations', reopen the roads so that you stop favouring the most expensive streets and wealthiest residents of the borough, and reduce the terrible congestion which has resulted from the LTN</p>
<p>There are much more cost effective ways to achieve the (good aims) of improving air quality for everyone. This project seems to focus entirely on the air quality for a narrow and privileged (white) minority.</p>
<p>A major issue is the amount of additional pollution that has been caused by traffic congestion caused by the introduction of the LTN, so although the pictures show nice greenery, this is more than counteracted on the negative side by the increased congestion and idling the measures will create</p>
<p>Given the congestion increase arising from the closure of this key junction, I have no confidence any of these objective will be achieved</p>
<p>Everywhere you look road side trees are being cut down in this neighbourhood. Those are better placed to achieve "Streets for Nature" objective, whatever that means.</p> <p>Turn this junction back into a "Junction for keeping traffic flowing", and keep nature on the verges and in the parks.</p>
<p>kids paying football and elderly kept out of the local amenities is the current result.</p> <p>Plus women afraid for their safety and either not daring to travel or having to use expensive door to door transport -against the aim of 80% journey PT or active travel</p>
<p>You have created massive amounts of idling and pollution by closing this road!!! Does anyone reading this actually live in Dulwich?!</p>
<p>You can put extra trees in without banning vehicle traffic.</p>
<p>There is enough greenery in Dulwich Village already! Stop wasting tax payers money and give it towards more urgent initiatives and good causes!</p>
<p>All cars are going electric by 2030. These pollution measures are a waste of public funds.</p> <p>Dulwich village already has lots of greenery. More is not needed.</p> <p>More consideration should be given to residents who are severely affected by the changes, and have no access to their own street, and are forced to sit in standstill traffic one street away from their own home.</p>
<p>The roads should be re-opened -its all very well making it beneficial there but the displacement onto other adjacent roads means more pollution for us! I don't see how that is an equitable solution??</p>
<p>IT LOOKS RIDICULOUS AND IS DANGEROUS TO SIT IN THE MIDDLE OF A ROAD WHILE CYCISTS WHIZZ BY HAVING COMPLETELY IGNORED ALL THE TRAFFIC SIGNALS</p>
<p>THEY DO IT, BECAUSE THERE IS NO SYSTEM IN PLACE FOR THEM TO BE CAUGHT.</p>
<p>IT IS A VEYR DANGEROUS AREA.</p>
<p>SUGGEST PUTTING THIS BACK TO SAFE ONE WAY TRAFFIC</p>

All it does is push vehicles onto surrounding roads, which are then busier with higher standing traffic and worse pollution. You have no evidence to show that the changes you are proposed create better outcomes for the area as a whole.
Paving huge areas and putting in a couple of trees and shrubs, is not really coming close to the notion of streets for nature. It's really unimaginative.
I can see nothing in the proposed plans which will improve the flow of traffic - quite the opposite in fact
There were plenty of lovely trees and greenery already around this area so it was necessary to cause misery to so many people by closing this junction to make an unnecessary "Village Square"
It's a very selective focus on nature - what about the nature you are not supporting where you are pushing extra traffic? The 'trees and flowers' are not really a big support to nature as they are isolated within a concrete island! What they will be full of is dog crap!
Forcing traffic into fewer streets is creating congestion and increasing pollution outside of schools planting a couple of trees is not going to combat this
Hard surfaces do not help at all with managing biodiversity or the consequences of global warming, notably the facilitation of drainage of surplus water. The more you talk about what you plan to do about the 'square', it seems only to increase the proportion of hard areas and the absence of natural or man-made drainage.
I don't understand the logic of having a play area next to a busy junction with dangerous and polluting cars and cyclists zooming along. The park is less than 10 minutes away where children can play safely and freely.
Really!! I applaud Southwark for their street tree planting, it's fabulous. However, new trees in planters to help prettify your street closers is not a valid excuse to close streets. Stopping people paving over their front gardens for parking IS damaging the local ECOLOGY and probably adding to local FLOOD threat. Join the obvious dots.
There is already a lot of nature in the area. More is not needed but easier ways to get around by car or public transport are. Not more facilities for bikes which many people either can't use or don't want to.
Plant trees or shrubs is good but they don't have to be in the middle of a junction. I can't see how the flow of traffic will be improved. On average, I do fewer car journeys but the time I spend in the car is not changed. The amount of time spent in slow moving traffic is increased. I can't put my elderly mother on a bike.
Traffic often sits stationary in the village with engines running because of the fact that many other roads are shut / have increased (displaced) traffic.
1. Trees are for parks, gardens, open spaces; and on sidewalks (trees with smaller roots that are less likely to 'lift' paving stones or shrink underlying clay). 2. Trees should not be planted on the King's Highway, unless in the central reservation of a dual carriageway. 3. The primary function of streets is to accommodate transport; inclusion of 'nature' is secondary and not to compromise the former.
I think the leap from "clean Air" to street for Journeys" is a ridiculous waste of money, has created major pedestrian safety issues. Rewind to when Southwark Council showed us the "creating places to be protected from the Sun!!!" Too many too count Dulwich residents do not need or approve of ANY of Southwark Council's "Street whatever "SfJ's"" spin. All we see and hear are more of the same theme: Southwark Council's agenda: profit before Dulwich drivers, and pedestrians!
These small trees & planted areas will do little to improve air quality and nothing to improve biodiversity. The vast quantity of hard landscaping will increase flooding of roads & pavements at the junction.
The portrayal is very idealised. The poor standard of upkeep care provided by the Council would guarantee this area would suffer neglect and quickly become a litter strewn eyesore.
Dulwich Village was always green thanks to the gardens of its inhabitants and thanks to the Dulwich Estate. The council are merely trying to jump on an existing band-wagon to make themselves smell sweet.
Green issues are very close to my way of thinking and I'd encourage any planting of more trees and shrubs in the Village. However, the traffic restrictions probably create more anti-green pollution, as I have already indicated in this survey, e.g. the "dogdems" manoeuvring of cars at the bottom of Calton Avenue at school times, all in low gear.
This objective is irrelevant in Dulwich where we have had an abundance of trees for centuries, including two parks, two orchards and the grounds of a picture gallery open to the public. This is a Public Highway, so there needs to be access for Blue Badge holders and other vulnerable car-dependent residents. If they are allowed access into Dulwich Park, then they should be allowed access here. That's a million times more important than planting a few, non-native trees.
Flat pavements are a problem as many kids don't differentiate between that and the road
Will result in more pollution!!!
All the IDLING is now around the Village onto the unfortunate people who live on the other roads round the village
This scheme is making the lives of many people Worse ... very few people benefit from this nonsense and the Costs are huge
What are the proposed climate benefits?

Adding appropriate plants and biodiversity seems sensible. It is ideal to reduce idling traffic, but I'm not sure how practical that will be to achieve! I still disagree with closing this junction, I'm afraid!
See comments in response to Q7.
Three acers does not a biosphere create
The closure of this junction was rejected by the community in your original consultation
Stop closing roads and junctions with the pretext to save us from doomsday. These are your pet project only. Mere money spin operations to justify your ineeded positions and high salaries inside tge council. Listen to the majority of people and stop taking us as fool. Stop working only for a tiny minority. You are our servants , we elected you and you keep disregarding what the majority wants (no ltms no road closures). You are mocking democracy and act as tyrants.
If you really believed this you would allow the passage of electric cars.
I'm not sure what the point of this so-called consultation is since you've steadfastly ignored any comments or objections in previous consultations and gone ahead with your pre-decided measures. The majority of respondents did NOT want this junction closed, but you closed it anyway, since you're in thrall to the cycling lobby and concerns for disabled people, local shops and displaced traffic obviously did not come into consideration. I suspect you're about to do the same with the so-called consultation on the proposed Controlled Parking Zone in Dulwich Village. It may look as if you're ticking all the right boxes regarding consultations, but those of us who have tried to engage with you in the past have come to realise it's a waste of time. Still, one more attempt can't hurt...
This will not clean our air or reducing the impact of climate change by increasing biodiversity, making our streets greener and more resilient to extreme weather. Trees will be broken or dry up due to lack of care. The area will soon be vandalised and full of litter. Bins will be overflowing and because people sit and eat outside it will further encourage the rats that already plague the area.
Please...3 trees won't make the difference that is required. We need woodland areas, not planters with shrubbery in it.
I work in a Green industry I know what is what
I do not understand how these changes will achieve the stated aims. What is the cost of these unnecessary "modifications" to the tax payer?
There are already plenty of trees in and around Dulwich and in fact much greenery will be lost by people converting their front gardens to driveways.
I have repeatedly set out my objections to this work in all your previous my consultations, and I believe you have ignored my and my communities objections throughout
You are reminded that our community rejected the closure of the junction in the first, original consultation
Dulwich Village is a green space already. Planting trees in isolation to one another reduces their capacity for flourishing, especially in hard landscaping.
Dulwich is already one of the greenest residential areas in London.
Clearly achieves the exact opposite
First comment.
You need to get the basics of the whole scheme right before adding touches.
Closing the junction in Dulwich Village has made air quality worse on surrounding roads where there are schools and hospitals. This has done nothing to help the impact of climate change
Disagree strongly
Again, you are creating a preferential system, where some areas benefit while others suffer. Shame on you!
The first consultation for the LTNs completely ignored the vast majority wish of the local population which wholeheartedly rejected the proposals including the closure of the junction.
The Council continues to ignore the impact of traffic restrictions on businesses and people living on boundary roads, as well as the difficulties that disabled and other vulnerable residents are forced to endure.
The LTNs have not achieved any of the goals - we are suffering from displaced traffic, delayed buses, reduced public travel options, closed businesses and increased pollution outside schools on boundary roads.
The profoundly undemocratic imposition of the LTNs against the views of the vast majority of residents is disgraceful. The waste of public funds on these expensive measures against the wishes of the residents is obscene and unnecessary.
The Village is full of trees. And this won't sort the increased pollution in neighbouring streets as a result of LTN closures.
Such foliage as has been planted is generally dying or scruffy.
The sign free, pristine illustrations provided do not reflect reality.

I do not believe that these measures will decrease idling. Trees and plants that thrive in a higher concentration of CO2 could possibly benefit but air pollution will increase.
Where would the extra road space on the northbound Dulwich Village junction with Village way come from?
Dulwich is fortunate in having an abundance of green space, trees and places for people to socialise. The concept of Streets for Nature in an environment already endowed with beautiful trees and green spaces is entirely superfluous. Efforts to enhance the environment should be focussed on areas of the Borough of Southwark where these attributes are lacking.
As in box7
It will do nothing to improve the flow of motor traffic, which is an essential factor in modern democratic life.
Waste of money, like the current 'flowerbeds.'
There are already trees in the area, so I think this is utter nonsense, cutting down the already limited social space
The changes already implemented and those proposed are put forward by people who do not live in Dulwich. Local business needs parking spaces and access from all surrounding streets to thrive and survive. It is called a 'Village' for a reason- to serve the local people and be a united community. Your proposals are ruining the 'village' atmosphere.
Pedestrian walk through the junction without looking making it unsafe for cyclist.
The flow of vehicle traffic will cease. It's already made much worse with the closure of Carlton Avenue. Fewer car parking spaces, wider pavements and cycle lanes will slow it up further. I think the current arrangements are pretty reasonable for pedestrians and cyclists- other than the traffic queues which will be worse under these proposals.
There are already lots of trees around Dulwich. I am in full agreement with more trees. But 3 trees at this junction will not eliminate the increased pollution you have caused by standing traffic making its way slowly through the village
Try tackling coaches idling on East Dulwich Grove and Townley Road,
More trees all around Southwark would be great.
Our feedback and comments have been ignored
Of course a few more trees in our street would be pleasant. But the idea that this constitutes any measurable help with pollution is laughable.
Stop dressing up an additional handful of trees in an already relatively tree rich area as some kind of solution to climate change & biodiversity. Your record with keeping greenery alive is woeful. You need to be planting a lot more trees across the borough & think of better carbon capture options & roadventing schemes. We have experienced some quite extreme weather in recent months (heat, wind & rain & it hasn't caused a problem.
This area has become unsafe for pedestrians as bikes whizz along here... perhaps they should dismount? At the moment the wooden plant holders look very cheap and uninviting and are badly kept.
All vehicles in this country will be electric in 10 years' time - realistically probably sooner, so this will reduce pollution, not the proposed measures here. In fact, why not install ultra-rapid EV charging bays (not these tiny lamppost chargers) on roads like Court Lane and/or incentivise the switch to EVs through reduced council tax, to speed up the transition. The reduced expenditure on these works can offset the lost income through the council tax reduction.
On biodiversity, Dulwich has so much greenery through the park and playing fields, that planting a few more trees as proposed will have no material impact.
Stop dressing up an additional handful of trees in an already relatively tree rich area as some kind of solution to climate change & biodiversity. Your record with keeping greenery alive is woeful. You need to be planting a lot more trees across the borough & think of better carbon capture options & roadventing schemes. We have experienced some quite extreme weather in recent months (heat, wind & rain & it hasn't caused a problem.
Children should feel safe to walk alone from school but if local muggings and crime continue it doesn't achieve the purpose.
many sites in southwark have far less provision in terms of trees, nature and open green spaces than Dulwich Village
See comments above
Return the junction to its pre Covid layout and remove traffic restrictions. All previous consultations have shown residents are against these changes by a significant majority. Please follow the results of your own consultations.
The Council has still not taken on board the clear majority of respondents to the original consultation who said that they did not want any of these measures
How are you improving the flow of traffic if you are blocking it? This will cause more congestion which no one will want to sit in.
Another waste of money!
Do not make it harder for cars and buses- waiting cars and buses create pollution near the schools and the playing fields. Stop spending money on the same roads in the Village and sort out other roads/areas that need improving like Barry Road and Lordship Lane. Add average speed cameras and 20-signs on posts to Barry Road.
The areas outside the closures and LTNs now suffer worse traffic congestion, air pollution and noise: High Traffic Neighborhoods. created by you.
The junction closure was rejected by the community in the original consultation.

<p>We live in an area with numerous parks and green spaces, no more are needed. Your proposed measures will not improve the flow of traffic, reduce congestion and idling which will reduce pollution. They will hinder traffic flow, increase congestion and idling and increase pollution. The measures are a total contradiction of your objectives.</p>
<p>This is primarily a huge area of hardstanding, and looks mostly like huge area of hardstanding. If this is a village square, then it needs service outlets to allow more pop up market stalls. If you are greening, then reduce the amount of hardstanding.</p>
<p>Dreaming . The congestion in surrounding roads will and has enhanced pollution .</p>
<p>In the previous LTNs nothing has been done. Camberwell New Rd has 6 schools on or near it as do other busy roads which have additional diverted traffic and additional pollution. Southwark and Lambeth have zero care of those living with diverted traffic. A FOI from me to both boroughs showed that neither Lambeth or Southwark monitor traffic in Camberwell New Rd. No doubt a similar lack of care is shown elsewhere.</p>
<p>It's nice to see trees but not and the expense of personal freedoms.</p>
<p>I am really astonished to see that Southwark have nothing better to do with their time an money than make an already privileged part of London even more privileged. Spend the money on people that need it. White privilege - totally unbelievable.</p>
<p>Street trees can be planted on pavements , we do not need to plant them in the middle of a road to achieve biodiversity. There are many tree pits paved over and left empty in Dulwich.These could all be replanted to achieve improved air quality and help to absorb emissions</p>
<p>A few trees in a concrete jungle will have a minimal effect on pollution. We have not seen any data that confirms this "greenery" will have any significant effect. At least it might have the effect of slowing cyclists down when the leaves fall! Presumably the council will ensure the pavements are cleared of leaves in a timely way, unlike the pavements in our road which have not been cleared this winter and have become a slip hazard.</p>
<p>This is completely unproven wishul thinking, Where is the data that this will have a significant effect!!!</p>
<p>This mock up greatly exaggerates the size of the space. The trees will need a great deal of attention which Southwark's street trees do not get. Who will sweep up the leaves? Last autumn's leaves and storm debris are still all over our pavements and blocking drains in the Village and in the Park. Where is the roadway for emergency vehicles? A proper marked route is essential but missing from this plan? Where are the slow down signs for cyclists and pedestrian crossings for pedestrians. Does any one at Southwark Council Highways know how many schoolchildren there are in Dulwich?</p>
<p>Closing the junction increases the number of idling cars going through the village - how can you say that idling will reduce while it goes up and creates more pollution?</p>
<p>Dulwich is full of beautiful leafy green spaces Dulwich and Belair parks for example not to mention all the glorious gardens - why there is seating on an intersection lined with stationary cars queuing through the village due to road closures is a complete mystery.</p>
<p>There is no evidence that the air is cleaner around the village. In fact since the introduction of the LTN long queues of stationary traffic often tail back through the village causing more pollution . This often occurs when children are walking from the station to schools</p>
<p>Greenery is always good, but not if it causes traffic jams and pollution elsewhere</p>
<p>The closures causes idling traffic which causes more pollution. What used to be a 10 min round trip now takes and hour</p>
<p>don't waste your money people do not want this</p>
<p>Who will look after the flower beds? See comment 7</p>
<p>Because the route through the village is now thwarted. There is only 1 way through, so now the traffic is exceptionally high at peak times. Whatever pollution there was before is now tenfold as there is stationary traffic right outside the entrances of 2 schools. The other traffic has now been displaced and is causing heavy pollution on East Dulwich Grove outside 2 other schools. If the council want to reduce pollution - then they need to CLEAR the roads so that the traffic moves quickly and away from the heavily populated areas. Vehicles, electric cars, buses and bicycles will be able to move safely & efficiently and have shorter journeys. Instead the stationary cars are fumigating the area. So let's be really honest here. This is not about pollution, this is about catching non local residents out with the bus gates in order to raise as much in fines as you can. It is criminal.</p>
<p>There are approx. 3 billion trees in the Uk, thats 45 per person. This is virtue signalling. If you were planing a wood, then great. A few ornamental tress is nothing. Plus, southwark dug up an entire park and mature trees in Peckham to sell for housing. Where was your streets for nature policy then?</p>
<p>This junction needs to be opened up to allow traffic to reach the shops and improve convenience for residents, particularly the elderly</p>
<p>Destroying the work that's already been done (albeit very poorly and ill thought out), and replacing it with something almost identical is going to be far detrimental to the "nature" it is supposed to be "for".</p>

<p>More trees are in themselves fine if in the right place. But in themselves will in no way compensate for the increased congestion, pollution and lengthened journeys caused by closing this junction to motor vehicles. The design fails your stated aims of improving "the flow of traffic, reducing congestion and idling to reduce pollution", both in DV itself, and in the diversion routes incl East Dulwich Grove, South Circular, Lordship Lane. It also seriously reduces network resilience against the frequent disruptions on the diversion routes, from roadworks, breakdowns, accidents etc</p> <p>The whole junction needs a much better rethink to optimize not only the "greenery" but also the connectivity and network resilience. A better solution would be not only to reopen CA but also to rearrange DV itself at this point to leave out traffic lights instead to provide one or two roundabout islands which could include planting and improve pedestrian facilities.</p>
<p>it has pushed congestion and pollution to other areas</p> <p>cyclist do not care about the green space and dont stick to the rules of the Highway Code . Its only a matter of time before a child or elderly person is hurt.</p>
<p>Who is asking for this? Please just stop wasting money on this initiative.</p>
<p>Improving the flow of motor vehicles will enable more driving - rather than less. So it will increase rather than radically reduce carbon emissions. This is radical...greenwash.</p>
<p>Although there would be some new green areas, this design fails to provide proper Sustainable Drainage - where the layout is carefully designed to most of the rainfall. Southwark is a decade behind other London boroughs here.</p>
<p>It's rubbish, and the Council knows full well that a majority of us in the area did not want it. It has created a shambles for buses and traffic in neighbouring roads. OPEN THE JUNCTION!</p>
<p>The street closures, even with the reduced times are not wanted. Air pollution and traffic has been pushed onto other local streets and affected local children and bus services. These street closures are not wanted. Please listen to local residents!</p>
<p>By closing Court Lane and Calton Avenue you have significantly increased traffic congestion through the Village and on East Dulwich Grove. A few trees being planted will not counteract the huge negative impact on health those road closures have caused.</p>
<p>We were advised by Clement at a public meeting this week that this no budget for its maintenance. It will fail. You are wasting money.</p>
<p>I disagree with the plans for this junction and believe the negative impact from displaced traffics exceeds any potential benefit .</p>
<p>Street trees can trap pollution. Why do you propose people socialise alongside the traffic, instead of in the Dulwich Village Orchard, Dulwich Park, brockwell Park school playgrounds and Sunray Gardens? There are no facilities on the street for children to enjoy the grass and play equipment of Southwark's wonderful parks. On hot days it's much hotter to be on tarmac and I just don't understand why Southwark is not encouraging people to enjoy healthier forms of recreational activity than sitting on the street.</p>
<p>Dulwich is one of the most densely covered areas in London for nature, with thousands of trees, two parks, an orchard and a Picture Gallery Garden open to the public. There is no need for this paved over area and non-native trees to be dumped in the middle of this ancient crossroads.</p>
<p>It's mostly block paving. I wouldn't be able to have that much hard standing on my driveway so why is it suitable for the square? It looks soulless and empty.</p>
<p>Please see previous comment, the design should accommodate all forms of transportation including cars</p>
<p>You have put hideous multi-coloured 'furniture' in the junction that denigrates the whole area. YUG. You have no taste.</p>
<p>The community rejected the closure of this junction. This is a waste of tax payers money.</p>
<p>This is destroying the connection between Dulwich Village & East Dulwich. The Dulwich Village community do not wish for this.</p>
<p>Obviously sensible to improve drainage but nothings written about the that I can see. Otherwise, the usual fantastical hokum seeking to justify interference locally by spurious links to the planet etc..</p>
<p>The ensuing traffic jams created by the road closures have made air quality worse. It has no benefit and is a lot worse for most people apart from a few roads with large houses who have benefitted from no through traffic which should be shared equally as before.</p>
<p>This is without merit and a folly of spend. Greenery is extensive right across Dulwich, and so this is unwarranted expenditure given the pressures across the borough of Southwark. The proposals are for the privileged, not those in real need and the spend should be refocused accordingly. It is quite shocking to see the disproportionate application of Southwark's budget.</p>
<p>Your measures up to now have not done so.</p>
<p>The multicoloured street furniture you installed looks cheap and downgrades the appearance of the village. (The varnished benches were in better keeping with your avowed intention to develop the village to a high standard.) The present junction looks like the playground of a poor nursery provision, where the management cannot afford to maintain the furniture.</p>
<p>Do you really claim that. Few flower boxes improve nature?</p>
<p>You will never be able to tell if it works because you have not established a baseline for comparison</p>

As mentioned above, unless this junction is reopened, no amount of trees will service the added CO2 emitted by vehicles sitting in increased congestion on lordship lane and the south circular as a result of the displaced traffic.
The introduction of LTNs at the advent of Covid have left to higher volumes of traffic, greater congestion, more traffic idling and pollution. There is no evidence to suggest the LTN has delivered or will deliver lower pollution.
The LTN has also increased traffic and idling outside a number of schools in the area, a hugely counterproductive step. Personally it forces me to drive past 4 schools on certain journeys, when previously it would only have been one.
These changes ae liable to increase congestion and idling
What a load of rubbish - our area WAS beautiful, peaceful, safe and green before these so called 'improvements' came along. Now we have stationary traffic, more crime because streets are empty and no one using the cycle lanes. Total waste of time and money
It would be possible to justify streets for nature if electric cars were allowed to pass and fossil fueled cars were prohibited. this would be an environmentally positive move.
There is plenty of nature in South London, we are blessed with green spaces. We do not need nature at an intersection. I do not agree to this being blocked 34hoirs/ day.
Too much concrete and no grass. A waste of money. Open it up for cars.
The council has in fact increased congestion in Dulwich Village and the surrounding areas by closing this junction, which we the community rejected in all consultations.
I don't support the measures taken by the council - I do not believe the consultation has been honest or fair and the views of local residents have not been listened to. I feel local residents have been corralled and that facts have been manipulated by the council so as to be presented as it suits. I would have been happy to support changes but not in this way.
Waste of valuable resources !
The pollution is so bad on Dulwich Common that my husband's asthma has badly deteriorated. By all means increase trees along the roads.
A smoother flow of traffic would also be a positive action. This is already a green area with a huge Dulwich Park adjacent. A few trees in the village will make little difference on an already extra tree lined area. Houses here have gardens. Traffic displacement in Croxted Road, Lordship Lane and Herne Hill is adding to pollution and this cannot be changed by a tree planting in the Village
Dulwich Village has always been a very leafy area. The new trees are just window dressing for an unwanted and unpopular scheme imposed by undemocratic councillors who have ignored the wishes of the majority at every turn!
If you are closing the road, which you appear to be, even though the residents do not want it, go the whole hog and get rif og the hard landscaping. This could be an extension of the green space next to it.
More trees always welcome, but they do need aftercare. Never see that happening. Who enforces the outsourced contracts for planting and maintaining trees!
Haven't noticed any difference
This type of landscaping is a magnet for litter. From observation elsewhere the shrubs in beds of this type become unkempt and bedraggled due to lack of maintenance. No indication is given of the cost. As councils are reputed to be strapped for cash a better outcome for the community would be for money to be spent repairing pavements and roads.
The community rejected the closure of the junction in the original consultation, so what will ensure that this consultation is received and acted upon according to the local communitie's wishes?
You are causing more problems for other areas.
This type of landscaping is a magnet for litter.From observation elsewhere the shrubs and planting in beds like this becomes unkempt and bedraggled through lack of maintenance. No indication is given of the cost of these works. As councils are reputed to be strapped for cash, any funding would be better for the community if it was spent repairing pavements and roads.
any greenery here which is already lower car use??? greenery on lordship lane please
As before, this is already probably the greenest part of the Southwark Area where many local people have gardens and green space, not to mention Dulwich Park, Bel Air Park and Brockwell Park close by. Spend the money in parts of Southwark which would benefit more
The Dulwich Village community rejected the closure of the junction in the original consultation
In favour of the stated objective. The plans appear to do the opposite.
Displacing traffic is a nett zero impact. It is not an area of high pollution anyway compared to now congested roads of Croxted Road, Norward Road and East Dulwich Grove/ Lordship Lane. You need to focus on the problems your street planning has caused there
Streets for nature are not wanted. It may surprise councillors and their officers to know that streets were created to facilitate movement not block it

The Council hasn't listened to the local community as it has ignored it's stated opinion as expressed in the results of previous consultations
I do not agree with the closure of this junction. I have said so at every meeting you held in the past before covid, at every consultation, and am appalled that you have consistently ignored local people's opposition to your scheme.
Streets are for moving not for nature
These aims illustrate the delusions of grandeur that now infest the mentality of our council. Southwark council is not the biodiversity sub-committee of COP28, it is a body elected to meet the very real social needs of all its residents. To prioritise these stated, otherwise very worthy aims at the expense of dealing with the serious problems in our borough is wrong and a misdirection of resources. Southwark council is putting the interests of a select few - who happen to be among the most affluent members of the community - ahead of its obligations to the community at large. This is the opposite of what the Labour party exists to do and as a member of the party I deeply resent its priorities being twisted in this way. Finally, the volume of traffic has been displaced, it has not been reduced; congestion and idling have been increased, not reduced; greenery is nice, but it is not as important as mould on the walls of people's homes.
All very beautiful. The main concern is that pedestrians feel it is a safe zone and overlook speeding cyclists
who is going to have the contract to maintain this clean space if it happens?
We already have lots of trees in Dulwich Village, and again you don't provide evidence for how you will improve the flow of traffic.
The closure of the junction has caused much more traffic going much further on congested roads elsewhere, idling.
As I have said you have created a dirtier air programme by cars being pushed onto the main roads, there is too much paving to create a green area, its all concrete. What a shame, little planting and why not plans some communal allotment space, actually get rid of a lot of the paving or open up to cars again.
There are plenty of parks and green spaces nearby which are far more pleasant and safer for people to sit and children to play.
I believe that all this has displaced and probably increased pollution and traffic jams.
it's very dishonest question. that plan has a bad impact on neighbourhood and there are sufficient places to plant trees without closing the roads.
This intervention does not cut the amount of traffic on the roads it just redirects it. It's extremely ironic for a labour council to take traffic from the prosperous parts of dulwich and redirect that traffic and resultant pollution to the less affluent parts of Dulwich. From a personal perspective the air quality in Court Lane is noticeably so much better than before although biodiversity is not noticeably better yet but the traffic and air quality on Lordship lane is noticeably so much worse.
You couldn't make this stuff up, labour should be directing all the traffic through our neighbourhood and thinning out traffic on lordship lane instead you have created a clean and lovely enclave for all the posh rich people to enjoy and absolutely and literally dumped on the poor less advantaged people in our community. Surely the Tories should be doing that!
We have so many parks and open spaces I would prefer to see investment in them.
The cars are not far away enough it's London city the capital of the uk. Unless measures are taken all over the city what is the difference?
When the UN talks about biodiversity helping to slow climate change they're not talking about a few extra flowers in Dulwich.
The suggestion that the Council's interference with improve traffic flow and reduce congestion and idling would be laughable were it not so appallingly untrue. The effect has been quite the reverse. Dulwich Village is one long traffic jam at many times of day.
The wealthy people in Calton Ave and Court Lane may enjoy less traffic and congestion, but it is displaced to other areas, so absolutely not overall an achieved objective.
Trees are always nice but not in the wrong place. Luckily, Dulwich is already very well off for trees, in the large gardens of residents and the lovely park and orchard.
There's already so much greenery in Dulwich.
The original aim of this temporary closure was for COVID reasons then there became the LTN plan to protect pedestrians and cyclists travelling to and from schools The council ignored all consultation and permanently closed the junction. The roads that this traffic has been displaced to are either gridlocked and polluted or have become race tracks 24hrs a day. These are the very roads where thousands of pedestrians move through Dulwich to get to over seven schools. Make it a timed situation under the LTN in order to protect the school children.. The motor vehicle accidents on displaced roads (you never include the South Circular) are due to highly frustrated vehicle users not. I have lived here for over thirty years in various roads in Dulwich, it scares the life out of me every day watching the school run. I have personally witnessed seven accidents on EDGmany of those wont be in your statistics as Police weren't aware. It is a failed scheme and is destroying Dulwich area.
Plenty of designated green spaces in Dulwich - use your money to improve areas in Southwark which would benefit more

Southwark's road schemes seem designed to favour a small minority while treating those who rely on their cars punitively.
Still paved
There is a beautiful Park nearby. The money would be better spent there.
Adding a few trees and shrubs will make no difference to biodiversity. The area is already very leafy with mature trees on the street and in gardens and with very large areas of parkland and woods.
Your objective of improving the flow of traffic, reducing congestion and idling will not be achieved. It's clear that the changes at this junction have had the opposite effect and have increased pollution and created terrible jams through displacement.
A few trees in already blocked off areas is hardly going to clear the air and improve / reverse the declining air quality for the rest of the community. This will improve NOTHING for those of us living on boundary roads and smacks of tokenism
Stop spending money on the village and spend elsewhere. Reopen the junction as repeated requested in previous consultations.
I can see five new trees in the picture. Since we need to plant millions of trees to effectively tackle climate change, Council time, effort and money would be much better directed at planting HUNDREDS more trees in Dulwich Park and Belair Park, only a few metres away from the closed junction.
You have just worsened flow of traffic elsewhere and increased air pollution in other streets. And there are far too many street signs. You have spent millions making the centre of village very unattractive
LB Southwark ignored the communities views to retain the junction. The opposite has happened with regard to congestion, flow and idling
We have lots of trees in Dulwich.
You are dumping more and more traffic onto the main roads and not taking all people into account. Southwark is not listening to the residents. We don't want this, and you keep ignoring the replies from the residents and plowing ahead anyway.

Comments for 2

leaves all over the newly narrowed cycle traps will make them a slippery death trap in winter
Very difficult to tell from the image how this will reduce congestion & idling. Need much better explanation of this part of the proposed scheme.
obviously there is more space for trees but Dulwich is not lacking in green space, whereas surrounding areas are.
Also whoever thought up the rainbow coloured benches has to be colour blind. They are an eyesore
Trees will always help - but we are lucky in Dulwich in that we have ample trees already
Dangerous re pedestrians and bikes mixing like that.
Would require maintenance - which is currently not being provided at all
would be better to reopen the square as the majority want.
if this scheme imposed more care and attention needed to keep it smart.
I like the trees but again this needs to be taken in context with all the traffic build up not seen in this image. CONTEXT!!
I think the 'greenery' is a bit tokenistic.
Sadly I cannot support planting more street because nobody is sweeping the leaves off the street in the autumn/winter - they are left to rot. Can you please first make sure you can get the leaves swept, and then maybe think about planting more trees. Otherwise more trees will make pavements more disgusting and dangerous for children on bikes and scooters.
There could be more greenery and could be done more creatively
Trees good if they can be maintained and leaves swept regularly to avoid cyclist/pedestrian slippage. Have yet to prove there will be less idling traffic/enough visitors for local business to remain.
It appears the designer of the landscape has not visited Dulwich Village, or decided not to respond to its context. This once difficult junction has left an amorphous space needing to be formalised to give it a "sense of place". Your proposed layout of trees, planting and street furniture reinforces the cycleway rather than creating a place for people to connect, socialise and play. It has no focus and no memorable features.
The existing grassed areas known as the 'Manor Wastes' are the character and language of Dulwich Village. From your illustrations you appear to be removing these features on Turney Road and beside the historic Burial Ground and replacing them with flower beds. The Council fails to maintain the areas, for which it is responsible - your design needs to adopt a more contextual approach with more truthful illustrations and green areas that work as rainwater soakaways.
Again, this proposal Justas makes life very difficult for all those who need to use a car on occasions. Which is most people.
please spend money on other necessary community improvement
dulwich was always beautiful - spending contentious unnecessary money on this vanity project when other areas and borough community needs are so acute is despicable

Why not plant more trees in the park?
Creating space here detracts from the attractiveness of Dulwich Village making it harder to visit.
See comment 1.. planting trees in the central part of the Calton venue/ Court lane junction is a recipe for leaf fall leading to slippery roads (have a look at the bottom of Court Lane at the moment, where the leaf fall has not been cleared for weeks) , poor lines of sight causing hazard for cyclists and pedestrians especially if emergency vehicles need access.
Its hard to see that it will reduce pollution, and any gain here will be outweighed by the shift of traffic onto Half moon Lane and Lordship Lane, to the detriment of schoolchildren and young families living there
Streets for Nature??? It's another area of London that will be paved over providing no run-off for excess rainwater.
If you have to plant trees and bushes, plant them in Dulwich Park
- this junction remains extremely dangerous because of cyclists speeding into the square, narrow down cycle lanes, increase space for pedestrians - seating area needs to be flexible
This is just a sop, and makes reversing these measure more difficult
I don't know. I suspect this is here for "cosmetic" reasons. Could we see an ecology report?
Whiles it may fill that objective, it has a detrimental effect on the older and disabled community. Many of our patients are elderly or have mobility problems and are dependent on cars to access help for their podiatry treatment. Blocking off this area restricts access for the public to the top end of Woodwarde Road, where our practice is situated. Since the initial measures have been put in place, it has had a direct, detrimental affect on our patients, both those who used to attend the practice, who now have much more difficulty accessing us, and for us to attend those in the Dulwich Village area who are housebound.
Greenery and trees are always good.
It's always nice to have more trees on our streets - but it's just misleading nonsense to claim that your proposals will make a significant difference to local pollution!
Idling has been created by southwark itself by the earlier redesign of the north dulwich junction.
there is no question that the a handful of village residents have hugely benefited from all the changes made by southwark to this junction since 2020, but many have suffered as a result and continue to do so.
I'm worried in the autumn when the increased volume of leaf fall lands on the pavements, making it slippery and dangerous to walk.
In Autumn, closely planted trees are likely to cause a hazard to the elderly unless fallen leaves are regularly swept away. These planting schemes look high maintenance so are unlikely to be well cared for and could well become a weed-riddled eyesore or be vandalised.
The current planters with granite kerbs have been installed at considerable expense, it seems iniquitous to be spending yet more Council money on a new scheme. The seating looks ugly and not in keeping with the heritage style of the local area.
There have been substantial drainage problems at this junction during times of high rainfall. Flat pavement is unlikely to help.
I cycle my children to/back school every day and one of the most dangerous parts is the end of court lane. Cars park there to drop their children to school and then u turn to leave. Very dangerous to have a heavy flow of cyclists with cars manoeuvring there. This design partially addressed that except from putting a parking spot there!! Seems very dangerous, how do you expect that car to come Out? Reversing or u-turning into a heavy flow of cyclist (many young children)
Please remove that parking spot..
far more depaving on the approach streets to the area. Especially Court lane as it gets close to the square.
An improvement of whats there, but a mass of stone and limited drainage? This is not a resilient build for all weather types, too hot in the summer, could flood during rainfall, poorly designed with a vision for what? Streets for stones?
I welcome further greenery.
There are currently double yellow lines at the bottom of Court Lane but lack of enforcement means that there are idling drivers there all day, especially during the ends of the school day. As the road is a dead end, this causes chaos as drivers try to turn around or reverse to the junction with Dekker Road.
See previous comments on parking availability and the need for fair traffic measures in Dulwich, in particular Burbage Rd.
The planters are empty most of the year as no one has been officially designated to look after the plants and planters. No trees have been planted.

The trees as shown block the potential flexibility of the new public space for events, and break up the attractive sight lines from Court Lane towards the infant schools, and block sunlight into the shops. Additional street trees would be better located elsewhere. The space should appear open and inviting. Planters should only be permitted in a way in keeping with the historic character, looking as if they have always been there, rather than modernist interventions with curved concrete etc. that clash with the conservation area. The conservation character of Dulwich Village is clear, such as white posts with chains. It is incredible that these visualisations have been produced without any apparent coherence with these. Note the role of the Dulwich Estate as defacto conservation officers here. Work must be in keeping with historic character, which is primarily Edwardian, with some older Victorian and even Georgian properties.
the impact seems negligible
The trees will take years to grow. Planters will not be maintained and the plants will die.
Not convinced as there is no explanation as to how you measure your objectives or how you regulate them e.g. idling. Have Council officer received the answers that residents have received when they ask car drivers (mainly school pick-ups) and coaches to turn off their engines?
If you plant new trees, plants etc. you need to maintain them - and that means in the first instance regular watering for a number of months!
At the total expense of the 'clean' air in Herne Hill.
what is this going to do to help the buses? If you want to get people out of their cars, you need to work with the Public Transport people, even if that is difficult.
There appears to be a lot of hard surfaces when there could be more greenery. Opportunity for SuDS!

Comments for 3 (partly)

For reducing congestion / idling , maybe we need to assess if the unnecessary total closure of Calton Avenue / Courtlane is the reason. No amount of greenery can replace a smooth flowing traffic . If idling needs to be tackled then traffic flow needs better . Permanent Road closure massively displaces traffic . I have never seen such massive queues as long as Calton Avenue was open . So now what you are proposing is additional tax payer money to be spent again in fixing something when root cause isn't addressed.
there can be no concerns about more trees, as long as they do not impact sight lines especially for the visually impaired.
I wonder when the same might be applied for the south circular and other areas which are far more congested and suffer from the bad flow of traffic, congestion and subsequent idling than the village particularly since the closure of 'Dulwich square'
More shrub planting
Cyclists are a nightmare when they don't obey the traffic lights.
Too much hardstanding - also this needs to be accompanied by a Pedestrian Comfort Level assessment to confirm it will result in an improvement.
what has Nature to do with it? we already have enough trees. I thought we are trying to calm traffic.
They will reduce visibility for road users, in particular seeing pedestrians.
1. Suggest evergreen trees should be planted as Southwark rarely sweeps streets and fallen leaves, especially when wet, can be slippery, block drains etc.
Increased greenery welcomed but cannot see how this will improve traffic flow unless the LTN's are removed
The tree density is very low - as shown in the illustration where only a fraction of the space receives shading. Canopy could easily be trebled.
While permanent planters and trees will be an improvement on the existing temporary street furniture, it will make no difference to congestion at the junction
The area is now attractive and has virtually no traffic, but a lot of the traffic has been displaced, it has not gone.
More greening and SUDS should be used to add shade, improve biodiversity and mitigate flood risk.
It is not clear how you plan to do this.
would need the council to look after better than presently
This does not increase biodiversity. You could increase planting, eg along the island by North Dulwich station.
Greenery is good but the main problem is near static traffic at this junction and red post hill junction due to poor traffic light phasing and the need for an extra lane at the red post hill junction to allow traffic to turn left/go straight on without getting stuck behind all the traffic turning right.
Additional greenery is great but there's a lot of vandalism
We see these well-meaning gestures at street level all over London whilst mature trees of decades of growth continue to be felled for poorly thought through housing projects and other types of urban development. There should be greater protection and management of existing trees too.

plant trees that provide a food source to birds/other animals - e.g. berries or fruit. the trees shown do not provide this.
Not 100% sure that closing off this road improves the quality of air for those who live where the traffic has now been forced to go, especially past all the schools in the area that now have more traffic queueing by them and school entry and exit times
The trees are fine but the whole road closure is just quite ridiculous to suggest it reduces idling and congestion or even pollution. It's created terrible congestion and idling, just somewhere else. It only benefits the people in the tiny quarter of a mile radius and displaces the problem to other areas as residents need to get round. It just leads to more idling on Townley road, Lordship Lane, Gallery Road etc.
More areas with grass (or alternatives like moss or wildflowers) would be good - could maybe even set up a community garden area
Should have much more grass
Any planting is good, so long as the choice of plants is correct for the situation and are maintained. More trees also good but need maintenance to ensure they don't die.
Yes. Privileged corner for privileged minority. Drivers just have a longer route around - the problems still exist. Monies should be given to other communities not here where life is already rosey in the Village with the park.
I like the trees,
Who is going to look after the flower beds? Please NOT a local resident. They should be tended professionally by Southwark gardening staff. How will they be watered?
there's been alot of money and change at these junctions... not sure it has all been put to good use.
1. The only element of this proposal that helps in this regard is the changes to the intersection at East Dulwich Grove and Dulwich Village/Red Post Hill.
6 new trees is hardly a climate benefit but congrats for the headline
Little is done to fix traffic congestion at this turning, it's all being done at repost hill jn
You would need to look at the heights of the trees because they could obscure visibility to traffic which would be a danger to pedestrians and vehicles alike.
I don't think your measures really will reduce traffic enough to have significant impact on pollution so you need a broader set of measures to achieve that. And really important that you devote resources to maintain new greenery. General principle definitely good. Really need to improve frequency of P4 and 37 and introduce a bus to West Dulwich to have major impact on traffic.
Good to see the additional flowerbeds, but it would be great to see even more, for drainage purposes as well as attractiveness and biodiversity. There is a relatively large amount of paving, which is expensive for you to install, and prevents drainage. Paving will also store heat in summer, thereby raising the air temperature. I'd be keen to have still more trees, though the 15 you propose are a good start. Trees will create shade and stop the paving from capturing the sun's heat. We know that areas of cities with more trees are cooler.
The leaves will need to be cleaned up more frequently in Autumn, in recent years this has really dropped off and the gutters are all blocked and pavements are slippery
More planting and more permeable surfaces
I am nervous because it all seems ok on paper but in reality the past 5 years of 'greener Dulwich' have actually disrupted many / most and have failed in most areas.....how will this be different?
Shops are suffering and there is less reason for residents to go to the village at all, it is a ghost town between LTN closures and gridlocked thereafter.
Plans will only increase this trend.....
All extra greenery is a great improvement. Anything to encourage water storage is also good. However current flower beds inappropriate and are impossible to maintain. Planting can be used to separate cyclists from pedestrians.
Same as first comment
Looks ok but who is maintaing it? Will leaves be swept properly so there are no hazards for pedestrians, cyclists, and car users?
It is better than it is now, but I disagree with closing the road to cars outside of school hours
There appears to be no analysis of the expected impact of the scheme on emissions and other 'nature' issues. What are the target reductions for CO2 for example. The proposal ms should be based on evidence and expected results with the Council held to account for success or failure. This should all be transparent.
Greenery is great.
The traffic is idling more than it ever has - reopen calton avenue
This is one of the leafiest greenest areas in London. Fix some real problems instead

You are unlikely to have much success because you are simply exporting pollution to nearby streets. Suggest you visit around 8 am and watch. Also you are creating a new extended rush hour of cars between 7 and 8 am on weekdays
I am not clear how it will reduce congestion. All the changes so far have increased congestion as cars have not so many options.
The trees are nice but once again this photograph is not realistic.
Only if you put in trees that you can care for and maintain. No nature to this point.
I agree that planting trees should be beneficial. I don't see how the measures will improve the flow of traffic.
A lot of concrete.
Measures to improve the flow of motor vehicle traffic lead to more motor vehicles and ultimately to more congestion. Priority should be active travel. The success of this scheme should be judged by the number of people travelling actively and a reduction in motor vehicle journeys.
Consider impact of trees on lines of sight & road safety. Are these trees that specifically absorb pollution? What is their purpose? Trees and gardens can be obstacles. Emergency vehicles use these spaces - check overhang. Consider impact of leaves on drainage systems; they make the pavements and roads slippery for pedestrians and bikes. Tree roots can lift pavements unsafe especially for individuals using strollers, walkers, wheelchairs and / those that are partially sighted. Consider a "track" along the pavement so that partially sighted individuals can follow a safe path along the pavement and to safe crossing points. Great slope for wheelchairs but not over bumps. Need traffic lights & signage for cyclists to reduce speed in this semi-pedestrian area. Use a checklist of groups of road / pavement users that need to be considered and what impact these changes have on them.
More planting / run off considerations - SUDS surfaces and less hard paving
I think the echelon parking needs to be urgently addressed to improve the air quality. Currently, so many drivers sit there with their engines running for no apparent reason, waiting for school pick up time, and this causes unnecessary pollution. Reducing the number of spaces, making them parallel, and making most of them for disabled drivers only, would greatly improve this (if well monitored to give drivers idling and using disabled bays illegally tickets)
Flower beds are not appropriate: they require too much maintenance and do not stand up to children playing. Grass verges (and posts) are traditional in Dulwich, stand up to drought, could be regarded as trendy 'rain gardens' and require relatively little maintenance.
I think you need a zebra crossing for pedestrians. Bikes don't stop at the lights, the only way to make it work is a zebra crossing. I have seen kids hit by bikes going so fast round here
Greenery is welcome, but unless semi-mature trees are installed, this is illusory for the next 10 years. What has been budgeted for this - and ongoing maintenance/watering etc?
It is great to have more nature, but not at the expense of traffic flow.
Much will depend on the choice and maintenance of the planting schemes which is not specified. Generally encouraging planting of pollution absorbing species as garden hedges and school boundaries - rather than artificial screens would be more effective in achieving these aims.
More trees - informally/symmetrically sited - are very welcome.
Flower beds are totally unsuitable, because they would be subject to drought and children playing and would require far too much maintenance. Grass verges are a possible alternative and very suitable in the Dulwich context.
The aims are well meant. I have doubts about the idling and reducing congestion. Where do you anticipate the cars will go I have mentioned above about the junction north of the village. Much more of an issue is to get the public transport so much more streamlined. This depends on TFL and until they get their funding and functionality up to scratch you won't cut the cars. Cars will need their place unless you want to eliminate all cars altogether. I feel this thinking is isolation to its surroundings. As mentioned from the start.
There is a lot more hard landscaping than greenery in the designs which is a missed opportunity for meeting this objective to its fullest potential

<p>The illustration is very attractive and a great improvement on the current tatty collection of planters and benches. However, whether the suggested changes that will certainly make it pleasanter for human beings will really attract more natural phenomena is rather doubtful. The key to those ambitions locally, are diverse settings in Dulwich Park and the many sports fields in the area and along railway embankments, subject to not creating dangers for railway movements.</p> <p>I suggest that 'streets for nature' aims to make sure that they minimize negative impacts on nature rather than expect them to do much for wild animals, insects, birds and diversity of flora.</p> <p>Local gardens are a great source of nature diversity and the suggestions for improving Dulwich Square and surrounding streetscapes will be marginal by comparison.</p>
<p>There could be a lot more. And there should be. In terms of design less focus on facilitating cyclists and emergency vehicles and more on making the space actually green.</p>
<p>The flowers look pretty in the picture and I like the sage and rosemary we have at the moment, but they have a tough time and need a lot of watering even though they're supposed to be drought-resistant, so I'm not sure flowers are a good idea.</p>
<p>Trees to delineate the Square (and help with carbon capture) are essential and need little maintenance.</p>
<p>A few more trees could be planted. Is there shade throughout the day where seating is?</p>
<p>More greenery required</p>
<p>Traffic calming for cyclists is required - they do in excess of 20mph and treat pedestrians as slalom poles in an obstacle course</p>
<p>Would be great to see a larger area made into free-draining planted surface.</p>
<p>The rian gardens are needed as soak-aways. Unless they are well maintained, they become ugly very quickly. Better if they are super low maintenance. Straight grass and white posts and black chains would be much more in keeping with the rest of the heritage nature of the village.</p>
<p>Trees are nice</p>
<p>How does adding more paved surfaces help? Surely we should have more grass / flower bed to absorb water</p>
<p>Seeking to improve flow of traffic seems at odds with reducing the impact of climate change, incentivising driving will result in more people driving, less people walking and cycling.</p>
<p>Prefer to see new manor waste on Dulwich Village frontage and posts / chains rather than flowerbeds. This would follow the character of the Village and streetscape of Conservation Area. Trees along Dulwich Village should align with existing.</p>
<p>As long as there is regular street cleaning and effective drainage, the above-mentioned measures should bring benefits</p>
<p>It is lovely for the village whilst Croxted Road suffers from more pollution as a result of traffic being displaced from the village. Surely we need tree more to combat the increase pollution.</p>
<p>More greenery and trees needed and well designed seating required, not what is in place now.</p>
<p>There is an overload of street furniture in and around the Village. Please consider the aesthetics of the surroundings. That applies to all of the Borough of Southwark.</p>
<p>There is still a very large paved area. Wider pavements are good for safer school drop off/ collection, but the area on the corner in front of the hairdresser is a large paved area.</p> <p>Could some moveable planters go here? and be moved to the side for community events?</p>
<p>There is still a lot of paving in the proposal</p>
<p>1/ Dulwich Community rejected closure of the junction in the initial consultation. 2/ crime and feeling unsafe as a woman returning home from North Dulwich station in the evening 3/ public transport (frequency of trains) has been reduced since covid. We need better public transport - increased bus and train frequencies if we are supposed to get rid of our cars.</p>
<p>Greenery needs to make this a safe space for pedestrians and show cyclists that they are visitors.</p>

Comments for 4

<p>I think pedestrian crossings should be made more obvious - there is currently a lot of pedestrians crossing wherever they find most suitable for their route, with cyclists passing by (sometimes at speed to catch the light open)</p>
<p>Attractive space.</p>
<p>The reduction in idling will partly depend on the impact of the changes at Dulwich Village -Red Post Hill junction. Also reducing through traffic in the area.</p>
<p>More planting the better but who is going to pay for looking after it.</p>

see comment above re need for blocks/plantar boxes
in addition commonly delivery scooters and electric bikes go through these restricted areas often fast and often without lights at night so we need measures to slow them down eg rough road surfaces at key junctions or speed bumps
Not sure if flowers in grass verges will work but it looks nice.
Please introduce trees that will be long lived and have substantial canopies - not ornamental short-lived fruit trees, which don't provide adequate heat-reducing benefits.
Pls include sustainable drainage in all four corners of the scheme.
Happy to see trees and plants as long as they are properly maintained.
Costs please
More planting and more trees would improve air quality and would improve the look of the junction.
The more greenery the better. Ideally with native trees.
they look aesthetically great but only benefit the privileged few... these measures displace traffic to the poorer areas of Dulwich... and lead to divisions. The very people who benefit from these are the only that usually drive the Chelsea tractors
The problem is at the junction of Dulwich Village and Red Post Hill, not at Calton Avenue
Definitely need more quality greenery. No sticky lime trees or such though!
You need to control the speed at which cyclists come down Calton Avenue, they've hit half a dozen kids in front of me on various occasions and I have lived here for less than 3 years.
I notice you have a lot of paving in the area. For drainage purposes, you may want to consider more plant areas so that the risk of flooding is reduced. Could you introduce more verges between the road/cycleway and the paved area on Dulwich Village.
I like the trees. It would be nice to have some additional greenery.
could put in a centre pease like a circle filled with plants.
It is really important to choose trees and bushes etc whose leaves do not cause a slippery surface for pedestrian sand people cycling.
The plans look more attractive than the current arrangements.
Trees need to have high crowns to ensure visibility in the junction.
It would be good to include homes for wildlife in the design (bug hotels, bird boxes etc). Also I hope the street lighting is considerate of light pollution and designed to minimise the impact of that.
More tree planting and less paved area would be desirable
still a lot of hard paving, especially in areas ppl are unlikely to walk.
The flower beds are not appropriate to this area , they generally look tatty. The design should consider posts and chains to discourage cyclists on pavements. This is a scourge of the whole Dulwich Village area.
would be nice to have more beds for plants/flowers?
Looks very positive but is there potential for more SUDS eg swales, permeable paving?
More trees = 5!
We need more trees.
All planting needs to be maintained to a high standard regularly. The current planting in this area is neglected and shabby.
I'm just looking at the images and thinking there is still quite a lot of hardscaping so wondering if even greater amount of trees/planting is possible.
The more the better
More benches, seating areas, cycle loops please

Welcome the introduction of greenery, however more trees are required to frame the Square and provide shade in the summer months
The flower beds are not appropriate in this area. The historic and contextually appropriate Dulwich verges should be used here. Planting needs to be maintenance free, drought proof, tolerate high volumes of rainfall and children playing
The introduction of green verges welcome as they can support 'rain gardens'
Consider posts and chains to discourage cycling on pavements and separate people from traffic
Seating areas need to be flexible - current proposal is unimaginative
Historic lamps posts and hanging baskets only add unnecessary clutter
The echelon parking on Dulwich village is dangerous and should be replaced by standard parallel parking
I'm all for more planting and trees to improve air quality.
More greenery is always welcome
Looks great! Maybe more planted areas to help when raining/to stop flooding
We are pro greenery where ever possible. However we just do not agree to the closure of the roads. It should be possible to add greenery without closing roads.
More trees
I would like more trees round the Square
There could still be more greenery. Surface water run off gardens etc?
Really like the idea of embedding the closed junction area with trees and seating to make it permanent.
I don't have the expertise to say whether these plans really will achieve this. But sustainable urban drainage is really important isn't it - is there enough of that in the plans?
I assume there is a plan and funding ringfenced for ongoing care of the trees so leaves don't cause a slip hazard and roots don't render the cycle and walk ways dangerous.
Reducing traffic should take into account more actions, like traffic calming measures and incentives for cycling and walking.
Sounds interesting but can't see what the measures are.
Trees are great IF a species where branches are well above head level eg those by No 37/3 bust stop in Brixton piazza
People like to sit with coffee or sandwich so we need LITTER BINS and regular cleaning. Will cafes be able to install their own seating or will it be tastefully controlled (?!). Please no ghastly plastic grass!
Only concern is kids not looking before crossing the road for bikes as lanes not well distinguished (now or in drawings) No enough bike stands at the moment or in the drawings to accommodate visitors by bike or parents dropping at schools
More grass and plants would be better to make the air cleaner.
It's a good idea to plant more greenery and shade trees.
This area needs more planting in keeping with the rest of the village with green verges, posts and chains to stop people cycling on the pavements. The current flower beds are an eyesore and not in keeping with the heritage style of the village.
Trees are good but I think they should be at the edges of the Square not in the middle.
More trees are nice
It would be nice to incorporate sensory planting with fragrance (herbs and fragrances flowers) to also improve the pedestrian/cyclist experience when using this area to stop for a coffee/chat.
Lovely to see more biodiversity, plans could go further in terms of adding permeable paving and rain gardens to deal with surface water runoff in a sustainable way. Would be happy to see a larger area given over to nature.
No flower beds and more trees, please. Would improve general appearance if the 'Dulwich look' posts and chains cd be employed, including to deter cycling on pavements.
More trees for shade in the summer would be great and whilst flowers are lovely they would require ongoing maintenance to keep them nice particularly in an area, as hoped, that has high pedestrians and children in particular. The area will also need to be well lit to ensure that it is safe and uasable in the evenings as well.
I think we need more trees for shade in the summer and, whilst the flower beds look really good, it would be very difficult to maintain that visual look and just resorting to the grass verges, white posts and black chains that we have elsewhere in Dulwich Village would be cheaper to maintain and more in keeping with the area.
Great to see greenery. Consider posts and chains to discourage pavement cycling.
Very encouraging! As mentioned before, I would suggest some more planting in front of the shops on Calton Avenue.

The greenery will be great but don't make it too difficult to maintain as the area has heavy use and could look shabby quickly. More trees would also be key to offer shade in the summer months. Also make sure there is still plenty of space for us to play whilst our parents stand around and chat.

Soft landscaping is welcome but please ensure trees are native or wildlife-friendly species if possible

Comments for 5 (completely)

I love the look of the new planting! So much better than just grass! Different varieties of trees adds so much to the view.

Looks very nice - hope those flower baskets make it to the final version!

Trees and planting look great

Any planting of new trees, bushes, etc is good

The proposals look great.

loving all the trees and plants

Very good idea

I have noticed that the boxes placed in Dulwich village /Calton Ave look a bit tatty and not cared for.

Fantastic, but look into Shrubs for easy care and get professional advice from RHS ecology etc.

More greenery is always good

Yes please to more trees!

Looks great!

Looks much better than before the changes

Wonderful!

Love the design and the enhanced features for pedestrians and cyclists

Good future maintenance of planting is essential

Provision of adequate seating/benches

Score of 5 is providing rain gardens/ SuDS are implemented

Will the trees really look this good? ;)

Creates a new public space.

I love the fact there will be more greenery, more trees are particularly welcome due to cooling, shade, wildlife benefits and flood mitigation.

My only comment would be, could there be even more trees? There is plenty of space

Fully endorse planting more trees and enhanced greenery proposal.

Fully endorse the idea to plant some more trees and increase the greenery. Adds to healthier air and is very welcoming.

Trees an important addition to improve environment and air quality.

I love bee friendly planting

it is wonderful to see the streets reclaimed from cars, and in the midst of a climate emergency, it is great to see the Council taking a lead in trying to create a more planet friendly environment

Can we have a SUDS garden here?

Be good to have as much sustainable drainage as possible

More trees

I think the council will have to speed up these projects and stop the cars ignoring the signs.

This is a lovely idea

Good stuff

The more planting of trees the better.

I like the benches, flowers and new trees.

I like the new trees.

More trees for shade is a positive improvement

I have struggled in the summer months to find anywhere to sit with my children and have food / drinks from the nearby shops. The additional trees will be important to provide shading, thank you!

The introduction of natural living elements to the scheme enhances a physical border that describes the community interaction, safety and social connection

I am no horticulturalist but think it looks nice (especially considering it used to be all tarmac and cars!)

I would ideally like to see a larger area of planting.

Really good.
Again more of these please
This should be encouraged.
Trees are nature. All very lovely in a country setting, but population density means we all need to get on with daily lives and generating the lifeblood of the community by working, shopping, using services locally. Wildlife needs water too. There's not a lot of focus on using less tarmac to reduce water run-off and flood risk.
Lovely!
More trees and planting will make the junction more attractive and usable. There are so many cyclists, walkers and kids going to and from school who use it now who benefit. The return to a junction that cars can use would be an unconscionable step back in terms of congestion, pollution and biodiversity in my opinion.
Great to see there will be trees and much needed shade!
A water feature would be nice.
Looks good. Keep the junction closed to cars.
This should improve the area in question markedly.
Of course. I would love to see less paving. But I realise this would introduce upkeep into the mix—difficult in these times.
The mature trees are lovely. Please keep them.
The addition of trees and more planting will improve the area visually, as well as improve air quality
More trees are really important to tackle climate change.
Greater tree cover is important. The trees should be deciduous so that there is shade in summer but sunlight in winter.
I greatly support any and all measures that aim to increase biodiversity and reduce pollution
New trees and greenery will provide much needed shade for everyone spending time in Dulwich Square.

Streets for Economy

To what extent do you think these measures achieve the 'Streets for the Economy' objective? - how much does this achieve the objective

Comments for 1 (not at all)

What does this even mean? Who came up with such an inane term?
These measures will be a disaster for local business
A lot of them shops rely on driving to get to park near the shops to carry heavy shopping especially older people and disabled
You are taking away their independence
It's a waste of money. What the economy needs is parking spaces which you are reducing
Does not help local business, affects it negatively
I am a local business owner. footfall is down so much in the village, you are HURTING business, not supporting it. Just go in the shops to see how many have anti cpz / anti ltn posters.
People will not use the shops in the week because it's too difficult to navigate the streets and park. The shops will be left to rely on weekend shoppers, the independent shops will eventually close down e.g. Biff shoe shop.
Local businesses in the Village have all suffered as a result - I know avoid going into the village altogether and shop on Lordship lane instead.
Closing this road without any consultation during Covid was insanely unjust and the amount you are spending on this junction is disgusting. Just stop and think what else you could do with that money you bunch of closed minded, incompetent people who don't represent the people in the area - the amount of pollution you have now pushed past Harris Primary on Lordschip Lane as you have essentially given all the rich Dulwich village residents private roads. As apparently their voices will be heard more than the masses who have to suffer increased congestion and pollution on other roads. I'm sure this is also just to try and ensure when the government tries to unwind this closure it's more difficult. Deceptive as always.
I no longer use any of the businesses in the village.
Less visits to shops from outside communities due to road closures-
Fact
We need to open this junction at off-peak times, so that people can reach the local shops. Not everyone can cycle or walk.
The yellow lines in Dulwich Village will be detrimental to the economy as people will not be able to stop to shop.
All these measures reduce the amount of people going to and using Dulwich Village. The only result is that the local businesses get fewer customers. I personally have never seen anyone using the existing seating provided so can not understand why Southwark council would want to waste more money on projects like this when all it can achieve is to reduce the numbers of people using the businesses in the village. Ask the business owners how much their business has been effected since all these traffic reducing measures have been implemented.
The measures have had the opposite effect and local businesses have been massively damaged by the changes. If your objective is to ensure that everybody buys online rather than in person in local businesses then congratulations!
AS COMMENTED THERE IS NO GREATER EFFINCY TO THE RUNNING OF THE LOCAL ECONOMY IN ANY WAY WHATSOEVER.....PLEASE PROVIDE ALL DATA THAT SUPPORTS THIS
Businesses need cars to be able to access their premises easily. this does not help in that regard, as cars cannot access the Village via Calton Ave at all and through the Village northbound at certain times.
These measures seem designed to crush small businesses.
The LTN has been the death knell for a lot of local businesses.
Local trades are suffering hugely from the traffic restrictions
access to shops is difficult
Southwark's Street Plans are destroying the local economy. The shops cannot thrive on purely local "walking trade" (The population density is too small). Some sales need to be generated from people driving to the area but nobody in their right mind would drive to Dulwich Village knowing they might be fined for forgetting the baffling time restrictions
This is already having a direct impact on the viability of businesses. Southwark should undertake a formal assessment to determine the economic impacts of the changes.
These measures will not help local businesses. Everything the Council does make it more difficult for local business.
Every business you go into along there hates these measures. Please read the room.

I will never use these areas. We have a park nearby . Why would anyone in Dulwich choose to sit next to the main thoroughfare of Dulwich Village with traffic bombing through? This is ill conceived as it causes inequality elsewhere in the heart of Dulwich. Unless you can offer the same to all residents why should one tiny area be given so much at the expense of huge number of other residents who are suffering more traffic and more pollution and more noise and a less green environment?
What about pensioners - remember you will be old one day. Don't expect me [REDACTED] to get on a bike
I hear from the majority of shopkeepers that closing Court Lane and Calton Avenue have decreased the footfall and some shops have closed.
Although aesthetically pleasing, the local business' rely on visitors to the area where customers can park. See earlier comments on the demise of Biff. Without local parking outside the shops or within easy access, the business' will suffer increased loss of trade and ultimately loss of revenue for Southwark and reduced local employment.
Absolutely not. These measures seriously affect my ability to use the local shops, and deter local trade from operating in the area. Not sure about the deliveries to local shops. I assume it makes this more tricky too and they probably end up blocking the displaced traffic
As someone who lives in village I don't need protecting from traffic nor a bench to sit down on
Without parking local business will lose trade.
According to shopkeepers, there has been a 20% decrease in customers since the introduction of the road closure. Therefore, the measure achieved the opposite of what was intended. It became too difficult to come to our neighbourhood, and customers prefer to shop elsewhere.
I am of the opinion that the changes made by Southwark were undemocratic, uneconomic for local shops disregard the needs of those who do not live in the bubble of central dulwich and utterly wasteful of public money. It has greatly undermined my confidence in any service provided or any public survey such as this. I am strongly of the opinion that enough is enough that any available funds should be directed towards reversing changes and towards existing sub optimal services such as road cleaning and managing crime and homelessness and if this is not possible ie if funds earmarked they should be returned to central government.
Too many unnecessary double yellow lines prevent customers from parking.
The "new" disabled bay is marked on the Controlled Parking Zone area 5 consultation map as an "existing" disabled bay, and the new loading bay is proposed as a car club bay. These proposals are therefore inconsistent and appear to try to use the same space to meet competing requirements.
No. Please DO NOT go ahead. Stop interfering in our local area. Southwark does NOT help the local economy - leave us alone and let us use our local businesses and park where we lawfully choose.
As far as I am aware, you have never consulted local business and taken account of the adverse impact this has had on them
What does this even mean?
Static traffic build up is so huge on village way, this idyllic image will never happen. This was wholly rejected by the community years ago and you still plough on regardless. Local schoolchildren's health is being adversely affected.
Local businesses have been struggling since these measures have been implemented - this is due to LTNs, not Brexit or COVID
Killing local businesses
Local businesses have already told you time and again- the introduction of LTNs has been so damaging to their trade. Less people are coming to dulwich/ dulwich village. People are inclined to buy less. They are overall less excessible Longstanding businesses have had to close down to due to the LTNs. These shops are struggling The shops that are coming in are chains. Not the independent charm that Dulwich village used to have.
I am almost certain shops are struggling due to limited parking and car access.
My husband and I (we live in West Dulwich) have long since stopped going into Dulwich Village because we can't park ([REDACTED]) and get fed up of being run down by bikes which seem to have priority over pedestrians in most of Dulwich
There are plenty of parks locally for people to sit on benches and chat. Closing a major junction in the midst of our village has displaced traffic and increased journey times for those unable to walk or use bicycles. This is inequitable on the elderly or those with disabilities.
You have benefitted a couple of businesses, whilst inconveniencing hundreds of others.
These are harmful to local businesses because of the lack of parking and access to small independent shops.
if you can't park outside the shops no one will go there and the shops will close
These changes are really hurting local shops so it achieved the opposite of what you want
If you cannot reach these areas no one will be able to spend time there.

The community does not want this junction to remain closed.
Has the council consulted businesses to find out what would help them? I understand not. Get on and do what you say you will do. Publish the results and LISTEN to us ALL and not just the fit cycling lobby.
You have taken no notice of our comments in the past. Will you take notice this time?
Why do imagine people want to sit there?
The community rejected this 24/7 closure in the original consultation, and yet we continue to suffer from it. You are destroying quality of life for working Dulwich residents and council tax payers. Through the distress and pain created the plan you are failing in your Public Sector Equality Duty. Cycling has decreased on roads which have taken the displaced traffic. Publish traffic and air quality data for all streets in the Dulwich area. At the DV/East Dulwich Grove junction you state that the “existing cycling wand segregation to remain”. This cycle lane is a disaster causing tailbacks through DV at peak times increasing pollution for schoolchildren and residents. The traffic here needs two lanes in order to flow smoothly and reduce pollution from traffic waiting to turn right into East Dulwich Grove - the majority of whom have been forced down this route by the closure of Calton Avenue. Your road planning officer should be shot.
Traffic is terrible now, impacting many. It is hard to travel by bus. Roads that have schools on and children walking along to get to school are heavily impacted - there is a huge increase in pollution for the children. The only benefit is to those who live on the blocked off street, at everyone else’s expense. No proper consultation, residents and local shopkeepers views ignored.
These measures divert people away from these areas and therefore will achieve exactly the opposite. They have already done significant harm to local independent businesses and will continue to do so
These measures have made it more difficult to travel to the area impacting local businesses.
To improve the economy (especially for businesses), you need to embrace cars and provide parking and car access. Public transport isn't always the answer (I'm not going to take a 6 foot Christmas tree home on a bus!) The council need to wake up to this.
It would be nice to have some businesses left in the area - not just coffee shops, which are presumably the people wanting more outdoor seating outside their premises. These proposals simply serve to make it more difficult for people to use the other businesses
Ask businesses
Where is the evidence that the local businesses impacted by these changes support the changes & were consulted?
I don't think it will make any difference to businesses
All these people have DULWICH PARK around the corner to enjoy the open spaces in. You do not need to create a mini park here.
The community rejected this 24/7 closure in the original consultation, and the wider area will continue to suffer, not benefit, from it. Traffic is still being displaced on to surrounding roads where families live and where children walk and cycle to school.
overall the plans including closing through traffic up court lane and calton avenue tend to reduce access to shops and hence reduce trade
by closing through traffic reduces traffic flow and hence local business
The shops have been badly affected by this LTN. They need parking spaces too on the Court Lane side maybe free for 20 minutes . Since you made the LTN here parking on the Court Lane side is difficult DURING THE SCHOOL MONTHS which doesn't help the shops. They need more support. I always see school families using this area and not so much the local community outside of this age range.
DO NOT CLOSE DOWN ANY ROADS BUSINESSES WILL CLOSE
YOU WILL KILL THE LOCAL ECONOMY
DO NOT DO THIS
IT WILL KILL LOCAL BUSINESSES AND SHUT DOWN SHOPS - DULWICH WILL BECOME A HAVEN FOR CRIME
YOU ARE KILLING THE LOCAL ECONOMY
DO NOT MAKE ANY MORE CHANGES

As it makes it less accessible and takes away the motivation to visit the village. Interestingly we had lunch in the village every week and since the inception of the LTN controls since Covid, we just avoid the area. these measures cater for the entitled few who seem to expect country style living in a London borough. The village is dieing and with the CPZ you simply put the nail in the coffin.
I do not see how any of these measures will improve footfall for local businesses and the space for loading seems to be well out of the picture, requiring long trips back and forth from the van.
I have heard many comment that they no longer come to Dulwich to support businesses because they are unsure of the times traffic access restrictions and finding access difficult due road intersection closures.
It will make pollution and congestion worse on East Dulwich Grove and Red Post Hill
Could harm local businesses - reducing passing trade could push up prices, which is fine for the wealthy inhabitants of Dulwich in their enormous houses, but not fine for normal people. Traffic is already being pushed onto neighbouring streets to the detriment of nearby residents. Traffic has to travel further to circumnavigate restricted areas (see previous answer)
Businesses have consistently said that 24/7 street closures to traffic are detrimental to their business. The queues of traffic in Dulwich village caused by closure of Carlton Avenue have dissuaded me from shopping there.
The community rejected the 24/7 closure of this junction in the original consultation and wider area continues to suffer, not benefit from, the proposals.
I used to drive to the village, park and shop before continuing my journey, with shopping, to my father-in-law. I now cannot drive to the village because of the road closure so I use Amazon. It has been dreadful for local shops.
Are businesses likely to use outdoor seating with the current spate of shoplifting? OK for cafes & restaurants where sidewalks are of sufficient width; Lordship Lane, despite its narrower sidewalks, offers more outside seating than Dulwich Village. Who would want to eat a meal alongside a cycle, e-scooter, and emergency vehicle route?!
The are is next door to one of London's significant parks - and the local restaurants already have enough outside space.
What a fake picture of life. No rain, no darkness, cycles being reckless. Just a fake, hyper depressing, hyper controlled world without real humans with real problems.
I was collecting my child last Friday at 6pm. We went for supper in Dulwich - something we have not done in over two years.
Why do we do not visit Dulwich any more. Too may tickets for driving through your exclusive streets. But now DULWICH IS PAYING THE PRICE - FOR this PUBLIC POLICY. The streets were empty - in December. No people. So deathly quiet. So depressing. So lonely.
The restaurants were basically empty - we walked in. No need to book.
5 years ago, all those restaurants where fully booked - alive - vibrant - bustling. People are great. Traffic is dynamic. Lively noise of people and cars and dogs and children is wonderful. I miss honking, laughter, frustrations, that is life.
Dulwich was empty and silent.
Stop wasting our taxes on fancy pet projects. Spend money in repairing roads . Clear manholes to avoid flooding of roads. Reopen closed roads under pretext of LTN and remove APR cameras that you installed to enforce them and you ise as cash cows to justify your positions and salaries.
Closing roads to traffic does not encourage people to stop by these shops. People drive for a reason and it isn't for pleasure as you might think. Forcing people to cycle or walk by closing roads isn't the way forward. Giving more options is, this means adding cycle paths without closing roads.
lucky shop owners on Calton ave
Looks very nice but shops, especially on Calton Avenue, suffer from lack of short term parking for customers
You don't have to be disabled to need car transport
They push traffic onto particular displacement roads which become congested whilst others have no traffic on them which is unfair to those on the roads that have all the traffic The congested displacement roads are on main bus routes so bus journeys are slow (I have had to abandon bus journeys for this reason) They cause longer journeys which increases pollution They prejudice the elderly and disabled who have no choice but use cars to get around Many cyclists are inconsiderate to pedestrians and appear to feel they have licence to speed through junctions and crossings without regard for pedestrians
Artists view is distorted. There is not room for traffic lanes, cycle path and planting
This change will not slow down cyclists nor stop them jumping red lights.

There has been minimal, desultory consultation with local businesses. Nobody travels by car into the Village to shop anymore so the economy is dependent on the relatively small local population.
Can't use the local shops because of restricted road access and parking controls. Reopen the roads and remove parking restrictions
I feel the proposed measures negatively impact local trade. They make deliveries more difficult. They deter local tradespeople like builders and plumbers from working in the local area.
The system serves only a small privileged section of the community.
There should be restricted access at certain times during school start and finish hours (like Townley Road) Outside that there should not be restrictions.
The present system: Discriminates against the elderly and the disabled Privileges cyclists (I am a cyclist) Restricts the liberty of people living in the area Increases car emissions and car journeys by causing traffic jams Displaces the traffic to other areas Creates an unsafe space, particularly at night The benches there are ugly
Other than that it is a great system! Not sure who is actually benefiting form the system other than a small number of people
I never visit the village shops ever now as I cannot park or travel in easily without sitting in lots of traffic
Stop giving the cyclists priority. I [REDACTED] won't be cycling ever again, but I have given up my car and I use the buses and walk as much as I can although my health prevents going very far. You are purposely discriminating against me. I think that's wicked and against the law.
Local traders say that they suffer from the high traffic in peak hours and the lower footfall in other hours due to the restrictions. Compare this with the bustling streets of Herne Hill where people can park more freely.
Restricted access, poor local bus routes, reduced parking, not enough cycle parking, increased rents/costs to cover.
Local shops are suffering, especially those that offer delivery. Local eateries are suffering, because anyone sitting in their outside seating areas is poisoned by the traffic fumes from stationary traffic.
Just stop wasting money on these endless 'consultations', reopen the roads so that you stop favouring the most expensive streets and wealthiest residents of the borough, and reduce the terrible congestion which has resulted from the LTN
The proposals basically stop all car parking in Dulwich Village - this is clearly a negative for the local shops
There is no evidence to think these proposals will help local businesses. On the contrary, making it harder for all who use public transport, as well as the elderly and disabled will encourage people to shop online and reduce support for local businesses.
Just have a chat with the current shop owners. Ever since this junction has closed, they have lost a significant amount of footfall. It's not helping them and it's not helping us.
Well done - you have managed to make successful businesses struggle to survive or go bust! Traditional shops that locals could visit are off limits if coming from West Dulwich or need car for mobility. Against the 15 minute city as you have barred those with protected characteristics relating to age and mobility from accessing.
As above. We don't want to "spend time" there because the traffic pollution you have created is terrible, and there is a fantastic park just down the road. No-one will ever "hang out" at this junction.
Many of the Village shops have suffered very badly from the LTN. It needs to be removed.
I basically don't visit the Village anymore - part of a multi journey trip so just miss it out and go where I am welcomed - nothing wrong the shop keepers it is you the Council.
Calton Avenue/Dulwich Village - no improvement, the opposite a backwards step as the proposal includes removing parking spots making it more difficult for clients to park their vehicle and therefore reducing the business for the local shops.
These proposals will greatly reduce the footfall at the local shops. With reduced accessibility and parking spaces trade will only be those who are local and mobile.
Have never spoken to a dulwich business who hasn't reported dreadful negative impact on closing dulwich to outsiders in the way these road blocks and restrictive parking measures have achieved
There are numerous opportunities to sit and enjoy Dulwich Village with plenty of seating and parks. There is no need to remove vital space for people to move around to go about their business by creating more of an obstacle course
These changes are not required. As a resident of this street I want access for my car on a permit basis. You are discriminating against local residents for people that travel to the village but do not live there. By allowing calton avenue residents car access via permits (with the ringo app), for example via gilkes crescent would solve this issue!

The businesses in Dulwich Village are already suffering from pay parking and lack of parking spaces. Historically a lot of people have driven to Dulwich Village to shop.
Think the road should be re-opened. Also preventing parking (or metered) will cause fewer shoppers & so not good for economy
SHUTTING DOWN ROADS HINDERS THE LOCAL ECONOMY
IT IS A VERY BAD IDEA - AND HAS NO ECONOMIC BENEFIT WHATSOEVER
Due to other plans along Dulwich village people aren't being encouraged to visit and shop here by car as no where to park , expensive parking for visitors to residents living here or reducing parking spaces altogether
The fact that at least one shop has closed due to lower trade says it all! If you actually ran a business rather than spend our money in this irresponsible way you would already know the answer to this. The local businesses have been against the changes since the start, which you are fully aware of as they have presented at your Council meetings (and then clearly ignored)
I come to the village regularly to shop and spend money. I cannot do this at certain times of the day because of the restrictions on access into Dulwich village so I consequently shop less here.
If you only make businesses accessible to the fit and able, it destroys community which grows around local shopping and eating etc. Many less able and older people who do not have blue badges, need to be able to park for enough time to access shops etc. this is being systematically eroded by schemes like this.
We are not living in some romanticised rural idyll. This is a busy London Borough and people need to be able to travel by car without constant congestion, traffic jams and hidden cameras at every turn. There is already plenty of open spaces for people to go in Dulwich - we do not need seating and play areas in DULwich Village , we need roads with free flowing traffic
It has reduced traffic to local businesses significantly.
You have decimated the shops in Dulwich.
People will not want to visit this area as the traffic queues caused by the LTN makes journey time to and through Dulwich Village ridiculously long. Also the pollution from queuing traffic close to the Dulwich Village/Calton Avenue/Turney Road junction makes the idea of sitting on benches very unattractive! This is a total waste of our Southwark Council tax payers' money.
I don't think you consider the economy sufficiently when you introduce schemes like this. Dulwich Village is quite inaccessible. Lordship Lane, in contrast, is much more easily accessed, whether by car, bus or on foot. By making DV a traffic nightmare, you have weakened the local economy.
All local business have been negatively impacted by the measures introduced which has been really sad to see.
Easy access and parking would promote footfall; most measures have made it harder for customers to engage with local shops
I have difficulty walking there (due to disability) so the changes are irrelevant to me. It is just another reason not to visit the village, the exact opposite of what the plans are trying to achieve
Nobody is going to sit here.
I used to go to dulwich village all the time since the new driving restrictions I never do as I have to drive another route
Present evidence suggests that the 'square' is not an appealing place to sit in. Its under-use is quite staggering and speaks volumes about its unsuitability!
According to local shop keepers, there has been a decline of 20% of their customers since the introduction of LTN.
You are expecting our local shops to mainly get their income from local foot fall. This is not enough to keep business going. They need people who are passing through the area to stop and spend. And the parking bays for them. Shops will go out of business. Broken window theory.
It is crazy to prevent people from travelling and parking in the village if you want business to thrive
Your proposals and current LTN restrict custom for local businesses.
The traffic is funnelled through Dulwich Village and it is not a pleasant place to sit. Also not sure it is fair that outdoor seating is being provided for Dulwich businesses and not other businesses. I don't think seating is a good use of my taxes. The borough desperately needs more investment in education and health not seating outside shops in an affluent area.
I use the local shops a lot but will be discouraged from doing so if there are lots of cyclists, adults and children hanging about.

<p>1. Seating on shopping sidewalk of sufficient width - yes, for short rests, not for socialising; parks are for that purpose</p> <p>2. Seating yes, on sidewalks of sufficient width outside eateries. See how it's done in East Dulwich.</p> <p>3. Seating on street highways is unwise and unsuitable.</p> <p>4. Cycle parking within green triangle at Village Way/Dulwich Village junction; or next to Village Hall, - yes, but not obstructing the Highway. Cyclists are fit enough to walk short distance to the shops.</p> <p>5. (during Covid epidemic, 'social seating' outside Dulwich Library looked like an illicit drug exchange site; scattered gas canisters were obvious; is that what you want for 'Dulwich Square?').</p> <p>4. Loading bay(s), yes; are these bookable by local businesses?</p> <p>5. Disabled Parking. Yes, though better in Gilkes Place.</p> <p>6. Wasn't all this foreseen when planning permission was given for housing on the former garage site at Gilkes Place; if not, why not?</p>
<p>I think the leap from "clean Air" to street for Journeys" is ridiculous waste of money, has created major pedestrian safety issues. Rewind to when Southwark Council showed us the "creating places to be protected from the Sun!!!" Too many too count Dulwich residents do not need or approve of ANY of Southwark Council's "Street whatever "Sfj's"" spin. All we see and hear are more of the same theme: Southwark Councils agenda: profit before Dulwich drivers, and pedestrians!</p>
<p>as above, LTN's are a farce and are criminal, they have been brought in without consultation. And just to let you know I do cycle to work every day.</p>
<p>How are businesses to survive if cars are not allowed access?</p>
<p>I don't believe you care about the economy of Dulwich Village at all. Coffee shops may proliferate but we have more than enough already. Hogwash is all I can say.</p>
<p>The closure of this junction and the timed restrictions have been a disaster for the local shops and businesses, as you well know. For most of them it has resulted in a 20%-80% reduction in sales and footfall and directly led to the closure of at least one shop, and to reduced opening hours and redundancies for others.</p>
<p>Terrible for local shops</p>
<p>Shopkeepers and cafe owners complain that restricting traffic cuts their business as a lot come from outside of the area</p>
<p>Killing Village traffic throughflow will kill the local economy ..</p>
<p>Southwark did EXACTLY the same thing with Rye Lane in Peckham and Rye Lane DIED</p>
<p>Jones and Higgins on Rye Lane was the equivalent to John Lewis it shut down due to the changes Southwark made on car traffic access into Rye Lane</p>
<p>I expect the small businesses in Dulwich Village will all go out of Business</p>
<p>We no longer bother eating or shopping in the Village as it is now inaccessible unless we detour in around</p>
<p>This idea is a total Nonsense it wasn't broken ... now Southwark has broken Dulwich Village</p>
<p>How does seating benefit business?</p>
<p>The businesses are struggling in the village - you need to reopen calton avenue. Restricting parking to certain windows is a terrible idea - we do not struggle for other people parking and residents and their carers need this street parking available.</p>
<p>See response to Q7.</p>
<p>Throwing good money after bad - the Baha'i eases there already have their own outdoor seating</p>
<p>The closure of this junction was rejected by the community in your original consultation</p>
<p>Southwark has consistently failed to listen to the views of local businesses.</p>
<p>Stop closing roads and junctions with the pretext to save us from doomsday. These are your pet project only. Mere money spin operations to justify your ineeded positions and high salaries inside tge council. Listen to the majority of people and stop taking us as fool. Stop working only for a tiny minority. You are our servants , we elected you and you keep disregarding what the majority wants (no ltns no road closures). You are mocking democracy and act as tyrants.</p>
<p>As above you have split the village in two with the closure of Calton avenue.</p>
<p>I'm not sure what the point of this so-called consultation is since you've steadfastly ignored any comments or objections in previous consultations and gone ahead with your pre-decided measures. The majority of respondents did NOT want this junction closed, but you closed it anyway, since you're in thrall to the cycling lobby and concerns for disabled people, local shops and displaced traffic obviously did not come into consideration. I suspect you're about to do the same with the so-called consultation on the proposed Controlled Parking Zone in Dulwich Village. It may look as if you're ticking all the right boxes regarding consultations, but those of us who have tried to engage with you in the past have come to realise it's a waste of time. Still, one more attempt can't hurt...</p>
<p>i know the local business owners, they do not want this.</p>

The local businesses have repeatedly rejected such proposals because they are already failing due to lack of passing trade. This will further reduce passing trade which they will be unable to make up from cyclists and pedestrians.
It is EMPTY. NO ONE USES IT. It is idle space...you might as well completely cover it in trees to achieve point 10. It's also terribly ugly and not in keeping with the traditional Victorian 'look' of Dulwich Village. It's a completely wasted opportunity.
The local economy has been wrecked by LTNs
not wanted by the majority of locals. We have plenty of green spaces around Dulwich. Why inconvenience people even more?
I think people already have enough seating in the area and businesses will not welcome the fact that no one can access their shops cafes by car. It will significantly reduce footfall.
Total waste of taxpayers money. There is no problem today in this area whereas there are enormous challenges across the Southwark area and wider society which need investment. Just because you claim extra funding for something doesn't mean it's the right thing to do
Small businesses need people to be able to drive to an area to use their facilities. If you continue to restrict parking then people will not use local services but drive to large shopping complexes, the only place where people can park, purchase bags of shopping and drive home. It is not convenient to try and take buses with bags of shopping, particularly with small children. If there is not parking then people will not use local shops for the vast majority of their needs
I have repeatedly set out my objections to this work in all your previous consultations, and I believe you have ignored my and my communities objections throughout
You are reminded that our community rejected the closure of the junction in the first, original consultation
You have already destroyed the economy of Dulwich Village by reducing the footfall by 1/3 due to the LTN. The shops and services are really struggling and you have reduced the opportunities of Dulwich residents (the Village is our local retail centre even at the fringes of Dulwich) so that our lives are the poorer for it. We are often forced into other boroughs to achieve what we could have done before in the Village, with MORE journeys, not fewer, to achieve a similar aim.
Clearly achieves the exact opposite. Will the council never learn from previous 'improvements' that have achieved the exact opposite of the suggested improvements.
Where is the information that shows how local traders have bought into this concept?
The traffic measures you introduced (against the wishes of the majority of local residents) have damaged local businesses. You did not properly consult with local businesses, and you ignored what they told you
The facts are businesses in DV have suffered negatively ever since the junction was closed to traffic and restrictions were put in place, possibly solely excepting the cafe which has benefitted from being able to commandeer the pavement outside to extend their business (do they pay increased rates for this space?)
One positive aspect is that you seem to want to throw away the gaudy rickety wooden seating that was bizarrely introduced two years ago which is completely out of character with the Dulwich Village environment. I. Ever see anyone who actually lives in Dulwich Village sitting on it. You should return the junction to its proper role as a road.
You are driving away business from local enterprises.
The Council continues to ignore the impact of traffic restrictions on businesses and people living on boundary roads, as well as the difficulties that disabled and other vulnerable residents are forced to endure.
The first consultation for the LTNs completely ignored the vast majority wish of the local population which wholeheartedly rejected the proposals including the closure of the junction.
The LTNs have not achieved any of the goals - we are suffering from displaced traffic, delayed buses, reduced public travel options, closed businesses and increased pollution outside schools on boundary roads.
The profoundly undemocratic imposition of the LTNs against the views of the vast majority of residents is disgraceful. The waste of public funds on these expensive measures against the wishes of the residents is obscene and unnecessary.
Everything you are doing seems designed to put the Village shops out of business.
The space at the junction is not attractive and sometimes feels like an attempt at a children's play area that has very little with which to engage. It is particularly unappealing in cold or rainy weather.
I would not want to sit outside.
Our local shops suffer as their customers cannot get to them. This particularly applies to older people or the less mobile who may need to use cars etc. A few disabled bays will not restore trade. There is also the problem of cyclists using the pavement as though they are competing at the Velodrome.
By all accounts the local economy has been adversely affected by the closure of the junction of Calton Avenue and Dulwich Village
You can't get there unless your male, white and with a bike. Total discrimination against women who disproportionately rely on buses and they are not served by your dangerous bike dominated roads.

As in box 7
It will destroy local businesses.
Many of our patients are elderly or have mobility problems and are dependent on cars to access help for their podiatry treatment. Blocking off this area restricts access for the public to the top end of Woodward Road, where our practice is situated. Since the initial measures have been put in place, they have already had a detrimental effect on our practice which has served the local community for 75 years. Our patients struggle to access our services and our employees struggle to get to those who are housebound. There has been no consideration in the proposals for the businesses in Woodward Road, which are still part of the local economy.
Waste of money and terrible for local business
Obviously this will adversely affect the retailers if motorists are unable to stop and park.
You can already sit outside most cafes in Dulwich and Hearne Hill.
This does not encourage people to visit the local businesses - the complete opposite in fact. Without parking spaces the shops will lose custom.
Southwark Council have all but destroyed businesses such as Biff in Dulwich Village with all this tinkering.
The cash cow parking spaces outside Green's etc are so unclear people are being fined and never come back to shop again.
People have back gardens and access to parks, they are not going to lounge around all day in Dulwich Square and then decide on a whim to buy stuff from the local shops. By the way, the shops won't be around much longer if you go ahead with the ridiculous plan to get rid of even more parking spaces. You are supposed to represent ALL of your constituents, not just the few cyclists that should be the loudest.
Leave free parking so customers can park and use shops. No yellow lines please.
Introduction of new double yellow lines on Dulwich Village detrimental to current small businesses - will reduce accessibility to shops.
Use of local shops and amenities is already reduced as a result of Phases 1 and 2 - many people (like us) now avoid going near the Village if we can avoid it - and your proposals will just accelerate the decline.
the town centre economies are reliant on people coming into them, and the numbers coming into the village have dropped steadily with the confusion and anxiety caused by bus gates and parking challenges.
Most people in our street and neighbourhood use the local shops some of the time and have been afraid that the changes and road closures will undermine our local shops which depend on passing trade (drivers) as well as local use by people within walking distance for a strong commercial success.
Where is the evidence that these things will actually help?. What would really improve things for local businesses would be: (i) Opening the junction (ii) Stop charging for parking outside the DV shops (iii) Stop yellow lining vast lengths of surrounding roads under the guise of safety, preventing shoppers from parking near the shops
You're killing the village
The parking should remain free because the local businesses rely on visitors not locals to thrive.
As before, bikes should be made to dismount in this area as there are a lot of people wandering about here and it is an accident waiting to happen. I always dismount when using my bike.
This is a very small area so it will never feel like an open area to "enjoy". Besides, as the predominant businesses in Dulwich Village are estate agents, these proposals are not going to encourage their greater use, nor do the local businesses need them for their customers.
Where is the evidence that these things will actually help?. What would really improve things for local businesses would be: (i) Opening the junction (ii) Stop charging for parking outside the DV shops (iii) Stop yellow lining vast lengths of surrounding roads under the guise of safety, preventing shoppers from parking near the shops
The proposed extensive double yellow lining and reduction of parking space will adversely affect the local businesses.
Children should feel safe to walk alone from school but if local muggings and crime continue it doesn't achieve the purpose.
This project has crippled the local economy with little possibility of passing trade. The businesses on Calton Avenue are invisible to all apart from local foot fall. The shops on Dulwich Village have lost the easy parking facility in front so people can't drop in on their way to other places. Pay by phone etc is too fussy for a quick nip into the chemist, post office or bookshop. With many new DYLs there's nowhere for visitors to be able to park.
Local foot trade is not enough to keep them going so we are likely to lose the variety and just get more estate agents or coffee shops. Disabled bays tucked in a side street out of sight make little difference.
It's noticeable in your artist's impressions that every day is bright and sunny which is a load of rubbish for London, England!! Will people with dripping umbrellas walk from a bus/train/car (parked half a mile away) in the middle of winter to keep using the shops in Dulwich Village?

local businesses have not uniformly supported changes
Dulwich village is empty at night. I feel less safe walking through this area than I did before changes
Does not address any of the problems created by by the closure of this junction - and looks likely if anything to exacerbate them
The Council has not taken account of the clear majority of respondents in the original consultation who did not want this junction to be closed
Return the junction to its pre Covid layout and remove traffic restrictions. All previous consultations have shown residents are against these changes by a significant majority. Please follow the results of your own consultations. All shopkeepers are against these measures and businesses have been harmed by them.
The Council has still not taken on board the clear majority of respondents to the original consultation who said that they did not want any of these measures
No cars or passing traffic means less business, shops will close. Totally pointless, will create a wasteland not the planned utopia. why make it the width of a car bt restrict cars - just to generate income!
The junction closure was rejected by the community in the original consultation.
All these measures damage local businesses and reduce the number of people using these areas.
Businesses have suffered from these changes. Ask the business owners if you want to know!
This will hi der local business by making it harder to reach them for all but a privileged few
I sometimes have to drive for work (assessing vulnerable students). I have had to reduce my work days as congestion has made getting around impossible.
Looks very nice but there are other more pressing financial concerns, eg, cost of living.
I am really astonished to see that Southwark have nothing better to do with their time an money than make an already privileged part of London even more privileged. Spend the money on people that need it. White privilege - totally unbelievable.... all those spoilt privileged kids going to their private schools... Southwark is unreal.
There have always been benches in DV and many cafes. Additional seating in this area is hardly used the position is not conducive to relaxation next to a main road. The area as it is now is noisy and exposed and no amount of re arranging will change this. Most local people shop but don't "sit" in the Village.
Likely to have a miminal effect in what is already a well endowed area with excellent public facilities.
Visitors are avoiding Dulwich because of the traffic restrictions, the excessive fines and lack of free parking spaces. Ask any of the businesses and shops and they will tell you that many are failing. Why haven't they or local residents been consulted on these plans? Not one of the approx 200 households in Court Lane nor the residents' association have been consulted. Please remember, half of the junction is Court Lane and all the houses on the junction have a Court Lane address.
They will not. Your suggestion is self-evidently false.
You need only speak with the local traders to know that the closure of Calton Ave has had a detrimental effect on their businesses. There does not seem to be any balance in the proposals to accommodate their needs.
I am not clear on how these measures will increase spend in this area.
Makes it more difficult for people to access the shops
Less people are using the businesses in the village and the objections of local businesses have been totally disregarded by the council
The cyclists are fast and dangerous. The Astro turf outside the cheese shop is cheap and ugly. Think it's been proven business use has fallen
have you asked the local businesses how the ltns have reduced business for them due to less passing traffic?
People don't come to Dulwich to shop any more - local businesses are not doing well. Several have closed.
see comment 7
But you've made it impossible for our local businesses! How can residents and visitors expect to feel welcome and positive when you've removed options for transport and made parking very difficult. They are very upset and fearful for the future. This is the opposite from your intention. You only seem to see our area from one point of view
Local shops are suffering since recent changes to roads. Bartley's reveue has plummeted and Jigsaw is closing on 10 February, for example.
The residents of Calton Avenue do not provide enough footfall for the shops to survive. And as the council have blocked off any through routes, and put parking restrictions in the area with double yellow lines, it is clearly shops that are only there to service the VERY local residents of the area who are physically able to use them. I used to visit the village 3-4 times a week. I have not been since the restrictions were put in place. This is "streets to kill the local Economy". Have you even spoken to the local businesses? It's as if the council are alien to the ACTUAL local residents and retailers.

I am a business owner. we oppose these measures. We all do, it's universally agreed, [REDACTED] are bad for Business. The only business to benefit from this, are the ones Southwark pay to do the proposals and the building work, which the councillors then go to work for.
The junction needs to be reopened and if yellow lines are needed they should be single not double to allow the shops to trade more fully at the weekends.
Absolutely no benefit to anyone apart from the contractors the council will be paying for doing the work.
No amount of street beautification will compensate for the negative effects on businesses of the junction closure and other measures hostile to motor traffic. Dulwich is spread out and is poorly served by local public transport (try getting from West or East Dulwich to DVillage on public transport - very slow and many changes - hopeless!) The council needs to completely rethink bearing in mind the needs of those using and/or dependent on motor vehicles. And not only the negative access effects on visitors, but also the obstructions to deliveries both into and out of the area, difficulties to postal collections and deliveries. The Network Management Duty is there for good reasons, and neglecting it as in these proposals have real negative economic, social effects.
the measures are making it difficult to get around, particularly to the village and East to West is effecting the local economy. it also limits the amount one can spend if you have to carry all purchases. It makes Supermarkets and Amazon a better option
This is perhaps the worst initiative of them all. Ticketing people even on holidays when schools are out of session.
I do not see any measures here that help the local businesses.
The effect of the lack of facility for cars and parking is devastating for the Dulwich village area shops and businesses.
It reduces passing trade
This is a cynical exercise. The Council has shown no interest or recognition of the serious difficulties faced by traders in the Village since the Dulwich LTNs were introduced. I refer to my comments in 7, 8, & 9.
More local businesses have suffered adverse effects from the closure of the Dulwich Village/Calton Avenue junction than have benefited from it.
This is nonsense
It's rubbish, and the Council knows full well that a majority of us in the area did not want it. It has created a shambles for buses and traffic in neighbouring roads. OPEN THE JUNCTION!
Shops suffer . Shocked at council's failure to respond to feedback from local community in the last consultation. The community rejected the closure of the junction in the original consultation!
Previous measures have proved to be dangerous, and not supporting local businesses. The parklet in front of Romeo Jones was destroyed by a passing van that drove in to it. High streets need safe and easy access for cars and pedestrians. Businesses need access for deliveries, customers and staff to be sustainable.
I disagree with the plans for junction and believe the drawbacks outweigh the benefits
I find it highly ironic that having disrupted the economic activity in Dulwich village by introducing the time to restrictions reducing car parking and closing the Carlton Avenue Court lane junction you and our attempting to revive these businesses by suggesting everyone spends their free time sitting right outside the shops. In your illustrations adults are sitting in broad daylight with a glass of wine, and children are running around, and they will inevitably be pestering their carers for snacks and ice creams. I just think it was fine the way it was. I think you're trying to fix a problem of your own making but these are not healthy outcomes.
The closure of this junction and the timed restrictions have been a disaster for the local shops and businesses, resulting in a substantial reduction in sales and footfall for most of the independent business, the closure of at least one shop, and reduced opening hours and redundancies. The failure to listen to let alone take account of the needs of local businesses is a disaster for the local economy and the excessive fines levied on visitors to Dulwich have made the centre of Dulwich a deserted shopping centre at key times of the day.
The shops in Dulwich village have been devastated by the LTN. They don't need seating, they need customers.
Please see previous comment, the design should accommodate all forms of transportation including cars
We have a park nearby. You are merely stopping locals from walking to the park, by giving them chairs and a tree on a junction. That is not good for them. Think about it.
The Community rejected the closure of this junction. It has already had too much money spent on it.
Not at all it's affected the easy to get to the village from East Dulwich cause far great pollution around East Dulwich instead all you've done is move the problem elsewhere.
As misconceived as all the rest of the schemes. Vehicular traffic is integral to many businesses and brings people to the traders. What about a fuel station, which would draw a lot of good commercial trade to Dulwich itself? The LTN did/does a lot of damage. Most of the philosophy seems to be based on creating a nursery and retirement zone, nothing like an enterprise zone which might actually help to provide the income to support the community (rather than the Council rely on penalising individuals who live here for minor infringements in order to fund their misjudged ideas).
Those unable to walk or cycle have difficulties parking to use the shops and get stuck in traffic jams if they try. This does not provide equal opportunities.

Southwark have had the feedback from the local shops but are ignoring it. The existing measures and these new proposals are killing our small business community.
See my comments in the previous question on your attempts at providing a " quality environment "
Shops have shut. Businesses have folded be abuse customer traffic is diminished.
Watch the streets slowly die
Ask the shop and business owners. They say it does not work.
Whatever you do with the junction, it will not service the whole community. Only a select few will benefit. This junction should be reopened as it was pre-pandemic.
Visitors to the area and the local shops are likely to be put off even more by the concern about traffic restrictions and poor signage leading to fines
Local business are failing and struggling thanks to the timed traffic areas and blocked off 'Dulwich square'. AND it looks so ugly now
The blockages have crippled the economy of the village . They have made it more difficult to use the village shops.
This has negatively affected all the businesses in Dulwich Village economically.
This will be a total waste of money. No one wants it. How much will it cost?
The street closures have been disastrous for local businesses
The suggestions will make the future of local businesses even more fragile. The current parking with free parking for an hour alongside these shops works well. By all means increate seating and planting, but if you have an honest consultation with ,local businesses I think you will find them very fearful f these proposals. The proposals seem to excuse motor vehicle parking that is a key part of the income of these businesses. I fear the proposals will see most of the small and much valued lo businesses close - to be replaced by estate agents and even more eateries when there are plenty already. These proposals for 'Streets for the Economy' need to be completely rethought and with genuine engagement with local businesses - I am not one of them but I use them all the time. This section of the overall proposals is the last sound and the least likely to achieve its objectives.
We, and most people we know in the area, no longer use the local businesses due to the closure of the junction - it is simply too difficult to travel to the area now with tailbacks through the Village and surrounding areas, reduced parking and times closures. Most businesses are struggling as a result. This is why the proposal to close the junction was rejected by a majority of the community in all council consultations.
The measures have made Dulwich village almost inaccessible and have had a severe adverse affect on the economy of local businesses. Not everyone is able to walk and cycle and this has not been considered in the 24/7 closure of the junction. The majority of local residents would be in favour of timed closures but this was completely ignored by the council.
I don't support the measures taken by the council - I do not believe the consultation has been honest or fair and the views of local residents have not been listened to. I feel local residents have been corralled and that facts have been manipulated by the council so as to be presented as it suits. I would have been happy to support changes but not in this way.
Absolute waste of valuable resources and money, fix the roads and potholes
The shops in the Village have lost trade because of the reduced footfall. How tragic is that? We need to support our local businesses.
How can we shop if we can't drive through and park? The economy depends on more than young families on bicycles. Those of us who have lived in Dulwich for a life time and are now retired are being penalised. We cannot spend our hard earned money in retirement if we can't access the streets and park.
Fine if you own a coffee shop but not viable for businesses providing other services. 'Aqua' and 'Biff' have already been forced out of business by these closures whilst Roger Pope the opticians shelved their plans to return to the village once they saw the damaging impact of the closures..
A thriving economic community needs to be accessible by everyone,including drivers.
Dulwich Village is alientating visitors, it used to be different to every other London suburb, now it is becoming like all the rest with yellow lines everywhere and signs. It is losing its unique appeal, and therefore visitors.
Can't shop, can't stop, can't carry anything. I shop else where now
The community rejected the closure of the junction in the original consultation, so what will ensure that this consultation is received and acted upon according to the local communitie's wishes?
The people don't want these changes as the make pollution and traffic worse for so many peole and for hardly any use
How do the shops replenish their stock? Where is the traffic meant to go? It will go onto adjacent streets and cause problems for residents. Not everyone can shop by bike or on foot. An economic disaster in the making.
as before
People who live locally can already walk/cycle easily. People visiting Dulwich need places to park, particularly for shops such as the florists, garden centre and furniture etc. shops. The changes made to date by Southwark Council have already had a detrimental effect on many businesses in the area. This will just make it worse
The Dulwich Village community rejected the closure of the junction in the original consultation

More and more shops are closing because of these measures - turning villages into soulless deserts. We need parking, access and open roads.
See prior answers. This changes nothing
Manifestly the measures are uneconomic
I think cars would help the economy more. The shoe shop has already closed due to the road closure
The Council hasn't listened to the local community as it has ignored it's stated opinion as expressed in the results of previous consultations
I do not agree with the closure of this junction. I have said so at every meeting you held in the past before covid, at every consultation, and am appalled that you have consistently ignored local people's opposition to your scheme.
Limiting access doesn't build up business
More worthy aims we don't need. Local cafès, the pub, restaurants etc already use their own seating facilities on the broad pavements in the area at their own expense. The idea that the council should provide outdoor seating for businesses to use is risible and a waste of public funds. Businesses need customers and they are being driven away by the hostile attitude of the council to drivers who are going to supermarket car parks instead. Incredibly, disabled drivers cannot use the Calton Avenue-Dulwich Village junction, so they are positively disadvantaged by its closure. Meanwhile, nothing is done to install a lift at North Dulwich rail station where people with disabilities, families with pushchairs and elderly citizens have to navigate a deep stairwell.
this will cripple many small independent traders who have already seen their turnover sliced due to the implemented road closures which after all is just another stealth tax that has already raised 13 million in fines forv tghc council.the village will become a ghost town.well done!
I think the LTNs can only have had a negative impact on businesses.
Have you been in the village lately? East Dulwich continues to thrive while Dulwich Village is cut off and left to decline. And in your graphic where are the street tables outside Au Ciel forcing pedestrians off the pavement?
I objected to the closure of the junction initially, it has had a dire effect on local shops
Yes it would be nice if there were tables, chairs set up, canopies, more planting and cars allowed back along the entrance into the village.
It's become a smug enclave where the same clique return to sit at the same seats whilst older people don't often venture out for fear of being hit by a cyclist.
i imagine that not being able to get to the shops would have negative impact on them. The have to rely on the limited local custom.
The community storeholders I have talked to think it has been a complete disaster financially for them and I can see why. What a great way to cut down on footfall. For instance we used to nip down to the flower shop in the car regularly to pick up flowers now its just not an option. You have gutted their trade which again is im sure an unintended consequence but it is a consequence so a fail on this one as well
I would prefer to sit away from the road and the parks an nicer environment and less polluted
On the evidence so far, the economy of Dulwich village is being impaired.
And what about the need for people to use vehicles for their jobs and trades.
Outdoor seating may help a couple of the businesses - for those few hours over the year when it is. conducive to sit outside. The junction is often deserted now.
Harold George use to be a wonderful, bustling place, full of people; almost empty now.
The shops don't need this
Not everyone wants, or is capable of visiting shops by cycle or on foot. Cycle lanes in place of parking spaces will reduce footfall in local shops
Not at all, all shop owners complain about decreased footfall and Parking restrictions will only increase that
incredulous people would want to sit watching & inhaling the queues of traffic trying to get through the village past the stationary south circular and the stationary East Dulwich Grove
Cyclists careering through the junction without care and attention
& if its anything like the past 4 years of misery there will be flower beds with weeds and withered plants to show for themselves
We need to have more parking spaces for visitors and disabled. Business needs customers.
Ask the Bookshop how business has been affected!!!
These schemes are damaging trade and dividing communities.

This has been terrible for businesses and us. They have closed due to less customers.
I doubt that many people will be rushing to spend time on a street junction when there are so many lovely parks and woods nearby. Dulwich is hardly a concrete jungle. Personally I visit these local shops much less frequently as it now takes so long to get there by road or public transport due to detours and traffic, so from my perspective, these measures have had the opposite effect.
I'd like to hear the opinions of the businesses themselves - have the existing measures improved or hindered business?
Local shops are closing! We have lost several independent businesses which added value and unique character to our area. Locals want facilities not more pavement cafes. Let it also not be forgotten that Dulwich Park (with its cafe and other facilities) is only a few hundred metres up the road as is Belair Park. We are fortunate to have many existing open spaces in our area to socialise in. We don't need to socialise on an asphalt square
See above comments. reopen the original junction and stop spending money on the Village. Spend the money elsewhere where it is needed.
Several local businesses have closed in the area of the proposed changes, or are struggling for business, and blame the continued closure of the junction for their financial hardship.
The best thing for the economy would therefore be to re-open the closed junction. The changes suggested above would have minimal impact.
The seating looks absolutely dreadful- more than 3 different types totally out of keeping with the historical character of Dulwich village . Also a hideous water fountain.
Where are elderly supposed to park now that parking is chargeable? The shops seem to be very empty most of the time
The pavement outside are very wide anyway and only a minority of businesses can utilise these in any event.
Access to shops, sports clubs and Dulwich Picture Gallery will be reduced for those living outside the immediate Dulwich Village area, who are unable to cycle or walk long distances. A number of shops and businesses have not been consulted. The needs of the elderly and those with a disability, who are unable to cycle or walk long distances, have not been adequately considered.
The traders in Dulwich Village did not want the LTNs and the blocked roads. They said that their trading had fallen since these measures were introduced.
Are you listening to what the traders are telling you?

Comments for 2

Your first point is already being addressed by Dulwich Park . When we have such a huge green space , why are we creating an artificial space in middle of the traffic ?
Yes , local business needs to be supported, but the minute you address the smooth traffic flow - outdoor seating would make sense. If you encroach roads for outdoor seating - it's only gonna lead to congestion and idling . There has to be a limit to outdoor seating - encroaching vehicular area cannot be an answer to everything .
Full support for disabled parking , maybe existing parking can be used rather than spend more money . Cycle parking bay is unnecessary.
It provides more seating for the local business but due to the increased traffic and lack of access (except via congested East Dulwich Grove) to the village I believe keeping the closure of Carlton Avenue to motorists deters people from visiting the shops there from further afield.
unless CCTV is installed to prevent anti social gathering and muggings this will just be a no go zone after dark. petty crime is on the increase on local streets and more police presence is not forthcoming so CCTV would make it feel safer and more welcoming
reducing traffic flow reduces the economy
You need to look at the realities of people getting from work to various schools, to elderly parents to home. To do that they need to be able to access areas by car. The council has disadvantaged local businesses by reducing footfall and keeping it low at certain normally busy times of day by the LTN. Dulwich is now empty of all life at certain times of day and full of stationary traffic at others.
The impact on local businesses has anecdotally at least not been good.
The shops rely on visitors being able to park nearby.
It will be interesting to see if anything changes. I believe the Village shops have definitely been affected by the current measures and drop in footfall with the parking and bus gate restrictions.
It will make it more difficult for businesses.
There ae not enough disabled bays for the disabled and elderly to use at the bottom of Court Lane. Only 1. Def not enough.
A lot of expenditure for little improvement.
Pedestrian and cycle routes should be clear, in terms of structure and design, not just signage.


Outdoor seating does not increase the business done by local shops etc. there needs to be parking for non local drivers and the disabled.
More pedestrian and seating would be great but cyclists do not respect pedestrians and ride on pavements, around seating etc which is dangerous
I'm afraid I think the economy would be much more helped by people being able to drive and park at the shops.
Any benefit that might come from more outdoor seating etc. is likely to be more than counteracted by the separate planned controlled parking zone, which will likely drive customers away from use of local shops
Loading spaces for the shops on Carlton Avenue seem far removed from the shops themselves
People can no longer travel through Dulwich village and parking costs are prohibitive which is totally putting anyone shopping there who can't get there on foot or doesn't cycle
Streets for the Economy? This is all made up now, surely?
Is the outdoor seating for the public or "for local businesses to use"? We have seen outside Gails & elsewhere the effects of allowing these businesses to colonise the public realm, obstructing pavements which were already quite narrow - particularly when also used improperly by cyclists.
Why was double yellow lines put outside the crown and Greyhound pub removed four parking spaces which had a direct effect on the local businesses and the road closures have not helped
Need a fence between the space and roads/ bike lanes to stop children going onto them
ditto
I'm concerned: what are these measures doing to damage the trade of these local shopkeepers. No where to park outside these shops for easy access, picking up orders etc. Fine, if you're mobile, but what of those who need car access to the door. These measures are reducing trade, passing trade, and limiting trade to only locals who are passing on foot.
If cars can't get to the shops due to the closed roads (like Court Lane) and the congestion on other roads, this hurts the businesses more than the minor changes you are proposing to spend money on here. It also needs to be free and possible to park nearby for short times otherwise businesses get hit because people can't get to them.
HUGE concrete benches look dreamful, are out of character for conservation area, and really unconformable to use.
Allow flexible space so that market stalls can be put up. Flexible space allows for events and activities. Cycle parking needs to be extensive, ideally covered and not used as a potential traffic barrier. Cycles get squashed due to vehicles hitting the cycle stands.
Stopping cyclists from careering through this junction and closing it to all pedal and electric scooter traffic would make better sense, rather than creating a dual function area that is not safe for pedestrians, particularly the elderly or thus with impairments. Cyclist should be made to dismount and walk through this area. The likelihood of a serious accident to young children or vulnerable adults increases in areas of multi-function that are without restrictions for cyclists etc.
Reducing the quality of the space, not including loading bays for businesses in the village parade shows the shortsightedness of the vision.
I welcome further planting. However the best way to encourage people to use the local businesses has been removed due to the lack of vehicular access and proposed further parking restriction nearby.
They will promote businesses such as coffee shops increasing the seating ! However I doubt there will be any positive impact on other businesses particularly those requiring larger items to be carried such as the dry cleaners and post office.
My understanding is that this scheme will take out many parking spaces that will cause greater parking pressure locally and have a detrimental effect on local businesses.
This is really poor urban design compared to the exemplary schemes of other boroughs like Lambeth, Hackney and Camden. It is cluttered with unnecessary lines and signs, while not being joyful.
There are no facilities to enable more use of cycle freight either.
I can see that the particular businesses on Calton Avenue may benefit from the additional seating etc but it seems to be the Council's view that there will be no disadvantage to local businesses from the elimination of car parking spaces, which I believe is misconceived.
We have an amazing park, amazing wood and a further park on gallery road. We don't need a few treats and more seating forming a barrier to get to the shops. Let people come and go easily passing through the village when they want and easily parking to visit shops and leave without undue congestion
Hardly anybody uses the seating area. They are not helping businesses. The nursery coloured benches look terrible and not at all in keeping with the traditional village look.

<p>On its own, it has its merits. In the context of the whole community it has limitations as I've already mentioned. It has felt like my personal voice has no effect. My journeys doing every day errands as a resident around the dulwich area takes hugely longer times. I pollute the air more as a result on those journeys. Going to a local gardening centre and buying plants.. not possible to negotiate multiple bus changes with those loads. Taking boxes to the charity shops ..not possible on the bus. etc etc etc</p> <p>The development is NOT inclusive of the whole community. Never has been. I do not feel heard. The one thing that would help so many of us would be timed access along Calton Avenue through the village. You have no interest in this.</p>
The shops should be afforded far more public space outside them. This should be maximised.
The above picture is misleading. Not to true to scale, the greenery on the left is actually a wall with low overhanging greenery making it difficult to walk down.
Loading bay on Calton Avenue is of limited value given Townley Road traffic restrictions - particularly important that Post Office and Pharmacy have an accessible loading bay. Where are vehicles using loading bay and disabled spaces supposed to turn safely?
<p>If you are stopping motorists from entering this area at certain times of the day, you are denying them the opportunity to shop (and causing people to shop elsewhere) Local shopkeepers already complain that they have lost business. Biff was forced to close. Making the area pretty does not address this fundamental concern that the number of potential customers is reduced by these actions so negates the aim of 'streets for economy'</p>
How will this improve cyclists' behaviour?
Getting to ulwich shops from West Dulwich is virtually impossible now. If CPZs introduced then shops will die.

Comments for 3 (partly)

<p>The above are helpful for disabled users and cyclists. However, doesnt this come at a cost of removing parking spaces? Without doing a review of the local customer footfall it is difficult to understand what the impact is to these business of making it harder for those to park.</p>
Motorcyclists, scooter riders and even car drivers currently ride and drive through this junction. You need to ensure your cameras are working.
If you insist on keeping this shut to traffic it is an improvement.
Measures will improve the area but am sceptical re local business support for the whole concept of pedestrianisation. I believe some of the local shop keepers have been against this? If the owners are ok with it so am I but I think they should have a veto on the whole scheme or see their revenues protected for (say) 20 years (using traffic camera cash!).
Still not addressing the problem of disabled access across the village. Also important to stop bikes being left on the pavements obstructing wheel chairs and pushchairs
I think inviting the business to use this space is an important feature. Could a weekend market be added as well?
<p>See previous comment. Better seating and more mature plants needed. Footfall for local businesses is still much lower than before. Whilst the parking in the Village has a new pay to park, with a free first hour. Trying to download the app to enable you to do this is not easy to use. The WiFi in the Village is notoriously poor - ask residents- and so can take 20-30 minutes to pay. Otherwise this is a good idea.</p>
There is no evidence as to the impact that this will have on local businesses
<p>Would have to ask the businesses what they think. At the moment it's very cluttered And the street furniture is awful</p>
More outdoor seating for the existing coffee shops and cafes on Calton Ave would be nice.
The aim is sensible but without dealing with the fundamental issues of better traffic flow through this junction and the red post hill junction it will not achieve its goals
Not sure. Would enquire with local traders
I would allow 1 hour free parking outside the pharmacy and post office - WITHOUT the need to go online or use a mobile phone.
This really puts people off and I think it does negatively affect the businesses.
No one should be allowed to park there all day - but people should be allowed to park for a while.

<p>Not everyone is able to use a bike. I tend to walk but am sometimes pushed off the pavement with the number of younger children zooming along on scooters or bikes or dogs on long leads.</p>
<p>Not 100% sure that closing off this road improves the quality of air for those who live where the traffic has now been forced to go, especially past all the schools in the area that now have more traffic queueing by them and school entry and exit times</p>
<p>The objectives will be met ONLY if a CPZ in the village is NOT introduced.</p>
<p>According to the overall design visual, the new loading bay seems to be beyond a set of cycle-only barriers? Also, allowing commercial vehicles to park there will encourage 3-point turns through the flow of cycle traffic which is incredibly dangerous.</p>
<p>DV is full of niche shops, estate agents and restaurants - it's not an average high street with shops where you can buy anything that's useful -</p>
<p>More seating/socialising space and a place for people to gather for events: carol singing etc. Maybe some market stalls?</p>
<p>Yes. Privileged area for privileged minority. Drivers just have a longer route around - the problems still exist. Money should be given to other communities not here where life is already rosy in the Village with the park. The richest borough with lawyers and titled people keep the riff raff out. Well done.</p>
<p>No signage saying 'Emergency Vehicles only'.</p>
<p>Again, who will be planting and tending all these flower beds? Because if they are not tended, the softened and attractive side of the re-brand will not be there. Face facts - the current boxes are pretty awful.</p>
<p>The footways need to be kept clear of both street clutter installed by Southwark Council and that of the traders to ensure safer circulation and convenience of those in wheelchairs or using walking frames, mothers with prams and those with shopping trolleys.</p>
<p>Specific spaces on the newly pedestrianised highway should be provided for tables & chairs, and stalls for local traders and businesses. LBS must provide positive assistance to facilitate special events and promotions. An electrical and water supply in the "Square" to enable the safe and efficient rigging of lighting and sound systems for special events, and the installation of the Christmas tree with lights</p>
<p>It is indicative of the of Southwark's priorities in that there is no questions within this consultation on the appearance and design quality of the proposed new piece of public realm in one of the borough's older conservation areas.</p>
<p>As long as the pavements don't all get cluttered up with A-boards, Lime bikes and e-scooters. Will there be dedicated bays for these?</p>
<p>Parking is really needed to access the shops. I live in West Dulwich and can sometimes cycle to Dulwich Village, but not everyone can cycle and the P4 bus is unreliable. (The parking in front of the parade of shops would be fine if we could get a phone connection to pay for it!)</p>
<p>More shop licenses to independent shops (not chains) to enhance village/community feel</p>
<p>There needs to be greater barriers between the cycle area and the seating area. I often see children running around in and out of the cycle area and they are in danger. Currently The cyclists think it's a road and the children think it's a play area.</p>
<p>It is important to ensure parking / loading spaces are maximised to counter the deterrent which the LTN has introduced to use of local businesses. One again humps are required to slow down bikes.</p>
<p>Cycle lane is too wide and dominates the area. Flower beds do not work and are vandalised and/ or difficult to maintain. Extra seating is a good idea. Please put humps to slow down cyclists. There will be accidents here as cyclists coming down the hill approach too fast. The whole concept of the blockage of this area discourages use of the shops and the new parking bays are confusing and involve using an App which discriminated against elderly and those who do not or cannot use mobile phones.</p>
<p>There is merit here, but I wonder what the businesses themselves think about these aspects of the plans. Where do they load merchandise if there is no parking, apart from disabled and cycles in front of the premises?</p>
<p>These spaces are not used in poor weather and seem like an investment in an affluent area that could be better spent in other areas</p>
<p>I'm not sure where people wanting to drive to the area would park, but maybe you are trying to discourage people from driving into the village area in the first place.</p>
<p>better than is now, there is a stupid and dangerous planter in the middle of the cycle lane, it is so dangerous, such a stupid decision by some idiot that has been in place he last year</p>
<p>I disagree that this road is closed to cars outside of the time limited restrictions, it is pointless and pushes cars to Lordship lane where more kids live, thanks for that !</p>
<p>Quick visits/shopping will be deterred so the result on the local economy is unclear</p>

Put chairs and tables at the cafes
Nice but too limited, the pavement should be widened further east on Calton Ave
I think the businesses at the junction may be helped but not those where parking spaces are being eliminated elsewhere, which is also inconsistent with an objective of the proposed CPZ to alleviate parking stress.
Too many chains in the village. Are independents being priced out?
A loading bay is necessary on Court Lane
Cyclists will have poor view of people waiting to cross from Court Lane side. Crossing should be raised and continuous to indicate pedestrian priority and slow cyclists. If this scheme is successful, more cyclists will come and reduction of pedestrian/cyclist conflict should be built in from the beginning for the long term.
The loading bay will force motor vehicles to make three point turns in pedestrian/cyclist space, leading to road danger. The bay should be for sustainable delivery (cargo bikes) only. Put a loading bay for vehicles on Gilkes Crescent and a raised continuous footway crossing on Gilkes Crescent to indicate pedestrian priority and slow vehicles entering and exiting the road.
Are you allowing emergency vehicles through?
Consider obstacles on pavement and also obstacles for business users to access these business where there are constraints on access at certain times.
See my earlier comment on the excessive width of the cycle route which appears to dominate the space.
Nice for the businesses that are very near by. No good for others in the village.
I would prefer Calton is not closed. But, if closed, this is a better design.
So many ugly signs!
The pool of people using the location is shrinking because they can't go by car to carry shopping, need a walking stick, or transporting more than one small child. Wake up and get the proper statistics if you want to measure the impact on the economy. High streets are dying and actually facilitating car parking and traffic circulation would enhance the economy more. Putting in cameras sure generates headline grabbing revenue for the council short term, but long term killing the golden goose. Better to move out of London.
Important to ensure where cars can use roads the road allows proper flow, congestion is not good for air quality or safety
Like the design. I think the residents in the flats need some free parking though, at least for a short time, for drop offs etc
The biggest open space in the square has a solid bench installed. Are businesses supposed to surround it with bistro tables? It just seems odd to have the solid bench in the middle of the square when there is already seating surrounding the square perimeter. Put a lamp, drinking water fountain or a sign post if you want to break up the space, but that large horrid bench will ruin the utility of the square. I just don't know why it is there.
Doesn't seem to be much cycle parking
Permanent communal spaces are positive but in reality the use of shared space will need to be balanced with a preference for seating for the shops that want to provide seating for cafes etc, including covered seating and tables that would be of more practical use.
Suggest the addition of rumble strips at the entry to the paved roadspace to reduce the high speed of cycles coming down the hill on Carlton Avenue (especially the high speed lycra clad sports cyclists and commuter cyclists). Sufficient parking for cycles and cargo cycles should be added. The existing electric bike parking zone on Carlton Avenue could be relocated here also. Cycle parking should also have CCTV surveillance given the nature of bike crime including during school pick up time. Planters are reasonable but should be in keeping with historic character and adopted by the Dulwich Estate for maintenance.
More street lighting is required in the winter periods to make it feel bright and safe after 4pm
it seems that only a few privileged profit from the measures
The current seating is not being well used. There was a parklet in front of  Dulwich Village but a car drove into it. To support local businesses, all modes of transport need to move freely, otherwise businesses will fail and jobs will be lost.
I think during school runs this area will pack and maybe not to the benefit of the businesses.
I have a mobility problem and that is why I travel by car as a passenger. I could go to the shops in the Dulwich Village area e.g. pharmacy, bookshop or to get a cup of coffee for a social time with friends if the car I travel in could set me down close to the pavement (as shown above). How can this be done? There are double-yellow lines and the area (to the front of the picture) indicates that only bikes may 'park'. A few grab-rails or a planter/s along the way would provide a rest-point to touch, and pause, while walking supported by a stick.

Same as my comments above.

1/ we find frustrating that we, Dulwich Village residents (I live at the village side of Woodwarde Rd), are restricted from exiting our roads at certain times, otherwise we face penalty charges. These restrictions should be applicable for NON-RESIDENTS ONLY!

2/ We need more CCTV cameras, police presence to improve safety on our roads and 3/ better public transport to serve Dulwich Village.

I do not feel safe walking in Calton Ave from 37 bus stop or Court lane coming from North Dulwich station in the evenings since the closures.

As long as cyclists are made to realise this is not a bike race track. Pedestrian priority means stronger business benefits.

Comments for 4

While double yellow lines across entrance to square are a good idea, they are not strictly supposed to be used like this - they should always follow a kerb line.

Without them one of the few visual signifiers that this is not a motor road is lost. A central bollard - either removable or that ES can drive over - would address this.

Southwark frequently screws up on details like this - for example on Sydenham Hill the bollards have been put inside the cycleway, reducing the width below the design spec (rather than on the line as shown in design drawings and visualisations)

more cycle parking would be good

I think improving the landscaping around the junction will make it a more attractive area for shopping and sitting.

Could a weekend market be an idea?

Could go further - the pedestrian area on the east side of Dulwich Village is very uneven and some of the mature trees are now so large they have become an obstacle for pedestrians to navigate.

I'd like to see more quality establishments being attracted to this part of the village and able to seat and serve more people outside.

Costs please

And who is going to run a competitive tender? Please don't think Southwark council can do it - it should be done by people who do this professionally

Looks lovely and anything to replace those flimsy rainbow benches will be an improvement. Glad to see loading provision for businesses and more cycle racks too.

Moving seating out of the road is a good idea.

The seating is a good idea. Could there be more space for outdoor dining?

I like the additional safe seating and outdoor dining

Very difficult. Can't believe the flower beds would survive unless the Council is prepared constantly to renew their upkeep.

Could there be grass and white posts as elsewhere in the Village?

Proper maintenance will be important to preserve the quality feel.

For safety reasons, I suggest pushing the hedge of Ash Cottage back to improve visibility for pedestrians crossing the junction (cyclists often come down Calton Avenue at considerable speed).

For the same reason, I suggest some speed humps or a clearly raised surface in the junction over the level of the entrance roads.

Please add bins, there are no public bins in your picture, you even remove the public water fountain?? Why?

Very much support cycle parking, seating and disabled bays.

The use of pay to park for the first hour is a barrier for less technologically able. Just make the first hour free without the ticket.

the double yellow lines should be behind the bike storage, not in front of it, and they should have double blips to deter motorists from using the cycle lane entrance for loading and blocking the entrance and/or the cycle stands.

the paved area should be built out further up Calton Avenue. Pedestrians will be crossing before the flower beds, so the no motor vehicles sign should prevent vehicles from getting up to the cycle stands and make it safer for pedestrians to cross.

I think seating is an improvement and bike racks welcome

The square itself is great, lovely design, but accessing it from any direction other than the East by bike or scooter is poor.

Will the cafes be able to seat customers outside?

A huge improvement on the pre 2020 situation but given how well the current seating is used, what's illustrated doesn't look adequate to seat everyone who'd like to sit in the square. Will businesses be able to put out additional tables?
- remove lamp posts and old hanging baskets - create features to slow down cyclists coming down from Calton avenue decent
Some secure parking for E-Bikes/E-Cargo would be beneficial such as Spokesafe lockers.
There have been several thefts outside the Post Office.
I don't know the true facts but speaking personally, in more inclined to spend longer there
I would give this 4.5/5 or 9/10
The flower beds are not appropriate in this area. The historic and contextually appropriate Dulwich grass verges should be introduced here. Plants need to be able to survive drought and high volumes of rainfall
Providing outdoor seating areas to support businesses is welcome
Additional disabled parking, a loading bay and cycle parking all welcome
Measures are required to slow down people on bikes
Wild flower beds not appropriate due to maintenance issues
Additional cycle parking required and include cargo bike parking
Area for sitting and congregating will encourage use of the local shops
Makes it a much more inviting area to visit and sit around in
This is fine
The eschelon parking on Dulwich Village is dangerous to those cycling past and should be removed. It could be replaced with blue badge space and also loading bays for the businesses on Dulwich Village
Great to see more outdoor seating and an improved public realm which will encourage more people to use the local shops and cafes. Could probably have more cycle parking, including adaptive and cargo bikes. Also make sure there is designated storage space for eBike/eScooter hire.
We desperately need more cycle parking there - I often have to just head home rather than stop at the shops and post office because the cycle stands are full. Businesses need to be made to use the loading bay rather than parking on the road (particularly the post office and pharmacy vans - who seem to park on the road even when there is parking available in the bays.
Seating areas need to be very flexible to allow for multi-use of the Square. Essential to talk to cafe, cheese and wine shop to know what they want.
Where and what seating is a very tricky question in a relatively small, multi-use space. Once the a maximum space is defined, maybe various prototypes could looked at subsequently
Looks Much better
Please ensure pavement pedestrian path isn't blocked by tables and chairs as at present - nightmare for disabled/prams etc Consider mild humps at bottom of Calton Ave to slow down speeding bikes What's to stop cars and motor bikes accessing Calton Ave??
No enough bike stands at the moment or in the drawings to accommodate visitors by bike or parents dropping at schools
Allow outdoor seating for the local businesses to attract trade and create a piazza style atmosphere
The increased bike provision and seating looks good.
This area needs much more cycle parking in safe areas to stop cycles being stolen. With additional planting, trees and green verges it would blend in well with the rest of the village. A change in the road surface to slow down cycles is needed or chicanes in the road.
The seating by the shops looks good, but in the middle of the square they need to be very flexible and consultation with Au Ciel and Heritage Cheese is essential.
Concerned that drivers will go through a camera enforced filter, should be physical
Advance green light phases for cyclists at all traffic light crossings. Effective measures to prevent loading/unloading.
The cycle lanes are very wide and will not encourage cyclists to slow down which is proving quite dangerous for pedestrians in the area (particularly those that move more slowly or unpredictably like children or the less mobile). Perhaps a strip of cobbles will help encourage cyclists to slow down. The flowers whilst pretty look like they could look much less pretty after a short time without extensive maintenance.

Flowers would seem to be overly expensive to maintain and the cyclists have to be slowed down more. The current design will have them speeding down Calton Avenue and straight through the "Square".
For people also coming from a distance if parking is difficult they will not come. What about after dark, this is planned with day time views.
Please consider people who are unable to walk too far and are unable to cycle.
That diagonal echelon parking has to go . It's so dangerous for cyclists especially children
Great to see outdoor seating for people/businesses plus the disabled/loading/cycle parking. More cycle parking would be great including for cargo bikes. Also something to slow cyclists down as some charge through which can make it feel a bit unsettling sitting with your back to it.
This section of the development should have a narrower space for cyclists and a wider area for pedestrians to sit, walk and pass one another.
The proposals are good, and I think that businesses will benefit. The echelon parking is dangerous, and is "an accident waiting to happen". It needs to be removed, and replaced with parallel parking or delivery space. This can enable a cycle track and expanding the public realm in front of the row of shops.
What is key is to slow down the cyclists coming through the space. At the moment mums and dads can't relax and enjoy the space as they have to be vigilant on where we are running as they still believe it is like a highway with racing cyclists, some mopeds and motor cyclists and even the occasional speeding car racing through.
- More cycle parking is needed in front of the pharmacy. A dropped kerb from the north (by the car parking) would make it more accessible. - Loading bay within the 'gateway' should be relocated to Dulwich Village (infront of shops) or Gilkes Crescent, otherwise it will create conflicts with cyclists when the vehicles are making turns to exit. - On-street cargo bike parking should be added to encourage modal shift to sustainable freight.

Comments for 5 (completely)

The seating in your images is 1000 times better than the mish mash of seating in the square now, SUCH an improvement and much more befitting the heritage area of Dulwich Village. And getting rid of all the tarmac makes it look so much more open and friendly to people (not cars). It looks like a real destination area. It's nice to have the seating outside the shops. Please make sure the materials used are suitable for the space. It's the centre of Dulwich Village, right beside our important local businesses and opposite an historic burial ground. I'm looking forward to using this new people friendly space. Can you formalise a name for the area as it becomes a destination in its own right? People are calling it Dulwich Square but it would be wonderful to somehow recognise the wonderful Alastair Hanton.
These measures will improve even further the space as a place to spend time, which must be good for the local businesses. great - well done - much better for cyclists and much clearer
The possibility of periodic events in this space will further enhance the local area and bring in customers to local businesses. Great to see disabled parking for those that need it and more cycle parking. Hopefully the cycle parking will include parking for cargo bikes
It looks like such an inviting space and great to have seating out on the square for the cafes.
Looks much better than before the changes. The cycle parking could be further in.
Super nice. Would it be possible to have space for occasional markets and events?
Occasional music events in Dulwich Square would create a community feeling.
I've been surprised that local businesses say their sales are adversely affected by the LTN/pedestrianisation/waiting restrictions. From my own daily observations I believe pedestrian footfall outside the shops exceeds pre-pandemic levels. If sales are depressed that is due to external factors e.g. the economy.
The plans look more attractive, and welcoming to those visiting the Village to shop than the current temporary arrangements. it is a great benefit to these shops and so long as council work to keep diversity of shops eg bakers and book shops and cafe and art then great but if you start to sell out to highest bidders for hiked up rents then we will lose this diversity and not achieve the focus - so it needs council commitment to keep a diversity of shops (esp book shops and cafes)
The new seating will definitely improve the area
Outdoor seating for businesses is brilliant but have you thought about shade planting ie trees near the seating? Otherwise on hot days people with children, older people and anyone else more sensitive to heat won't be able to use the seating. Bicycle parking will be very welcome 🍷
We need better mobile phone reception in Dulwich village to support the local businesses - it is essential that the phone mast situation is thought of in these plans
Fewer cars means more local people out and about, stopping to buy things locally, also walkers and cyclists tend to stop and spend more in a locality like this.
Additional trees and seating areas important.

<p>Already it has been fantastic to see people sat outside as a result of the LTN's and enjoying a coffee or the like. I've even seen young people just come on a pleasant day and enjoy a picnic</p>
<p>All cycle parking should be able to accommodate non-standard bikes like cargo bikes and adapted mobility cycles. Seating areas should be able to accommodate wheelchair users.</p>
<p>i think you need to replace the echenlon parking (which is dangerous) with parallel parking</p>
<p>Bike lane on calton avenue. There's also someone with no eyes in your picture, so you should fix that (they are by the bush)</p>
<p>Much more footfall clearly visible</p>
<p>Much more cycle parking please and one day a cycle lane up Calton!!</p>
<p>Much more cycle parking needed - especially outside Dulwich books.</p>
<p>Great.</p>
<p>As before, some shelter would be good, and howabout lockable bike parking, ie with the lock incorporated</p>
<p>Love this!</p>
<p>Shops will benefit from these measures, I am convinced. They will see more footfall over time. and the deliveries can still get there.</p>
<p>Much nicer to sit here than when the road was a rat run - I now use these shops more as a result. Also, we now have the opportuntiy to put Christmas trees here or have community events, which is a massive addition and helps the local businesses too.</p>
<p>More cycle parking is needed by the chemist - please consider added a dropped kerb so you can access it from the north (by the car parking).</p>
<p>The designs look great and should encourage people to spend time in Dulwich Village which can only help the local businesses.</p>
<p>There is never enough bike parking so this is great to hear. Will the bike parking be secure and enabled for both cargo bikes and also for enabled bikes?</p>
<p>People will eventually learn they can't drive just because they want to pop to the dry cleaners. If everywhere is the same, and there is virtually no parking anywhere, people will eventually be forced to change their behaviour and stop driving. We used out car every couple of months now because its just easier and quicker to walk or cycle and I am sure many people would do the same is driving gets progressively harder. Shop owners may have a slight dip in business while people change their ways, but people will always need shops....the ones here might not be the right ones if people can go online for these things, but more cafes and recreational shops will get plenty of business from people passing who are walking and cyclint</p>
<p>This looks lovely</p>
<p>Despite resistance from car users local businesses thrive within a safe active travel space and businesses increasingly understand that their footfall is dependant on the social interaction that takes places around their shops. People linger, chat and pop in</p>
<p>I firmly believe this will be a big plus for our local businesses.</p> <p>I understand some have local shops have (ostensibly) objected to creating the square, but if you scratch beneath the surface there some other factors to consider</p> <p>e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > HG - very influenced by many of its very long-standing customers who are loudly objecting to LTNs > Biff - listed LTNs among many reasons for closing, including brexit, online shopping and a desire to retire. The journalists naturally pulled out the point which would get the most clicks... > Village Books - I am actually not sure of their view but trading is probably tough with online retail / kindles, aging customer base, etc.. Hopefully higher footfall from the square will help to offset these headwinds and they'll do well. Fingers crossed, it's a great shop. <p>The coffee shops, estate agents and boutique retail etc should do well - as people browse these on foot rather than drive to them</p>
<p>Previously I shopped in another area. I changed my practice and now I enjoy walking to this junction and using these businesses because being protected from traffic (noise, pollution, stress) make this a more pleasant experience.</p>
<p>Far more footfall, increased rents and a constant supply of new successful businesses all points towards this being an economic success, it is great to see</p>
<p>Nice. Although I do like a planter, to make the place feel safer. Rather than just cameras.</p>
<p>I think these proposals are great there is already some use of the pavement in this way I think a clear route needs to be maintained in front of the cafes with seating outside so give them plenty of space</p>
<p>A very welcoming shopping area!</p>
<p>What an improvement!</p>

Looks nice.
I only cycle through but since the area has been closed to traffic I've been stopping to the cafe and this proposal makes it more pleasant.
I love going to the shops and I'm allowed to go to the shops by myself because it's safe for me to cross the square.
Another huge improvement to this area.
I really like this.
Would like to see that cafes and businesses are able to retain clustered tables outside their premises. But this doesn't seem to be reflected in Drawings as is.
Love the outside seating area. More cycle parking is definitely needed.
Having a nicer area for sitting will encourage me to use the local cafe and shops in the area
It will make me far more likely to spend time and money in the area.
Seating and trees are both really important.
The loading bay must be actively enforced in order to be useful.
Since Dulwich Square improvements (and the Southwark and Lambeth LTNs), I cycle regularly from Tooting to use the shops and cafes, and sit outside. I cycled here to do Christmas shopping! I am much more likely to use the shops in Dulwich as it is such an appealing environment. Much more so than in Wandsworth where I actually live.
Brilliant! Provision of cycle parking is key; as is seating that is clearly segregated from the cycle way.
As previously mentioned, these measures would mean I visit local businesses more regularly and stay for longer when I do

Statutory measures

To what extent do you think these statutory measures will improve safety and minimise congestion and disruption to all traffic? - how much does this achieve the objective

Comments for 1 (not at all)

You'll simply move all the parking further up and on to Gallery road. You've not solved anything. Plus you're making it harder for people to get to the shops.
Will cause nothing but disruption
It's going to cause more problems like the other ltns do that most people hate
Without checks people will still stop in these places
A duty to minimise congestion and disruption to all traffic - think about it
Not enough space for cars and bikes. Public transport is not an option, number 3 bus takes 30 minutes to travel along Croxted Rd because the traffic is so bad because it's all been forced to use this road due to road closures and restricted timings.
Dulwich village is becoming a no go area for residents and is now only for tourists in the Summer.
Closing this road without any consultation during Covid was insanely unjust and the amount you are spending on this junction is disgusting. Just stop and think what else you could do with that money you bunch of closed minded, incompetent people who don't represent the people in the area - the amount of pollution you have now pushed past Harris Primary on Lordsship Lane as you have essentially given all the rich Dulwich village residents private roads. As apparently their voices will be heard more than the masses who have to suffer increased congestion and pollution on other roads. I'm sure this is also just to try and ensure when the government tries to unwind this closure it's more difficult. Deceptive as always.
Since the measures have been brought in the traffic at peacetime is at a standstill...
Creating more pollution....keep traffic moving to reduce pollution...
And as these are all single carriageways, the buses are caught up in the congestion, thus making public transport utterly unusable
Adding double yellow lines will not decrease congestion. From my experience of driving through the village several times a week the congestion is not caused by the inability of cars to pass through the junction due to the road being too narrow. It is caused by the sheer volume of cars that have to queue up for the red post hill junction in order to continue their journey and the only way you will reduce this build up of traffic is to remove the LTNs in the East Dulwich and Dulwich areas.
This will increase congestion and further disrupt all traffic.
Can't see how it will help as the scheme has created huge extra congestion as it is by making the junction between Dulwich Village and East Dulwich Grove one lane.
I WILL REPEAT THERE IS NO WAY THAT ANY OF THESE PROPOSALS OR THE CLOSURE OF THE JUNCTION TO TRAFFIC IMPROVE SAFETY AND MINIMISE CONGESTION. PLEASE SUPPLY DATA THAT PROVE IT DOES
Leave it alone. Stop tinkering with a scheme that does not work.
This totally defeats the purpose of your previous question, to keep businesses open people need to park. Double yellow lines in many of these places (eg bottom end of Court Lane) entirely unnecessary.
It is more tick box but not achieving the objective- above reasons apply.
I still do not understand how making all car journeys longer and slower improves congestion or reduces pollution.
Traffic levels are not reducing, I have just being displaced onto other routes making those areas significantly busier
Dulwich Village congestion has been maximised. In sixty years I have never known such traffic queues since the bogus LTN was imposed against local opinion in the "Consultation"
I had thought that the LTN schemes were worth experimenting with and that some of them, across London, have achieved their aims and met with local support. The bogus Dulwich LTN turns out to have been just dogma imposed on the local community (using emergency powers intended for another purpose) so that Southwark Councillors could boast that their "20 LTN's" have been a success
It will just lead to an increase in illegal parking.
You are making this area so protected it will mean the traffic spills over with excess parking on to the roads already suffering from the project/ Why are you not protecting all roads equally?
None of these measures should be enacted until an entire study of the impact of the 2020 covid closure has been done on the whole of Dulwich with the adverse measures caused to adjacent roads addressed as part of the package. What about the Burbage/Turney junction which is far more dangerous than Calton/Gilkes?

Local shops are suffering already financially, It would appear you are trying to kill the facilities we already have, the traders will end up going out of business
By further restricting parking on Turney Rd opposite Dulwich Hamlet Primary School and Dulwich Village, you are causing a parking problem for teachers at both the Infant and Junior schools who rely on their cars to get to work. This has a detrimental knock on effect to surrounding roads such as Boxall, Aysgarth, Pickwick and Burbage. This will also increase the negative trading pressure on the shops and restaurants who's trade had already been severely affected by the current alterations to the Turney Rd / Calton Ave / Court Lane junction. Witness the closure of Biff (a valuable and essential shop supplying shoes and kit for local school children). The reason for the closure was the loss of trade due to the reasons above.
Quite the opposite. This makes traffic.
As per everything put forward, it will have the opposite effect
Restricting parking on Turney Rd will have a negative effect on the surrounding roads. Also a detrimental effect on local trade. ABSOLUTELY NO IMPROVEMENT WHATSOEVER.
THIS ROAD NEAR INFANTS SCHOOL ON TURNEY ROAD IS SHUT DOWN DURING SCHOOL ENTRANCE AND SCHOOL EXIT TIMES - YOU ADDING DOUBLE YELLOW LINES JUST PUTS ADDITIONAL PRESSURE ON PARKING AROUND THIS AREA. CRAZY, HAIR-BRAINED SCHEME
There is a massive increase in congestion and disruption to traffic on East Dulwich Grove, Lordship Lane and the South Circular due to the road closure. Safety isn't achieved as more traffic also means more risk of accidents.
Too many double yellow lines
Your constant interference and big state / big brother attitude is not welcome and does not help us. Stop adding more signs, stop adding mlre signs. It DOES not help safety, it does not help power people to be responsible for themselves. Please please stop wasting our taxpayers money on your endless war against local motorists. Let us be. No more schemes no more changes.
People in the area need places to park so they can access the village shops and schools.
Some parking is needed to support local businesses. The limited parking available at present should continue.
Local businesses need some parking close by. The present limited parking does no harm and helps the shops.
There's no thought given to the safety of those living on roads crammed with displaced traffic. This entire scheme continues to be divisive and only advantageous to a minority.
I do not understand how these measures have been put into place without radically changing the roads. All that has happened is cars are now squeezed on to main roads with buses and sometimes cyclists creating hugely dangerous traffic situations. Yet again a plan has been put into place by the council ignoring the overwhelming voice of local residents against it. You cannot make effective change without creating larger roads primarily for dedicated bus service. You are not decreasing car usage but increasing it as well as increasing danger to cyclists on these now overcrowded nearby roads. And of course the most important factor is that elderly people, blue badge holders etc have now been cut off from appointments and travel by car.
Static traffic build up is so huge on village way, this idyllic image will never happen. This was wholly rejected by the community years ago and you still plough on regardless. Local schoolchildren's health is being adversely affected.
All you're going to achieve is make life more miserable for folks living outside these double yellow restrictions
Cyclists are not at danger from cars! They are a danger to pedestrians particularly and cars. Cyclists do not obey the highway code. No they do not minimise congestion just create it!!!! Anybody can see that. Please improve buses and trains - this is how you get traffic off the road. More east west bus routes. Bus routes going to more locations. Trains that run regularly. Open the junction ! Listen to your constituents- stop ignoring the 66% who didn't want the LTN in the first place. You obviously do not care about your constituents and if you think you do, then you are deluded and need to take a long hard look in the mirror!
Huge congestion elsewhere in Dulwich
To a very great extent the measures have simply displaced traffic, they have not reduced it this has resulted in incredibly high traffic volumes on the South Circular, Croxted Road and a huge volume of traffic using Turney and Burbage Road.

None of what you propose will make any difference to the congestion on the surrounding roads. You are helping the few, not the many and especially not older, frail or disabled people
I live in Herne Hill. (NOT DULWICH) and object to this obsession with Dulwich Village.
Benefits a few at the cost of hundreds
In my view you ought to be prosecuted for your failure to ensure congestion minimisation. Your strategy displaces congestion and makes it worse elsewhere. You have made many journeys longer and caused tonnes more CO2 emissions and particulates to enter lungs than if you'd just saved the money and installed electric charging points.
This entire plan makes East Dulwich Grove and Red Post Hill more congested and less safe
They just displace traffic to other roads
The community does not want this junction to remain closed.
I am very suspicious of this further phase. We have been ignored from day 1. I can mostly manage without using my car, but at ■ and with a ■ year old husband I do not know how long this will last before we join the numerous frail elderly folk denied access. I feel very strongly that we have been ignored apart from the loud trumpeting about how you listened to our complaints about the totally ridiculous proposal to close off Turney Road!! I suspect that was a deliberate ploy to try and make yourselves look good! I bet I am not the only person to think this. And can you blame us when you have persistently ignored the majority view and have wilfully ignored the needs of the most vulnerable in our society? You seem to treat us as fools and this "consultation" has all the hallmarks of yet another sham consultation.
You have disrupted traffic in surrounding areas by these imposed measures
The community rejected this 24/7 closure in the original consultation, and yet we continue to suffer from it. You are destroying quality of life for working Dulwich residents and council tax payers. Through the distress and pain created the plan you are failing in your Public Sector Equality Duty. Cycling has decreased on roads which have taken the displaced traffic. Publish traffic and air quality data for all streets in the Dulwich area. At the DV/East Dulwich Grove junction you state that the "existing cycling wand segregation to remain". This cycle lane is a disaster causing tailbacks through DV at peak times increasing pollution for schoolchildren and residents. The traffic here needs two lanes in order to flow smoothly and reduce pollution from traffic waiting to turn right into East Dulwich Grove - the majority of whom have been forced down this route by the closure of Calton Avenue. Your road planning officer should be shot.
Traffic is terrible now, impacting many. It is hard to travel by bus. Roads that have schools on and children walking along to get to school are heavily impacted - there is a huge increase in pollution for the children. The only benefit is to those who live on the blocked off street, at everyone else's expense. No proper consultation, residents and local shopkeepers views ignored.
If you want to meet your objectives you need to open up the roads again. It is much worse than it used to be.
I rejected this road closure during the original consultation and reject it again. This road closure only benefits a few residents who live at this junction. Meanwhile the rest of the Dulwich community are having to deal with the impact of this closure i.e. more congestion on other routes exacerbating poor air quality and congested roads. This road is a direct route from Dulwich to Herne Hill. If it were open travel time on that route is quick & limits pollution. Now, with the timed closure of Townley, all cars have to take a longer route down lordship lane, along East Dulwich Grove past the Charter East School - so much traffic is diverted there it's appalling. Please listen to the residents and the Dulwich community and re-open the road. The Dulwich community is suffering and not benefitting at all.
You have created the problem with the 24 hour closure of Calton Avenue. Stop making it worse now
The Court Lane / Dulwich Village / Carlton Avenue system is now confusing and ill-thought out. Cyclists coming down Carlton Avenue rarely obey the traffic lights resulting in numerous near misses with pedestrians.
I think pedestrianising areas just invites bikes and people to have accidents.
A good way of killing off the remaining businesses in the Village will be to stop people who want to use them from parking there. This is presumably the aim of this policy
You have caused congestions in SO MANY streets around this junction. lives have been made hideous in Croxted Road and, in my own area, the junction of Lordship Lane with the South Circular is now almost always busy, and the South Circular now moves so slowly that traffic takes short cuts through residential streets. Misery.
The community rejected this 24/7 closure in the original consultation, and the wider area will continue to suffer, not benefit, from it. Traffic is still being displaced on to surrounding roads where families live and where children walk and cycle to school. There is no need to have double yellow lines on court lane, it's super quiet anyway.
All that was needed to improve the flow of traffic through this junction in the first place was the introduction of double yellow lines up the first part of court lane.
the dreadful local congestion is caused by closing off this area- it should be opened again

Overkill on the yellow lines - makes it much harder for the shops to welcome visitors. Since you put the overly long yellow lines at the bottom of Court Lane - parking has become a huge issue. Thanks!
Forcing all traffic that uses court lane to enter Dekker Road, which is a single lane road with cars parked both sides, has resulted in a trebling of traffic on our road since before the village junction was blocked. This is very dangerous and totally unsuitable
IT WILL CAUSE COMPLETE CONGESTION AND DISRUPTION
YOU MUST UNDERSTAND - PARENTS WILL NEVER ABIDE BY ANY ROAD RULES - YOU MIGHT AS WELL FORGET IT.
FORGET DOING ANY OF THE MEASURES YOU ARE WANTING TO GET THROUGH
NO ONE IS INTERESTED
WE HAVE ALREADY GIVEN YOU FEEDBACK ON THIS - YET YOU STILL CONTINUE TO ASK THE SAME QUESTIONS
THE ANSWER IS: STAY AWAY FROM MAKING ANY MORE CHANGES TO THIS AREA (AND THAT INCLUDES CPZ'S !!)
ABSOLUTELY NO DIFFERENCES
Not necessary at all, if the other suggested revisions re. increasing soft landscaping, providing SuDS and clear pedestrian/ cycle only structures are made to the junction.
The traffic through the Village is absolutely appalling and there is a constant stream of polluting vehicles queued because of the traffic light problems at North Dulwich.
I am not convinced that more yellow lines achieve any of the objectives, nor that they are required.
Double yellow lines will not solve the problem of huge traffic tailbacks
This scheme is a major disruption to all traffic and the safety of elderly, disabled and other residents is compromised by the access issues of closing the intersection and having to do a major detour around the village. The displaced traffic on Croxted Road, Dulwich Village and the South Circular causes major congestion for large parts of the day.
The whole area is currently very unsafe and as such statutory measures are not being met
It will make pollution and congestion worse on East Dulwich Grove and Red Post Hill
Yellow lines are often ignored. Traffic may be less congested in this area, but it has to go somewhere- ie to neighbouring roads, to their detriment.
Does not minimise congestion, just moves it elsewhere
The congestion is caused by the 24/7 closure of Carlton Avenue.
The community rejected the 24/7 closure of this junction in the original consultation and wider area continues to suffer, not benefit from, the proposals.
maintaining the closure of these roads causes maximum disruption to traffic - vehicles simply cannot use the roads. The way to minimise disruption is to open them up again to vehicles. I cycle to work everyday and the road closures have not helped with cycling at all. The result has simply been to increase traffic and therefore pollution on neighboring roads - causing me as a cyclist to be exposed to increased pollution.
A bit safer for emergency vehicles; but not for turning round nor for cyclists.
Reducing parking just means people circle round more looking for spaces. Increases pollution and congestion.
A further waste of money. A bubble of absurdity. This Statutory reference is hot air.
Stop wasting our taxes on fancy pet projects. Spend money in repairing roads . Clear manholes to avoid flooding of roads. Reopen closed roads under pretext of LTN and remove APR cameras that you installed to enforce them and you use as cash cows to justify your positions and salaries.
does not address the traffic issues in surrounding areas which has been displaced from Dulwich Village.
We have an obligation to ensure our roads are managed effectively to improve safety and minimise congestion and disruption to all traffic, which includes pedestrians, cyclists and other road users. - WHAT ARE YOU DOING TO IMPROVE THE TRAFFIC ON EAST DULWICH GROVE???
The disabled bay at the bottom Court Lane will be difficult for drivers with restricted mobility who will have to back out through a narrow entrance. Some people have limited ability to turn their head and trunk. I can't see that it will any effect on congestion
The congestion is not due to there not being yellow lines. It's due to re-routing more traffic through the East Dulwich grove junction.
Double Yellow Lines are not the answer. Encourage Electric car travel by exempting such cars
Traffic in surrounding areas has increased due to displacement.

There are already double yellow lines outside Dulwich Village School and traffic flows easily with parked cars on one side as now.
Congestion has been maximised - try walking along Dulwich Village to the park at weekends
These will make it worse for safety and pollution
Traffic is displaced, making those roads highly polluted.
The system serves only a small privileged section of the community.
There should be restricted access at certain times during school start and finish hours (like Townley Road) Outside that there should not be restrictions.
The present system: Discriminates against the elderly and the disabled Privileges cyclists (I am a cyclist) Restricts the liberty of people living in the area Increases car emissions and car journeys by causing traffic jams Displaces the traffic to other areas Creates an unsafe space, particularly at night The benches there are ugly
Other than that it is a great system! Not sure who is actually benefiting form the system other than a small number of people
All traffic is just displaced
These measures are ridiculous
You have moved all the traffic on to East Dulwich Grove where I live. It just isn't fair that we should have to put up with all the extra traffic, which is causing so much more pollution. It's not just during the week that the traffic is slowed down. On a Saturday and Sunday there are piles of cars slowed down between the Townley Road traffic lights and Dulwich Village lights. What are you planning to do to reduce the traffic in this area. I've had a lot of bad health the last two years and whenever I go out I have to breathe in the fumes of the cars engines puffing away while they wait in the traffic jams. Why should we be discriminated against?
People who live in Dulwich will not drive through the village to get their coffees and buy from the shops, so the parking is not useful. People who drive through to get to the schools / activities etc are confused by the rules and will be further restricted. Many of the local traders rely on footfall that comes from people who drive to the village, who would do so less with these yellow lines.
Displacing parking onto much smaller streets and local residents, therefore making these much narrower streets more congested and much less safe, especially for elderly, children and cyclists. Which suggests you will enforce costly permits onto the local community prohibiting visits by social care/family and friends/essential house maintenance services etc and ultimately collect more money from local residents in fines.
You've already done enough to stop passing trade from local businesses, please dont make it even worse
unnecessary yellow lines, not needed - fed up with your endless fiddling about and spending millions of £s - all utterly wasteful. What on EARTH are you doing this for? you spout lots of green air stuff but you are actually causing dreadul pollution
The main adverse traffic issue is the very heavy use of Court Lane Gardens by parents dropping off at Dulwich Village/Hamlet. They park on the double yellow lines, often with engines running. As the school is supposed to be for local children there should not be any such parking so Court lane Gardens should be made red lines at the Calton Road end.
The proposed yellow lines will have little if any effect on traffic flow - the traffic flow issues are caused by the current road lay outs causing tailbacks as soon as one vehicle turns right (going towards North Dulwich station) or because of the reckless behaviour of cyclists weaving in and out of traffic. This has nothing to do with parked cars. Indeed, the creation of extra cycle lanes will make it worse - unless the council are going to actually ensure cyclists use them properly
I do not see an existing issue which requires more yellow lines. This feels like unnecessary expenditure
So there is practically no parking in Dulwich Village. Go back to section 11 about the economy.
Traffic has been displaced. This is a fact - inspite of councillors hiding the evidence. TfL figures for South Circular show this as does the no 3 bus route. Now no 3 reduced frequency due to congestion...so you have helped the cause of having to use own car / taxis as public transport less frequent!
If you have a statutory duty to reduce congestion this has been breached in spectacular fashion!!
Total joke You are ignoring the wider Dulwich. Well documented extended bus times on Croxted Road for example in TfL own report.

<p>Again, reducing the number of parking spaces available makes life extremely challenging for those who need to drive. Which is all of us occasionally and some people all of the time.</p> <p>These proposals hugely favour the young and able.</p>
<p>It will remove needed parking that will then impact residents at turney road</p>
<p>You already know that congestion has exponentially increased in and around Dulwich in the few roads available every day.</p>
<p>It's fine as it is and is simply going to create more money for the council in fines when people going about their business unable to stop anywhere!</p>
<p>Closing Calton Avenue junction has caused the worst congestion Ive seen in 40 years living here. It inconveniences me every day!</p>
<p>disagree with reducing parking spaces which are needed for visitors, shoppers, carers etc</p>
<p>CLOSING A GAP ON AN ALREADY CLOSED-OFF ROAD WILL HAVE NO BENEFIT AT ALL AND I I DO KNOW HOW THIS WILL HELP YOU FUFILL YOUR "STATUTORY MEASURES TO IMPROVE SAFETY AND MINIMISE CONGESTION" THERE ISN'T ANY CONGESTION BECAUSE GILKES CRESCENT IS ALREADY A CLOSED-DOWN ROAD!!!!</p>
<p>Totally insufficient provision for Blue Badge parking.</p>
<p>You have a responsibility to do this on all streets not just on some roads (with very high house prices) for the privileged few. If you took the time to do proper research into the impact the road closures (and timed closures) have had over recent years then you would know that you are not delivering on these objectives</p>
<p>I have lived in the area for 50 years and am not aware of there being any accidents due to road layouts</p>
<p>These measures are more likely to create yet more congestion</p>
<p>There was no need to change the old layout. A waste of money and time. Luckily it is now a revenue earner for Southwark through controlled vehicle signs. Shame on Southwark.</p>
<p>The yellow lines already in position serve a good purpose. It is totally unnecessary to extend the lines further.</p>
<p>The intention is unclear. The few people who wish to park near to Dulwich Village (e.g. shopworkers, school staff, shoppers) will still try to park as close to Dulwich Square as possible. All you will do is displace them further from the junction. What's the point of that? And you might put the few visitors to DV off coming altogether, damaging the local economy still more.</p>
<p>The plans are solely for cycles and pedestrians and not for cars at all.</p>
<p>Due to difficulty walking due to [REDACTED] treatment and age, I find it almost impossible to visit the village as I used to almost on a daily basis.</p>
<p>There is no parking, the LTNs restrict entry....the village has lost its soul through your measures....and the current palns make it even worse.</p>
<p>The fundamental issue, especially at school and rush-hour periods, is the existence of traffic congestion going north through Dulwich Village towards the traffic light controlled junction at E Dulwich Grove and Village Way. These proposals will not improve the current situation in any way, and where there is traffic congestion, there will always be increased CO2 and NO2 pollution, whether from stationary vehicles' emissions, where they have no automatic 'stop-go' engine devices, or those where that do, from starting up again.</p>
<p>Can you provide the statistics with the record of incidents before and after the introduction of LTN, please? Congestion already increased dramatically with the introduction of LTN. There won't be any improvement with these statutory measures.</p>
<p>You are nuts to suggest that Dulwich Village is heavily congested. It is the least busy part of the area! I do not understand why you want to demolish businesses and hamper families with these unnecessary restrictions, especially by presenting them as part of a false agenda which can only make congestion worse in the surrounding area.</p>
<p>Yet another ruse to reduce parking space and make the case for parking permits by the back door.</p>
<p>There is no traffic in these area or problems. I assume it is a tactic to try to create pressure on parking to make the CPZ fund raising attractive. It is not unsafe.</p>
<p>Won't make any difference to current measures. No one stops there anyway.</p>
<p>1. Calton Avenue &c - do you mean Gilkes Crescent or Gilkes Place? Please check. 2. The Court Lane to Dulwich Village closure only has minority support. Why are Village Ward Councillor Representatives incapable of representing this? 3. Turney Road &c - do you mean Dulwich Hamlet or Dulwich C of E Primary school? Please check. 4. Dulwich Village &c - no.</p>
<p>Southwark Council's past. present and future disruptions perpetuate disruption.</p>
<p>as above, LTN's are a farce and are criminal, they have been brought in without consultation. And just to let you know I do cycle to work every day.</p>

I do not understand why the pavement in Turney Road needs to be widened. It seems to me to be quite adequate at present. Given the current road layout, cars parked on the southern side of Turney road do not impede traffic flows nor present a hazard to the schools. Consequently, the proposed double yellow lines simply address a problem which is of Southwark's own making
Why is the Council so focussed on providing increased seating areas in streets? Streets are for movement by bike, walkers and people in cars.
Papering over the cracks.
Fundamentally this consultation is a farce. The Department for Transport has not yet transferred control of the current pedestrianised area of the Junction roadway to Southwark Council for its 'Streets for People' ambitions. This is because Southwark Council has refused to comply with the Department of Transport's request for a review of all Southwark's LTNs.
You have failed to make this junction safe for more than three and a half years. The failure to correct the pedestrian and cycle lights, which both show green at the same time in Turney Road outside the Infants' School, when this has been raised with you many times by the Met Police and by residents, including me, and the extent to which these measures have resulted in cyclists jumping red lights and cycling on pavements, demonstrates a lack of interest in creating a safe environment here. Painting DYs will do nothing to make this junction safer as they don't address the key behaviours that cause the junction to be dangerous.
Awful as usual with our councilors!!
There were far better ways to improve safety
this Sledgehammer nonsense isn't good
Reducing parking will adversely affect the businesses in the Village
This will cause more congestion and make it harder for local residents to visit the shops causing more businesses to go under and people to take their business elsewhere
I strongly object to Southwark Council introducing all of these double yellow lines. The ones in Carlton Avenue and Court Lane would not be required if this junction was not closed. The ones in Turney Road and Dulwich Village are not required at all. There is NO existing problem that they would solve and I believe that Southwark Council is proposing to introduce them simply to CAUSE parking problems that they will then 'solve' with the CPZ.
The closure of this junction was rejected by the community in your original consultation
The community rejected the closure of the junction in the original consultation.
Stop closing roads and junctions with making Ticket giving Cameras money cows x you with the pretext to save us from doomsday. These are your pet project only. Mere money spin operations to justify your ineded positions and high salaries inside tge council. Listen to the majority of people and stop taking us as fool. Stop working only for a tiny minority. You are our servants , we elected you and you keep disregarding what the majority wants (no ltns no road closures). You are mocking democracy and act as tyrants. You only dislocate traffic to other roads where people have less important lungs to preserve , moreover you completely disregard the existence of clean EV to which you pay no mention and no attention in incentivate their use or the creation of widespread EV charging pointts.
Awful traffic in Dulwich Village now, one slow route.
Herne Hill get our traffic as we 'drive the long way round' to get home.
The congestion is worse as people rush in when restrictions are lifted
All traffic has not reduced. Traffic is simply displaced on to other people's door step (mine included). so the small majority benefit whilst the majority now deal with increased pollution and bus journeys more than doubled in time. Traffic is bumper to bumper and a lot of this traffic is displaced to school roads or affects school routes which adds journey time for children. People sit with engines on in traffic for far too long adding to pollution and congestion when journeys in Dulwich did not used to be this painful and long. Even when I cycle it is dangerous as the cars are stock piled on to one road. The cycle only routes are great but if I need to go on to the other roads to get where I am going I am faced with miles and miles of cars and having to weave through ridiculous amounts of traffic.
I'm not sure what the point of this so-called consultation is since you've steadfastly ignored any comments or objections in previous consultations and gone ahead with your pre-decided measures. The majority of respondents did NOT want this junction closed, but you closed it anyway, since you're in thrall to the cycling lobby and concerns for disabled people, local shops and displaced traffic obviously did not come into consideration. I suspect you're about to do the same with the so-called consultation on the proposed Controlled Parking Zone in Dulwich Village. It may look as if you're ticking all the right boxes regarding consultations, but those of us who have tried to engage with you in the past have come to realise it's a waste of time. Still, one more attempt can't hurt...

<p>congestion on the surrounding roads was NEVER a problem - it now is, Lordship lane, east Dulwich grove, croxted</p> <p>Traffic has jst been displaced.</p> <p>you know this as feedback has been consistent for 4 years.</p> <p>You will ignore this.</p>
<p>Nothing in this proposal improves safety, minimises congestion and disruption to all traffic, which includes pedestrians, cyclists and other road users. Most of the problems have been caused by unwanted change to date and this will not improve matters. Layers upon layers of traffic displacement onto other local roads, longer journeys will not make anything better for anyone.</p>
<p>The council has a complete failure to respond to feedback from the local community in the last consultation - these proposals and road closures are ruining our area</p>
<p>Better flow?? Have any of you actually been through the village on a regular basis?? Do you live with the shambles that has been created??? It's a car park because of the stationary traffic. It's so much worse than it used to be. It also causes so much more pollution on the surrounding roads, and it's so much more dangerous for cyclists who cycle on the South Circular because of the displaced traffic. It's devastating to the surrounding areas.</p>
<p>You have created a traffic nightmare in the area and forced people into longer journey times or just not going to the shops and instead ordering deliveries. Instead of a lovely village atmosphere we now have empty streets except for delivery moped drivers</p>
<p>I have repeatedly set out my objections to this work in all your previous consultations, and I believe you have ignored my and my communities objections throughout</p>
<p>You are reminded that our community rejected the closure of the junction in the first, original consultation</p>
<p>I have lived here for 50 years and we have not needed double yellow lines before. They will spoil the conservation area. Try changing the duration of the traffic lights to achieve better flow, minimise congestion and disruption to all traffic.</p>
<p>Clearly achieves the exact opposite</p>
<p>You've provided no data on how these measures likely to affect Burbage Road, nor any measures to mitigate the impact your timed closures have already had on Burbage Road traffic.</p>
<p>THE OPPOSITE.</p>
<p>Not possible to answer the minimise congestion question until we all understand what your missing traffic data analysis may show.</p>
<p>You have consistently failed to meet your statutory obligations to improve safety and minimise congestion and disruption to all traffic</p>
<p>This is a complete failure on the part of the council. The original reasons given have been to reduce pollution. However, the increase in journey distances cobined with the increased congestion on neighbouring roads have clearly combined to increase overall pollution generated. Reduction in pollution is more down to the ULEZ extension out to the South Circular, removing more poluting vehicles. I addition the times junctions are designed to catch unaware drivers out and create revenue. I submit that very few people would consciously drive through one of the restrictions knowingly. There should be illuminated warnings to indiate when restrictions are active. This would be a genuine and reasonable way to enforce the times restrictions.,</p>
<p>More ugly yellow lines. Why are you forcing cars and drivers from using the local shops. Not everyone can walk or cycle and the age of many elderly Dulwich Village residents should be taken into consideration.</p>
<p>Congestion happens because people need help to travel by car and will be forced to take risks.</p>
<p>The Council continues to ignore the impact of traffic restrictions on businesses and people living on boundary roads, as well as the difficulties that disabled and other vulnerable residents are forced to endure.</p>
<p>The first consultation for the LTNs completely ignored the vast majority wish of the local population which wholeheartedly rejected the proposals including the closure of the junction.</p>
<p>The LTNs have not achieved any of the goals - we are suffering from displaced traffic, delayed buses, reduced public travel options, closed businesses and increased pollution outside schools on boundary roads.</p>
<p>The profoundly undemocratic imposition of the LTNs against the views of the vast majority of residents is disgraceful. The waste of public funds on these expensive measures against the wishes of the residents is obscene and unnecessary.</p>
<p>We don't need these changes. And therefore don't need more yellow lines resulting from them. How you can claim to promoting the economy while removing parking spaces (and so help to create parking congestion where there currently is none) is beyond me.</p>
<p>More and more restrictions reduce flexibility and cause anxiety and stress. These emotions can contribute to mistakes that would not otherwise have occurred.</p>

<p>This whole project has not had the support or consent of the majority of the residents. The Council is riding roughshod over the views and wishes of the majority - this is not democratic.</p>
<p>I fear that the council will ignore the views of residents as it has in the past. The current arrangements increase pollution and peril to pedestrians while harming the shops. We have to be grateful that the council has magnanimously restored access for emergency vehicles at the Court lane Carlton avenue Dulwich village junction. These latest proposals will only make the bad job worse.</p>
<p>As in box 7</p>
<p>Your statutory requirements to minimise congestion and disruption to traffic would be met by complete abandonment immediately of all measure taken.</p>
<p>Removing parking bays and just slapping yellow lines everywhere does not constitute an improvement in safety, it increases congestion and disrupts all forms of travel. This seems completely against the stated objectives but as local residents we do not expect anything less from this current council.</p>
<p>1, Freudian slip "We are introducing double yellow lines" not "proposing". 2, in my experience yellow lines do not deter motorist who have a sense of entitlement or have a disabled passenger</p>
<p>The road network has been made much worse by recent changes. Pollution (which you do not report) must have worsened with queues going into Herne Hill and queues in Dulwich Village going north to North Dulwich station. You have made the situation worse at great expense- what sort of a planning department do you have? Answer-an incompetent one and the rate payers are meeting the cost.</p>
<p>Not at all! Pedestrian don't look and it is dangerous to cycle</p>
<p>These measures are not needed and will do nothing to improve safety. All it will do is lose custom for the local shops and make your constituents feel even more repressed than they already do - thanks to your constant attempts to make Dulwich Village feel like a prison. Please leave the Village alone - you have already done enough damage.</p>
<p>You have increased congestion on all main routes in area.</p>
<p>We didn't want this so just leave as is or revert - no more changes please</p>
<p>Will restrict access to local retailers. In particular any new yellow line on Dulwich VillGe near Turney Rd junction.</p>
<p>There should not be yellow lines to allow customers to park freely to access the shops and businesses.</p>
<p>the introduction of double yellow lines on both turney and dulwich village will allow traffic to move faster than it does currently</p>
<p>and remove parking spots for many workers in the Village</p>
<p>which will put parking pressure on other roads like Boxall, Aysgarth etc</p>
<p>Your interventions have decreased the effective use of roads. I find it hard to see how, under your statutory obligations, closing the CA/DV junction is justifiable. It has caused untold congestion and disruption without any discernible improvement in safety. It has generated much more traffic pollution exactly where it should not be by routing large volumes of slow moving traffic past multiple schools. I see no reason to add even more yellow lines to the mess you have created. Increasing the number of yellow lines in the area of this junction will increase the number of cars circling looking for space to park in residential side roads. Either that or they will give up visiting and shopping in Dulwich all together</p>
<p>It's going to make it worse</p>
<p>I think there will be more ongoing congestion as fewer parking spaces, more people trying to get to the shops / schools and they will clog up eg Court Lane even more. Businesses are suffering from people not being able to park for 30 mins to use shops etc. Living here , trapped by when we can leave by car (there are times when we need to use a car despite using bikes, walking and public transport etc too), without having to drive up and around routes which lengthen our journey time and costs , it is horrendous !</p>
<p>If you opened the junction back up again then none of this would be needed. The roads are too narrow to make these extra yellow line areas effective.</p>
<p>Your interventions have progressively decreased the effective use of roads. I find it hard to see how, under your statutory obligations, closing the CA/DV junction is justifiable. It has caused untold congestion and disruption without any discernible improvement in safety. It has generated much more traffic pollution exactly where it should not be by routing large volumes of slow moving traffic past multiple schools. I see no reason to add even more yellow lines to the mess you have created. Increasing the number of yellow lines in the area of this junction will increase the number of cars circling looking for space to park in residential side roads. Either that or they will give up visiting and shopping in Dulwich all together. Well done!</p>
<p>The reduced parking spaces and extensive double yellow lining will significantly disrupt traffic.</p>

<p>These proposals will continue to increase congestion on surrounding roads. The LTN measures in Dulwich simply displace traffic to other roads and increases pollution. They are also very divisive within the community. In particular, they have impacted the travel time on buses. We should be focused on improving public transport so that people can leave their cars at home not introducing more measures which simply displace traffic.</p>
<p>this is unnecessary and will adversely affect businesses, most of which are independent. at a time where the economy is struggling and hospitality businesses are closing please do not do this!!</p>
<p>Children should feel safe to walk alone from school but if local muggings and crime continue it doesn't achieve the purpose.</p>
<p>As a resident who lives around the area and is familiar with the layout and traffic condition around Dulwich Village, my view is that this is completely unnecessary. The area does not suffer from persistent parking issues and the traffic in the area has little to do with people trying to use the currently unrestricted parking spaces in the location. There is ample space on the road for both traffic and cyclists travelling both directions and the pavements are fairly wide therefore benefit to cyclists and pedestrians would be minimal. In fact putting up additional signs and road markings for parking restrictions would spoil the character of the village which is primarily why people in the community love spending time in the village.</p>
<p>I believe the measures will increase congestion and make little difference to safety. There have been no reported safety issues to my knowledge apart from cyclists ignoring red traffic lights and behaving as if they have right of way over pedestrians and other traffic.</p>
<p>See comments above</p>
<p>The Council has not taken account of the clear majority of respondents in the original consultation who did not want this junction to be closed</p>
<p>Return the junction to its pre Covid layout and remove traffic restrictions. All previous consultations have shown residents are against these changes by a significant majority. Please follow the results of your own consultations. A further blizzard of double yellow lines will only weaken local businesses and seal the village off from local residents.</p>
<p>The Council has still not taken on board the clear majority of respondents to the original consultation who said that they did not want any of these measures</p>
<p>YOu are not minimising congestion bt creating it!</p>
<p>This has been a monumental failure and: The areas outside the closures and LTNs now suffer worse traffic congestion, air pollution and noise: High Traffic Neighborhoods. created by you. The junction closure was rejected by the community in the original consultation.</p>
<p>These measures will increase congestion and cause further disruption to traffic.</p>
<p>The Dulwich community gave an overwhelming NO to these proposed changes from the beginning and continue to do so. I feel sad that council seems to believe it 'knows better' what residents need, rather than listening to what they want. When will you listen to us?</p>
<p>There is no need to introduce double yellow lines in the village. The parking situation is fine as it is now. It will only result on pushing more cars to our street. Also if you make it difficult to park when there is no justification for it, there will be fewer people visiting Dulwich which is a shame. It would be nice for Dulwich to continue being vibrant and full of visitors over the weekend. I think you should not disrupt that.</p>
<p>The disruption already caused has harmed all but a privileged minority . Surrounding congestion is enhanced and visitors deterred</p>
<p>Any road narrowing, especially where it forces traffic to confront other means of traffic, ie cars and cycles, cycles and pedestrians automatically has the effect of slowing down the traffic and hence increasing congestion</p>
<p>The money from Southwark council tax payers has been lavished to no good effect on this junction from before COVID. The beneficiaries have been those living in already affluent, less polluted, less traffic congested areas as well as schools that only the very well off can afford to send their children to. Those who have lost out are the rest of us, the majority. When will our council and MPs represent our interests? Whatever benefits may be achieved in these limited areas are more than offset by worsening of congestion, pollution and thereby the health of the majority. Not what a Labour council is elected for.</p>
<p>You have shown you are completely uninterested in the problems of diverted traffic. Quite unethical.</p>
<p>Completely pointless. Seems to be all about making parking impossible and nothing to do with making the junction safer.</p>
<p>They don't address the bad job done thus far.</p>
<p>I am really astonished to see that Southwark have nothing better to do with their time an money than make an already privileged part of London even more privileged. Spend the money on people that need it. White privilege - totally unbelievable.</p>
<p>The council's interference with traffic flow has caused the congestion we now have . It is an impossible situation which is causing distress to families living on the roads to where traffic has been diverted to. These roads are now a health hazard for all in the area</p>
<p>Looks like they will make congestion worse</p>

The council has blatantly ignored public opinion on closing this junction and now seeks to gain approval by making erroneous unproven statements. This closure has not reduced traffic and has instead led to increased congestion and pollution from idling cars around Dulwich Village at certain times of the day. The community is disrupted and the council has failed to meet its "statutory requirements". Placing a few double lines at this junction is totally unnecessary and the effect will be ugly.
The council schemes are thinly-veiled rhetoric to facilitate self-serving hare brained schemes rather than well thought out and properly consulted.
Inadequate parking spaces and double yellow lines will kill off the remaining businesses. That's what the businesses themselves say. This plan discriminates against the elderly, who can't use phone apps to park their vehicles. Please remember that the closure of the Village junction was overwhelmingly rejected by local residents in the earlier consultation.
Far from minimising disruption/congestion, the proposals have the opposite effect - see East Dulwich Grove and Croxted Road. It seems that the Council has sacrificed the safety (including in respect of air pollution) of those roads for the benefit of others.
The Calton junction was never dangerous previously. I believe that the junction remains a hazard for pedestrians/wheelchair users, with e-bikes at vehicle speeds coming through, linked with human nature to cross when it looks clear, irrespective of the traffic lights. A pedestrian walking down the north side of Court Lane, for example, will not trouble to walk down to the pedestrian lights (you can see this in action now). There is a blind spot by the corner house. What steps are being taken to slow down cyclists/e-bikes coming down Calton?
Many cyclists ignore the traffic lights, especially to turn left into Dulwich Village/College Road. How will that be managed? As discussed above, a zebra crossing would be better.
The road closures have meant the flow of traffic is completely disrupted. There are bottlenecks through the village because of the extra traffic using East Dulwich Grove - it's been a complete disaster for people living in the vicinity.
This will only result in residents and visitors driving around for longer, trying to find other parking.
If anything these measures will encourage bicycles, motorbikes and cars to drive even faster through the village than they do at the moment and will decrease safety
Really stupid idea that reduces parking considerably and with it access to shops and other amenities, to their and our cost. A bad joke
Ridiculous. Causes angry drivers to circle around looking for spaces. Whilst there are schools here, there will be lots of car usage. With more double yellows there is less resident parking. Allow people to get driveways more easily
waste of money
no one wants this and very anti vehicle
Does the council want Dulwich Village to die as a destination?
"Streets for Economy"??...but now the council are saying they want to minimise the visitors to the area? Is it going to be CPZ soon....why not add that now - then you can really kill them off...
Over the last 15 years, southwark have consistently added more and more restrictions in this area, and traffic has got worse and worse. So, you are adding more and guess what, traffic will get worse. Not just here, but on 'sacrificial' roads. You need to just leave us in peace.
There is no issue with parking opposite the infant's - there are already double yellow lines keeping parking away from the junction and barriers outside the school with zigzag lines
This will make things worse and increase both traffic and pollution. It will also adversely affect the shopping centre
"Other road users" means motor vehicles, for which roads are primarily designed- not an afterthought. Putting in some DYLS are almost irrelevant to improving safety and minimising congestion and disruption. On the other hand, closing CA and CL at this junction is highly relevant and is ignoring your statutory Network Management Duty; these closures significantly increase congestion and disruption. If you really want to improve these matters -as is your duty - you should reopen the junction. When the closures were originally made, it was clear that no network traffic impact studies had been undertaken. That was ignoring your statutory duty. Before going ahead with this project you should make such studies and publish them. There may be a case for some of these DYLS but they should be kept to the minimum. With your stated aim of supporting local businesses you should be providing as much easy parking for visitors as possible.
congestion has never been worse and safety has been compromised with people frustrated and driving erratically - overtaking and speeding at every opportunity only to be stuck in more traffic.
This is perhaps the worst initiative of them all. Ticketing people even on holidays when schools are out of session.
Generates massive traffic backlogs in the morning due to funneling of traffic down one route
The double yellow line proposed outside [REDACTED] presents a serious problem for visitors and the owners of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] have a disabled mother who visits often and cannot walk more than a few paces

The elimination of parking spaces adds nothing to the safety of the junction
See 7. Congestion in boundary roads has been much worse since the closure of the Calton Avenue/Dulwich Village junction.
Pedestrian are at risk because ofg this!
It's rubbish, and the Council knows full well that a majority of us in the area did not want it. It has created a shambles for buses and traffic in neighbouring roads. OPEN THE JUNCTION!
The community rejected the original Permanent closure of the road on the. basis of terrible congestion being caused and the community was ignored.
I have only seen negative effects of what has been done thus far and think the new plan will make things even worse - please stop wasting money on these terrible plans and return Dulwich to what it used to be like. Benches and flowerpots don't make up for the disruption to traffic and increased queues on surrounding streets. A previous 'consulation' rejected the closure of the junction in the centre of Dulwich, but this appears to have been completely ignored.
You are removing a significant number of parking spaces by doing this. This will force cars onto side roads unnecessarily. This will reduce footfall in businesses. This will have a very negative impact as a consequence.
They are not necessary. Safety and congestion are not an issue. However, congestion has become more of an issue since the introduction of the LTN
The displaced cars will cause much greater inconvenience than any benefits
You have failed to make this junction safe for more than three and a half years. Safety has got substantially worse, especially for pedestrians, and disruption to emergency vehicles, buses and community health and social services has worsened substantially. Congestion and pollution on surrounding roads have also got substantially worse.
See previous comments: it is essential to avoid any further damage to the business of the locaps.l comments
They will create more disruption and more pollution in certain areas.
Please see previous comment, the design should accommodate all forms of transportation including cars
These schemes have completely ruined our community. The displaced traffic outside my home is extremely distressing and even more so because I feel completely ignored by my council.
Well done: you are making it even more difficult to access the local shops. How will thy survive?
We rejected the closure of this junction. Re open the road as it's made nothing better & everything worse
Traffic has been displaced onto other roads because of the closure of this junction. Bicycles are unregulated, often have poor lights or no lights, do not heed traffic lights and go very fast.
Stopping traffic completely and moving it to the south circular or East Dulwich Road is not stopping it it's re homing it at the cost of others.
Not at all because as always, issues will be displaced not eliminated. Trying to eradicate all vehicle traffic is a foolish endeavour and the implementation of increasingly draconian restrictions is unworthy in a free society.
There is a worse glow of traffic due to the Dulwich village closure and LTNs
These proposals will not improve safety or congestion but will create further bottlenecks and standing traffic. Southwark has shown no evidence to underpin these proposals and if it has any, it has failed to provide it for the consultation. The extent of double yellow lines proposed is not reasonable or needed. It is a masked anti-car agenda. Why not focus on the flow of traffic that includes the buses moving adequately. Many of us have asked for details on bus movement and flow, and for it to return to former levels - it has been impeded by the existing junciton closures.
Your current double yellow line restrictions on Court Lane are regularly breached, particularly near the park gates opposite Evelina Road. There are no penalties. Often the vehicles are official cars or vans with local authority logos. I was even told by one such driver that he was given dispensation by the authorities and advised to stop on the double yellow lines because he stopped briefly to deliver items. He did not think it was important that he obstructed the view of pedestrians, adult and children emerging that were emerging from the park, from the drivers of passing cyclists and cars! What makes you believe the controls at the village end of Court Lane will achieve your objective, without wardens and fines?
You have ignored local opinion and made living, working and using the area more difficult and less pleasant.
If you actually took your obligations seriously, you would reopen this junction.
There is zero need for double yellow lines. You are just creating more expense. How much more of tax payers money are you hoping to waste on this vanity project?!
Southwark has lost trust by the way this has been conducted. It ignored the majority view. And undoubtedly views like mine will be ignored. As someone who has cycled for years rather than use the car you would expect me to support this, but I expect honesty.
The recent changes have increased conegstion through Dulwich Village and the propsoed changes will not mitigate this.
People still drive their kids to school. Coaches still line and block traffic flowing - it's a travesty.
Restricting parking makes it even more difficult to access the shops.
The shops need an open road and plenty of free parking. Yellow lines will kill businesses.

<p>This is the funniest thing I've ever heard. The Council has made congestion so much worse through the whole of the Dulwich area and made life a misery for businesses. The introduction of more double yellow lines will make the area a ghost town. I have to admit I'm not sure why these consultations are sent out. As the consultation has ignored the majority of the community's wishes in all previous consultations.</p>
<p>The measures brought in with the junction closure combined with the poorly thought through location of the timed bus gates have caused immense disruption, congestion, pollution and danger on surrounding roads. Dulwich has become a very unattractive and dangerous area to live as a result. The roads are now very dangerous because of the immense congestion during the timed closures and certain streets have become very dangerous because of the lack of passing cars. For example the number of recent muggings which have taken place in Woodwarde Road.</p>
<p>I don't support the measures taken by the council - I do not believe the consultation has been honest or fair and the views of local residents have not been listened to. I feel local residents have been corralled and that facts have been manipulated by the council so as to be presented as it suits. I would have been happy to support changes but not in this way.</p>
<p>You are forcing the shop footfall down in the village, stop with this madness, listen to the people !</p>
<p>How do people park and go to the shops and other businesses?</p>
<p>They are unnecessary. You are killing off trade and access to achieve little</p>
<p>Closing roads to vehicles, only ADDS congestion. This has been proven since the road closures and the bus gate have been implemented.</p>
<p>what happened to the charm of conservation dulwich village. there are so many yellow lines everywhere, perhaps the rules should be reversed and no lines mean double yellow? you are changing the nature of Dulwich Village. I moved here from central London because there were no yellow lines, parking restrictions and signs.</p>
<p>While claiming to encourage local business, by making parking more and more difficult (more and more proposed DYs where not necessary) these measures achieve the opposite.</p>
<p>Cause more congestion, anger and frustration</p>
<p>Double yellow lines are never enforced - waste of time and adds to visual pollution.</p>
<p>The community rejected the closure of the junction in the original consultation, so what will ensure that this consultation is received and acted upon according to the local community's wishes?</p>
<p>Put our roads back the way they were. These measures were supposed to be temporary. The Consultation were ignored and you are dictating how we have to live our lives and you are restricting our rights to roam free. We all know climate change is a load of rubbish. Release the data on Lordship land and Goose Green. You will find a big increase in traffic and pollution caused by you the Council for your own ends.</p>
<p>Double yellow lines are not enforced - a waste of time and it will cause visual pollution.</p>
<p>as before</p>
<p>Reopen the road.</p>
<p>Yet more pointless changes. The measures proposed are not statutory - there is a statutory obligation to minimise congestion/disruption but the measures themselves are of the Council's own making. The measures taken by the Council to date have caused additional disruption and congestion</p>
<p>The Dulwich Village community rejected the closure of the junction in the original consultation</p>
<p>support speed restrictions but not road closures</p>
<p>Double yellows is not going to change traffic flows. Who thinks it would?</p>
<p>They increase congestion by displacement</p>
<p>Think it's going to slow cars even more.</p>
<p>The Council hasn't listened to the local community as it has ignored its stated opinion as expressed in the results of previous consultations</p>
<p>I do not agree with the closure of this junction. I have said so at every meeting you held in the past before covid, at every consultation, and am appalled that you have consistently ignored local people's opposition to your scheme.</p>
<p>Free parking spaces opposite school on Turney Road must be retained.</p>
<p>This is yet another set of traffic measures to cure problems created by a previous set of measures. The council is engaged on an endless cycle of change that has created - not reduced - disruption, congestion, pollution, division and disillusion. All at huge expense to funds that should have been spent on the real problems of disadvantaged people.</p>
<p>Minor Tweaks. The fundamental problems stem from the closure of Calton Avenue.</p>
<p>yes ridiculous what do you guys have against motorists and where are customers supposed to park? again just another excuse to raise more revenue in parking permits/fines .it will result in dulwich village becoming a no go zone for customers thanks a bunch.</p>
<p>Your measures to date, imposed without consultation using emergency legislation never intended for your purpose have merely dispersed traffic and attendant pollution into other already congested streets, added greatly to congestion and badly impacted on directly affected local residents</p>

There are already double yellows between Dekker & 1 Court Lane so I don't understand what you're proposing that's different??
You have maximised congestion and disruption so how will a few more signs and trees make any difference?
There is no need for this. Congestion has only been a problem since the introduction of the LTN
I really cannot see the benefits and think it is a huge expense of Southwarks money,
Please do not ignore the fact that the local community rejected the closure of the junction at Dulwich Village in the original consultation.
Traffic is sufficiently disrupted and constricted.
the road closures and limitations clearly are going against your statutory obligations
It has increased congestion and has totally disrupted what was a fairly decent traffic flow. What is more you have tried to apply statutory measures by overriding the local community in a very non statutory manner.
Easy access rather facilitating a turning circle for cars having to turn around due to road closures
Increase congestion in less wealthy surrounding areas. Areas where homes and residents are poorer and are directly situated up against the road. Homes without long spacious gardens with trees helping to clean their air. Homes where people cannot afford to not work if their children get sick from pollution. While Dulwich gets greener, poorer surrounding areas suffer. The traffic has to redirect somewhere.
Where? In the village? What about outside that tiny area
The original aim of this temporary closure was for COVID reasons then there became the LTN plan to protect pedestrians and cyclists travelling to and from schools The council ignored all consultation and permanently closed the junction. The roads that this traffic has been displaced to are either gridlocked and polluted or have become race tracks 24hrs a day. These are the very roads where thousands of pedestrians move through Dulwich to get to over seven schools. Make it a timed situation under the LTN in order to protect the school children.. The motor vehicle accidents on displaced roads (you never include the South Circular) are due to highly frustrated vehicle users not. I have lived here for over thirty years in various roads in Dulwich, it scares the life out of me every day watching the school run. I have personally witnessed seven accidents on EDGmany of those wont be in your statistics as Police weren't aware. It is a failed scheme and is destroying Dulwich area.
its going to make life even more disruptive for the local businesses and until cyclists can be forced to adhere to the designated 20mph that all other modes of road transport are restricted to its going to make it more dangerous than ever for pedestrians.
There are serious accidents with more than 5 overturned cars in the last quarter on Croxted Road. Crazy speeding and noise when the road is not fully blocked from all the way at Norwood road to South Croxted Road. Until this problem is not resolved all measures proposed here are going to wreck havoc
The community rejected the closure of the junction in the original consultation and this has been ignored.
People who have lived in Dulwich for many years know how vital the junction is for traversing Dulwich. This junction closure only displaces traffic causing unpleasant traffic jams elsewhere.
The suggested measures will cause more accidents and reduce traffic flow
Southwark's road schemes are punishing the many, to the distinct advantage of the very few.
An entry feature??? When we aren't allowed to enter Court Land at the junction! Before the junction was closed the double yellow lines weren't extended as far as they are now, why extend them when the junction is closed? This is a huge inconvenience for older residents who need to park at the bottom of Court Lane when they aren't able to walk to the Village. I often need to go to the Pharmacy, for example, to collect prescriptions and being able to park at the bottom of Court Lane is vital for me. [REDACTED]
Why on earth??? You are great at fulfilling commitments to the few whilst roundly ignoring the increased risk, congestion and disruption elsewhere.
The closure of the junction is the source of the congestion and traffic disruption. Reopen the junction and this just goes away.
as mentioned above, the disabled bays in the deadend street sections are horribly dangerous - it will cost lives!!
For the reasons discussed above the closed junction should be reopened: the continuing closure has detrimental impacts including increased congestion and more dangerous roads in many parts of our community.
The removal of so many more parking spaces is excessive and unnecessary - the Council has already removed lots in the earlier phases. The removal of these extra spaces will negatively impact local shop/ cafe trade and add stress for who cannot find parking near their homes, their children's schools and other amenities. This impact will be felt most by those with young children and the elderly.
The removal of further parking spaces appears to be a cynical attempt by Southwark to try and force through a CPZ which destroys residents trust in the Council (and the councillors).
Will displace more cars of workers who must drive to the area daily ie teachers and constrict residents ability to park at all
Do not do this.

Comments for 2

We don't currently have an issue with cars parking in these locations and therefore affecting traffic flow. The traffic flow issues are from a single carriage way, a bike lane at red post hill and the closure of the Calton Avenue junction in the first place.
noone parks there anyway
Not necessary unless parked vehicles impedes the flow of car traffic - say perhaps Turney Road. Otherwise parked vehicles no hazard and reduces parking which hurts shops and residents.
Cars are not the issue here. It's the cyclists that make the area unsafe by expecting pedestrians to move out of the way regardless of whether they have a green light or not. How will double yellow lines improve what is not a car issue.
With single lane traffic in both directions along Dulwich Village, there is space to also allow parking. Parking along the road does not currently obstruct the flow of traffic.
No idea - the map doesn't load
Double yellow lines do not necessarily increase traffic flow.
I am afraid you are cutting out all casual shoppers to the Dulwich Village specialist shops. It has already impacted during the closed LTN periods. The double yellow lines are good for safety and sight lines, but very bad as a welcoming shopping area to those coming from further afield. Dulwich Village (the road) is already blighted by double yellows and this plus all the signage, is making this look very unwelcoming.
Calton Avenue-Rather than being central the entry feature should close the incoming carriageway making it obvious to vehicles coming down Calton Avenue that the road is closed and to slow down cyclists before they reach the 'Square'. The feature should be moved 5M away from the Gilkes Cres junction to provide turning space in what is a dead end. Court Lane-Entry feature should close the incoming carriageway making it obvious to motor vehicle coming down Court Ln that the road is closed and to slow down cyclists before they reach the 'Square'. Turney Road-The pavement in front of DVIS should be widen further to accommodate the number of pedestrians particularly at school times. Dulwich Village-The pedestrian crossing to the north of the junction should be left where it is.
There are already enough restrictions for the sake of the schools
You are removing parking bays, this is a bad bad idea!!!
Greater research and observation needs to be carried out regarding impacts.
See previous comments pertinent to this question especially Q1 Encouraging people to congregate by a busy thoroughfare and expecting that children will not see the paved thoroughfare as a play/ cycling area stepping out in front of cyclists seems counterintuitive
The placement of the bike racks in court lane/ Calton Avenue do not match the stated objective of having a turning circle. Much better to have this inside the narrowing and the turning circle outside this
Cyclist exit from Calton avenue into Turney Road will remain as unsafe/ likely to promote congestion as it has been for the last 3 years unless phasing of the lights into Turney road match the phasing of the cyclists from Calton Avenue such that it does not cause them to stop as soon they have set off
Dulwich is blessed with many parks with playgrounds for play and cycling
They won't be enforced so would assume they will be irrelevant.
The whole concept appears largely to be done for revenue generation and not for the stated aims. I despair being an elderly pedestrian that my life in Dulwich is becoming less safe and more difficult to get to my Dr Dentist etc
I am not convinced these are required and the danger is that you will turn Dulwich Village, with all its eccentric charm, into just another urban landscape.
"...statutory measures..." - Jesus this is a misleading statement, there is no statutory requirement to close roads and push concession to more heavily populated areas, I live on Lordship lane with my kids and I have seen the considerable increase in congestion on my street because of this change, more kids including mine are impacted by this than in the village
The times restrictions are fine, the improvements to the junction is just the fix the complete mess you left with the last lot of updates which left it dangerous for both cyclists and pedestrians.
The major disruption and congestin is caused by other measure introduced, such as the timed entry to certain roads
Double yellow lines are not required at the south side of the junction coming into Dulwich Village. Parking in these locations does not impede flow through the junction and does not pose a problem. This is simply a way to minimise parking availability within the village, creating perceived parking issues to further your desire for a CPZ.
I am not sure they will make any difference
Yet another proposal that will simply displace traffic and move it elsewhere.

These measures just move the congestion elsewhere to other local roads, and frustrate, intimidate and prejudice against those disabled people who HAVE to use their cars or rely totally on vehicular transport. And local residents who want more easily to access their homes in Court Lane, and Woodwarde Road.
We are in a climate emergency. More measures to stop driving have to be taken. The roads are great when the private schools are on holiday - I want far more action to make driving harder in dulwich because we are suffering from enormous numbers of drivers coming from miles around to the private schools. I would like to see people driving to these schools charged a local congestion charge for doing so. The air quality is so awful and I am sick of our children suffering because people drive everywhere
I live in Southwark, but I do NOT live in Dulwich. I live in Gipsy Hill and Crystal Palace part of Southwark.
No need for traffic lights. A Tiger crossing will suit more people and make the space far safer and people friendlier. More depaving in Court lane as you get closer to the square. Calton Avenue to have a far bigger speed reducing measure - a more extreme chicane at least. Cyclists come down the hill at speed and head across the square or alongside the square. It is essential to get them to walking pace before they get close to the seating areas.
These measures are unlikely to make any significant difference. They are unsightly and unnecessary.
Too many bicycles which have disregard for pedestrians
Traffic and queuing has increased along Dulwich Village since the introduction of the elements of the LTN so with the exception of the restricted hours waiting / polluting traffic has increased and congestion has increased and these measures promise little in reality to reduce this. Cyclists continue to use the pavements inspire of the extensive and costly measures put in place by the Council & I see no likelihood of this being changed by these measures.
The length of DYs should be increased and be backed up with peak hour loading bans.
The echelon parking should be replaced by parallel parking, otherwise people cycling cannot safely pass, especially at peak times.
Traffic flow through the village is restricted by congestion for traffic leaving the village towards Red post hill. I don't see any change.
I genially don't believe the cycle junction in the square to be safe as cycling down Turney Road being you around a blind bend at two pedestrian crossing points (exactly as present). It is unpleasant to cross as a pedestrian, especially with a child or dog as you cannot see cyclists approaching at speed. It is also unpleasant to cycle through as you are inserted into two crossing points without any prior sight lines of the crossing points.
Congestion on Dulwich Village and neighbouring roads has increased
Just pushing the problems and congestion further out to surrounding residential roads.
Cars still drive very fast and there are always a lot of queues and / or slow moving cars polluting the air as children walk to school
Let's hope that you don't have more than two disabled drivers at anyone time.
Measures to improve the Village push the problem further up the roads like Court Lane, already happening. Not all children are walked to school many brought in cars. My situation as a car driver for someone with currently limited mobility, but not permanent so does not qualify for blue badge, cannot use disability parking. Cannot get near to shops as need to repark after person has got out of the car.
I disagree with new yellow lines as these will put pressure on parking for residents of these houses in Court lane, Calton Ave- when new houses are just being completed on Calton Ave, only metres away from Dulwich Village closed junction. I agree with new disabled bays and outdoor seating area on Calton Avenue

Comments for 3 (partly)

I think double yellow should not be so long that it again displaces parked cars to other roads . Dulwich village can have some areas as double yellow but not all of it . Not everyone can walk to local food joints / cafe / grocery . If someone wishes to bring elderly / infants , you can expect them to walk all the way . Resident should feel cared for not frustrated by newer measures every now and then . There is enough rear garden space in each house to enjoy outdoor seating and socialise . Not everything has to be made into a tourist walking zone . So double yellow needs to be sensible thought over as people will end up parking their cars and congesting other streets. Maybe weekends and term breaks these yellow lines should be open for parking .
you are displacing the vehicles not removing them. there is no access for deliveries, no access for disabled, no public transport provision (as usual) and all you will do is displace parked cars from a shopping area to a residential area. wand then you will claim there is an issue and that we need a cpz. [REDACTED]
The existing double lines at the bottom of Court Lane between 1c and Dekker are sufficient and work well at the moment. Extra are not needed.

I can't see if double yellows are being proposed throughout the village eg where Gails and other local businesses are but if so I don't agree with those due to the impact on businesses. Those businesses don't benefit from the pedestrianisation of Dulwich square and rely on passing traffic. The road is also very wide and closed at certain times of the day so I feel safe riding my bike along there as things are
You're going to face a little pressure to remove the closure of Gilkes Crescent once the housing development is completed and in my view should resist that. I think that pedestrian crossings should be kept at a slight remove from road junctions where possible. Some of the outdoor seating areas should not be solely for the use of customers of local businesses such as cafes.
it will not be helpful to stop parking in the main stretch of dulwich village near to the dulwich village shops as many, including me sometimes, while driving will want to stop there briefly to pick up shopping
See previous comments on traffic displacement
These seem sensible measures but could have been brought in without the wrong-headed LTNs
They should improve safety but will possibly lead to an increase in disruption and congestion.
The Dulwich Village double yellow lines will cut down even further the ability to stop and park in to use the shops and restaurants. Can't see this will help the local retailers at all, and adding the cycle lane here would seem unnecessary (and would probably add to the congestion).
All very welcome but will need enforcement or will be ignored by parents continuing to think parkruns dangerously on double yellow lines during school run is something they can get away with...
Removing parking/drop-off capacity must not have a knock-on effect.
The creation of bus gates along Turney Road and the northbound section of Burbage Road have resulted in cars parking/idling at the Turney Road/Burbage Road crossroads in the lead up to the restricted period ceasing, often on double yellow lines. Cars will also speed along Turney Road to beat the restrictions. This activity is negatively impacting on the aim to make journeys safer. I have three young children who cycle to school with an adult, and it is a concern to me.
There are also plenty of instances of parents/carers parking on the unrestricted section of Turney Road to then continue their journey to a local school. Again, the imposition of bus gates (which I am not against per se) have merely shifted the concentration issues to another area rather than changing behaviours.
The bike lane design outside Turney School is ill conceived and makes that area more dangerous... The bike lane is not the issue the location of the lane is ill conceived as you get to the bottom of Rosendale Road with the lane on one side...
Still very difficult to approach Turney road entrance to Francis building at DVIS on bikes - no dropped curb/obvious stopping place opposite entrance
Parents are still inconsiderate and parking where they shouldn't. Same for delivery vans. It will just displace them to other neighbouring roads
There should be double yellow lines going further up Court Lane to restrict parking on the hill.
Not 100% sure that closing off this road improves the quality of air for those who live where the traffic has now been forced to go, especially past all the schools in the area that now have more traffic queueing by them and school entry and exit times
Unfortunately the respect drivers have for double yellow lines seems non-existent. So my answer is not a reflection on the efforts of the council
There should be double yellows at all locations throughout this area and crucially there needs to be enforcement through cameras or by wardens. Various delivery vans already illegally use the space at the junction of Calton/Dulwich Village and this needs to stop.
Yes. Privileged corner for privileged minority. Drivers just have a longer route around - the problems still exist. Monies should be given to other communities not here where life is already rosey in the Village with the park.
These statutory measures will likely improve safety and reduce congestion but they will likely increase disruption
Not sure it's really doing anything to reduce the traffic - only improved buses will do that
I do not understand the phrase entry feature and turning space. Does this mean that vehicles can use the double yellow line area to do a u turn? I have already commented that the cars backing out from Gilkes Crescent are a danger to cyclists and pedestrians.
I am not very supportive of attempts to minimise the congestion created by car use - the smoother traffic flows the more traffic uses the space. I think anything to discourage car use (including congestion) is positive, considering the urgent need to reduce emissions.

<p>You have a network management duty which between Lambeth and yourselves you give no due regard to the Act states the term "traffic" includes pedestrians. The duty requires the LTA to consider the movement of all road users: pedestrians and cyclists, as well as motorised vehicles – whether engaged in the transport of people or goods with an overall aim of the "expeditious movement of traffic" implies a network that is working efficiently without unnecessary delay to those travelling on it. Road users do not view the road network as divided between local authorities and use as a whole, irrespective of who is responsible. Not only do you need to consider your network, but the effects on others to prevent moving the problem elsewhere, or causing problems across administrative boundaries. But more positively, it is to achieve the best operation of the network as a whole, especially in conurbations where networks of adjacent authorities can be highly inter-related.</p>
<p>Safer for cyclists</p>
<p>The area on Court Lane by A3 will be an incentive for illegal parking, even with DYs with double blips. Cars will pull up there to turn and drop. Instead the pavement on the west side of Court Lane by A3 should be built out to the north of the cycle stands, leaving the road only for access to the properties. The same on the east side by C1 on Court Lane- the pavement should be built out to disincentivise parking here. This should be a single lane with access only to the properties.</p> <p>On Calton, the same problem: vehicles will get stuck accessing the loading bay and do 3point turns across the cycle lane. Creating danger for cyclists and pedestrians. Instead, pavements should be built out on the south side of Calton to make it impossible to park there, and then move the buildout/tree on north side to next to the cycle storage. That way vehicles could reverse out of the loading bay and turn at the junction with Gilkes, without endangering cyclists.</p>
<p>Who can say until it is tried out? In fact your heading suggests that this decision has already been made. Certainly the parking restrictions, including yellow lines, in residential roads beyond the Village have created more congestion and more expense for residence, but these views appear never to have been taken into account.</p>
<p>This road seems too wide for a 20mph street and will encourage speeding. Can it be narrowed?</p>
<p>Blocking off the end of Calton Avenue is going to cause congestion. [REDACTED] the lack of a right turn from the village into Calton Avenue means you are forced to make a longer journey, meaning more pollution. That said, I don't care personally. I cycle as often as I can in London, as it makes more sense and most of us don't need to be driving cars about the place. So any measures that deter people from driving are good. The only concern would be the additional pollution and congestion created by the traffic measures.</p>
<p>For children's safety is justifiable!</p>
<p>As a daily user of this junction the plans don't deal with the 3 biggest safety risks:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Vehicles doing awkward 5 point turns at Gilkes Cresc/Calton Ave, endangering cyclists & children. The plans appear to make it MORE dangerous by leaving less space for turning vehicles? Clearer signage/layout needed at Woodward/Calton junction to stop cars driving down. But more thinking needed. 2. Vehicles still drive through the camera gate. I also witnessed a police chase where the car narrowly missed children playing! Can we erect visual barriers in the middle of the cycle path/road - something flexible that emergency vehicles can drive over before they pop back up? Or electronic bollards that lower? Without this, we WILL see pedestrian & cyclist injuries. 3. We need speed bumps for cyclists, & a visual / black & white pedestrian crossing over the cycleway at the point most people cross - from the eastern pavement at the end of Calton, over to the cafe/hairdresser.
<p>Even more restrictions on people visiting Dulwich to the detriment of local businesses</p>
<p>ditto</p>
<p>Cars still seem to stop on double yellows outside the schools for drop off ! There should be more obvious ways of penalising these people</p>
<p>In some areas but displaced traffic will cause problems in other areas. Speeding bikes are also a problem.</p>
<p>Providing turning space for cars will encourage cars to use this space . Encouraging this increases road danger. This is not safe space for pedestrians and cyclists. Policy aim is to reduce motor vehicle journeys.</p>
<p>Please put double yellow kerb pips also to prevent cars waiting on double yellow lines.</p>
<p>I suspect there will be a knock on effect to push congestion elsewhere. Traffic flow would be improve by removing cycle barriers and having a box ahead of the cars to allow them to wait at a junction. Noting there must be enough clearing space for turning of large and emergency vehicles. Are the double yellow lines next to burial ground in Dulwich village not a bus stop in which case that doesn't work. When a bus is parked traffic needs to pass otherwise the junction is not safe which again means the cycle barrier does not work.</p>
<p>My previous comment. There is still too much traffic on the main Dulwich Village road very close to the primary school. Children need to be protected from traffic noise and air pollution.</p>
<p>Will they be inforced? due to lack of loading bays vehicles often block the junction or the pavement some lines wont change that unless there is enforcement OR A LOADING BAY</p>
<p>Please disincentive car use in Dulwich and on Red Post Hill. The roads are regularly rammed and polluted.</p>

I'd be in favour of going further and introducing permitting on the roads to reduce congestion by people using Calton Avenue and other neighbouring roads as a car park.
It may improve safety, the question to ask is, is it unsafe currently? Your actions have consequences elsewhere. Are you making it safer when it is already safe enough, yet increase parking problems and have a negative effect on local residents and businesses.
The shops need parking spaces
You need to police and penalise parents who stop on the lines next to DVI and the Hamlet school. The opposite side of the road to DVI on Turney has valuable parking for residents and teachers and do not pose danger. The ridiculous aspect of this is parental behaviour on the side of the school. Police it properly and then it will improve safety.
I have no comment on the rest because it is part of your policy of denying access vis Calton Avenue into the village. I have mentioned it throughout the questionnaire that you are penalising the overall community by not facilitating timed access via this junction. I don't feel heard.
I don't object to the proposed double yellow lines in themselves. I am concerned about possible knock-on displacement of parking and through motor traffic from Dulwich Village into Burbage Road. Has the Council got evidence to model these impacts? There is no point in just shifting the existing problems from the Dulwich village centre into our residential road.
Changing the pedestrian crossing appears odd since the highest volume of pedestrian footfall is parents dropping off children at the infant and middle schools. I note that you do not identify the entrance to either school on the diagram despite these being the most significant features of this location. Additional planting around area C2 is also unnecessary and a barrier to effective pedestrian and cycle movement (note that cyclists parked around location A3 are likely to want to enter the road here and not be blocked by planting). Changes to the parking arrangements on Dulwich Village south of the junction also seem unnecessary and likely to be worse not better. The segregated cycle lane at A2 prevents two lanes of traffic with the left lane turning left into Turney Road. A3 does not represent a good location for cycle parking as this location has low natural surveillance and so would be ripe for thieves to break cycle locks with few passersby and no overlooking from houses.
There should be more parking restrictions or yellow line restrictions Village Way. especially at school drop off/pickup times. It is dangerous cycling through Village Way at these times. Large vehicles opening doors into traffic, cars crossing the opposite lanes in front of cycles to secure parking pots. Village Way ought to be a no parking zone during these times.
How will you 'police' your measures to ensure safety and minimise congestion and disruption?
Is there any parking provision for residents of houses on Dulwich Village, Court Lane etc affected by the double yellow lines?
Visuals still show parked cars on Dulwich Village, but cycle lanes on plan.
I'm sure you'll have a very peaceful walk to school. Unlike our children in SE24
As before may help for the roads you sited but worsens congestion in other areas as traffic is displaced
They are bottle necks at each end of the Village.
The double yellow lines on Turney Toad and Dulwich Village are understandable but seem excessive on Court Lane and Calton Avenue. It would be more useful to have parking to support people using the shops. Hardly anyone uses those areas for turning.

Comments for 4

The number of cars driving through the square illegally seems to have diminished to my eye so it's safer for pedestrians. It's great to slow the cyclists down, they can be a menace speeding through.
I hope so. Will need to see it in action especially at school drop off and pick up times when the most activity occurs
Question School zone markings - they suggest could legally park here outside school hours. Both sides of Turney Road need to be double yellow with 'no loading' pips.
I think the yellow lines extend too far along Dulwich Village to the south of the junction - I'd like to see some ability to continue to park on Dulwich Village retained for short stops to visit the shops.
Restrictions need to be enforced and be regularly seen to be being enforced
Your original proposal was a safer and built on the success of the reduction of traffic of the traffic restrictions on Calton in creating a cycling corridor to London.
Is there significant congestion on the footway of Turney road? Removing the road space will mean cyclists have to mix with cars closer to the junction which is less safe.
No comments. In complete agreement with the proposals.

Will never get rid of congestion - so main issue is about making things safer for more vulnerable people (pedestrians and cyclists)
I support access only for emergency vehicles only. Blue badge system is
1. Abused
2. Once people are in a car, they do not need preferential shorter routes
People will still drive their children to school - will just park in other roads!
I think the proposal is helpful, but it's not clear why there are loading bays on Calton avenue and there are no loading bays on Court lane. Houses at the beginning of Court lane are singled out and that should be mitigated.
Support the double yellow lines but there's much more still to be done to make this area safe and inviting for walkers and cyclists.
remove echelon parking and make parallel - will have big safety impact
I would like to see more limits placed on private car use. Deliveries and trade all fine, but fewer PVs please.
Remains to be seen by how much it lowers congestion but seems to be a move in the right direction
Please can all the DY lines have blips on them so no stopping there can be enforced?
Pips should be introduced to stop loading/unloading
Ensure all traffic lights provide an advance green for cyclists
It's difficult to say what the effects will be in the wider area.
Clean air, safety and active travel should be the priorities. Private motor vehicles in London need to be phased out.
Slower traffic is the right direction and fewer cars. I read that Austria city plans with the goal and question: "is this best for children?" Great way to plan in my opinion.
Great! Major issue with cars stopping on Court Lane to let kids out to go to school then doing 3 point turns right into the path of cyclists
Gateways very welcome
I would still prefer to see more restrictions more motor vehicles than we currently have, as part of the wider picture. Burbage, although not 'busy' is still used as a cut through
I believe that the echelon parking outside the shops in Dulwich Village needs to be replaced with standard parallel bays. It is currently dangerous for cyclists.
Traffic Enforcement needs to be outside the Dulwich Village Infant School at drop-off and collection times. Some parents park their cars on the double yellow lines, zig-zag lines and the bus stop causing congestion and an unsafe route for children on bikes.
Good idea
More double yellow lines and more CPZs please.
The yellow lines at the junction of Woodwarde rd and Calton Av could be removed to create more parking space. This would show you have listened to motorists and it would still be possible for people to drive to the village, if they have big parcels to post for example.
Enforcement should be also implemented.
Only that the gateways are an excellent idea
a right hand turn for cyclists coming along Dulwich Village from the South would be good, lots of cyclists use Calton to connect the Greenway route over Denmark Hill to the College Road Hill so enabling this to be better used by them would help them at the minute it seems there is an over prioritisation of the cars in turning right when coming from the north into Turney Road. This needs addressing if it is to protect cyclists
The dangerous echelon parking on Dulwich Village should be replaced with standard parallel bays. The echelon parking is a nightmare - very dangerous especially for kids cycling with big SUV vehicles reversing out into the road with poor visibility. Please address this ASAP.
Make more clear where the bike lanes or compared to pavement - kids get this wrong now and the bike lanes are same colour as pavement here, bikes come down here far too quickly already and need to slow down for this area as they come down Calton
Need to slow cyclists down as downhill lead into the square where can pick up speed
Widened footpath outside the DVIS Francis building on Turney Road is a positive idea. Not clear whether parallel parking spaces on Turney Road that appear to have been removed are to be offset with spaces elsewhere.
These proposals look sensible. However, they will need to be monitored after implementation and adjusted as required in the light of experience to achieve objectives.
Please include a forward signal light for cyclists.

We still need to address traffic from private schools, which is a major contributor to congestion and air pollution, particularly when children at local state schools are walking and cycling to school.
Ensure the cycleways do not become free flowing such that more pedestrians are put at risk
You do not have an obligation to *minimise* congestion, which suggests priority over other policy objectives. The traffic management act requires you to manage your roads with "a view to achieving [the expeditious movement of traffic] so far as may be reasonably practicable having regard to their other obligations, policies and objectives".
In my opinion the changes comply with your duty as they consider traffic flow while having regard for other objectives. Reducing numbers of visitor car parking on Dulwich Village could help go further as they reduce the number of car trips to the area
I don't like that the pinch points along court and Carlton are referred to above as 'turning places'. At present, these areas are a sign isn't risk to cyclists as drivers anxiously maneuver their vehicles to make tricky 3 pt turns. I would like there to be a stronger emphasis that these are areas for those who choose active travel.
Reduced parking will make cycling safer. Please consider changing the dangerous echelon parking that causes people to reverse into oncoming traffic and not see cyclists.
An advance green on the traffic lights for cyclists would be helpful to keep all road users safe.
Slow down the cyclists to increase safety
Please improve the timing of the traffic lights. At times of very low traffic cyclists are still kept waiting for sometime after triggering the sensors. Why do the lights not change sooner if there is little or no vehicle traffic?
Add pips to stop loading. Ensure cyclists have advance green.
Making it safer (and more pleasant) for families to walk and cycle to school will drastically reduce the amount of vehicle traffic through Dulwich Village, making the area safer and healthier for all. Since the LTNs were put in by Southwark and Lambeth, I stopped driving the school run and my daughter could cycle to school safely. So we are one less car causing traffic, air pollution and congestion!
I support introducing double yellow lines restrictions. I would suggest that all parking between Calton Avenue and Dekker Road on Court Lane is removed, and that motor traffic is excluded from using that stretch.
The echelon parking is a hazard for all road users that needs to be removed.
As long as cyclists are slowed down sufficiently so the they are not speeding through the junction. This may require cobble stones or rumble strips to make riding too quickly uncomfortable.
- Turney Rd yellow zig zags should be replaced by DYs with no loading pips to restrict parking at all times. - DYs shown on plan before the Turney Rd cycle lane need loading pips. - Add disabled bay on Turney Rd for families accessing DVIS Francis building. - No loading pips should also be added to the DYs on Gilkes Crescent to stop this road becoming a school drop-off zone for drivers.
Double yellow lines shall improve safety if enforced. Please add "no loading" where this is needed to deter / prevent dangerous parking, particularly at school drop off and pick up to enable safe walking / cycling / scooting to school.

Comments for 5 (completely)

It was super dangerous for children cycling to turn right into Calton Ave from Dulwich Village. This fixes it.
East Dulwich /Dulwich village junction improvements will help a lot.
great job
This becomes a walking destination, it will encourage people out of their cars.
much needed.
Rising bollards that can be operated by any emergency vehicle would prevent drivers accessing the square. I'm concerned that the plan will not make the junction safe.
Makes sense to keep the areas around the square clear.
Double yellow lines around all junctions are an efficient safety feature.
Cars should not be parked in these areas.
Improves safety for pedestrians. Traffic will be worse, but over time people will find other modes of transport.
Parking restrictions at junctions is a must and has my vote. Much safer for cyclists and pedestrians
The best thing Southwark can do to improve safety is to reduce car useage, which the Council has taken a lead on
I think it's the best plan, given the fact people still want to use their cars

It just needs to be enforced properly as people will end up parking there.
Yes, please introduce
Let's encourage minimal use of cars.
Please consider changing yellow zig zags around schools to double yellow lines with no loading pips. Otherwise this is free unrestricted parking outside of the school drop off / pick up times.
Double yellow lines generally all need no loading pips, otherwise drivers park for short time to do the school drop off and enforcement officers can't issue PCN.
Please add no loading pips to all of the new double yellow lines, otherwise drivers will stop on them to do the school drop off and CEOs can't issue PCNs.
Consider changing the yellow zig zags outside schools to double yellow lines (with no loading pips) to deter driving / parking all day.
Fewer private motor cars overall would clearly be the best thing to improve everyones journey times as well as better air quality for all.
....and should go further by introducing E-cargo bike parking spaces.... and perhaps introducing an E-cargo bike hire scheme for businesses and residents
I see here the turning space has been designed in on Carlton Avenue, which is neat.
Really need the double yellows in there and for them to be enforced, as with my previous comment the post office van and chemist vans regularly just park on village way just by the traffic lights and the square causing a hazard to people using the crossing.
Minimising traffic disruption is not the aim. We must de prioritise cars and drivers in favour of pedestrians children cyclists and clean air.
Traffic before at that junction was awful - clogged, barely moving.
Please put in PARALLEL parking outside the shops - current situation with diagonal echelon spaces is very dangerous with so many cyclists and lots of SUV's parking there. I have witnessed near misses when vehicles reverse out.
Please make the parking outside the shops safer. Cars reverse into the road and it is dangerous.
Need co trolled parking at foot of court lane where the DYLs end.
It would be good to put a raised pedestrian crossing across the end of Gilkes Cres where it meets Calton Ave.
It would be good to take this opportunity to change the echelon parking. As it is it is dangerous as cars reverse out into the traffic flow. Either make it normal parallel parking or amend the angle to the other direction so cars reverse in. Also additional loading bay at the southern end of the parking would be good.
The loading bay in Calton Ave would be better just in Gilkes. Delivery vans turning in this restricted section of Calton would be difficult.
Parking makes it more difficult to safely walk and cycle. These are important and necessary measures.
I support all double yellow line restrictions

31-Jan-24