

Object/Support	Feedback Category	FeedbackText for 2425-012 Dulwich Village Streets for People	Officer Response
Wholly Object	Financial	<p>There is not a parking issue in these roads. There will be a cost to Dulwich residents and their visitors. There will also be a cost to implement the CPZ which is not warranted given that all local residents objected even in these roads - the only road wanting any restrictions was Gilkes Crescent and the knock on impact in adjacent roads has not been properly evaluated and is unwarranted. No account has been taken of residents who need to use their cars for accessibility and the impact of double yellow lines and other areas of free parking being taken away will be unnecessarily severe given there was not a parking issue in the first place. I believe this is a divisive and extreme measure in which the council is seeking to fund raise via parking charges/fines by wrapping its policy in green washing</p>	<p>The council has carried out parking pressure surveys in the area, the data indicates moderate to high levels of pressure in the majority of the roads. A permit scheme will help reduce non-local traffic and therefore increase the available parking for residents, businesses and their visitors and customers.</p> <p>Double yellow lines have been proposed on junctions in-line with the highway code and seek to improve road safety by improving sight lines at junctions for all road users, pedestrians and cyclists.</p>
Wholly Object	Parking	<p>there was no parking issue in these roads, there will be a cost to residents and their visitors, there is a cost to the council which is unwarranted, it will cause parking pressure unnecessarily eg where they will be drawing double yellow lines, residents objected to the original consultation but have been ignored, there will problems for disabled/mobility impaired people, there will be a knock on impact to surrounding roads.</p>	<p>The council has carried out parking pressure surveys in the area, the data indicates moderate to high levels of pressure in the majority of the roads. A permit scheme will help reduce non-local traffic and therefore increase the available parking for residents, businesses and their visitors and customers.</p>

			<p>Double yellow lines have been proposed on junctions in-line with the highway code and seek to improve road safety by improving sight lines at junctions for all road users, pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>The Council, as part of its budget setting process, sets the cost of permits and permit costs are benchmarked against other London local authorities to ensure that they offer value for money. Whilst it is a financially difficult time for many people currently, the long-term benefits of safer and quieter streets and healthier and more sustainable travel options, is a long-term goal for the council. Also, owning and running a car in London is expensive and most households in the borough do not own a car.</p> <p>Permit and PCN income is heavily regulated and permit charges are not to be used to generate income for the council, as such any excess income is ring fenced. As</p>
--	--	--	--

			per the TMA 2004. More details can be found here: <a href="https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2004/18/schedule/9">https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2004/18/schedule/9</a> . Any surplus income will be used within the legal ring-fence for parking income under section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
Wholly Object	Parking	This whole scheme is a total waste of money. It will not improve the lives of residents. All Southwark's so called "consultation" is a total waste of time. Our local councillors do not listen to objections from residents.	The proposals are aligned with the councils Streets for people strategy which aim to create a healthy environment for the community
Wholly Object	Parking	As a visitor to Dulwich I require freedom of access as a pedestrian, cyclist and driver. These proposals -which appear to have already been implemented despite the consultation period not having closed will serve to displace traffic to other less well-off areas of the Borough. This is a morally unethical proposal which seeks to create a peaceful urban environment for the wealthier voters in the borough at the expense of the less well-off and less vocal majority who will be the on the sharp end of the massive traffic displacement generated (as we have already seen)	The Dulwich Village Junction Improvements will have a significant positive effect on socio-economic equalities, especially for those on low incomes whose main means of journeying is active travel. The proposals will create quality safer community spaces for active travel, improve interaction with nature, support the local economy and promote community cohesion and surveillance
Wholly Object	Traffic	we object as it is wholly unnecessary and you are ruining Dulwich	

Wholly Object	Parking	There is a garage who parks his unfinished cars on the street up to 7 cars. There are cars that are not roadworthy , 13 counted last month. Cars are parked for months whilst people go on holiday from north Dulwich station. Local schools and tennis clubs added to the above make it impossible to park outside one's house , these people have no connection to the street and make it hostile.	The CPZ will ensure that there is fair use of parking in the area. Paid for parking has been provided in the form of shared use bays and much of the wider area remains free parking.
Wholly Support	Parking	Please introduce timed parking to stop , holiday makers from ND station, weeks on end, schools clogging parking spaces from 7:00 onwards .tennis clubs from 8:00 am and now the restaurants where there is ample parking supplied outside by Southwark	Should the scheme be introduced, parking will be prioritised for residents, their visitors and shoppers, where appropriate. A review will be carried out 12 to 18 months after implementation. During this stage further changes will be considered depending on the requests and needs of the area.
Wholly Support	Parking	Parking is a nightmare re parking for schools. Holidays from ND station, weeks on end , garages parking their unfinished cars,local restaurants where ample parking supplied. We are are a free for all ! !	Should the scheme be introduced, parking will be prioritised for residents, their visitors and shoppers, where appropriate. A review will be carried out 12 to 18 months after implementation. During this stage further changes will be considered depending on the requests and needs of the area.

Wholly Object	Parking	<p>To date, the impact of the traffic changes in Dulwich has hugely increased traffic in the area, has caused additional pollution on roads with schools on (both the roads themselves and those used by children travelling to/from school), has negatively impacted local shops and has massively increased the amount of traffic and parking on side roads (such was Trossachs Road, where I live). This change will exacerbate all these issues.</p>	<p>The statutory proposal is aimed at improving safety for all road users.</p> <p>The decision-making process for the timed restrictions gave due consideration to the socio-economic impact of the changes and there is no evidence that the traffic management changes are having a negative impact on local businesses. The new public square, once completed, will provide a vibrant social environment that will support local businesses</p>
Partly Object	Parking	<p>I object to point p (ii) of this proposal. If we want to improve visibility and safety on Woodward Road's junctions with its 5 side streets , we need to add 2.5m of DYs on each side of each junction. In Woodward Road, that would add up to 30 meters of DYs (and not the proposed 113.5m). It looks like the plan is to add 280m of extra DYs in Woodward and its 5 side streets, which is excessive and will unnecessarily contribute to parking shortage for residents in this area.</p>	<p>The proposals are aimed at improving safety for all road users</p> <p>Double yellow lines have been proposed on junctions in-line with the highway code and seek to improve road safety by improving sight lines at junctions for all road users, pedestrians and cyclists.</p>

Partly Object	Parking	<p>The parking and loading restrictions on Turney road seem undually restrictive at weekend when lifting them completely would support local businesses who have already been greatly adversely affected by the changes to the viillage and junction. A village relies on shops/ cafes and restaurants and much has happened to undermine their businesses.</p> <p>It is surprising that the structural changes for site H are being enacted before the consultation process has finished.</p> <p>Having just 3 disabled parking slots, and none in front of the shopping arcade, is restrictive and discriminatory; by definition people who have a blue badge have mobility that limits their walking to &lt; 50 m or makes it unsafe for them to be left alone whilst their carer goes to park elsewhere .</p> <p>The overall reduction in parking along Turney road, which was not supported in the previous consultation, will also undermine local businesses. There is a limit to how much Dulwich residents are likely to eat out, and people coming form further afield will need to have much better transport links or the means to park</p> <p>Its unclear that you have allowed good access for emergency vehicles into Calton Avenue and Court lane. Is this not a statutory requirement?</p> <p>The bulge at the NW end of the physical barrier B lining the cycle lane on Dulwich viillage at the DV junction will cause challenge and accidents , especially for people with cargo bikes for their children and for deliveries ; its poorly designed given the intention of the project</p> <p>Unless measures are enacted to compel the scooter and bike companies to collect their vehicles, they will litter the pavements causing a hazard for others; this is something that the council could usefully focus on</p>	<p>Two new additional disabled bays are being proposed. The disabled bay in front of the shops will be retained as part of the CPZ proposal.</p> <p>Access will be made available, post construction, for emergency vehicles from Court Lane and Dulwch Village</p>
Wholly Object	Parking	<p>There are not enough disabled bays and nor are they near enough to the chemist and the post office. My husband is disabled, and this will stop him being able to pick up his medication s as the disabled parking is too far from the chemist. Also, he will not be able to enjoy eating out at restaurants in the viillage as one disabled parking bay is nothing like enough near the restaurants. This plan is discriminatory to disabled people . I strongly object to it.</p>	<p>Two new additional disabled bays are being proposed. The disabled bay in front of the shops will be retained as part of the CPZ proposal.</p> <p>Access will be made available , post</p>

			construction, for emergency vehicles from Court Lane and Dulwch Village
Wholly Object	Parking	<p>I strongly object strongly to the proposed parking restrictions.</p> <p>The number and location of the disabled parking is totally unacceptable. The profile of local residents means that many are disabled or have reduced mobility and/or can't carry stuff. 2 disabled places remotely located means people won't be able to access the chemist and post office.</p> <p>I am disabled and I feel that this proposal will totally ruin my life. I won't be able to get to the chemist, post office and dry cleaners. I will have to rely more on other people and it will significantly reduce my social life as I won't be able to socialise and use the local shops, coffee bars and restaurant. I believe that this proposal is discriminatory and has not taken into account the impact on the elderly, the reduced mobility and disabled people of Dulwich. The lack of of general parking and disabled parking in particular will result in the disabled and less mobile people having to walk much further which will result in more risk of tripping and falling making the local amenities less safe and accessible for the less able local people.</p> <p>I reiterate that I very strongly object to this proposal and find it discriminatory and thought less. How many disabled people actually physically contribute to developing these plans? Obviously their provision is not taken seriously into account.</p>	<p>Two new additional disabled bays are being proposed. The disabled bay in front of the shop will be retained as part of the CPZ proposal.</p> <p>Access will be made available, post construction, for emergency vehicles from Court Lane and Dulwch Village</p>
Wholly Object	Parking	<p>There is no need for Double yellow lines on the south side of Dovercourt Road. Please stop spending council money on schemes that residents are opposed too</p>	<p>The proposals are aimed at improving safety for all road users</p> <p>Double yellow lines have been proposed on junctions in-line with the highway code and seek to improve road safety by improving sight lines at junctions for all road users, pedestrians and cyclists.</p>

Wholly Object	Access	I object to all the DYs in Dulwich Village on Village Way . These will severely affect the business of the shops and will mean they will go bust and become empty . It is just not necessary . There will be nowhere for people to park when visiting the shops and restaurants . This is particularly important for the aged and disabled residents who access the post office and pharmacy and other shops .	The proposals are aimed at improving safety for all road users  Double yellow lines have been proposed on junctions in-line with the highway code and seek to improve road safety by improving sight lines at junctions for all road users, pedestrians and cyclists. paid for parking spaces have been provided near the shops, which includes 1 hour of free parking.
Partly Object	Parking	The prolific use of long DYs on many roads will remove too many parking places, where the roads were not under parking pressure previously.	The proposals are aimed at improving safety for all road users
Partly Object	Parking	I feel that the double yellow lines that are currently in place at the junction of Eastlands Crescent and Dovercourt Road are fit for purpose and should be replicated elsewhere in the LTA . I find however that the measures proposed by the council are unreasonable, excessive and unnecessary and will only lead to conflict within the area. I would urge the council to adopt such measures that ensures both the safety and well being of its citizens.	Double yellow lines have been proposed on junctions in-line with the highway code and seek to improve road safety by improving sight lines at junctions for all road users, pedestrians and cyclists.
Wholly Object	Parking	The whole plan is a massive expense , creates more traffic on boundary roads and displaces parking elsewhere when controlled parking not necessary	There will always be a level of displacement when introducing a new parking scheme; however, the limit of this will be unknown until after the scheme goes



			<p>live. The Council tries to design schemes in a way that we can try to mitigate such displacement but it is difficult to prevent. It is often seen that people will choose not to drive and use other means of transport therefore minimising this as an issue. The scheme is not being installed on private estates.</p> <p>The scheme will be reviewed within 12-18 months of being implemented, should it go ahead. Therefore, any issues which remain once the scheme has been bedded in we will seek to address these with residents and businesses.</p>
Wholly Object	n/a	<p>Please see my email below about the permanent Court Lane road closure, the most recent proposal bring in controlled parking on Townley rd,, Gilkes Crescent, Gilks Place, Carlton Avenue and East Dulwich Grove will put more pressure on streets like mine as Desenfans road is one of the closest roads to the outrageous road closure of Court Lane. It is wrong that residents have been stopped from using the Court lane access into the village. I have no alternative but to sit in traffic and drive to either the south circular or North Dulwich. It is already increasingly challenging to park my car outside my house because of these badly thought out measures. I will not be able to charge my car up if these proposals go ahead as it will become increasingly difficult to park in Desenfans road. Southwark's road closures and traffic restrictions are not democratic and are destroying what was previously a lovely</p>	<p>There will always be a level of displacement when introducing a new parking scheme; however, the limit of this will be unknown until after the scheme goes live. The Council tries to design schemes in a way that we can try to mitigate such displacement but it is difficult to prevent. It is often seen that people will choose</p>

		<p>place to live. I am very angry about it.</p> <p>The measures are actually causing more pollution not less, it is absolute lunacy.</p>	<p>not to drive and use other means of transport therefore minimising this as an issue. The scheme is not being installed on private estates.</p> <p>The scheme will be reviewed within 12-18 months of being implemented, should it go ahead. Therefore, any issues which remain once the scheme has been bedded in we will seek to address these with residents and businesses.</p>
Partly Object	Parking	<p>I am writing to you as a resident and committed cyclist who rarely uses a car and mostly relies on cycling and public transport.</p> <p>I strongly disagree with the reduction of parking spaces and especially the removal of short stay/ waiting spaces in the village. The beating heart of the village are the small businesses that are located on Dulwich Village and around Carlton Avenue (e.g. the independent coffee shops/hairdressers/book shop etc). Whilst there are parking spaces for the large pub, this plan would entirely remove the ability for people who are passing through the village on their way elsewhere, or people who come to visit the particular shops (such as the hairdresser) to park their cars.</p> <p>This could prove fatal for the smaller businesses, which are cherished by the community, in particular the smaller food/coffee establishments which rely on people who come for brief visits. Large chains like Gails or Pizza Express – which are owned by private equity firms - may be able to cushion smaller revenue in a location like Dulwich the establishments owned by small businesses owners may not.</p> <p>I would hope that a Labour Council would bear in mind the needs of the community and small businesses over private equity giants.</p> <p>While I generally support measures to improve</p>	<p>The proposals are aimed at improving safety for all road users, which will create a safer environment for businesses.</p> <p>The new public square, once completed, will provide a vibrant social environment that will support local businesses</p> <p>Cyclist will have their own signal phase at the junction in all directions, and this will improve safety for all road users .</p> <p>Free on street parking will still be available on Dulwich Village for local residents.</p> <p>The junction of Dulwich village with East Dulwich Grove</p>

		<p>cycling access and safety, I do think that it is of utmost importance to bear in mind the local idiosyncrasies of the Village.</p> <p>I also do not see how the cycle lane by the Dulwich Village crossing with Turney road will improve safety. It appears to me to potentially have the opposite effect as many cyclists turn right to drive up Carlton Road, and so need to be on the right hand side of the street in order to be able to do this safely. Is there a cycle-specific traffic light?</p> <p>It is also unclear what the measures are for providing parking for the residents on Dulwich Village i.e. 70-74 or 76. Where will the residents keep their cars? It doesn't appear to have been thought through.</p> <p>In short - PLEASE do consider the small businesses in the village. I would find it very disappointing for Labour to potentially put small companies out of business.</p> <p>Further, and I have made this point previously to Council members: I understand that the overall objective of the traffic restrictions is to reduce traffic, lower emissions and encourage people to use public transport or cycling. I support this idea.</p> <p>However, some of the measures taken in Dulwich have the opposite effect. For instance the barrier for cyclists at the corner of East Dulwich Grove and Dulwich Village may provide a marginal amount of extra safety for cyclists, BUT it consistently backs up traffic, all the way to the two local schools on Dulwich Village, with cars idling with their engines on... thereby producing pollution. An alternative would be to have the cycle lane go through the area with the trees on the right-hand side, with a separate light.</p>	<p>is being re-designed to improve the flow of traffic</p>
Partly Object	Traffic	<p>P.S&gt; I forgot to mention --- rather than removing parking spaces, a greatly more important measure for safety would be to install speed bumps in the Village (e.g. by the zebra crossing) and along College Road and Gallery Road. There are many kids crossing the roads from multiple nearby schools, as well as elderly people - and I frequently see drivers speed on these roads with no regard for pedestrians, including some that don't stop at the zebra crossing at all. This is a huge safety issue that has been consistently ignored. There are traffic cameras to catch people coming into the village</p>	<p>Speeding is managed by the police and not the council. <a href="#">Speed humps slow the speed of traffic, however they do not improve sight lines for all road users, which is why this option was not taken forward as part of this scheme, which seeks to</a></p>

		during the restricted times, but none catching people speeding.	<a href="#">improve overall safety in the area. Based on the new designs we expect vehicle speeds to reduce.</a>
Wholly Object	Parking	<b>[MULTIPLE online consultation portal 3 responses received on 20/09/2024, bu this is counted as an objection, the other 2 responses are 'in support']</b> There is a garage who parks his unfinished cars on the street up to 7 cars. There are cars that are not roadworthy , 13 counted last month. Cars are parked for months whilst people go on holiday from north Dulwich station. Local schools and tennis clubs added to the above make it impossible to park outside one's house , these people have no connection to the street and make it hostile.	The CPZ will ensure that there is fair use of parking in the area by discouraging long term and or all day commuter parking. Paid for parking has been provided in the form of shared use bays and much of the wider area remains free parking.
Wholly Support	Traffic	Any measure that disincentivises and inconveniences drivers, thereby reducing traffic, is a good thing as protection of the environment and safeguarding the health of children and adults who walk along the road is paramount. East Dulwich Grove is still far too polluted and full of traffic. There are so many drivers, many of whom could walk / cycle / use public transport but do not do so as driving is the expedient option. Please make these changes to safeguard the health and safety of all the children that walk along the road every day.	Noted
Wholly Support	Parking	Fully support the proposals	Noted
Wholly Object	Parking	It appear to be further restrictions on accessing this part of Dulwich, closed roads, timed access and further removal of any short parking bays or loading areas.	Noted
Wholly Object	Parking	I object	No reason given