

Appendix 2 – Summary of responses

Number	Comment
1	<p>Please take this email as an objection against the proposed Nunhead controlled parking zone(CPZ) TMO2223-037 CPZ Nunhead.</p> <p>Reasons for objection below</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is already limited spaces for residents to park given the high number of motorist in this area & the minimum spaces available. 2. If residents were to obtain permits this could lead to additional drivers circulating to find available spaces, specifically as the teachers who work at the school on whorlton road also use current available parking spaces to attend work. 3. Number 2 in turn would result in higher pollution with these motorist circulating numerous times which will also conflict with the aims of ensuring highway safety. <p>I would also just like to point out the website listed on the letter does not work & shows the below error when trying to access.</p>
2	<p>I am writing to support the introduction of controlled parking on Whorlton Road SE15.</p> <p>The area is overrun with non-residents parking on the street to visit the park, various churches and pubs and restaurants. Local resident fight for parking on a daily basis and introducing a parking scheme would go a long way to alleviate this.</p> <p>As a sidenote - the link to the “appyway” website on your consultation letter does not work - this is the third consultation from Southwark that has dead or irrelevant links. I am starting to think this is deliberate!</p>

We got a letter through our letterbox dated yesterday about this consultation however, none of the documentation appears to be posted on either the Southwark website or the consultation portal.

In any case, I would like to strongly object to the approach being proposed by the council.

The council is proposing a piecemeal approach to traffic/ parking management without any consideration of the impact on surrounding roads.

This will result in displacing cars to roads where, by the council's own studies, there is over 80% utilisation of parking spaces. A holistic approach needs to be taken to this.

The process followed is also flawed for the following reasons:

- 1) The "majority" you are talking about in some instances is 2 to 1, when turnout is this low there is not a statistically significant majority
- 2) If you ask the question "do you want a CPZ on your road based on Plan A", the results from that can't be used to create a Plan B as it might then affect the answers to the first question
- 3) The council has provided no studies or further analysis of the impact of any of the changes proposed and seems to be jumping from one idea to another

The council has also not reassured anyone how the impact of these changes will benefit residents or meet its objectives to reduce traffic and make streets safer.

For example, whilst I understand the safety impacts of putting double yellow lines on Nunhead Lane, there is currently a large amount of parking related to the Lighthouse International Church that occurs there each Sunday. By adding the double yellow lines, those cars will then be displaced to neighbouring roads which will negatively impact residents and make no impact on the amount of traffic.

If the council wants to help residents, a bolder stance will need to be taken to actively discourage people from driving to this area.

If you have any questions on the above, please do not hesitate to reach out to me.

3

4

This is pure residential area not commercial, this additional financial burden on residents.

	<p>I'm a resident of Scylla Road on the consort estate.</p> <p>I object to the expansion of residents permits for parking as see this as a money making scheme from the council which already takes so much from us via service charges and council tax.</p> <p>What evidence is there that this will improve parking availability in the area? The estate parking bays have not been included so it will put pressure on those.</p> <p>Does the capacity of proposed CPZ spaces meet the residents need? My worry is we will pay this money and limited space will be as is.</p> <p>I don't see the high charge of £20 a month for less cars being parked on street as being value for money. It's fine as it is. Residents don't need another expenditure. And for visitors to not be able to park near by.</p>
5	What is the reasoning for doing it? What problem is it trying to solve?
6	I wish to object to this proposal: I do not believe that enforcing parking fees to residents is fair. Moreover, the parking pressure isn't really during the week but rather at the weekend when many people visit the area so if you really want this to be effective, Sunday should be included.
7	I would like to support the nunhead CPZ, but I think it would be better if it was just 9-11am to stop people parking there all day. It doesn't need to be all day.
8	Hi, I live on Whorlton Road and would rather not have parking permits there please. I find it easy enough to park most days and it will not change the most annoying part which is the school pick up and drop offs. If we do proceed to permits please can it be cheaper? I think the amount you are proposing is too much. I used to live in Kensington and Chelsea and it was far cheaper to park in the whole of the borough!! Please do not introduce but if you do make it cheaper. Thank you
9	cool, good idea
10	WE HAVE REALLY SUFFERED WITH PARKING SPACE AND SHOULD HAVE THE PROPOSAL MORE FAVOURABLE THAN IT IS. PARKING CHARGE TO BE MADE CHEAP AND TIME EXTENDED TO 2200.
11	I support this proposal but would prefer if the time will be extended from 0700 to 2300
12	Consideration needs to be given to the cost of the permits that residents will need to pay. There are other areas in southwark where some residents either get 1 permit free (per household) or pay a low fee of £10. Yes, people want to be able to park in their area / in front of their house but they shouldnt be made a cash cow to do so. More needs to be done to encourage people to minimise use of their cars as the "zone" is only going to push people into other areas; repeating the problem. Ultimately this feels like the long con to get the whole of Southwark made in to a CPZ so they can generate more money...if the prices of permits were reasonable it would feel like a genuine attempt to mitigate the parking issue but I equally know people paying £249 for a permit which doesnt seem justifiable when others are paying less / no

	<p>money. If the infrastructure of public transport was better that would go some way maybe offering another alternative to people driving any subsequently needing parking resulting in traffic and residents frustration.</p>
13	<p>This will impact upon the residents of tyrells court without any benefit to us in the form of resident permits</p>
14	<p>Not happy with the new restrictions - wholly opposed!</p>
15	<p>Resident of Tyrell's court without allocated parking. Use of roads listed within this proposal would severely impact us.</p>
16	<p>There is a problem with the availability of parking on Carden road through the week and weekend, in part due to the very popular church on the road. Evenings and weekends are extremely busy when the church is having events (which is frequent). Responses to the prior consulatation did not indicate a problem because the majority of respondents didnt want the CPZ in Nunhead. I would want an independent analysis of the availability of parking. Can you use data from the traffic control cameras to measure the number of available spots on the road? Expanding the CPZ to Scylla road will exarcerbate an already existing problem on Carden Road. We often have to park on 2 or 3 roads away which is challenging with young children .</p>
17	<p>This is just another tax when people are struggling with the cost of living. It is wrong.</p>
18	<p>I very much support the introduction of a CPZ in Whorlton Road, however I note that the introduction of 'no waiting at any time' at the Peckham Rye end of Whorlton Road XXX, which would create difficulties for visiting working men (plumbers, electricians, window cleaners and the like, or indeed to me for unloading shopping etc). Please could the double yellow lines be turned into single ones for XXX I'd be most grateful if this change to the proposal could be made, at present it makes be feel somewhat under siege! Thank you.</p>

19	<p>This proposal will not control parking effectively at the times when such controls are most needed. The end result will be that, if residents purchase parking permits, they will be paying for a service they are unable to use. The hours during which there is greatest pressure on parking are at evenings and weekends. This proposal will control parking during weekdays instead so it will not relieve the pressure at times when such relief is most needed.</p> <p>The greatest pressure upon parking is caused by a church to which large numbers of people come from outside of the area. It does not have its own parking facilities so worshippers are required to park in the surrounding streets. This would be effectively controlled by restrictions which operated from 1pm to 11pm on seven days per week. Such restrictions would also constrain commuters from parking in the area (although this is not a major problem because there is no local railway station or other public transport hub close by). In having a restriction which begins in the middle of the day commuters are constrained because they know they will be in contravention by the time they return to collect their vehicles in the evening. It would also help local businesses because they predominantly tend to receive deliveries from suppliers and have customers coming to see them in the morning.</p> <p>I am attaching a spreadsheet which shows the results of a survey I did myself some time ago. Although this was conducted in 2016 it still broadly represents the current parking patterns. It shows the number of cars parked in Old James Street at three hour intervals from 7am to 10pm on a selection of days over a three week period. You will see the greatest pressure on parking is in mid to late evening. It is lowest first thing in the morning. The people coming to evening meetings in the church tend to depart between 10pm and 11pm leaving vacant parking spaces which are not filled until later in the following morning.</p> <p>I would therefore propose that these restrictions are not introduced and the Council considers alternative proposals which would better meet the needs of the local area.</p>
20	<p>We think the parking hours are excessive as when we replied to previous consultation, we stated 11am-1pm Monday to Friday for resident permit holders. Other parts of Southwark have for example a 2 hour window of no parking e.g. 11am - 1 pm Monday - Saturday we feel this would be adequate to deter commuters from parking in the street and allow family the opportunity to park outside of the restricted time (11am-1pm).</p>

Sturdy Road and Ellery Street are nowhere near Scylla Road, Old James Street and Whorlton Road so linking them together is ridiculous. The needs of those residents in each of the areas is completely different. We have no problem with parking in the Gordon Road area as the free parking around the Harold Moody Park creates a buffer for residents and working people from the high street or the bus garage. The loss of 40-45 free parking spaces not associated with house frontage will cause havoc and increase the problem of parking in the area to unacceptable levels. You seem to be happy if residents and visitors pay for parking so it is not about cars surrounding the park being a hazard. The residents of Nunhead rejected any increase in a CPZ and now you are proposing to punish them by moving the potential of 40 extra vehicles looking for parking in an area that was not under any pressure. Many people come to the Library, the Community Centre and Nunhead High Street and park for short periods of time which is fine as there are usually free spaces. By increasing the CPZ to Sturdy Road and Ellery Street you are going to make coming to the Library, the High street and the Community Centre onerous and I would expect visitors to reduce significantly.

You must have conducted an impact study that will show you the consequences of removing 40-45 free parking spaces on the surrounding community. Where is it.. Can we see it? It would seem that you are simply taking a very small minority of people in favour of the CPZ and lumping them in with the residents of Old James Street, Scylla Road and Whorlton Street who may have more interest in a CPZ. You should publish the figures for each area so that we all have an informed view of the consequences. The proper consultation steps would have been to offer the surrounding streets near Ellery Street and Sturdy Road an option to have a limited CPZ should the proposal of extending to Sturdy Road and Ellery Street be overwhelmingly accepted. Your proposal for a Nunhead-wide CPZ was rejected by the vast majority of residents. It is irresponsible of you to create a proposal that will severely impact those residents who will feel it is just a punishment.

CPZ B extension - Proposed Order - Maps.pdf

The above maps seems to have an error which makes it difficult to make an informed view for residents. The north side of the Harold Moody park has free parking along the whole of the length of Sturdy Road. Your map shows that an extension of yellow lines will be created (A) and a very small area of Paid parking (C) which leaves 2/3 of the road with no parking restrictions. Is this correct or just an error?

21 Please include your impact study in the documents available for download and let me know when they are uploaded.

22 This proposal should not go ahead unless there is a whole borough strategy for implementing a CPZ. Residents of Carden Road are already unable to park on their own street due to massive parking displacement and this proposal will only make it worse. Wholly oppose!

23	<p>Unfortunately, I agree with CPZ in principle. However, the council has tragically bowed to self-interested opposition to the previous CPZ consultation which included the roads around my street - Carden Road. The impact is - as we warned - catastrophic and about to get significantly worse. We are surrounded by two massive new housing developments - neither of which have parking facilities. In addition, we are plagued by a massive influx of church goers from all over London who arrive by car on weekday evenings and all day Saturday and Sunday and park in our road. The environmental impact is appalling. Similarly, Southwark are now proposing a cycle lane next to the Rye which will further reduce parking around Carden Road. Elderly, disabled and people with children are being displaced from their own street and forced to walk from streets away to get to their homes. The council has ignored this problem despite it being raised on multiple occasions. The council has also installed numerous bike parks in this one street even further reducing the available parking. The new consultation can only be viewed within this wider context. It is certainly true that the environmental impact will be positive however, until there is a fully coherent strategy across the residential area of Nunhead, I am forced to oppose this proposition in the strongest possible terms. The residents of Carden Road are already devastated by the lack of controlled parking and measures introduced elsewhere will only increase the already dreadful situation. We urge the local authority to get a grip of the overall parking strategy and ensure that a fully equitable, transparent and realistic CPZ is introduced throughout the borough rather than this ridiculous piecemeal plan which can only have been devised by someone on work experience.</p>
24	<p>I need to drive for work and support the CPZ installation on Whorlton Road, where I live, but with one change to the current plan. The permit parking should extend to the Peckham Rye end of Whorlton Road to increase the paid parking area for residents because we are under tremendous parking stress. Therefore, double yellow lines should be removed from the PR end of Whorlton Road. If the plan is to install Bike Hangers on these DYLS, then this should be changed. There is no need for a Bike Hanger on Whorlton Road. Owners of cycles on Whorlton Rd keep them in the hallways, which is cheaper and safer. Bike Hangers can be located on the pavements at Howard Court, Austin Court, and Rye Oak Primary School without compromising valuable paid parking spaces. Removing the roadblock outside the school on Whorlton Road will allow emergency vehicles to get through and ease the chaos created by parents who insist on blocking the road during school times.</p>
25	<p>We do not want this area to be controlled with parking restrictions!</p>
26	<p>I am a resident on Whorlton Road. The road is currently used as regular parking for visitors to local areas which can mean it is hard to get parking for residents and guests. A system of parking permits and visitor permits would help this situation.</p>

27	<p>I live on the Consort Estate (Huguenot Square) I see that you have greatly reduced the amount of spaces that are going to be available to park in against Old James Street and Wholton Road. This is very unfair on the residents in Sylla Road. I am concerned that there is no mention of Estate Parking which is a nightmare at this time with outside of the area people parking in the Squares whilst they go to work etc. I have frequently had to walk a long distance from my home after trying to find somewhere to park that is not controlled zone. I am 71 years old with many many health conditions. Why is there no estate parking permits included in this consultation? I am concerned that with so little parking spaces going to be implemented that residents are not going to be happy. Outsiders are going to want to park in the estate and that will be twice the problem than it is now.</p> <p>Please give more parking spaces to Sylla Road.</p>
28	<p>As a resident of Whorlton Road I have been a supporter of the extension of the CPZ zone however now that I have seen the proposed plans I can only see a move by Southwark Council to increase parking pressures on our street rather than alleviating them.</p> <p>These issues are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implementation of 'No waiting at any time' on Whorlton Road alongside 47 and 49 Peckham Rye. This makes no sense what so ever. It cannot be to improve sight lines as the 2 first bays towards the junction of Whorlton Road and Peckham Rye are maintained and also the garden walls of both properties restrict your sight lines here anyway. This is the blatant removal of 6 parking spaces with no reasoning. - The proposal of the parking outside Rye Oak Primary School is confusing. At the moment Whorlton road is closed to vehicles and the proposals look like they have been planned for an open Whorlton Road. There has been no communications about plans to re-open Whorlton Road to traffic. If this is the plan this needs to have been correctly and clearly communicated so that we can respond to these parking proposals correctly. However I would add that the road is wide enough to allow parking alongside the Northside of the road at all times. - The Proposal to introduce 'No waiting at any time' along both sides of Scylla Road from the Jehovah Witness Hall to no 10 Scylla Road again makes no sense. If you are maintaining the existing parking from the Junction of Scylla Road and Peckham Rye again it cannot be to improve sightlines at this junction, the introduction of this can only be seen as a method to reduce parking spaces and therefore increase parking pressure within the scheme. Currently I think this removed approximately 10 parking spaces that are currently available. <p>My suggestions would be as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Remove the 'No waiting at any time' on Whorlton Road alongside 47 and 49 Peckham Rye and include it as permit holders parking places. - You need to correctly clarify if Whorlton Road is to remain open or closed. - Reduce the 'No waiting at any time' to within 2m of the junctions into Huguenot Square and 2-8 Scylla Road.

29	Absolutely ridiculous proposal - this is a low traffic neighbourhood and you are removing parking spaces to justify CPZ coming in later. It smacks of bullying by the council.
30	Although the area suffers from congested parking, not many new parking spaces have been created to alleviate some of this stress. For example, currently on Scylla road by house numbers XXX it is a double yellow line, however there is enough space there to fit 2 parking spaces without affecting traffic or visibility. Also, I disagree with the removal of the single yellow line by Labro Tools shop and CostCutter, as this will affect the two businesses and the ability for customers to quickly stop and buy some products. It should be short stay parking to allow business to thrive.
31	Although the area suffers from congested parking, not many new parking spaces have been created to alleviate some of this stress. For example, currently on Scylla road by house numbers XXX it is a double yellow line, however there is enough space there to fit 2 new parking spaces without affecting traffic or visibility. Also, I disagree with the removal of the single yellow line by Labro Tools shop and CostCutter, as this will affect the two businesses and the ability for customers to quickly stop and buy some products. It should be short stay parking to allow business to thrive.
32	Although the area suffers from congested parking, not many new parking spaces have been created to alleviate some of this stress. For example, currently on Scylla road by house numbers XXX it is a double yellow line, however there is enough space there to fit 2 parking spaces without affecting traffic or visibility. Also, I disagree with the removal of the single yellow line by Labro Tools shop and CostCutter, as this will affect the businesses and the ability for customers to quickly stop and buy some products. It should allow short stay parking so these businesses can thrive.
33	<p>I support the proposals but have concerns that fewer parked cars on Scylla Road and Old James Street will mean even more fast through traffic by drivers using it as a rat run. There is already too many cars driving too fast around the bends, particularly near Rye Oak School and it often feels dangerous as a pedestrian or on a bike, especially when walking or cycling with my child.</p> <p>I would like this through road to be closed but in the meantime I urge the council to add planters or bike hangers or reduce the width with bollards to slow traffic down and discourage dangerous through traffic.</p>

34	<p>I am concerned that the proposed Nunhead CPZ B extension is flawed and unsustainable. The reasons for this being as follows</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Residents naturally wish to park as near as possible to their homes. Not all residents will wish to pay for a permit meaning parking pressures will be increased in the areas nearest to the CPZ - Already there exist parking pressures in Carden and Barforth Road. The pressure will over time move up towards Tresco Road. The existing bollards at Waveney Avenue only add to this pressure - The community has become divided over this issue and these divisions could create more bad feeling - Vehicle sizes have increased which means less space for parking, with the current trend for oversize vehicles only adding to the problem - Vehicles are often parked and not used for weeks at a time with owners of those vehicles apparently not living locally - It will soon become clear that the proposed Nunhead CPZ B extension will need to be extended itself to cover the area proposed in the original scheme <p>In conclusion, whatever the current parking problems are in the proposed Nunhead CPZ-Zone B extension area, if the proposal is accepted will simply be displaced to the nearest roads without restrictions, translating in my case to the Carden, Barforth and Tresco Roads which have existing parking pressures of their own. Therefore the Nunhead CPZ Zone B extension proposal is not adequate and does not go far enough to resolving the parking issues in the area.</p>
35	<p>I am a resident on Carden road and whilst I support the proposals for CPZ in the areas I feel that as a street which already faces parking pressures (which you are aware of), by making all the streets around ours CPZ then it will just put further pressure onto our road. We have nowhere else to go, there are no other surrounding streets that we can access. And those that there are are going to get busier as we are forced to park on their roads now. We already have to compete with those attending the church at the weekends and now on top of this we'll have everyone else looking for parking close to Peckham Rye now too. By adding double yellow lines at the end of road now too it's just going to make it even worse. Where is everyone suppose to park? We are a one car family who mostly cycle but need to use our car for visiting family and occasionally for work. This will make this even harder and more stressful than it already is. Please please reconsider this proposal, it causes us so much anxiety and we may have to move from the area as it becomes even more impossible. We have young children and cars drive up and down our road so fast looking for spaces to park and it's very dangerous and not to mention more polluting for us and our children, Thanks for your consideration</p>
36	<p>We would like Carden rd to be included in the parking restrictions</p>