

	Grounds for Objections	Officer's response
<p>1 - Wholly Object</p>	<p>I live at [REDACTED] and this pocket park, will stop any parking access outside our house. Whilst we don't have a car, we rely on deliveries as my husband is disabled and does receive hospital transport which needs to park as close as possible. I am puzzled why it is healthy to have a pocket park opposite an underground garage. This garage at Lorrimore Square has vehicles going in and out emitting a lot of emissions due to the slow driving. Since the road closures Chapter Road does have regularly motorbikes travelling through the barriers which will presumably will continue regardless of pocket park. The point is that the pollution from the vehicles is not healthy for anyone especially young children.</p> <p>In spite of low air emissions this is an important point. I know that the dog area which is very popular will be next to the pocket park and this could be a problem for some people in their enjoyment of the park. The other point is where will vehicles turn round when they leave Chapter road as it is narrow at 24 with so many parked cars.</p> <p>There is no benefit to this pocket park and other places such as the corner of Chapter road and Manor Place which could extend Pasley Park in the north rather than west part.</p> <p>Please do find better uses of the money that has been donated in good faith.</p>	<p>Hospital transport vehicles will still be able to collect and deliveries still be made /to this address.</p> <p>Double yellow lines at the end of the pocket park will allow stopping for loading/unloading and to pick up passengers.</p> <p>A meeting held with respondent on site at Chapter Road to discuss concerns and confirm that hospital transport will be able to pick up from outside neighbouring property.</p> <p>Vehicle movements and emissions have been reduced with the introduction of the traffic filter on Chapter Road.</p> <p>The proposals are fully aligned with Council policy and the objectives in the Streets for People strategy to create safer streets. They are funded from budgets which are ring-fenced for street improvements.</p>
<p>2 - Wholly Object</p>	<p>Environmentally unfriendly. Risk to pedestrians especially Children and the elderly. There is already a park next to this proposal. No access for emergency vehicles to properties 26 and 28 Chapter Road. Also vehicle access is required for 26 Chapter Road - this was specified to your project manager at the time.</p> <p>I have experienced cyclists speeding down chapter road and this would be detrimental to pedestrians. The proposed pocket park in chapter road is badly situated next to a dog area in the park and may cause a risk to Children playing in the area.</p> <p>Environmental hazard. Speeding cyclists - risk of accidents with to children and elderly Vehicle access required for 26 Chapter Road. Emergency access required Badly situated next to dog compound - this could Entice entice aggressive animals towards children. There is a park next door available to the community</p>	<p>Full vehicle access is maintained for No. 26 Chapter Rd. Emergency service vehicles will still be able to access No. 26 and No 28 Chapter Rd.</p> <p>The potential issue of speed of people using bikes through the closure is specifically addressed by the formalisation and segregation of the cycle path and the inclusion of bollards and ramps at each end to slow people down at the approaches.</p> <p>The dog exercise area within Pasley Park is separated from the highway by a fence and does not form any further hazard to pedestrians on the highway than to users of the park in general.</p>

<p>3 - Wholly Object</p>	<p>Wholly object to the Chapter Road pocket park proposal on the following grounds:</p> <p>1) Children's health &amp; safety Encouraging a children's play area alongside a cycle lane, used also by regular moped fast food delivery vehicles defies all logic. Fumes from cars and vans visiting Lorrimore garages. Children's play area alongside dog pen. Plenty of scope for bitten little fingers. Pasley Park experienced a serious XL bully attack on park user summer 2023. There is a risk of placing a children's play zone alongside the open fencing of the dog area on Chapter Road.</p> <p>As Chapter Road has been closed by LTN barriers, the regular commercial traffic that still attempts to use the route by mistake would have to reverse outside the park gates and significantly alongside the proposed children's play zone. Crazy idea - but probably looks good on paper.</p> <p>2) Environmental Environmental impact of above traffic activities outside the Chapter Road entrance does support Southwark's cleaner greener initiatives. Higher carbon monoxide emissions impacting park users at entry point.</p> <p>3) Access issues to No 26-28 Chapter Road Challenging access conditions for residents of above address. One resident has a disability and requires regular ambulance pick up/transfer for treatment. The proposal will make life extremely difficult for a Southwark resident.</p> <p>So wholly object. Proposal is not logical and instead creates significant health and safety, environmental and traffic challenges.</p> <p>Spend your money Southwark on improving the children's play ground that's actually in Pasley Park!</p>	<p>Full vehicle access is maintained for No. 26 Chapter Rd. Hospital transport vehicles will still be able to collect from No 28 Chapter Rd. Double yellow lines at the end of the pocket park will allow stopping for loading/unloading and to pick up passengers.</p> <p>A meeting held with respondent to discuss concerns and confirm that vehicle access is maintained for No. 26 Chapter Rd.</p> <p>As noted above (No.2) the dog area within Pasley Park is separated from the highway by a fence. The proposed play area is also set back from the park boundary by the existing footway. The issue of hazard from dogs in the park is being addressed by Parks management team.</p> <p>Vehicle movements and emissions have been reduced with the introduction of the traffic filter on Chapter Road.</p> <p>The proposals are fully aligned with Council policy and the objectives in the Streets for People strategy to create safer streets. They are funded from budgets which are ring-fenced for street improvements.</p>
--------------------------	---	--

<p>4 - Wholly Object</p>	<p>The pocket park is to be located at the entrance to Pasley Park. We understood that pocket parks were to reclaim under-used areas that were a blight or an eyesore and could be put to better use. This area at the Chapter road entrance to Pasley Park is none of the above. It is right beside a park - people will have to walk through the 'pocket park' to access the actual park - and opposite residential housing.</p> <p>This part of the street has not been pedestrianised - cars exit the garage at Lorrimore Square into this street and cars have to turn at the planned pocket park area, on a very narrow area, to return down Chapter road, as the road is blocked off at this part. Apart from some cars entering or turning at this point, the plans for an hopscotch area on the pavement, beside a cycle lane (also used illegally by motorbikes who cut through the blocked part of the road) concern us, given the speed of some cyclists and the inability of small children to differentiate between pedestrian and road areas. The 'pocket park' also runs alongside one of the dog areas within the park and, although separated by railings, could also cause difficulties with children being startled by dogs. Even more concerning are ongoing issues with problematic dog owners; a recent dog attack occurred within the park when the dog jumped the railings and savaged a passerby. It would seem irresponsible to bring children into the orbit of this problem, particularly when you consider the consequences of an attack on a small child by an aggressive dog.</p> <p>We have been in consultation with the Newington Councillors who advised that changes have been made to the original plans, which we hope includes the removal of the benches, as this could lead to anti-social behaviour and annoyance to the residents. Also of major concern to us is that there is vehicular access to Pasley Park at this point (required by Parks for maintenance) and we do not believe any consideration has been given to this. No one wants this access either lost or even further restricted and we would be interested to know if the Consultation has been discussed with Parks themselves. We have discussed it with them and their response was not enthusiastic.</p> <p>We have made several representations to our Ward Councillors about these plans. As a Friends of a park group, we are in favour of pocket parks and greening the area, but in appropriate places. To place a pocket park right at the entrance to an actual park seems a superfluous waste of money.</p>	<p>The proposals are fully aligned with Council policy and the objectives in the Streets for People strategy. The Pocket Parks schemes will repurpose the streets to provide more pleasant environment for all and to create opportunities to play-on-the-way to encourage more active travel for local people.</p> <p>The proposed design will relocate the traffic filter to allow motor vehicles to access the underground garages for the Lorrimore Square residences directly from Lorrimore Square. This will allow easier access to pick up and set down at these properties and reduce motor vehicle movements along the northern part of Chapter Road.</p> <p>As noted above (No.2) the dog area within Pasley Park is separated from the highway by a fence. The proposed play area is also set back from the park boundary by the existing footway. The issue of hazard from dogs in the park is being addressed by Parks management team.</p> <p>The inclusion of seating within the proposals for Chapter Road is in line with the SfP strategy to provide places to rest for pedestrians, particularly important for the elderly and less mobile.</p> <p>A tracking analysis has been carried out for the proposed design, which established that the new design will allow the same access for a maintenance vehicle into and out of the park as currently.</p>
<p>5 - Wholly Object</p>	<p>Ridiculous waste of money in hard pressed times.</p> <p>Honestly there is nothing but ego involved in the pushing of "pocket parks" and "parklets" they are nonsense</p>	<p>The proposals are fully aligned with Council policy and the objectives in the Streets for People strategy.</p>

<p>6 - Wholly Object</p>	<p>My partner and I are residents of Albert Westcott House in Alberta Street. I am 67 years old, she is 65. I am disabled, holder of a 'Blue Badge' permit and am absolutely reliant on my car to enable me to shop, visit my family/ friends and attend medical appointments. Parking in the area is already inadequate to meet the requirements of local residents. The proposed amendments will only make this worse, to the extent that car ownership for residents will become extremely difficult,. While I appreciate that is clearly the object of the exercise, the proposals take no account of the needs of elderly and/or disabled residents for whom having access to a motor vehicle close to their home is a major factor in maintaining a good quality of life. Much as the provision of improved cycling facilities might be welcomed, from a purely personal point off view my severe mobility issues mean that this will be of no help to me or anybody else in a similar position. The needs of elderly and disabled residents do not seem to have featured in the consideration of these proposals at all.</p> <p>On an additional point, there is an existing area of garages to the front (north side) of Albert Westcott House. The rear of this garage block fronts onto Alberta Street and presents a bleak looking 3m tall brick wall which would the rear boundary of the proposed 'pocket park'. The architecturally brutal aspect of this ugly wall seems wholly out of place with the aims of the pocket parks exercise. In all the time I have been resident in Albert Westcott House I have never witnessed anybody either parking or removing a vehicle from any of the garages, nor accessing them for any other purpose. The pavement on the Alberta Street side of the garages presently seems often to be used as a dog toilet by owners who fail to clear up after their animals and negotiating this area of pavement often requires care in avoiding dog faeces. In my opinion, this situation is exacerbated by the aspect of the brick wall, which may well encourage similar thoughtless behaviour once the pocket park adaptations are carried out. Hardly providing a better environment for children to walk to and from school. Surely, it would be better to demolish these garages, and replace them with paid permit residents parking spaces, this obviating the loss of parking facilities in Alberta Street and Ambergate Street with the added bonus of presenting a far less austere vista from the proposed 'pocket park'.</p> <p>I should be grateful for full consideration to be given to my comments and proposals above.</p>	<p>Analysis of utilisation of parking in the area shows that there is currently sufficient provision of residents' car parking and no parking stress in the area (CPZ Zone E: North West Walworth): 951 Permit Bays with 694 permits issues and with average daily visitor permits 701 which gives 74% utilised. This is in part due to the low levels of at ownerships within the area, 18% of households have permits.</p> <p>Comments and suggestions about utilisation of garages at Albert Westcott House have been passed on to the Estates Parking team.</p>
--------------------------	--	---

<p>7 - Wholly Object</p>	<p>"(NOTE: See original email for attachments) Thank you sending me the digital plans. My focus is on Penton Place and Amelia Street where I both live and work. However, the objections with regard to safety and parking apply to all the affected streets. I state some background, before setting out my objections below.</p> <p>Background. I was involved last year when the original proposals were discussed, and I note that an amendment has been made to mitigate the obstruction of the access to Iliffe Yard on Amelia Street especially with regard to bin lorry access. The Council has not justified locating the new structures alongside existing secure play areas, and it is clear that the real intent to the proposals is nothing to do with the needs of our children or the environment, and the objections previously raised remain valid. As a result of the LTN we have a number of new problems affecting safety:</p> <p>Pavements have become unsafe for pedestrians due to bikes/e-bikes/scooters, and even motorbikes. Roads less safe due to lorries threading through narrow streets and reversing back (when they used to access from the nearest main road). Delivery vehicles and cars needing to turn in narrow streets often mount the pavements to do so. Increased noise from reversing beepers/warnings. Emergency vehicles and deliveries/visitors unable to locate properties in the maze of cul-de-sacs. Severe shortage of parking for delivery vehicles, trade vehicles and cars needed by older people, etc. OBJECTION.</p> <p>I object to the so-called 'Pocket Parks' because they will exacerbate the existing problems of safety and the current parking needs noted above. The details of my objection are set out below:</p> <p>A. Objections on Grounds of safety:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed raised speed platform will give bikes/e-bikes easier access to pavements, and will encourage them to take to the pavements even more than already happens. We will lose the protection currently afforded to pedestrians from parked vehicles along the kerbside. We already have a speed hump.</li> <li>2. The concept is contrary to all efforts to train children to respect roads and be aware of traffic. The existing secure play areas take children off the road into a safe environment for play and exercise. The 'pocket parks' will contribute nothing to the environment for children, and will be counter-productive in distracting them from going to the safe play areas. Given the existence of safe play areas right next to the proposed pocket parks in the middle of the highways, there is no benefit or justification for these proposed features.</li> <li>3. The need for lorries, fire tenders, bin lorries and many delivery vehicles to reverse long distances along the cul-de-sacs created by the LTN is a serious safety matter. It is astonishing that the Council should propose a speed platform and a 'crossing point' close</li> </ol>	<p>A meeting held with respondent on site at Penton Place to discuss concerns.</p> <p>Emergency service vehicles will still be able to access all properties in the area of each of the Pocket Parks.</p> <p>As noted above (No.6), analysis of utilisation of parking in the area shows that there is currently sufficient provision of residents' car parking and no parking stress in the area (CPZ Zone E: North West Walworth)</p> <p>The proposed design for Amelia Street &amp; Penton Place in total will remove two permit holder parking bays on Penton Place, one of which will be replaced with a Car Club parking bay. (Across all four Pocket Parks a total of 14 bays will be removed)</p> <p>The comments concerning the extended provision for deliveries and overnight parking need has been logged with Highways.</p> <p>The raised table by 40 Penton Place, close to Berryfield Road referred to in the response is no longer included in the design.</p> <p>The requirement for a crossing point here was identified in earlier consultation and will allow pedestrians walking along Amelia St to continue to access the housing areas to the south of Penton Place.</p> <p>The proposals are fully aligned with Council policy and the objectives in the Streets for People strategy.</p>
--------------------------	---	---

to Berryfield Road. This is the only location on Penton Place where lorries can turn after making deliveries (e.g. to Canterbury Place shops or Clements Yard). I attach some photos of a day when four delivery vehicles were present at the Iliffe Street junction at the same time (this is the favoured delivery spot for many lorries). The daily routine is that lorries reverse (from Iliffe Street) to Berryfield Road where the road is wide enough and the junction quiet enough to turn. Alberta Street/Penton Place junction is too narrow and busy to facilitate lorry turning.

4. By locating a raised platform outside 40 Penton Place, children are being directed from the park, back across the dangerous (funnelled) cycle lanes, instead of crossing at the quieter spot directly outside the park (opposite no 60 Penton Place). At present, the main danger to children is from bikes, but to install a speed platform which creates an impression of a safe crossing point is to put children in danger.

#### B. Objection on the Ground of Parking Needs

Despite the low car ownership in the area, the available residents' parking is already inadequate. Current provision in the immediate area of Alberta Street and Amelia Street is less than one residents' space per ten dwellings. Many parking spaces were lost when the LTN was introduced. This was supposed to make more space for cars to turn in the narrow streets, but failed to take account of larger vehicles. At the same time, redundant double yellow lines near redundant corners were not released to replace the parking lost.

Since the pandemic, there has been a sharp rise in the demand for delivery drivers and other mobile trades. Many local people have found jobs in this sector and now need to park when not working. This has increased the need for residents' and other overnight parking. People in this area should be facilitated and encouraged into these occupations so that central London does not need to rely on tradesmen driving from distant suburbs.

Many older or disabled people who rely on their cars (and cannot park at a great distance from their homes), are now unable to go out on evenings and weekends because of the fear of being unable to park when they return. This is a real issue for the community.

We cannot afford to lose further parking, or to lose additional overnight parking offered by single yellow lines. People's mobility and livelihoods are being put at risk. The notion that people own cars unnecessarily when there is some other transport alternative, is long out-of-date and shows the council fails to understand the community and its needs. Single Yellow Lines should be retained to enable additional out-of-hours parking. Parking would be better managed if double yellow lines were limited to locations with a safety or access requirement, instead of using them as a weapon in the war on motorists and businesses.

	<p>C. Objection on the Ground of Wasting Public Money The scheme will do nothing to achieve its stated aims, and as such is a waste of public money. If there is surplus budget, it could be usefully spent on improvements to existing secure play areas in renewing or upgrading facilities.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing that the entire scheme has been dumped."</p>	
<p>8 - Wholly Object</p>	<p>I have a disability and you are taking all our parking spaces away from us the children have a park in Penton Place which is ok but it's not ok because it opens when you get drunk in the early hours it's so wrong what you're doing. All ready blocking roads of we now have more congestion in our streets which the sick people suffer with I'm asthmatic and my asthma has been through the roof since all these road closures disabled people can not just hop on a bike or scooter when we suffer health issues I understand you want a healthy world but this is not the way the children have plenty of green space what do the disabled and sick people have nothing you can not even be dropped off at hospital now without getting a parking ticket the world has gone so mad I don't agree with it and I hope many others don't agree too we suffer too</p>	<p>As noted above (No.6), analysis of utilisation of parking in the area shows that there is currently sufficient provision of residents' car parking and no parking stress in the area (CPZ Zone E: North West Walworth)</p> <p>Two residents' permit parking bay will be removed on Penton Place, one of which will be replaced with a Car Club parking bay. (Across all four Pocket Parks a total of 14 bays will be removed)</p> <p>The proposals are fully aligned with Council policy and the objectives in the Streets for People strategy.</p>

<p>9 - Wholly Object</p>	<p>This latest intended round of road restrictions has only just been brought to my attention. I am shocked that such extensive changes are once again being made with virtually no consultation with the local residents. I would even suggest that there is some subtlety involved in that so little information has been issued and so little effort has been made to inform local residents.</p> <p>My first objection is the cost of such work when it is clearly of very very limited usefulness. I note that the national press reported at the weekend that it has been largely accepted that the cost of 'pocket parks' is out of all proportion to their usefulness, and in fact many are blighted with a complete lack of use and even causing anti-social gatherings outside of peoples homes and dwellings. The 'pocket parks' in the area in question are situated next to a real park, again demonstrating the fact that these parks are not really being set up because spaces are needed or wanted, but because the council wants to use them to restrict road use and parking.</p> <p>My second objection is that the creation of pedestrian/cycling spaces and restriction of car traffic and parking have all been overtaken by the massive increase of bikes, electric bikes and scooters, being used without any respect to pavements or roads or pedestrians. Whatever restrictions are put in place are irrelevant as far as controlling bikes and scooters. This is a far more urgent issue than restricting parking and creating supposedly safe crossing points, because electric bikes &amp; scooters are often travelling faster than cars, they are invariably on the pavement, and they are silent so that no ones knows they are coming. Every day there is the distinct possibility of injury to a pedestrian coming out of a house or flat entrance anywhere on Penton Place. This is the issue that needs addressing.</p> <p>My third objection is that parking space is being unreasonably and unnecessarily taken away. I personally do not need parking space but deliveries to my residence, or workmen coming to make repairs do. And they cannot get parked. As far as residents are concerned all the available parking is fully taken up. This suggests that, whether the council approves or not, many people still need cars for their work or for family reasons. The council has to consider all members of the public who are residents in the borough, and not just those that it suits them to deal with. To take away more parking should not be done without proper consultation with the residents.</p> <p>My fourth objection is that the increased restriction of the roads is damaging businesses in the area and will ultimately lead to companies moving out of the area and even shops closing. There is already evidence that tradesmen are reluctant to take on work in the area because of the difficulties of getting around and</p>	<p>The proposals are fully aligned with Council policy and the objectives in the Streets for People strategy. The Pocket Parks schemes have been developed over a number of years with extensive community engagement and formal consultation.</p> <p>The consultation for these Traffic Management Orders has been carried out and publicised in line with standard process for Statutory Consultations.</p> <p>As noted above (No.6 &amp; No.8), analysis of utilisation of parking in the area shows that there is currently sufficient provision of residents' car parking and no parking stress in the area (CPZ Zone E: North West Walworth)</p> <p>As noted above (No.7 &amp; No.8), two residents' permit parking bays will be removed on Penton Place and four parking bays will be removed on Alberta Street (Across all four Pocket Parks a total of 14 bays will be removed)</p> <p>The comments concerning the parking provision for deliveries has been logged with Highways.</p> <p>The potential issues of speed of people using bikes through the closures is specifically addressed by the formalisation and segregation of the cycle paths through road closures and the inclusion of bollards and ramps at each end to slow people down at the approaches.</p>
--------------------------	---	--



	<p>parking. (All tradesmen need vehicles). The cost of engaging tradesmen has increased because of the difficulties they experience.</p> <p>It is increasingly difficult to get deliveries to places in Penton Place, including the shops and the requirement for trucks to reverse long distances and to park on pavements and double yellow lines has already made Penton Place a less safe street than it was when traffic flowed smoothly.</p> <p>The same issues of parking and truck access apply to Alberta Street.</p> <p>I repeat again that this scheme is being imposed on the residents of this area subtly and without proper notice and consultation. I hope that the entire scheme will not be taken forward and consideration given to all members of the community and not just those favoured by the council.</p>	
--	---	--