

The increased number of CPZ in the Dulwich Village area is not welcomed and has/will negatively impact local residents, businesses and schools.

I refer to your letter of 2 September concerning the Statutory Consultation. I am a resident of Woodwarde Road. I see the Council are now proposing double yellow lines across the consultation area which I assume to extend beyond Townley Road, Gilkes Crescent, Gilkes Place, Calton Avenue & East Dulwich Grove. Your letter is ambiguous on this point.

On the basis the proposal for double yellow lines is across the broader area I see absolutely no reason for these quieter residential roads to be defaced by further road markings. I therefore strongly object to this part of the proposal.

I make these comments as a daily pedestrian who is also beyond retirement age.

I am a resident of the Southwark end of Turney Road in Dulwich and am writing to ask that you include Turney Road in the Dulwich Village CPZ.

It does not make any sense to provide free parking when the borough is trying to reduce the harm caused by driving. A wide area CPZ is a tool to transfer a small portion of the social costs of driving back to the driver and would act to deter some car trips. A wide area CPZ also provides the council with a mechanism to lean against the trend for cars to get bigger and so more harmful by charging such cars more. A wide area CPZ also signals that the council and society will not forever tolerate the free ride drivers now get with respect to the social costs driving in urban areas imposes on others and so may gradually alter behaviour. I urge you to reconsider and proceed with your original wide area CPZ plans.

Including Turney Road in the CPZ would make it a safer cycling route by reducing the number of pinch points caused by parked cars and by reducing the volume of traffic by making the road less of a parking destination. Turney Road is a natural continuation of the safe cycling routes that lead into Dulwich Square. However it is not itself safe now as they are many close passes in pinch points.

Thank you for your attention and your work on this issue.

I have received your missive about this matter. I note proposals to implement CPZ in Townley Road, Gilkes Crescent, Calton Avenue, East Dulwich Grove. This is almost certain to result in displacement of non-residents parking from these areas to adjacent roads such as Beauval, Woodwarde, Dovercourt, and others. One immediately obvious consequence of this is to restrict the freedom of residents in these roads to park.

This is not fair to the residents of the adjacent roads outside the CPZ is it? What consideration has been given to these possible consequences? Either don't impose a restriction or impose it in such a way that adjacent residential roads do not bear the consequences, which may not be possible.

As a resident of XX Gilkes Crescent, I note the proposal to introduce Marker F - no waiting at any time outside XX Gilkes Crescent. My XX is a regular disabled visitor so we request that this remains 'no waiting' and not 'no waiting/no loading' so she can park outside the house using her disabled badge. We request that Marker F - no waiting at any time - is extended approx 5 metres to the south along the Gilkes Crescent, to line up with the frontage of the houses along the southern side of Gilkes Place. We have serious concerns about safety when large vehicles are required to turn around outside XX Gilkes Crescent. It is the only place on the road they can turn and the turning circle is wholly inadequate as it stands. It needs to be kept vehicle free for a greater distance to the south on Gilkes Crescent than you have shown on the plan. Finally, we note Marker J proposes both paid and residents' parking at the south end of Gilkes Crescent and just residents parking at the north end. We think this should be reversed. Once a vehicle driving south along Gilkes Crescent has passed Gilkes Place on its right, it cannot turn around - it has to reverse until it reaches the Gilkes Place/Gilkes Crescent junction turning circle. This is dangerous and we do not think public parkers should be encouraged/permitted to park at the south end. Paid parking would be safer at the north end of Gilkes Crescent.

This proposal is negatively affecting our Road (Dovercourt Road) significantly, as it will increase traffic and parking in our road from teachers and pupils as traffic will be displaced. The road is already massively congested during term times with restrictions on parking in other roads. We strongly oppose the measures.

There is significant traffic on the lower end of Court Lane caused by people parking for school drop off/pick up. The "No Waiting" restrictions Mon-Fri 8-9.30 and 15-17.30 hrs on Calton Avenue should also cover Court lane from the cemetery to the junction with Desenfans (or maybe Druce). I also do not think the afternoon restrictions need to last until 17.30. That will have an adverse affect on local shops and residents. The restrictions should be til 16 or 1630 only.

We were consulted about CPZs last summer and in January 24 and the last consultation clearly showed that ONLY Gilkes Crescent wanted the CPZ. Carlton Avenue and Townley Road and East Dulwich Grove said they did not want a CPZ. We were also informed by XX that if we didn't want the CPZ then we wouldn't get it. This is a betrayal of trust. Please only go ahead with Gilkes Crescent.

This is going to cause chaos if you go ahead. Where are teachers to all the MANY schools we have in this small area going to park? They will park in the roads next to the CPZ which is where I live.. This isn't going to stop people driving. Also turning Carlton into a CPZ is not going to stop parents dropping off their children there which is the main reason I believe you have given to put a CPZ there. Parents will still drive and stop in illegal places to drop off and pick up .

Also the NHS Medical centre and Dentist in Townley Road attracts a lot of medical staff and patients in their cars . This plan for Townley Road is going to NOT help them . We are already very short of District Nurses and Health Visitors - this is going to make these jobs here in Dulwich very unattractive.

When you put the CPZ in North Dulwich and then East Dulwich and now here you are basically joining up all the areas you can when it is not necessary.

Double Yellow Lines - I spoke to one of the council employees at the Library meeting about CPZs in January 24. The plan is still overkill. Where are people on Townley and East Dulwich Grove supposed to park ? I am a cyclist so good sight lines are important but you DYLines are too long - please make them shorter and on ED Grove please remove them - I suspect you want to put cycling lane down there but it isn't necessary as most people cycle on Carlton Avenue.

Basically you are making Townley Road off limits to any local resident which is shameful.

All this will just drive residents to pave their front gardens into hard drive ways. That isn't very green is it? Leafy Dulwich front gardens are disappearing in our road (Beauval) as yet another drive way is being put in this month.

I wholly object to these proposals for the following reasons:

- there is no need for controlled parking on Gilkes Crescent. The primary problem is that someone is using the street to run some form of car dealership - this can be dealt with by Southwark if they were willing to enforce existing legislation

- I object to the need to buy a residents permit to allow for visitors or tradespeople to park

- I am deeply concerned about the impact of removing free parking from around the shops in the Village, they have already been negatively impacted by the LTN and ongoing, unnecessary road and pavement works (which is an outrageous misuse of public funds at a time of significant economic difficulty).

While I support the new parking restrictions I think they should be extended to a wider area. All the people dropping off at Jags and Alleyn's will now be parking in other roads and, to encourage the use of public transport, I think the permits should be extended to Dovercourt, Beauval and Woodward Roads.

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 place to live. I am very angry about it.

The measures are actually causing more pollution not less, it is absolute lunacy.

Gilkes Crescent between Gilkes Place and Calton Avenue is not open to through traffic due to a locked gate. So access to shared Zone J requires all vehicles to reverse towards Gilkes Place. This is a busy area for pedestrians, including children travelling to and from school. I don't believe it is appropriate for this zone (J) to be Shared. I believe it would be much safer for this area to be permit holders only as they are used to navigating their way out in a safe manner.

Gilkes Crescent from Gilkes Place to East Dulwich Grove has only houses with front driveways, and so would seem more suitable for a shared zone rather than Permit Holders only as per the current proposal.

The junction of Gilkes Crescent and Gilkes Place is to be used for turning, as has been the case for the past few years. Large vehicles need to turn and are often obstructed by parked cars. The creation of No Waiting Zone F will assist with this issue, but should be extended by one car length towards Calton Ave. this would allow a clear turning area as vehicles will reverse towards Calton Ave when making the turn and any vehicle parked outside our house (XX) is both a hazard to the vehicle making the turn and also in danger of being bumped. It also would help for any pedestrians who may be inadvertently behind the turning vehicle.

I wish to object to a number of aspects of the Dulwich Village CPZ.

1. I oppose the removal of the double yellow lines in Great Spilmans on the grounds that this will allow parking right up to the junction with East Dulwich Grove and make the junction more dangerous.

2. I oppose the extension of parking restrictions to East Dulwich Grove. This was not requested by residents but, in the statement of reasons, is said to be necessary because of the high likelihood of displacement of parking from Gilkes Crescent where parking restrictions are also to be introduced. Yet you make no mention of the implications of the extension for displacement parking in Great Spilmans which is left completely unprotected. The rationale for this appears to be that it is a private road (which it is). However, my understanding of the road traffic legislation is that it is open to Southwark to introduce parking restrictions in private roads provided that it has the consent of the person responsible for maintenance of the road i.e. the Dulwich Estate. Southwark has already reduced the quality of life of Great Spilmans residents by deliberately adopting a policy of increasing traffic in East Dulwich Grove. Southwark's own data show an 11% increase in traffic on East Dulwich Grove compared to pre-Covid levels. Now you want to make the situation worse. The effect of your proposals on the residents of Great Spilmans seems to me to be a relevant consideration. Yet there is little if any evidence that it has been considered.

3. I object to the extension of free parking for coaches in East Dulwich Grove. These vehicles, which are used to bring in children from outside the area, cause congestion, noise and pollution. I see no reason why the owners of these vehicles should not pay for their use of the road space on the same basis as others. Why is the local authority prioritising the needs of private schools and their pupils over the needs of local residents?

I was previously supportive of the idea of a controlled parking zone, but having now seen the detail it is clear this is not actually anything to do with reducing traffic or improving safety, but it is solely a money making scheme for the council.

All the parking bays currently listed as "paid for parking" should be replaced and made "residents permit holder parking" only. This would effectively reduce traffic and improve safety, where the current proposals do not.

The only justification for keeping them as paid for parking can be to raise revenue for the council. This is completely unacceptable. Parents at the private schools in Dulwich will have no problem paying the small charge for parking so it will have no impact on traffic, air quality or safety. Make them resident parking only and the scheme might have a chance of achieving its stated objectives.

I am writing to object to the above Traffic Management Order for the following reasons.

1. There is no parking issue on Druce Road.
2. I do not have a car and will be unduly financially punished when receiving visitors or when builders attend because I will have to purchase visitor parking permits.
3. I objected in the original Consultation but this appears to have been ignored.

I look forward to hearing from you.

CPZ Dulwich Village

I strongly object in this statutory consultation to the council's proposed amended CPZ in Dulwich Village for the following reasons:

1. The proposed CPZ is not wanted or needed by local residents
In the council's recent consultation (December 2023 to January 2024), the ONLY road in Dulwich that was in favour of a CPZ was Gilkes Crescent. All other local roads were overwhelmingly against, including East Dulwich Grove (91% against), Townley Road (74% against), and Calton Avenue (66% against).
 - By introducing this amended CPZ, the council is directly going against the results of its own public consultation, and imposing parking restrictions that residents do not want or need.
 - Cllr XX, Dulwich Village councillor, has said publicly that the council will only proceed with a CPZ if the majority of residents are in favour. Officers must honour promises made by locally elected representatives.
2. The council's reasoning about school-related parking is flawed
The council says in the consultation report that residents have raised concerns about parking-related issues linked to local schools, and specifically mentions 'known school issues on Townley Road'.
 - The report fails to mention that Alleyn's, the large independent junior and senior school on Townley Road, is introducing a new school policy for staff, visitors, parents and pupils that will significantly reduce the number of school-related private cars coming into the area and parking on local roads. Officers should not be basing recommendations on a situation that is now out of date.
 - The amended CPZ applies all year round rather than just in term time.
3. The council is exceeding its powers under the law
A local authority's power to impose a CPZ derives from Section 45 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, which says that a local authority may impose a CPZ only for the limited purposes specified in Subsection 45 (3), namely having regard to:
 1. the need for maintaining the free movement of traffic;
 2. the need for maintaining reasonable access to premises; and
 3. the extent to which off-street parking accommodation, whether in the open or under cover, is available in the neighbourhood or the provision of such parking accommodation is likely to be encouraged there by the designation of parking places under the Section.
 - The council is imposing a CPZ without having regard to these matters.

- The council is imposing a CPZ for reasons other than these limited purposes.

4. The council has not consulted with organisations representing residents or businesses about the amended CPZ

By law – Regulation 5 of The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure)(England and Wales) Regulations 1989 (SI 1989 No.1120) (“the Regulations”) – when proposing a CPZ the council has a specific mandatory obligation to consult with organisations representing those who use the road, or those likely to be affected, while proposals are still at a formative stage and before a decision is made. The council has not consulted with local residents’ associations or with local businesses about the amended Dulwich Village CPZ at any point.

TMO2223-037 CPZ Dulwich Village

I strongly OBJECT in this statutory consultation to the council’s proposed amended CPZ in Dulwich Village for the following reasons:

1. The council is imposing a CPZ that is not wanted or needed by local residents In the council’s recent consultation (December 2023 to January 2024), the ONLY road in Dulwich that was in favour of a CPZ was Gilkes Crescent. All other local roads were overwhelmingly against, including East Dulwich Grove (91% against), Townley Road (74% against), and Calton Avenue (66% against).

- By introducing this amended CPZ, the council is directly going against the results of its own public consultation, and imposing parking restrictions that residents do not want or need.

- Cllr XX, Dulwich Village councillor, has said publicly on many occasions – in person and in writing – that the council will only proceed with a CPZ if the majority of residents are in favour. Officers must honour promises made by locally elected representatives.

2. The council’s reasoning about school-related parking is flawed

The council says in its consultation report that residents have raised concerns about parking-related issues linked to local schools, and specifically mentions ‘known school issues on Townley Road’.

- The report fails to mention that Alleyn’s, the large independent junior and senior school on Townley Road, is introducing a new school policy for staff, visitors, parents and pupils that will significantly reduce the number of school-related private cars coming into the area and parking on local roads. Officers should not be basing recommendations on a situation that is now out of date.

- The amended CPZ applies all year round rather than just in term time.

3. The council is exceeding its powers under the law

A local authority’s power to impose a CPZ derives from Section 45 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, which says that a local authority may impose a CPZ only for the limited purposes specified in Subsection 45 (3), namely having regard to:

1. the need for maintaining the free movement of traffic;
2. the need for maintaining reasonable access to premises; and
3. the extent to which off-street parking accommodation, whether in the open or under cover, is available in the neighbourhood or the provision of such parking accommodation is likely to be encouraged there by the designation of parking

places under the Section.

- The council is imposing a CPZ without having regard to these matters.
- The council is imposing a CPZ for reasons other than these limited purposes.

4. The council has not consulted with organisations representing residents or businesses about the amended CPZ

By law – Regulation 5 of The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure)(England and Wales) Regulations 1989 (SI 1989 No.1120) (“the Regulations”) – when proposing a CPZ the council has a specific mandatory obligation to consult with organisations representing those who use the road, or those likely to be affected, while proposals are still at a formative stage and before a decision is made. The council has not consulted with local residents’ associations or with local businesses about the amended Dulwich Village CPZ at any point.

Please acknowledge receipt of this email.

I OBJECT TO THE REMOVAL OF FREE CAR SPACES OR LOADING ON
DULWICH - VILLAGE WAY
REASON: YOU ARE KILLING LOCAL BUSINESS AND RESTRICTING RIGHT
TO DRIVE TO DULWICH VILLAGE

I OBJECT to the above Traffic Management Order for the following reasons:

- no parking issue
- cost to residents
- cost of public funds
- causing parking pressure where there is none
- we objected in original consultation but have been ignored
- mobility

I OBJECT to the above Traffic Management Order for the following reasons:

- no parking issue
- cost to residents
- cost of public funds
- causing parking pressure where there is none
- we objected in original consultation but have been ignored
- mobility

I don't think there is a need for a CPZ on Calton Avenue as most residents have off-street parking in front of their houses. As long as the schools traffic observes the current rules (for example, not parking across driveways), there is no problem with parking at present. Thanks, Bill.

You have no mandate from the constituents to do this - in the first consultation residents across the area overwhelmingly told you they did not want this and they still don't. Yet you proceed without giving any thought to their feedback. Ignoring the views of your constituents denigrates the office to which you have been elected (by the very people telling you they don't need or want this) and puts all politicians in a negative light.

I am generally supportive of the proposal but object to the change loss of 19 free parking bays, which will be replaced by extremely expensive, £5 per hour bays. This is higher than the fees charged for on-street parking in Westminster or Chelsea, and difficult to justify in a much less affluent borough like Southwark. This is a considerable reduction of amenity for the local residents. While I understand the council needs to raise funds where it can and it may be challenging to keep these bays free, I object to the change to paid bays.

I agree with the proposals but I would prefer single yellow lines and not double at junctions. Those areas can be used for parking outside the restricted times. There is very little parking in the area for residents so taking some away will making parking worse and possible cause a backlash to the scheme. I believe parking at junctions is covered by existing legislation.

TMO2425-011 Dulwich Village CPZ

“XX OBJECT to the above Traffic Management Order for the following reasons:”

It is outrageous that limited Southwark funds are being misused against the wishes of the majority of the local residents.

- no parking issue
- cost to residents
- cost of public funds
- causing parking pressure where there is none
- we objected in original consultation but have been ignored
- mobility

It is outrageous that limited Southwark funds are being misused against the wishes of the majority of the local residents.

The proposals will increase congestion and reduce access to the businesses in Dulwich Village. There are sufficient restrictions already. More are unnecessary and will increase pollution from standing traffic.

Following the last 2 CPZ consultations in Southwark (last year) and then in Dulwich Village earlier this year where the majority of the people said overwhelmingly that they did not want a CPZ , we arrive at your new consultation. We are being ignored.

I strongly OBJECT to this new CPZ proposal. Only one road in the whole area was in favour and you have decided to implement it across 4 very important roads against the wishes of most local residents.

Why do our family object. Because you cited dangerous parking in the area and I don't see any empirical data for this? I hear a few people complaining on Twitter/X . I also don't see how making a CPZ in Carlton Avenue is going to change a very small minority's' behaviour .

Anyway the local community are working with Alleyns school to prevent very few parents parking illegally. Alleyns are also trying to make their staff walk or cycle to school . Why adding a CPZ to Townley Road is good for the residents is a falsehood. It will just become expensive and difficult to park in their own street. It will certainly make it very difficult for their staff who do drive to park and they will then drive further away to park their cars. This CPZ WILLLL CAUSE parking

pressure in the surrounding areas. I live in the street just next to Townley Road so our road will experience the effect of this CPZ and not in a good way.

The cost of this CPZ and DYLS is a cost to Southwark Council which we pay for - I do not agree with this cost to the residents and to the public funds when there is no parking issue.

The shops in Dulwich Village will once again be impacted by the CPZ and the DYLS where less and less people will use the shops as the Dulwich Square has already shown. People already avoid the area due to the LTN and this is going to make it worse. This is also not helpful for the groups that use St Barnabas church during the week which hosts all sorts of events like children and LinkAge groups - please note a lot of the parish are elderly and need to drive to church for weekday events.

The use of the DYLS is disproportionate in your plan. I cycle to work and the sight lines are fine. This is just extreme.

I object to the above Traffic Management order for the following reasons:-
There is currently no parking issue and
If implemented will cause parking pressure where there is none currently.

There is no parking pressure in either Carlton Avenue or Townley road, and neither of those roads were in favour of implementing a CPZ - Gilkes Crescent was the only road who wanted to implement.

Making Carlton Avenue and Townley Road a CPZ will move visiting traffic to Beauval and Dovercourt and cause parking pressure where there is currently none.

The majority of visiting traffic in Townley Road are teachers who come from elsewhere to teach. The road is mainly flanked by fields and there are limited residential properties on this road. There is plenty of parking space currently.

I support the proposed CPZ. It would be good if any signage could be limited to the height of front garden walls on Gilkes Crescent.

I am a pedestrian and do not own a car. I agree that parking on the corners in Woodwarde Rd is a problem but worry that 10 metre lines will encourage corner cutting and speed. At the moment traffic slows at the corners because visibility is poor.

I am writing with regard to the proposed CPZ in Dulwich Village and associated restrictions. This isn't in the expectation that Southwark councillors or officers take any notice whatsoever of its residents. Indeed any consultations are treated with utter contempt by the aforementioned groups, as was witnessed by the LTN 'consultation'. It appears the decisions are reached BEFORE residents are consulted. That being said, I will object to the proposed CPZ in the strongest possible terms;

*The consultation earlier in the year showed only residents of one road, Gilkes Crescent, wanted a CPZ, yet Southwark wish to include other roads in the proposed CPZ. All other roads were against, most by very wide margins. Why are residents being ignored, again?

*The real motives behind Southwark's push for a CPZ in Townley Road and Carlton Avenue are so transparent. It will place intolerable parking pressure on surrounding roads such as Dovercourt, Beauval, Woodward, Dekker, Desenfans, to name but a few. Then the residents of these roads who have to deal with displaced parking because of the CPZ will want a CPZ. And Southwark will then get what they wanted all along - A Dulwich Village wide CPZ. You're taking us all for fools, again. Just remember who pays for all this though, the Council taxpayer.

*The current parking situation is just about manageable, as is evidenced by the overwhelming majority not wanting a CPZ. So therefore Southwark are creating a problem that doesn't exist. Rather its about pursuing an agenda by a few lobbyists and their hand maidens at the Council.

*I also wish to object to the proposed double yellow lines on streets within the 'consultation' area. This was an issue brought up about 6 years ago in the streets leading off Woodward road and the vast majority of residents were against. There is no rationale for removing parking spaces, unless it's part of a plan to confect parking pressure. All the roads in Dulwich now have speed humps, so there is no danger of cars speeding along Woodward Road and endangering cyclists, pedestrians or other drivers from side roads. I've lived in Dulwich for over 30 years and am aware of no problems or accidents that necessitate DYs. As a daily driver, it is a non issue so what is the real motive?

As a resident of Dulwich Village I am concerned at my ability to secure a parking permit at any one of the current residential areas that are shown to be under consideration for permits (Gilkes Crescent for example).

Currently, I and my neighbours find it difficult to find any parking in the area and unless permits are made available to those who live on the road in Dulwich Village this would cause me to have to sell my vehicle to be compliant.

If the council can confirm it will provide permits to those residents in Dulwich, I will be in support of this proposal, until that time I have to show that I am wholly against it.

There is no need for a CPZ in Dulwich . We have lived here for 35 years and it is not necessary .

I strongly support restricting Gilkes Crescent & Carlton Avenue from people using the road to park and ride as part of a daily commute, or even in more extreme cases leaving vehicles while they go on holiday or even for commercial purposes. More generally anything that can be done to reduce the number of unnecessary vehicles driving around and improve the flow of traffic in the area I'm wholly in support of.

I wholly support the proposal. Parking rules have not be followed on Gilkes Crescent: there has been parking across driveways and abandoned vehicles. Crime - in the form of car break ins and car theft has also occurred.

I approve of the Gilkes Crescent, Carlton Avenue permit parking as it will get rid of these cars people have abandoned there.

I fully support the revised CPZ proposal for Dulwich Village. Limiting the CPZ to areas around local schools and focusing on school drop-off and pick-up times is a sensible approach.

This plan should help reduce traffic during peak times, which will significantly improve safety for children who walk or cycle to school. It will also contribute to reducing air pollution in the area, which is crucial for everyone's health, especially young people.

Additionally, these streets currently experience issues with long-term and commuter parking, making it difficult for residents and their visitors to find parking. The CPZ will help address these problems by prioritizing local residents, making parking more accessible for them.

It's also important to note that the proposal includes a reasonable amount of paid parking spaces and designated loading areas for goods vehicles. This should alleviate any concerns from local businesses, as it ensures that their customers and deliveries can still access the area easily. In fact, by improving parking turnover and reducing congestion, I believe this will benefit local businesses.

Overall, this is a balanced and thoughtful proposal that benefits both the community and local businesses while improving safety and the environment.

Strongly support CPZ in Gilkes Crescent

Happy with the revised CPZ

Support parking restrictions and hours

Fully supportive on environmental, traffic and parking grounds - having changed my tune on this topic! Ultimately this feels like the right thing to do by the x,000 kids walking to school in the area.

The impact of bringing in residents parking on adjacent streets will likely be significant making it even more difficult to park in areas that currently do not have any issues. I am not convinced that the Council has significant evidence that this element of the proposal has been requested by many residents.

It's really inconsiderate to suddenly require payment for parking outside my own home, especially when it's the most convenient spot for me. With all the financial difficulties many of us are already facing, adding this extra cost only compounds the burden.

Not only that but I'm an old man on medication and my daughters come to visit me a lot. This added cost and hassle may prevent them from visiting as often

Great proposal

Full support. Calton Avenue is full of cars used by Jags and Alleyns. As a resident I often cannot park anywhere near where I live.

Fully support CPZ in Dulwich Village! This will help to reduce car journeys and is long overdue - Dulwich has been a free car park for too long and should be a cpz in line with the rest of Southwark.

I object and disagree with the need to introduce a CPZ on Townley Road, I have lived in this road since 1986 and in all the time I have lived here there has never been a problem with parking, houses are only on one side of the street and it is not close to any train stations for commuters therefore there is plenty of space to park.

The school causes additional traffic obviously but this is mainly coaches and given that the road is already closed off to traffic one way between the same times as the proposed CPZ I fail to see how these changes would make a difference other than generating additional revenue for Southwark council.

The main congestion issues on the road are 100% caused by the road closures in Dulwich Village which has forced all the traffic that used to travel down Court Lane on to Townley Road. Southwark council introduced those changes at the time while ignoring the residents who objected.

Now Southwark council appears to want to further penalise Townley Road residents by forcing them and their guests to pay to park on their own road. Why introduce a scheme that affects the entire street if the issue is the school which is only at one end of the road? Residents in the neighbouring roads will be able to park for free whilst Townley Road residents will be forced to pay for parking, especially for those with mobility issues.

It feels like the views of the residents have been ignored again, as you said in your consultation letter, because we have not asked for this CPZ and do not believe there is an issue with parking/congestion that this would solve.

As a pensioner I feel further penalised because, during a cost of living crisis, my limited income will be reduced further to pay for the parking permit and my family will also have to pay to visit me and provide the vital support I need.

Very supportive of this CPZ as all the parking reduces sight lines for crossing the road and generates car journeys which lead to increased traffic in surrounding area. Please ensure that the hours cover school drop off and please extend the CPZ to other areas

1. Very pleased to see the proposal to put double yellow lines at the very dangerous junctions at the ends of Beauval and Dovercourt Rd. This is long overdue as cars block the crossing and sight of oncoming traffic. It has especially put children, the disabled, those with buggies and older pedestrians at risk when trying to cross the roads. Its also a major problem for drivers- we have had many near misses over the years.

You may get objections from residents who feel their convenience to park outside their house is much more important than the safety of others.

2. There is no doubt the proposal will displace the parking to roads that do not to have parking restrictions. However, the residents made the choice not to have it and this is the inevitable consequence. We suspect the opposition will come from a relatively small but very vocal group in these roads who oppose any restriction on their freedom to drive and park anywhere they like. Once in place it would be good if you give these roads the chance to join the zone

I object to the introduction of double yellow lines along Woodward road. (paragraph 2(o) in traffic order, 'F' on the map) This is a wholly unnecessary item which represents a waste of scarce council funds. There are no issues arising from individuals parking near the junctions in this road.

I object to the timings on the parking restrictions in Calton Avenue. Why are these different from the current bus gate operating hours? The traffic restrictions in this area are already overcomplicated and apply at times (school holidays and bank holidays) when the reason for their imposition does not apply.

I wholly support the need for extending the CPZ within the borough CPZs have been successful in other adjoining areas which is impacting on Dulwich Village and surrounding roads.. Extending the CPZ will reduce car usage particularly for short journeys and where active travel alternatives are available.

This will make school travel safer, and deter school travel by car

This proposal directly affects access to North Dulwich Lawn Tennis Club, for which I act as xx. The club is a key part of the community with several hundred members (including many schools/juniors), providing access to a sport with many health benefits (social, physical, mental). The proposed restrictions would severely impact this and would particularly affect children as they attend during the day. As a minimum, Gilles crescent should be left free from the restrictions. This street has been used for years and years to give direct and free access to the club, with no issues.

This proposal makes the area inaccessible for disabled that is very important to me.

It fundamentally does not solve the problem and just pushes people to park Forster away, likely on busier streets, risk getting in and out of their vehicles in traffic and leave their cars linger their while dropping goff while having a longer walk.

Sort out some better flowing parking and drop off areas instead of yielding to pressure by a small community that benefits from a bit less traffic twice a day - especially given most of them chose to buy next to the school that had been there for decades if not centuries before.

My children attend Alleyn's school. They are XX. We need to drive to drop them off. You cannot put in a cpz next to a school like this and give no ability for children to be dropped off without causing a fine. These schools have been there for much longer than any resident and so everyone who moved into the neighbourhood knew they were moving next to a school which would mean roads would be busy at drop off and pick up times. If there were a CPZ put in place what would be the councils suggestion for how my kids could be dropped at school? There isn't a bus or a train that's possible. I could understand a CPZ that was put in place for the middle of the day to stop people parking all day. But one put in place just on school hours proves to me that this is designed to only affect children which is a bit of a disgrace.

Stop this robbing of ordinary people and this inexcusable war on drivers! What a disgusting and shameful way to raise cash for the councils. No rationale to agree with! If the objective is to stop people driving around the area, first introduce many more buses and bus routes so people can get where they need to. And be aware of how many businesses and jobs in the area you are going to destroy!

We need access to this area daily during school days. We live very far from school, it's impossible to cycle or rely on crappy public transport. Imposing this restriction effectively takes away my daughter's education chance. Also imposing the restriction will have impact in two nearby school, therefore, Dulwich area will become less attractive.

I agree that parking should be controlled, but do not think that these measures go far enough. Limiting the highlighted roads will bring cars to park on smaller roads without the restrictions, eg dovercourt, which will be very disruptive. Residents parking should be Dulwich wide!

I find it puzzling that such a restrictive proposal has been put forward, as it offers little practical benefit for those who rely on their cars. While imposing restrictions may seem simple, developing meaningful, practical solutions that genuinely improve residents' quality of life is far more challenging. Unfortunately, this proposal falls short of that.

I would prefer to see a plan that addresses the needs of all residents and offers real alternatives, rather than simply adding more restrictions. It raises the question of whether the broader impact on the community has been fully considered, as the proposal lacks the thoughtful solutions we need.

I support the CPZ in order for the safety of the school children and the reduction of traffic and encouragement of use of public and other means of transport.

Although Alleyn's are very proactive in environmentally friendly transport, there are occasions when parking is necessary at school.

My son goes to Alleyn's. He takes the coach but there are occasions where this is not possible. I do not believe that my parking for a couple of minutes to drop him off causes any danger or traffic problems. I park respectfully, I avoid the coach bays and I don't park on the yellow lines or over drives. I also believe the school has created a car park for some staff but do not think it is unreasonable for some staff to park on the road outside their place of work. We respect and value our staff and making it impossible for more than a handful of them to drive to work is unacceptable and discriminatory to those who live further away or have disabilities or other limitations. The parking and driving restrictions around Dulwich are already more than enough to calm and limit traffic around the area and alleys is very supportive on active travel to school. This is an unnecessary and punitive measure.

While I am generally supportive of reducing traffic, Southwark council seems very much focused on making it impossible for parents to safely transport children to school in Dulwich area.

Generally, our children are taken to school on bike, however there are odd occasions where it is necessary to use a car, such as when older grandparents help out with the school run. This proposal will make it impossible to have ad hoc childcare from those less able.

Furthermore, the restrictions will not stop people using cars, only displace them, causing congestion, pollution and increasing danger to children in the surrounding area.

I am against this proposal because it leaves no where for us, resident xx to park our car. Currently, there is already very limited parking available, but this proposal would make it completely impossible for us to park in Gilkes place, while parking in Gilkes Crescent will also be very scarce.

I totally disagree with everything in this proposal

These changes are much needed and will help to promote safe walking and cycling which is so important to do.

The number of huge SUVs dropping off at the schools is ridiculous and creates such unnecessary danger and deters from active travel as it creates a dangerous environment around the school.

I attend Alleyn's School and walk in every day. These changes will make it safer for me to walk in and get to school.

I am in favour of these proposals. We have had a CPZ in xx for a few years now, and it has been very effective at reducing parking problems for residents.

My comment on the proposals here is that I am concerned that there is no mention of, nor apparent provision for, improving access for school pupils at JAGS and Alleyn's schools to arrive by bicycle. If the CPZ as implemented here is successful in reducing the number of parents using cars to drop-off and pick-up their children during school drop-off and pick-up hours, it would be hoped that some of those would travel to school by bicycle. What can be done to make sure that the roads approaching the school are less hostile, and there are safe routes for children to ride to school with their parents? I take one of my children to school in this area, and we won't cycle on East Dulwich Grove or Village Way due to unsafe driving by motorists.

Unless you stop people driving in their kids to school they will all do it. The air is toxic where the kids learn and play. Roll out more closures asap

With this revised CPZ, Dovercourt Road with its proximity to both the schools and the CPZ, will almost certainly become much busier for parking than it already is, forcing more residents to turn their front gardens into parking spaces, and making life harder for local residents to park. This halfway house measure does not work and should be reconsidered.

These actions will create even more disturbance to the residents. We already pay so much in taxes, and now to have to pay even more. When will this end? It doesn't make sense to have CPZ zones in these areas .

Please stop

Making it difficult for the local population .

This would cause me to not be able to park and get to work for school and teaching the kids is widely important for the nation so something like this would cause loads of problems for loads of staff

I whole-heartedly disagree with these parking restrictions. We all wish to minimise driving but there are times when children and adults need to drive to or from school. This can be for a variety of reasons including:

- Children needing to carry lots of sports equipment, instruments, art portfolios etc or get to school early/leave late at times not served by the school coaches. This happens a lot at these schools and part of the reason they are successful and contribute so much to the Dulwich community is that they offer a wide range of activities but these cannot all be served by children walking to school or the limited public transport in the area, and school coaches are not flexible enough.
- Parents needing to get to work or get home for meetings and so needing to drive children. In this time of VAT on school fees, it is even harder for parents and the schools to keep going so please do not make this any harder.
- There are no school coaches which get children to school in time for early morning clubs or pick up after matches or clubs (especially in the junior school) and you will end up with 7 and 8 year olds having to walk on their own to parents who have parked further away- this is utterly unsafe. Or parents will need to hover in the car on the streets waiting for their children to come out the gates on their own and again, this will cause accidents.
- Public transport in the area is poor compared to many parts of London and some parents have no choice but to drive.
- Alleyn's and Jags are destination schools: children travel from far away and the school coaches cannot provide all the timings needed. If parking is removed, the number of children looking to come to these schools will eventually drop and these schools contribute huge amounts to the local community. Even if people don't agree with private schooling, the fact remains that thousands of people benefit from having access to the facilities at these schools and if the school suffers, so will the local area.
- Anyone who cannot walk very far will not be able to attend events at school or pick up children- this includes grandparents such as ours who help pay the fees and want to be involved in their grandchildren's lives but you will make that very hard to do.
- Sometimes parents need to attend events at school and the only way to fit that in with work is to drive- please do not stop parents being involved in their children's schooling. Parents can park near other schools so please do not penalise Alleyn's and Jags.

- These schools have been there for 400 years. Anyone buying or renting a house on the roads nearby did so knowing there was a school nearby so there is no need to change parking for them. If anything, traffic has reduced nearby in recent years so there is even less need to introduce parking restrictions now.

- It is always possible to find parking in the roads near Alleyn's so this is not a serious issue and not worth disrupting so many people's lives. If you are concerned about people parking all day then introduce a ban from 11.30-12pm for example, which will also be very easy to police.

- Alleyn's School itself, despite being very pro active transport, do not support this as they realise it is impractical for parents and could be very unsafe for children. Please be fair and do not introduce the parking restrictions.

Have been working in the area for the last 15 years, all these restrictions are for one simple reason to make revenue for the council no benefit for the residents and contractors what so ever. The whole this is dust in the people's eyes. It doesn't mater what people think!

This proposal will make it impossible for us to drop or collect our daughter from school. We have 3 young children so cannot cycle. There is no public transport provision for us. The only reason you have to even consider this is because you shut all the roads and now the residents of these roads are complaining. To do this would be to compound your mistake.

This proposal will make it impossible for us to take our daughter to school. We have 3 children so cannot cycle in a bucket bike or similar, the only way we can drop them at school is by car. Blocking parking makes this impossible and there is no available public transport that meets this need. Furthermore, the whole world has been fine without these rules - the only reason you might need them is because you shut all the roads. If the roads were open then the residents wouldn't have felt overwhelmed by traffic

I entirely object these proposals..

This will just push parking into narrower and tighter areas.

Oppose parking restrictions- already so many in the area.

I am a parent with my children attending the local Alleyn's school in the affect area. We drop children in morning and collect in the evening during the proposed restricted hours. It's wholly unnecessary and will make the children walk farther in side roads to be dropped off and safety risk walking alone. It's targeted against school parents and have no justification except creating more hassles for parents and students and penalising them financially. . The parking is already marked and no obvious issues are known to us. I would value if it's not implemented.

As a parent of a pupil at Alleyn's junior school, we use our electric vehicle for the 4km journey to pick up and drop off, parking on Townley Road. 3 days per week, our EV remains parked on Townley Road for the duration of the working day, as we commute directly from school drop off to Central London. The CPZ would cause displacement of parking on to nearby streets, and will be personally disruptive.

Our 3 children go to school at JAGS and Alleyns. Already there are traffic restrictions on townley road, hillsboro road and green dale road. These further traffic restrictions are unnecessary and incredibly obstructive to any parent who has a child at these schools, who cannot live within walking / cycling distance.

I believe the timings should be reconsidered to allow for school drop offs and pick ups of younger children, such as having parking restrictions only from 8:30-15:45. The current proposal will cause further congestion and traffic in surrounding residential streets at busiest times due to the number of schools in the area.

I believe you need to make an extra effort to improve public transport, specifically bus frequency as this makes it really difficult for very young children, elderly people to travel in these times.

Completely pointless. The current restrictive regime is more than sufficient. This will do nothing to help residents, visitors and those using local school. If additional measures must be brought in, they need to come with alternative travel options. Public transport currently isnt sufficient. Cycle paths are poor. Safe routes to schools are inadequate. Making marking more difficult without the alternative arrangements doesn't help anybody

As a parent who drops and frequently picks up a child to Alleyn's, this proposal is short-sighted and will cause an increase in air pollution and congestion, and incredible inconvenience to school staff , students and parents. Instead of parking along Townley road and walking to the school, parents will have to idle in the few remaining permissible spots, increasing air pollution and congestion. Secondly, removing the ability to drop off and pick up children has a monetary cost : the school coach service costs nearly 2500 a year .

There are very few parking areas in these streets as it is. Sometimes I have to drive to this area as my daughter goes to school there and when there are train disruptions which can be very last this is the only way I can get her to school on time. If you had linked this proposal to an agreement with Southern Trains and Thameslink that they would reinstate the quarter hourly service between 0730 and

9.30 and in the mid to late afternoon into the evening, you would have a more cohesive strategy and probably a huge increase in support.

I object to this proposal as it effectively stops me dropping off my daughter to school.

My children go to the local schools. We are all for greener, safer travel and cycle almost everywhere but sometimes (esp. given the woeful public transport across Dulwich) we have no reasonable option but to drive. Your schemes have already made it incredibly painful to get children where they need to be on for instance an inclement day in the depths of winter or when they need to transport bulky kit bags and musical instruments, or when the school won't allow them to take their bike through the buildings. Aggravating an already tense parking situation will create yet another burden on locals trying to get on with life.

Although I very much prefer to use public transportation, this proposal is impractical and punitive. It will prevent occasional visitors and in many cases stop required parent visits to the school. My child is disabled and frequently ill. I often have to pick her up with little notice, but do not have a blue badge. Your proposal will create severe issues and appears driven by a complete lack of understanding of the wide geographical dispersal of students and their special needs

I got ADHD child to drop off every day to school and this is not going to help at all

As a regular visitor to the proposed area, and given due consideration to the current restrictive access to the area, this will have a significant impact to my family's access to the local facilities, including, local sports facilities, restaurants and schools.

I use that space to drop my daughter when she is late for school. There is no public parking nearby so make this a controlled area will gravely inconvenience me

I object to this proposal.

I note something similar was introduced on Hillsboro Road and now there is a single resident car parked there each day. No one else can park there even paying & also no income for the council in parking permits.

Why are there no waiting zones around a school at pick up and drop off times, do you want parents to circle in cars causing more pollution?

Sometimes people need to get to the schools for short periods of time for volunteering etc which would not no longer be possible.

The proposed parking charges are extortionate akin to those of central London.

There are inadequate facilities for short term free parking as in all other boroughs.

Some of these parking restrictions are for Saturdays too. This is a wholly residential area then so no need for this.

Visitors to residents would no longer be able to come freely as there aren't enough parking spaces.

Please leave this alone as it is, there is no need for this change - it won't even bring in any money as no one will use the 1-2 hour parking places, will cost a huge amount and be of no benefit to anyone.

This seems solely to harm anything to do with the schools in this area!

I strongly support this proposal. The area in question has a very high number of school children from age 4 to 18 passing through daily on during term times during the proposed CPZ hours, mainly on foot and bicycle (including those who are dropped off by bus and then walk a short distance to school). There is very heavy car traffic particularly down Townley Road, Calton Avenue and Woodwarde Avenue from parents attempting to park to drop off children, making the immediate area around the schools very hazardous for pedestrians and cyclists. My daughter and I cycle through this area every day to and from school at JAGs, and I see instances most days of distracted or dangerous car driving from parents particularly down Calton Avenue. The changes will not in reality impact any parent wishing to park on Calton Avenue or Townley Road for school drop-off, as there are no spaces left on these roads in the morning given the number of residents who are already parked there. The effect should therefore mainly be to prevent unnecessary car traffic. Promoting active travel and the use of public transport rather than private car use is highly important to the lives of everyone, from a safety perspective, a public health perspective and an environmental perspective. The proposals give a fair balance between preserving the ability of residents and visitors as well as those using local shops to access the area and park cars if appropriate, and preserve emergency vehicle and delivery access. The proposals contain some provisions to minimise 'spill-over' effects into the immediate area, though I am concerned they do not go far enough by themselves. I appreciate there are other CPZs being proposed by Southwark which may help with this.

It's a terrible idea

Parking restrictions would push traffic on to other roads. People still need cars to access village and schools with young children. Already unsafe with people parking irresponsibly.

I am a regular visitor and will find it extremely difficult to park as these areas already have access restrictions during school times and not being able to park during an extended period will cause immense hardship especially given Frequency of trains into North Dulwich is very limited (2 per hour)

Following a previous survey all residents of Dulwich Village area were against the introduction of CPZ. Therefore, it would be unlawful to introduce them on a smaller scale.

There is no parking issues in any of the roads listed. In a residential survey only the residents of Gilkes Crescent were in favour. The School has been there since 1857 and if it were not those green fields would be houses. If teachers can't park the school will fail.

Teachers can't afford Dulwich house prices there since before the houses. The majority of Carl

I wholly object to this proposal. As a school parent with a newborn baby, it is not practical or possible (as there is no direct public transport route and I clearly cannot cycle with my newborn) for me to drop my 4 year old daughter at school without parking very briefly on these roads. This will also have a negative impact on nearby shops and cafes/restaurants who already struggle to cope with the

impact of the LTNs - if people cannot park on roads outside of the LTN, they will simply not use these facilities.

It's unnecessarily and the hours of operation are clearly targeting school drops and pick ups.

A cpz operational for 2 hours in the middle of the day would be much fairer

I do not support CPZs in our area. It is wholly unnecessary and pushes parking into other areas just like the restrictions to traffic do. I think it's not a sustainable way to approach London traffic

These parking restrictions make life really hard for most people visiting the area. As a resident I don't want Dulwich to become a problem for people to reach because that makes my life harder too. Can we just keep Dulwich normal as it is. I have lived in Dulwich for over 17 years. These changes are unnecessary.

I supported the original Dulwich wide CPZ. I support these proposals and would like to see further CPZ restrictions introduced. It is key that parents taking the children to school, and I am one of them, are discouraged from using cars.

I have a child at Alleyn's School, which falls within the area. We cycle to and from school almost every day, adhering to the school's green policies and using the cycle lanes provided. However, like many at the schools in the area who play a musical instrument and sport, my child plays both the cello and both cricket and tennis, and when two or more of these fall on the same day it simply isn't safe to cycle with both a cello on one's back and carrying a cricket bag and tennis racket, and on those occasions we drive. In these instances we will also look to car share, and where possible we will arrange for different kit to be taken on different days in order to limit the number of times we aren't able to cycle, but it would simply not be possible to cycle, or indeed walk, with everything needed. I firmly believe that Alleyn's school does everything it can to encourage and educate parents and pupils to choose the greenest option, and therefore that cars are only used when necessary. I feel fairly confident that neighbouring schools will be doing the same. I think this policy would unnecessarily penalise both residents (as your consultation so far has shown, only one road in the error is pro this move) as well as conscientious parents who only drive when it is strictly necessary. I very much hope that you decide against this action.

I support the revised CPZ proposal for Dulwich Village, particularly because it prioritizes safer and healthier travel for schoolchildren. By restricting traffic during school drop-off and pick-up times, the plan encourages more walking and cycling, which is crucial for reducing congestion and creating a safer environment for young people on their way to and from school.

Another key benefit is the positive impact on air quality. Fewer cars driving through the area at peak times will lead to less pollution, which is vital for both the children and the wider community. Cleaner air and quieter streets will make the neighborhood more pleasant for everyone, and this step will help contribute to long-term environmental improvements.

In addition, the inclusion of paid parking spaces and loading areas addresses the practical needs of local businesses without compromising the environmental and safety goals of the proposal. By reducing unnecessary traffic, these changes can actually help local shops by making the area more accessible and attractive to customers.

In summary, the proposal is a well-considered way to make the area safer for

school travel, improve air quality, and create a more livable environment for residents and businesses alike.

Dovercourt Road must be included in the CPZ. Being located and abutting Alleyn's school means all the pupils and staff and visitor will park in Dovercourt Road adding to the existing terrible congestion and parking during school hours and displacing residents from being able to park.

I live very close to the CPZ and my children walk to schools in the CPZ. The CPZ should reduce school run traffic making it safer and more pleasant for children going to and from school and residents. There is a risk that this CPZ displaces traffic and parking to nearby areas. It would be much better if you implement your original plan with a much wider CPZ. Specifically my road, Turney Road, needs a CPZ to reduce traffic and reduce risk caused by parked cars to cyclists.

This makes it impossible for working parents who are travelling on to work after the school run to be able to walk their children safely into school. We would need to park so far away that the drop off would be really difficult stressful and therefore dangerous, particularly if you need to drop small children at more than one school

I fully object to this parking zone. As a resident on the other side of lordship lane this will have a severe impact on already congested streets from a parking perspective. It is currently a nightmare for any resident to park their car, effectively making them a prisoner on the street as moving your car risks not being able to park anywhere near your home for some time. If, like me, you have small children, I hope you understand that this can be incredibly impractical as well as potentially dangerous. Without conducting a CPZ review to the east of lordship lane you risk an element of Chaos. Please consider other options - expanding the CPZ, shorter hours or a complete redesign. There is a serious problem in the whole area with parking caused by all day parkers, overnight vans and multi car ownership. Please think twice about the impact this will have on the residents next to the CPZ.

I have been working at Alleyn's for 10 years and bring my three children to work as they attend the school where I work. The resident parking will enormously impact on the commute of four people who share travel together. Occasionally my children take the bus which is massively over full and they often have to wait for a number of buses to be able to get on to get home. It seems unfair to me to stop people from being able to commute by electric vehicle to work without ensuring that the appropriate changes are made in relation to this - will there be significantly more buses laid on? Please don't make this change to Calton Avenue - it has an immense impact on the teaching body of the school. My feeling is that the residents of the area were fully aware that they are investing in an area that hosts a school and its community when they moved into the area and that should be supported rather than penalised in this way!

Thank you for your consideration,

How are we as a family supposed to manage this?! We cant walk, the kids cant walk or bike alone, there is no bus. No consideration what so ever.

I choose to work locally in South East London to ensure I can get home quickly for personal reasons, often parking my car on Townley or Calton Road. Being able to return home swiftly during lunchtime and after work is really convenient. Without this, it would be an hour's walk and I may not be able to continue my current job.

In order to reduce car traffic during school drops we need to ensure adequate public transport to an area that has many schools and high foot fall. For eg. There is only one bus route from Brixton/Herne Hill to Townley road, and that is the 37. During school hours it is impossible to get on a bus due to the large number of students and other commuters . Blocking traffic and stops on Townley and Carlton is only valuable if you are able to provide increased volume of buses and other public transport to ensure children can safely get to school on time

If you are going to do a parking scheme you need to do all of the nearby streets for a wider area not just a few. Otherwise you will just move the problem and concentrate it. Dovercourt will become the closest unrestricted parking street to the school and one of the closest to North Dulwich Station. It will be crammed. If Dovercourt gets a CPZ, next it will be Beauval etc. It needs to be all of the streets or none of them.

I suggest you add Dovercourt Road and Beauval to the scheme

There is no parking issue where you would like to introduce this CPZ.

This proposal is also failing to recognise that some children are sometimes unable to walk or come actively to school (breaking a leg is a common occurrence in children), and may need transport in a car at times. This includes children with a temporary ailment, as well as those with permanent disabilities.

You are also failing to consider that the wider area has a very low PTAL score and that public transport is not a solution for everybody based on the current transport offer.

As a result of this CPZ you are going to create parking issues to other roads

My two children attend Alleyn's school and they are dropped off by car. If these restrictions are introduced, it will cause great disruption to our daily routine. I would imagine more chaos every morning and afternoon as parents fight for even smaller number of parking spaces available. The problem is the public transport options are wholly inadequate and therefore many parents must rely on their car. NIMBYism is not the solution.

This is a catchment area for a number of schools, and there are a wide variety of commuters, visitors and other service providers who need access and short term parking during school opening and closing hours.

The proposal inconveniences a great number of people, for negligible benefit.

I disagree with reducing parking outside Alleyn's School. Whilst parents rarely use cars for the regular journeys to and from school, we do need access to the school for collection of vulnerable and sick children, and for journeys involving large amounts of kit for music or sport.

I am so fed up of being penalised for having a car whilst the council is spending stupid money on creating squares in Dulwich village. You are highly penalising

businesses in the area . You should be supporting local who need to park the car nearby for shops or to commute!

I am a local resident, and both of my children go to school in the area impacted by the proposed CPZ.

- This will make it incredibly difficult for hundreds of parents of children at local schools to park on the school commute (Dulwich Hamlet, Dulwich Village Infants, JAGS prep, JAGS pre-prep and Alleyn's). Many families do not live within easy walking distance of these schools and rely on being able to park on these streets to get their children to school quickly and safely.

- It will make access to and therefore the use of wonderful local facilities such as North Dulwich tennis club and JAGS sports centre much more difficult, and will threaten their future if members cannot easily access it (my children are currently members of both)

- If a controlled parking zone is required to prevent commuters using East Dulwich and North Dulwich train station to park on these streets, then this could easily be achieved by following the precedent set around Herne Hill station, where restricted hours are 12-2pm. This allows families who are trying to get their children to school and clubs quickly and safely to still park in these areas at school drop off and pick up time

- This proposal shamefully appears to be targeting families of local school children to prevent them being able to drive to school. There are no viable alternatives for many families.

I have two children that go to this school, one is on a music bursary as such leaves and starts at different times that make it unsafe for her to always use the bus. I do not earn a lot of money and cannot afford for her laptop to be stolen as such dripping and kicking up is the only solution. cycling is not safe and the weather is not great for cycling.

I wholly object to this proposal as I find the parking situation in Dulwich Village is entirely adequate. The introduction of CPZ will inconvenience visitors and will not deter those who drive their children to school from continuing to do so. Current traffic issues are not usually caused by inconsiderate parking, but rather by the volume of traffic. The introduction of CPZs will only increase congestion as cars try to stop and offload children anywhere on the road as they will not want to stop and pay for parking. This will have implications in terms of safety and the environment. I fully object to the proposal.

As a parent of a child attending one of the schools in the proposed CPZ, I strongly support the proposal. For too long, parking in this area has been chaotic and dangerous at school drop off and pick up times, and it is a wonder that there are not more injuries to pedestrians and cyclists.

Parking near schools like this should always be heavily restricted during drop off and pick up times -- if parents do need to drive, they should park or drop off a safe distance away from the school, so that their parking maneuvers and three point turns when in a rush and children are crossing roads are not a danger to others.

I object to controlled parking zones in the mentioned areas. There is already a camera controlled route between 8-9am and 3-4.30pm.

There is also an additional restriction of a school street on Hillsborough Road. I feel the restrictions around Townley Road and the surrounding roads are excessive in relation to the restrictions already in place. If put in place, it would be a major inconvenience to commuters, visitors and workers to the area and increase traffic in the surrounding roads, which I feel defeats the purpose of the restriction in the first place.

My daughter goes to Alleyns School and because she lives so far from the school I sometimes need to collect her or drop her off by car. Restricting parking around the school will make this very difficult.

Sufficient traffic calming measures already in place

I teach at Alleyn's School , I have a xx which means working long hours to support the xx of the pupils. I need to be able to park in order to do my job. I park on Carlton Avenue & need to be able to park in easy walking distance of the school. The current restrictions seem to be completely adequate.

I work at Alleyn's school as an xx, earning a minimal wage. The proposed hours of the CPZ will prevent me from being able to drive to work for a morning, afternoon or full day shift; therefore I will no longer be able to work.

I am a parent to an Alleyn's student, and parking within a 10 minute walk of Hillsboro Road is vital to our family. I cannot ride a bike, due to health reasons, and cannot realistically take the bus due to where my house is and how old my young baby is. We already struggle every morning and afternoon to find parking. Please do not do this. We are not wealthy people, and just want to give our daughter the best education for her advanced intelligence. We cannot afford to pay for parking.

I will not be able to use my car to drop my children at school and then commute to work. This will mean getting a train and a bus with my children (ages 2 and 4), and then another bus from their nursery/school to Alleyn's. Please reconsider.

This will cause problems on our road. There is plenty of space on Carlton Avenue and to make that restricted is completely unnecessary. Does someone at the council live on Carlton Avenue, as the changes are entirely to their benefit and to the worsening of others.

This will affect a number of people's access to the school who live further away and are unable to walk or get appropriate public transport. This will also affect a number of parents dropping off children.

I am completely committed to using public transport whenever possible, and for the main part prefer it, but the lack of available transport from my home to my work place would mean the my journey time would increase by 300% - and that is not an exaggeration. Furthermore as a Special Educational Needs Coordinator, my hours are long. I need to be in school early every day and already leave my home at 7.15 am to get to work. This change to parking would put undue pressure and stress on me and I would have to seriously consider whether I needed to find an alternative post.

I wholeheartedly agree with this proposal to reduce traffic around the school

I am writing to express my firm opposition to the proposed Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in Dulwich Village, particularly as it pertains to Townley Road, Carlton Avenue, and the surrounding areas. As a parent with a child attending Alleyn's School, I have serious concerns about the impact these additional restrictions will have on families like mine during the already stressful drop-off and pick-up times.

There are already existing parking restrictions on Carlton Avenue and Townley Road, which make the process of dropping off and collecting children from school incredibly difficult. The new CPZ proposals will only exacerbate this issue, making it nearly impossible for parents to safely and efficiently manage drop-off and pick-up without causing unnecessary congestion or violating parking regulations.

It is important to consider the daily practicalities faced by parents who rely on these roads for short-term parking during school hours. By adding further restrictions, the council risks creating an even more chaotic and unsafe environment around the school during peak times. The proposed time windows (8:00 am – 9:30 am and 3:00 pm – 5:00 pm) are precisely when parents need access to these areas.

In addition, I am particularly concerned about the displacement of parking into other nearby roads, which will only shift the problem elsewhere and create additional stress for local residents. The focus should be on improving traffic flow and accessibility for all road users, rather than imposing further constraints that are detrimental to both parents and residents alike.

I urge the council to reconsider these proposals and to engage more meaningfully with parents, schools, and residents to develop solutions that address the concerns around school-related traffic, without penalising those of us who need to use these roads for essential, short-term purposes.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I look forward to your response and hope that you will take into account the very real challenges that these restrictions will pose for the local community.

I work at Alleyn's school and I need somewhere to park my car

My daughters attend Alleyn's and JAGS school and occasionally we need to drive - eg to pick up for optician/medical appt or if carrying cello which doesn't fit on the bus. We all try to take the bus when we can rather than drive but on occasion it is genuinely necessary so please don't make life too hard by stopping all parking.

The great charm of this area is that it does not feel you have to pay every time you park. It has become harder to park in the area over the last 20 years but it is still possible to find spaces easily enough. A CPZ is unnecessary and feels simply like a money making tool!

I support the proposal as it will reduce traffic flow to the area and encourage active travel. However, as a resident on one of the adjoining streets in a different CPZ (with a 12-2 restriction) I am concerned that the discrepancy between the restriction timings will lead to displacement of parking onto our road. Please could the Council consider aligning timings to reduce the risk of displacement.

I strongly object to the CPZ. I work in the area affected and it would have a negative impact on me being able to reach my place of employment.

As a resident of Steen Way, our only available parking is on Green Way. We are not eligible for a residents permit. With the introduction of further restrictions in the area, I believe that Green Way would become further congested. It is already not fit for parking for residents in the area who are unable to receive a permit.

Please would you extend the parking restrictions for longer in the morning to stop parents parking at the secondary schools.

I think this is a terrible idea. As a visitor, coming to the community tennis club, it would be extremely difficult to visit without coming by car (with my small children who cannot cycle or walk). It feels like a real shame to be making SE London more difficult to navigate, especially for those of us with family members.

In reference to the proposed car parking/stopping restrictions on East Dulwich Grove and adjoining roads, I would very much like to see longer periods where no vehicles may stop/park on the roads. 7am-10am and from 3pm-7pm at least. I have a child that attends one of the nearby schools and I am fully aware of the great number of parents of pupils who make wholly unnecessary and ridiculously short trips in their cars to/from school up to twice a day. The area is well served by train and bus routes and a great many pupils live within a 30 minute walk to these schools. Your proposal is long overdue.

I object to you placing a CPZ on Townley Rd and Carlton without placing one on Dovercourt Road. Parking is really hard on this road during the day already due to Alleyn's School teachers & students> this will make it impossible. As a council you chose to allow Alleyn's to expand their pupil numbers making parking even worse. I would rather you placed a CPZ on Dovercourt and responded this way in the previous consultation. If you choose not to place a CPZ on Dovercourt Road then I fully oppose your suggested CPZ on Townley and Carlton road as it will significantly affect my ability to work in Healthcare and my quality of life.

I would like to voice my objection to the below proposal,

Permit Parking Area (PPA 'DV')

K

Mon-Fri

08:00-09:30 15:00-17:00

The planned Permitted is simply designed to course maximum disruption, as currently most residents in the area have off street parting, so the proposed installation will of permitted park at the primary hours that the JAGS and Alleyns is starting and finishing times has nothing to do with improving the quality of the life or reducing traffic it is simply designed to cause inconvenience.

how will this permitted parking benefit, not the residents as housing for majority of the road is on a single side, in the years have used the road there has been no issued with inappropriate parking / block of residential housing, traffic has never been an issue either.

I have not seen any issues with regards to safety either as all road users (motorists and cyclists) are very aware of each other.

There already plenty of restrictions (Low traffic neighbourhoods / LTNs) around the area that affect car usage, and most of it has cause more traffic, specific affecting the main roads as cars are funnelled in to a single road because alternative routes have been cut off.

At present the LTN's are simple designed and created to cater for the local residents, without much consideration for the affects it will have around the wider area and the problem will cause these other neighbourhoods, if the is allowed to continue the whole London will be on be LTN , affecting businesses / schools / hospitals etc...

This constant imposition of restrictions is not the only way to proceed the role of local and national government is to make life easier for the everyone not just a select few.

The parking restrictions are therefore, unnecessary and will impact the local business and the schools is proportionately, with little benefit to the residents of the road.

I argue you to consider the implication of imposing the restrictions, there are time we need to take our daughter to school and it necessitates us to be able to leave our vehicle in the area, however our impact to the residents is nil most if not all have off street parking.

The affected schools have wide catchment areas and often parents of students will need (even if generally they use the coach/active travel/public transport) to drop off or pick up near the school by car (before after medical appointments or external sports or other engagements). This could be in any weather and when the student may have a lot of equipment (bags, sports kit, musical instruments etc). Making all

the areas around the school where fast drop-off/pick-up is so helpful "no waiting" seems excessive.

More parking and driving restrictions is not the answer, it has caused so many issues and not being able to drive my daughter to the hospital as a resident during those hours is frankly ridiculous and barbaric. The whole driving restrictions have been an unmitigated disaster and diverted more traffic from to my road - Matham Grove - something agreed by Southwark Council and Councillor XX especially after their traffic monitoring exercises backed this up. They subsequently said they would do something t about it like making Matham Grove a cul de sac but of course nothing has been done. Again empty promises and lies from the Council and councillors. The only reason for more timed traffic restrictions is to get more money in fines for the council, which clearly care less about residents and more about their coffers, even when their evidence tells them their plans are wrong or need changing. Enough is enough

Children in local schools with physical needs will have to commute by cars to school and the parents will have to be able to park closer to the school to take the special needs children safely into school.

I appreciate the concerns that the proposals are meant to address and in principle would like to support them. However increasing restrictions on Townley Road and, in particular, Calton Avenue, would cause difficulties related to care of our family member who has autism as I am often called to come to the school at short notice to meet with teachers, provide support and take them home in event of a mental health crisis. As you will appreciate taking public transport is not an option in this circumstance. We do not park near school under any other circumstance during the school day and I always seek to avoid Townley Rd where possible and do not park in the coach bays.

I wonder if reducing the duration of the proposed restrictions would still allow discouragement of people unnecessarily using the area at peak drop-off / pick-up times but avoid penalising people like our family who might inadvertently stray into the restricted times for legitimate and unavoidable needs related to an equality act protected characteristic (as I have done before when called to pick them up towards the end of the school day).

Difficulty parking when collecting children from school

I object due to the financial implications of not being able to drop my kids to school with a car. There is no alternative for my family especially important during the winter months where walking isn't an option

With three children that attend the school on Townley Road, it becomes very difficult for us to partipate in school related activities that often take place during those times. I believe this will actually disrupt the sense of community of the school, which boasts students from all over London.

This presents further inconvenience to busy, working families who have no alternative to drive their children to school. Imposing further additional parking restrictions at pick up and drop off times in an around Dulwich and East Dulwich will make an already difficult juggle even more of a challenge. I do not support this.

Change is never easy, but the council is absolutely right in trying to make a change. This may only be the first of many variations, but something needs to happen to improve safety and air quality in the area. I trust that these changes come with monitoring and feedback for future adjustments.

The proposed scheme will cause displacement of parking to adjacent roads thereby creating a problem where none exists at the moment/ worsening the current situation.

The proposed scheme will cause displacement of parking to adjacent roads thereby creating a problem where none exists at the moment/ worsening the current situation.

My road will become even more crowded due to cars parking away from the CPZ. At the moment there is no parking issue here and locally. Some people do have to drive to work nearby, due to working early or late, and need to be near their work place for safety reasons- catering and cleaning staff for example at the local schools.

This is another way for the council to make money out of hard working residents. Although School traffic is not always perfect, it is no different to any other location near a school. I would encourage the council to work with the Schools, as we know they are doing already before putting in these draconian measures. The proposed charges are also higher than other boroughs.

I regularly visit East Dulwich Grove and occasionally need to park for various purposes. There are so many roads now closed off to access or where no parking is allowed that it is a major deterrent to using those shops and other facilities. Why are these further restrictions necessary? I doubt if traders and small businesses in East Dulwich and Dulwich can survive on just those that live within walking distance. I regularly use bus services but there are still many occasions when I need to use a car.

I wholly object to the restriction of parking on Calton Avenue. It is vital for the schools and is fine as it is.

Very inconvenient.

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 xx, where I live). This change will exacerbate all these issues.

I object to the proposal in the main as staff and teachers at the local schools need to be able to park close to these local schools without financial penalty. We live on townley road and parking doesn't appear to be an issue in our opinion. The proposal would negatively impact the neighbouring streets of Dovercourt and Beauval Rds by pushing move parking onto these and making them much more difficult to get through.

This proposal is unacceptable. There are lots of families have no options but rely on cars to do school pick ups and drop off. This proposal will provide them with no options.

I wholly object to such a proposal

The proposals seem to take no account of the fact that there is a large school nearby! What is the provision for temporary parking for parents dropping off children? Wishful thinking along the lines that a disincentive to drive will magically encourage parents with small children to use bicycles in January while carrying school bags and musical instruments is almost a comically idiotic proposal! What will actually happen is that cars will stop - dangerously - in the middle of roads to do 'flying' dropoffs after which young children would walk unaccompanied with valuable equipment. This risks road safety and child protection. And parking, and flying dropoffs, will be displaced disproportionately to nearby streets. This is a recipe for a dangerous and chaotic mess.

I support the implementation of the CPZ in Dulwich Village, however the hours should be in line with the East Dulwich CPZ (8am - 6pm)

I live on xx, next to xx. Since parking in front of my home has been made pay-only, my only option is Gilkes Place. It's hard to find parking in the morning, but I could usually find a spot late at night after moving my car from Gallery Road. Parking on Gallery Road at night is unsafe due to frequent incidents of smashed windows.

If this proposal goes ahead, the only possibility left would be parking in Gilkes Crescent. This is problematic for two reasons. First, the road between Gilkes Place and Gilkes Crescent was recently closed (another great proposal of yours). Second, and most importantly, there are very few parking spots in Crescent because all residents on Gilkes Crescent have private drives, and obviously, people can't park in front of them.

This proposal would make parking much more difficult for residents like me and shows a lack of understanding of our needs.

It is already quite difficult to park for non residents. There have been times when my daughter has been very ill at school and I had to bring my car to pick her as she was not in a state to walk. With the current restrictions it is quite tricky however with furthermore restrictions it will be quite unfair and an impossible task to manage for issues like this. This is for all pupils not just our child. Sometimes children need to get a lot of heavy stuff to school for events etc. are they to carry it for a mile because they or parents can't park? That's discriminatory towards pupils travelling from a distance.

I'm a resident of East Dulwich for 15 years and I'm fed up of CPZ constantly popping up in places where you need access and parking. I walk and use public transport as much as I can and like many other residents do, however there are occasions where I need to drive. Parking is becoming impossible and this area is near my daughter's school and sometimes I need to drive and pick her up. It's bad enough you can't drive through the end of Townley road at these time but there is no need to impose further restrictions. It won't stop people driving it will just clog up areas slightly further away. It WILL NOT help congestion and air pollution - just makes it worse in other areas. If people need to drive they will still drive. This is just another way of the council trying to make money and not the solution to air pollution they are claiming.

The level of restrictions via parking restrictions or low emissions is becoming absolutely absurd. It is becoming simply impossible to drive your children to school. We have an electric car so our commute is no emissions but our children are at two schools. This impacts the ability for working families to drop their children to school at a time when many businesses are becoming increasingly less

tolerant of the old Covid work from home mentality. These draconian restrictions are piling on the pressure for hard working families who are in a rush most mornings trying to balance work and parenting

Change is not necessary - it is fine as it is. Sometimes parents need to park to pick up their kids for legitimate reasons and you are making that too difficult for poor parents and it is the children who are being affected by this.

I car share and we drive daughter and friends to school. Driving is our only option. This will make getting to school and back to work almost impossible. My daughter already has to wake early and I will have to just set off 15 minutes earlier and get to work 15 minutes later

Jags is an exceptional and extremely popular school which has a reach far and wide across London. Lately rated the best independent school in London 2024. Above the age of 7, pupils are able to use the school coach service. However, before this age, there is no safe way for infants to be taken in and dropped off at school where suitable public transport links are unavailable for those longer distance commuters. Currently, parents drop off and collect within 5-10 minutes and so there is a steady rotation of cars all leaving the area free within a time frame of around 30 minutes twice daily.

By imposing parking restrictions directly outside the school gates, this will simply aggravate parents of young children who will be forced to take dangerous / illegal measures to ensure safe drop off of these children. I have observed this on College Road for example where a school for under 7 year olds has minimal parking available for drop off and so dangerous parking and manoeuvres are more likely to occur and injure children and locals. Parents regularly park on double yellows, zigzags, private property, or in residential spaces as there is no other option and children need dropping off.

Children will always need to be dropped off and collected at the appropriate time, and for longer commuters cycles and public transport will simply not suffice. Parents will unfortunately then find other ways to park illegally wherever possible that will likely generate greater concern for residents than ever before. Strongly opposed to the restrictions and am grateful if this idea could be dropped, thank you for your kind attention.

Please add my objections to the proposals there is already no where to park when shipping etc and there is a tennis club there which does not have parking .

TMO2425-011 Dulwich Village CPZ

I wish to object to the proposal to install DYLS at the junctions of WOODWARDE ROAD and DEKKER, DESENFANS, DRUCE, DOVERCOURT and BEAUVAL ROADS on the grounds that:

- 1). There have twice been public consultations on this, in 2016 and in 2024, and on both occasions the majority of residents have said they do not want them or consider them necessary. In 2016 Southwark Council accepted the results of this public consultation and we expect the council to do the same in 2024.
- 2) There have not been any accidents at these junctions and parking is primarily by residents, who are considerate and do not park near to the junctions.
- 3) The excessive length of the proposed DYLS suggest that their introduction would be to considerably reduce the amount of parking space available, with the aim of encouraging residents to request a CPZ in Woodward Road. This is not wanted by residents nor needed.
- 4) Woodward Road is in a Conservation Area. Introducing DYLS would change the character of the road as they would create a visual eyesore.

For all the above reasons we request that Southwark Council withdraws its proposal to install DYLS on Woodward Road.

Dulwich Village Area Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ)

I live at [REDACTED]. This is my response to Southwark's letter of 2/9/24 inviting comments regarding its proposed new CPZ affecting East Dulwich Grove ("EDG"), Gilkes Crescent, Gilkes Place, Calton Avenue and Townley Road. The stated purpose of the CPZ would be "to enable better management of school traffic". The main school traffic in question is that connected with JAGS (EDG) and Alleyn's (Townley Road).

At present some uncontrolled parking is available on each of the above roads and extensive use is made of the available parking space at all times. The school traffic includes large coaches which are parked outside JAGS and Alleyn's at school delivery times. Areas specifically for the parking of these coaches are marked out on the roads.

The proposed CPZ would cover all the areas in the above roads currently available for uncontrolled parking. It would operate Monday to Friday 8-9.30 am and 3-5.30 pm. Presumably paid permits would be available to residents to enable parking during those hours and outside the restricted hours parking in the zones now available would be open to anybody without payment, with some form of surveillance in operation to enable Southwark to impose penalties on the owners of unauthorised vehicles parked during restricted hours i.e. anyone without a permit inadvertently parking a vehicle, or leaving it parked, during those hours would be liable to a penalty.

For reasons given below, the proposed new CPZ is unlikely to achieve its declared objective of enabling better management of school traffic.

EDG is a road with heavy through traffic in both directions including frequent buses on two routes. The traffic has been made worse by road closures and restrictions elsewhere. The school coaches would, presumably, continue to park outside JAGS and restrict the available width of the road at that point. There might be less parking during the restricted hours in the currently uncontrolled areas but there would be some permitted vehicles still parked in those areas so the width of road available in EDG would not be increased. Even if all parking was excluded during the restricted hours this would not eliminate the bottleneck outside JAGS though it might permit the formation of an extra line of traffic in the stretch of EDG leading up from the traffic lights and causing additional pollution. Similar comments could be made about the effect of the CPZ on traffic outside Alleyn's.

The point can also be made that it still seems uncertain whether JAGS' proposal to move its pre-prep from its existing position to buildings it owns next to the main school on EDG will be carried through. If this did happen, it would certainly increase the amount of traffic in EDG at school delivery times though it is difficult to see how the proposed CPZ could ameliorate this additional problem..

Gilkes Crescent and Gilkes Place are enclosed enclaves without through traffic. There is extensive parking in both these places inside and outside school delivery times and it is far from obvious that any great part of this parking is "school traffic". A similar comment could be made about Calton Avenue - it is not closed, but its

through traffic is cut off from Court Lane and the village.

Deciding whether to proceed with the new CPZ involves balancing a dubious hope of improving "management of school traffic" against the certainty of imposing new inconveniences on residents and their visitors i.e. either arranging and paying for appropriate permits, or running the risk of penalties if vehicles are inadvertently parked in or left in the wrong place during restricted hours.

The argument that the new CPZ is required because otherwise people whose parking facilities elsewhere have been restricted by other CPZs will come and park in this locality should be given no weight. It is simply an argument for getting rid of all free on road parking in South London.

On balance, the proposed new CPZ should be opposed.

I am strongly against this proposal as it will worsen the already limited access to the local schools every day, while there only has fairly poor transportation for young families (age less than 7 will not allowed on the school bus) who travels far from the school. The train is not regular when rains and snows, and bus will takes for ever, the only safest and on time transportation is by car . If this proposal materialises, families with young kids will not be able to afford £5 /hrs to drop off and pick up young kids to school everyday.

This proposal will only put those families and children in misery. Further more, some families may not choose Dulwich school at all because the parking issues.

As a parent from a local school I can see the morning issues with poor parking. However, this is short-lived in the day. There are also already many obstacles to driving in the area with the school hours restrictions.

As someone who also works in Dulwich Village, the further negative effect to footfall will make to running a viable retail business increasingly challenging.

Despite the free 1 hour parking, the local wifi does not work sufficiently to allow people to easily log on to the parking app. PCNs are frequently handed out by the traffic wardens, further discouraging people from coming to the village.

£5.10 p/hr also seems extortionate. One hour is not enough time to have a coffee and browse the local shops (presumably that is what you should be encouraging people to do), and so that extra £5 makes a coffee or any purchase that much more expensive. This is all adding up to actively discouraging shoppers and will destroy local business. The majority of the shops at this end of Dulwich Village are independent, do not have big corporate budgets and financial cushioning. Every customer counts.

On Calton Avenue, many of houses have their own driveways where cars can be parked, so they do not need Resident's Permit spaces.

Creating a CPZ along Calton Avenue will simply create a new parking problem on Dekker, Desenfans, Dovercourt etc. Currently, it is possible to find a space and park along these streets at any time of day. This will change. Residents will find it harder to park near their own homes because of these plans because it limits the parking options and will push anyone wanting to visit the village (without getting caught by the driving restrictions during school hours) a few streets further along.

By reducing available free parking on Gilkes Crescent and Calton Avenue, it is likely that more people will try to park in the limited number of 1-hour free spaces in the village, which have been decreased with the current remodelling, and therefore there will not be enough parking provided in front of 25 - 49 Dulwich Village.

3 x Disabled Person's parking bays on Dulwich Village and the corner of Gilkes Place also seems disproportionate – 3 out of 22 spaces by 25-49 Dulwich Village are allocated to Disabled Persons. I imagine at least two (if not all 3) of these spaces will likely be unused for the majority of each day.

Therefore, I strongly object to these proposals for a number of reasons, as stated above. I believe the overall result will make the parking problems worse, not better. I also believe that local businesses will further suffer by making visiting Dulwich Village even harder and more expensive to visit.

I am very concerned that Dovercourt Road is being left outside of the new CPZ and will therefore be the closest street to Alleyn's school without any parking restrictions. We already are frequently unable to park near our house as a result of school related traffic, and this will only get worse if cars seek to park in Dovercourt road to avoid the restrictions that are being introduced in Townley Road. My daughters attend xx and xx school and regularly cycle to school along Townley road. It is already dangerous with the number of cars and coaches in Townley Road. If there are additional cars trying to park in Dovercourt Road around school drop off time, that will present an increased risk to my daughters' safety as cyclists. I strongly recommend that the part of Dovercourt road that has the junction with Townley road should be treated in the same way to avoid us seeing an increase in the volume of cars trying to park here.

I currently park on Townley Road or Calton Avenue one afternoon per week to transport my disabled xx to the swimming pool at Alleyn's school. My xx has MS and gets tremendous relief from being in the pool. It is necessary that I am able to park so that I can escort her to the pool building. There are no appropriate public transport links from her home to the area and given her limited mobility, parking further away is not an option. Removing parking in the local area will have a significant impact on the quality of life of my mother. Given there is such limited parking available in the area, I do not believe that reducing this further will have a material impact on the traffic in the area or the air quality.

We don't believe the parking restrictions are required on Carlton avenue with no houses down one side of the street.

Gilkes Crescent is the only place that my daughter (xx and xx at JAGS) can safely park close to her school. She has multiple sports and singing commitments and needs to be able to drive to school and park locally in order to get to those commitments.

I object to the proposal ..it is just going to create congestion elsewhere

We visit Carlton Avenue once a week to pick up our daughter from school at 5.15pm. We have never experienced any inconsiderate parking at this time and would never aim to inconvenience local residents ourselves. I suspect that the enthusiasm of Southwalk for including parking controls on Carlton Avenue is primarily for the purpose of increasing parking revenue rather than for the benefit of local residents and the general public that use the area.

This plan is going to create less parking spaces, which in turn will create more traffic and will push these cars onto surrounding streets. This is completely unnecessary. A waste of public money.

I am an Alleyn's school parent living in Clapham South. There is no parking at the school site whatsoever. Our child uses the Foundation school bus option to travel to and from school. However, on the occasions that we as parents are obliged to come to the school during the hours in your proposal, public transport options would take over an hour from our home. Therefore we would still need to drive to the school and park nearby. Under this proposal we would now have to pay to park near the school. In addition, your proposed measures are unlikely to improve traffic for local residents, because the number of people parking in the area will remain the same. The parents who already visit the local schools by car will continue to do

so, and now they will have to pay to park. I do not see this as anything other than a money-making exercise by the Council. I am wholly against this unfair proposal.

My daughters are at school in Dulwich and I am aware that many teachers park on the roads affected. There is insufficient parking on the school grounds and I am worried that the changes will impact teacher recruitment and retention. Dulwich is not very accessible by public transport so there are not easy alternatives
I also don't support parking restrictions on Calton Avenue. The businesses in Dulwich village that have already been impacted by the road closures around the village and will then also lose after school trade. Not everyone attending the dulwich schools can afford to live nearby so this proposal benefits the rich rather than benefitting the whole community

Dulwich is becoming almost impossible to live around/in.
We have kids at JAGS and DPL and already it is a nightmare with all the different restrictions in the area.
Please keep at least one school approachable (JAGS).
The LTNS and generally negative approach to parents are making the area unviable.
Don't do this please. Some people in £5m houses have 20 mins of moderate traffic each day - they will just have to deal with it

I disagree with the creation of a CPZ on the proposed streets. Doing so will only push parking pressure unfairly onto other nearby roads creating no net advantage to the community as a whole. The school has been here longer than any resident and everyone choosing to live near a major school would be well aware before buying that the implication of their chosen location would be intensified parking pressure during school hours. If unsafe parking is the problem, increase ticketing of those violating the existing rules rather than introduce any kinds of CPZ.

I am writing to express my strong objection to the proposed expansion of the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in Dulwich. Beyond the unnecessary nature of this initiative, I am particularly concerned about the questionable allocation of public funds for this project, especially when there are far more pressing issues in our community that remain inadequately addressed.

First and foremost, this proposal represents a misallocation of resources. At a time when many essential council services are severely underfunded, it is alarming that significant public funds are being directed towards an expanded CPZ. Dulwich residents have repeatedly raised concerns about deteriorating services, such as delayed waste collection, underfunded public spaces, and insufficient maintenance of local roads and pavements. Rather than diverting funds to an unnecessary CPZ expansion, these resources would be better spent improving basic services that directly affect residents' quality of life.

Secondly, there is a lack of cost-benefit justification for this project. What concrete evidence does the council have to demonstrate that this expenditure will provide value to the community? Given the relatively minor parking issues in the area, the scale of the investment required to expand the CPZ appears excessive. The council must clarify why this project is being prioritized over more urgent community needs, especially when financial resources are limited.

Additionally, the neglect of underfunded council services is glaring. For example:

- Waste Management: Residents consistently report missed collections, litter-strewn streets, and overflowing bins, creating unsanitary conditions.
- Road and Pavement Maintenance: Many streets in Dulwich suffer from poor road surfaces and hazardous pavements, posing risks to pedestrians and cyclists. These issues should be addressed as a matter of priority before investing in parking schemes.
- Social and Community Services: Essential services for vulnerable groups, such as the elderly and disabled, have faced significant cutbacks. These services are in dire need of additional funding, which would provide far greater benefit to the community than an expanded CPZ.

It is also worth noting that the expansion of the CPZ fails to address residents' real priorities. While parking may be a concern in specific areas, it is by no means the most pressing issue for the majority of Dulwich residents. The council should instead focus its attention on enhancing public services that are currently underperforming. By spending public money on this CPZ proposal, the council is ignoring the broader needs of the community and prioritizing an issue that affects only a small proportion of residents.

Finally, fiscal responsibility and accountability must be considered. In this era of financial constraints, it is critical that the council demonstrate sound judgement in how it allocates taxpayer money. The decision to channel funds into expanding the CPZ raises serious concerns about the council's commitment to fiscal responsibility. Public funds should be invested in projects that provide tangible, widespread benefits, rather than on a scheme with limited value to the community.

In conclusion, I strongly urge the council to reconsider this misguided allocation of

resources. Instead of expanding the CPZ, these funds should be redirected towards improving waste management, repairing roads, and supporting essential community services. Dulwich residents deserve to see their tax contributions used for projects that truly enhance the quality of life for everyone in the community.

I trust the council will give these objections due consideration and refocus its efforts on addressing the real needs of our community.

I am writing to formally object to the proposed expansion of the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in Dulwich. While I appreciate the council's intention to manage parking congestion, I believe that the proposal is unnecessary, poorly considered, and will have a range of negative impacts on the local community for the following reasons:

1. ****Disproportionate Impact on Residents****

The proposed expansion will disproportionately affect residents who rely on street parking. Many homes in Dulwich lack off-street parking, and introducing a larger CPZ will impose additional costs on residents, forcing them to purchase expensive permits for an issue that does not currently warrant such drastic measures. This is particularly burdensome for families, elderly residents, and those on lower incomes, who may struggle with the added financial pressure.

2. ****Lack of Evidence Supporting Parking Issues****

There is insufficient evidence to justify the need for a wider CPZ in this area. While certain streets may experience occasional parking congestion, this is not a widespread problem that warrants such a broad and invasive policy. The current level of parking restrictions has proven sufficient for managing local parking, and an expansion would be excessive and unnecessary.

3. ****Negative Impact on Local Businesses****

Expanding the CPZ would deter visitors from accessing local businesses, especially small independent shops and services that rely on customers being able to park nearby. With limited public transport options for many visitors to Dulwich, creating additional parking restrictions would discourage footfall, further harming businesses already struggling in the current economic climate.

4. ****Potential Increase in Traffic and Pollution****

Introducing a wider CPZ could lead to unintended consequences, such as increasing traffic and pollution in surrounding areas as drivers are forced to circle longer distances to find available parking outside the restricted zones. This could undermine the council's sustainability and clean air goals, creating more environmental harm than benefit.

5. ****Inadequate Consultation and Public Engagement****

The council's consultation process on this issue has been insufficient. Many residents feel they have not been properly informed or given adequate opportunity to express their views. A decision of this magnitude, which impacts daily life for many people, requires much more robust public engagement to ensure all voices are heard. Expanding the CPZ without thorough input from residents is premature and potentially undemocratic.

6. ****Alternative Solutions Have Not Been Fully Explored****

Before expanding the CPZ, alternative measures should be explored to address any localized parking issues. These could include targeted enforcement in specific areas during peak times, better signage, or introducing time-limited parking rather than expanding the entire zone. Such measures would be less invasive and more considerate of the needs of both residents and visitors.

In conclusion, the proposed expansion of the CPZ in Dulwich is unnecessary, financially burdensome, and likely to have a range of negative effects on residents, businesses, and the local environment. I urge the council to reconsider this proposal and focus on more balanced and less restrictive solutions to any parking concerns in the area. Thank you for considering my objections.

I am a frequent commuter to Dulwich and given the limitation in public transport and step free access of trains, I had no choice but to rely on cars. The proposed change would add challenges to my commute. There is currently sufficient off street parking in the proposed area for residents as those spaces are rarely used up. I do not support further restrictions in the proposed street as it would simply displace traffic to other streets. Restricting traffic will also have negative impact to small traders and shops in the area.

Residents claiming that there "are unsafe parking-related issues linked to local schools," is the residents' way of making life difficult for the schools in the area. This has been an ongoing problem, I'm afraid, and it is simply getting out of hand. Drop off and pick up times will always be busy whether there is a CPZ or not and introducing a CPZ on Townley Road, Calton Avenue, East Dulwich Grove, Gilkes Place and Gilkes Crescent will cause huge displacement somewhere else as people who have no other choice but come to work by car (of which there are many) will still need to park somewhere. Putting in more and more restrictions will make life extremely difficult for many people employed by the schools in the area (both teachers and operational staff) and a CPZ will not achieve what the residents claim they want.

The Council need to leave somewhere for parents to drop off and also wait at pick up time. Many parents of schoolchildren travel by car because of their work or because they are not on a public transport route or bus route and it is unfair and unreasonable to effectively draw a zone around the local schools where they cannot wait. Many of these parents travel in electric or not polluting cars because they have no choice and it is totally unfair that they are penalised on air quality grounds which is not relevant nor their fault if they drop off/pick up in a non polluting car. It is already difficult and expensive enough to drive in London , please do not take away people's choice of how their children get to and from school.

the complexities of the road system only benefits the council in terms of fines. this is an unnecessary extra burden. I wholly object

I strongly object to the proposal to putting double yellow lines for 10 metre either sides of junctions in Woodward Road and nearby side roads. You say this is for junction protection but give no evidence of what this means and why it is needed. This is a very low traffic area , and there are no problems with speeding or dangerous driving. I am unaware of any accidents or near misses at any of the junctions. It is not a legal requirement to have 10m yellow lines and there are numerous examples of where Southwark has not enforced this in other areas. By removing so many available parking spaces you will actually make the roads more dangerous as people double park for drop off and deliveries . A much more reasonable 4 or 4.5 m yellow line would be more than adequate. There is no need to take away so many parking spaces from residents . The roads are perfectly safe.

This proposal will not solve and keep safe the arrival and departure of hundreds of pupils to local schools. Traffic will be pushed further on to surrounding roads causing an increase in air pollution (East Dulwich Grove) and danger to those being dropped off at streets further afield, with more roads to cross to get to a school site. Staff and employees of the schools will face life-altering difficulties including longer travel times, lack of medical access and loss of income through unreliable public transport options and/or having to pay to park. Parking on main roads (Lordship Lane) will cause greater congestion and danger for pedestrians, drivers and public transport users. This proposal backs the views of so few and affects the lives of so many.

TMO2425-011 Dulwich Village CPZ

I strongly disagree with the proposal for very long double yellow lines at all the junctions in Woodward Road, roughly 10m length each side of each corner of each of the five junctions. This is a low traffic neighbourhood with a 20mph speed limit and there is no record of any serious accidents caused by close parking to the junctions. This proposal would mean the road loses over 20 car parking spaces which would make parking unnecessarily difficult. It appears there has been no evidence-led safety analysis to justify them, especially since the recent traffic calming measures have made this an extremely quiet, low traffic volume area. I therefore strongly disagree with the installation of any double yellow lines.

I object to the addition of double yellow lines on Woodward Road. I believe they are unnecessary as there have been no traffic incidences on the corners of this very very wide and quiet street. It is even more quiet since the traffic calming measures, bus gates and no through roads were added in recent years. The proposed yellow lines would take up valuable parking space which would cause marked inconvenience to many who live here -plenty of whom are old or have

young children and would very often no longer be able to park near their home. This proposal would adversely affect the residents of this street and the roads which intersect with it, none of whom requested it.

Parking around the school of Alleyns is vital. My 9 year old son travels to the school after normal school hours to attend clubs. He cannot catch public transport alone so we must drive him.

Our two sons go to Alleyn's and we need to be able to park near the school for drop offs and pick ups. A lot of other parents need this access too.

Controlled parking zones will simply displace traffic from the school roads to the neighbouring main roads such as my own - Lordship Lane. I understand the use of CPZ to residents but am sure the proposal will have little impact on environmental factors - clogging up already very congested roads such as Lordship Lane. It is also likely to cause a safety issue with parents forced to commute to the area to drop children in an unsafe way. I do not support the proposal

I object to point 2 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.

I strongly object.

I would herewith like to express my objection to the above proposal with regards to double yellow lines on Woodward Road.

I live at no. xx

Double yellow lines would unnecessarily increase parking pressure on Woodward Road. This would lead to increased traffic on the road, with drivers cruising around to find a parking space. I am also strongly against a resident parking scheme.

I strongly disagree with the proposal for double yellow lines at all the junctions in Woodward Road, roughly 10m length each side of each corner of each of the five junctions. This is a low traffic neighbourhood with a 20mph speed limit and there is no record of any serious accidents caused by close parking to the junctions. This proposal would mean the road loses over 20 car parking spaces which would make parking unnecessarily difficult. It appears there has been no evidence-led safety analysis to justify them, especially since the recent traffic calming measures have made this an extremely quiet, low traffic volume area. I therefore strongly disagree with the installation of any double yellow lines.

I strongly object to the proposal of double yellows on the junctions of this street. It has always been a quiet road, even more so since your recent traffic calming measures (bus gates, no through roads, reduced speed limits etc) and is wide and easy to navigate, as a pedestrian and as a driver and as a cyclist.

There have been no incidents where parking has caused an RTA, and no request for it by residents. Extra parking restrictions would put huge pressure on the

parking here, making it difficult for residents to park near to their homes. Households with children or elderly residents (of which there are many) would find this especially hard. Your proposal offers no benefits to the people who live in and use these streets and only imposes difficulties and hardship.

We have lived in xx for over 40 years and now moved to xx Desenfans Road
If You are to operate this CPZ the times should be 8.00 TO 9.30 and in the afternoon 3.00 To 4.30PM and NOT TO 5.30 PM

This CPZ WILL MEAN MORE CARS WILL BE PARKED IN Desenfans Road

As a resident in Woodwarde Road xx I wish to object the proposal for very long double yellow lines DYLS at all the junctions in Woodwarde Road, roughly 10m length each side of each corner of each of the five junctions (longer at Beauval). I object on the grounds that this will mean we will lose about 10% of the present parking in and around WWR.

The reason stated for all this wiping out of parking space is "for junction protection.." However, it is not a legal requirement, we are a very low traffic neighbourhood with a 20mph speed limit, there is no record of any serious or- I think even minor- accidents caused by close parking to the junctions, Furthermore, Southwark is happy with 4m DYLS in at least one of the streets off the much busier Lordship Lane (Bassano Street).

Finally there is no indication of any evidence-led safety analysis as is generally expected for public expenditure.

Many thanks for considering my objection to the proposal,

I am a resident of Great Spilmans, a private road owned by Dulwich Estate and located between Townley Road and Gilkes Crescent, two of the streets considered in the above referenced CPZ. Great Spilmans is directly opposite one main school in the proposal (JAGS) and one street over from another (Alleyns). I object to the proposed Dulwich Village CPZ for the following reasons:

1. Impact on Great Spilmans was not considered in the proposed CPZ, yet it's location between two considered streets (Townley Road and Gilkes Crescent) and proximity to several schools (see map 1 in the map of maps) means it is at least as equally likely to see significant displaced traffic as those two streets (see Statement of Reasons document). This will likely increase inconsiderate and unsafe parking on Great Spilmans rather than reduce it.

2. By excluding Great Spilmans from consideration in its proposed CPZ, yet including adjacent streets to it that were considered, Southwark Council is infringing its own Equality Framework 2021.

3. 4 in 5 streets included in this latest version opposed the CPZ (see Statement of Reasons).

4. The proposal to remove the double yellow lines (DYL) at the entrance to Great Spilmans yet add them to entrances throughout the CPZ zone and extend DYL further to other streets for added parking protection is again an infringement of equal treatment. It means residents are being protected with DYL at street entrances who live within a defined geographical area of Southwark, except those who live in Great Spilmans living in that exact same area (see overview of map of

maps, Great Spilmans is in map 1). I request the DLY on Great Spilmans are retained to prevent loss of unsafe parking at this junction.

I please request that Southwark Council and Dulwich Estate work together to include consideration the impact of the CPZ on Great Spilmans and other private roads owned by Dulwich Estate.

You may like to know that the submit button did not seem to work on the consultation portal, preventing submission of this objection via that route, thanks. Please take this email as objection to the proposal with the stated grounds.

Thank you for consulting on this matter. I believe that the increase in sustainable and active travel is a positive ambition, and over the past 14 years I have seen more and more pupils and colleagues travel to work via bike, run or use public transport and it is great that they have made that choice. However, I feel very strongly that the proposed CPZ will effect the ability of some staff at Alleyn's, including myself, to travel to work . I work long hours all year round and schools often have evening events, and for me, travelling home late at night from North Dulwich does not feel safe, as a female, and would add between 30-45 minutes on to my commute. I have had one uncomfortable experience when just walking to my car nearby where I was nearly mugged recently at around 9pmish. Many staff have multiple drop offs ahead of starting their day at a fixed time - there is no flexibility to be late because teachers are in front of a class at the start of each day (early here), catering staff need to in to prepare lunch, admin staff need to check pupil attendance promptly. These staff cannot make those multiple drop offs by public transport and so there is a real risk that they will seek different employment, at a time when there is a shortage of staff. As a working mother of four, I empathise with colleagues who have these daily challenges with nursery and school drop offs and collections, it is a juggle and sometimes car use is the only way it all works. Most working parents cannot employ a nanny to drop off and collect their children. As well as this proposed CPZ in Townley Road, Southwark are also requiring the School to remove its school's temporary car-park and so there is even less space for the school to accommodate parking, and I will no longer have a space to park on site. I appreciate that there are good reasons for sustainable travel, but imposing CPZ on Townley and Calton Avenue will prevent me and many others travelling to work and ultimately there will be a decision to make on whether to continue working in Dulwich, which could have a significant impact on the School's operations and the education of children. I therefore request that the CPZ is not introduced on Townley Road and Calton Avenue.

I do not support implementation of the Dulwich Village CPZ as proposed. The "statement of reasons" document clearly acknowledges that the scheme only has resident support from one of the five roads considered, Gilkes Crescent. It does not have support from four of the five roads in the consultation. It does not have local support to be implemented and other tactics should be developed to solve the underlying problems.

The "statement of reasons" document states that the problem to be solved is that of inconsiderate and unsafe parking-related issues linked to local schools. Council officers acknowledge in the current proposal that implementation of the CPZ will create significant parking displacement from Gilkes Crescent and Townley Road - the two roads where this is an issue - onto East Dulwich Grove and Gilkes Place and have included measures in the proposal to address this impact of the CPZ. Great Spilmans, a single track residential road immediately opposite the entrance to JAGS, currently suffers from disturbance from traffic flow and parking by parents dropping children at local schools. Great Spilmans is equally if not more likely to see parking displacement as a result of this CPZ implementation than East Dulwich Grove and Gilkes Place however, unlike these roads, the proposals do not include any measures to address this impact of the CPZ. The consequence of this is that Great Spilmans will become the one local road, immediately next to the schools, where parking is not controlled with residents then seeing inconvenience, disruption, reduction of quality of life, less safe roads, and direct cost for residents of implementing subsequent mitigation measures after the CPZ is in place. Southwark Council and Dulwich Estate should work together to address this gap in the proposed plans and to address these concerns from residents of Great Spilmans (to include for example, refusing planning permission for the new JAGS pre-prep school on East Dulwich Grove which will only serve to increase the underlying problem the CPZ is addressing).

The plans suggest that the Council is proposing to remove the existing double yellow lines and "Private Road" signs at the entrance to Great Spilmans. The "statement of reasons" contradicts this and says "there will be no physical changes at this location". These lines and road signs are on the private road, managed by the Dulwich Estate, were paid for by residents and should not be removed as part of this proposal.

I object to this money making scheme that will displace traffic and parking to other local residential roads

What might not have been an ideal traffic arrangement for Dulwich is now an utter mess and chaos which is unsustainable. I understand that during COVID shutting down roads to encourage more active areas for pedestrians/cycling was a good idea, however you assumed that you could just extrapolate that after COVID was gone.

Closing road didn't work as traffic was heavily displaced into other roads, affecting people living in those roads and making specific roads nice and quiet for some lucky neighbours. This is unfair. An example of this are the roads around the Village, e.g. Carlton Rd. London isn't Amsterdam or Munich. You're assuming that everyone lives locally and only has to spend 5 min to e.g. drop their kids to school or get to work. Traffic isn't only local. London doesn't have lots of options for traffic so closing roads won't stop e.g. people to have to go to work and have to go through e.g. Dulwich. This also applies to traders, deliveries, etc. As a resident I've seen an increased number of complicated rules for road access which makes me wonder how much money has the council profited from PCNs and what is that

money used on... furthermore, you're planning on introducing resident's permit which come at a cost to residents.

If you want to make changes, you should leave other options available. Great to have more dedicated cycle paths. This can work without closing roads. People who choose to live near a school are aware the pros and cons. Same goes for someone who chooses to live near a busy road, or a quiet road far away from school/work.

I fully object to this proposal.

I use this area to park as a commuter at Alleyn's School and this would hugely impact my ability to get to work.

I have worked at Alleyn's School for over 20 years. I travel from over 10 miles away and due to medical conditions I am limited in my options of travel. Trains are prohibitively expensive, fairly irregular from Croydon to Dulwich, and frequently don't run (late running trains terminate at Selhurst rather than continuing on to West Croydon, leaving me stuck. Bus travel means I have to take 3 buses xx which are frequently full at this time and more than doubles my journey time. This makes the car the only real viable option for me. With the road closing and low traffic neighborhoods introduced during Covid, this has made getting to the school in a vehicle a much more arduous task. Any slight issues on the nearby roads (roadworks, accident, etc) even further reduces access and causes massive traffic buildups. If you add further restrictions in terms of where non-resident parking is available, this will increase traffic even more where parking is available and potentially add a considerable walk into work, with which I would struggle. In short, the current restrictions are making my journey into work a daily misery. These newly proposed measure will make the situation for me even worse and will make me seriously consider my current employment in the area. I would also like to add that I drive an electric vehicle, so am not impacting the air quality in any way in the area. Can additional consideration be given to electric vehicles. Currently the only additional consideration is the very expensive charging/parking bays on Townley Road.

I am a parent of 2 children at Alleyns, who get the train to school. I know the area extremely well as I lived in xx for 16 years until recently, cycling to school. I have an electric car. The only time that I would drive my children would be if they are bringing a large art homework or similar thing in, or if they were unwell, say a broken or strained limb. These parking measures as punitive. I have not met any parents who drive their children to school each day. If someone is forced to it is unwillingly. It will make life a great deal harder on those days when life is hard regardless. My children went to a local primary school for 12 years and panicky drivers trying to avoid fines and read complicated signs were the ones that drove into them on their bikes and scooters. Making it incredibly difficult to use the roads when you are forced to does not make it safer.

I wholly object to this proposal.

I do not have off street parking so rely on parking on Carlton Ave and Townley Rd. It would be very expensive for me to buy a resident's parking permit.

I disagree with the proposal related to Calton Avenue. It constitutes currently the only possible access point to drop off / pick up my child at/from Alleyn's school. Moreover, Townley Rd is non-accessible during the proposed timeframe, necessitating, anyway round/reverse movements. Parking on the avenue for the above purpose is temporary (5-10 min) and the imposition of any type of parking restrictions will not have a measurable effect on residents' ability to park, whereas will probably have negative effects on Woodwarde Rd and further roads in the area. Moreover, most of the residents have private parking driveways. By personal experience, there are empty parking spaces on Calton Avenue most of the time during the proposed timeframe

There are enough restrictions already!

I believe the present restriction are more than sufficient and no need to impose further. Parking is already an issue for workers, which will then further impact residents and compromise the safety of children as commutes 'frantically look for' limited opportunities to park.

This proposal does not take any account of the impact it will have on families who walk or cycle to school on most occasions but through temporary disability, are unable to do so and thus would be adversely impacted by not being able to drop their children to school via car, if the need arose. I live with a hidden disability for which a blue badge remains unavailable and this proposal will have a direct negative impact of me and others like me who live in the area. The removal of pay and display bags in Dulwich Village is also a huge error as those spaces are already always full. It prevents local elderly people who rely on a car to accessing the shops and amenities. The ongoing lack of mobile phone reception in that area is also a perfect recipe that allows Southwark Council traffic wardens to issue tickets when customers have no ability to access the app to pay or register for parking, without asking one of the businesses to use their wifi! I urge you to consider the wider impact these proposals will have to residents who live in the wider Dulwich area and suffer with traffic displacement on our roads.

Making it harder for people to park in these areas just increases the number who will need to hover at pickup times. It also makes it more difficult for shop owners as reduced parking options will deter us from popping into these businesses when we can more easily support the hairdressers, bookshops and cafes in east and west Dulwich.

I strongly object to the provision proposed for adding DYL to the junctions along Woodwarde Road.

The proposed length of the DYLs is excessive and will cause major issues to the residents .

I am not aware of any accidents or incidents occurring due to the lack of DYLs at the junctions.

The roads are quiet , low speed and have other calming measures in place..

The extensive length proposed will significantly reduce the number of parking spaces which will especially impact the more senior, disabled and less mobile residents making it harder for them , their visitors and carers to visit them and reduce their social lives.

No safety impact assessment of the measures has been provided as would normally be expected.

From conversations with residents the current provisions are thought to be adequate and the proposal are not considered to be necessary or welcomed.

Southwark use the 4 meter DYLs at many minor roads junctions why are the larger

ones proposed when there is no history of incidents or accidents.
The larger clear areas around the junctions will make it less safe as drivers and cyclists will be encouraged to cut corners and accelerate into the roads leading to potential more frequent and dangerous incidents
Why is this proposal hidden away in the context of the Dulwich Village/ Carlton Avenue junction modifications?
I again reiterate that I strongly object to this aspect of DYs along Woodward Road.

The proposed parking restrictions will just displace the parking to adjoining streets creating problems in those streets.
I agree double yellows near junctions can make roads safer.

I have a child at Alleyn's but live outside the area. My daughter uses the coach service most days but there are occasions including Saturday mornings when we have to drive her to/from school due to extra curricular activities the timings of which do not work with the limited coach schedule. Whilst I appreciate sensitivities around parking, and suffer from them myself at our home due to the proximity of the local station, parking is already extremely difficult under existing restrictions. These proposals don't address the issue of the availability of parking space they merely shift the problem to someone else's detriment as children will still need to be taken to/from school.

I live in xx and commute to Dulwich to work at a school. The restrictions are unrealistic especially with the lack of public transport. In the summer I cycle, although have been knocked off my bike more times than I can count due to the lack of bike lanes. I recently broke 3 ribs as a result and needed to drive to work. I have tried to get the bus but for example today I left my home at 6:32 and arrived in Dulwich at 8:28. Two hours of commuting isn't sustainable. As a result driving (lift sharing as I do now) is the most efficient and safe way to get to work especially in the winter. With school events I often finish work after dark and do not feel safe waiting for the bus late at night. With these restrictions it will give me no choice but to find an alternative school to work at. The traffic/ parking restrictions would cause much more traffic and congestion and would just push the parking issue further from these roads. Please re-think this decision.

A CPZ is not needed in DV as there is sufficient space for parking. Furthermore, the additional street furniture will adversely affect the aesthetic environment and make the Village an uglier place to live.

I work at Alleyn's and mainly drive here to work. Buses from where I live are unreliable and take too long, involving a change. Walking takes me 50 minutes each way, which is too far for me after a long day, especially in bad weather. If I cannot park at a reasonable distance from my place of work I will have to consider leaving my job.

You are forcing all the cars onto fewer roads. These roads have more traffic and cause more pollution as the traffic is stop start all the time. Please could someone explain how you get 3 kids at 3 different schools all with PE bags and school bags

to school on time. You cant use the bus or train and a bike is not big enough. This is just another tax on working parents trying to get their kids to school then work. The times are only during the school run and not at weekends.

I commute to Alleyn's school for work. I currently both cycle and drive. Dulwich is a poorly connected area and it is difficult to commute to. The roads that I also have to cycle on are busy main roads which don't contain cycle lanes and therefore are not very safe. I choose to drive when conditions are dangerous such as icy or heavily raining, often in the winter. However, without this option, I am left with an extremely unreliable bus system which is often very delayed/inconsistent bus system. It seems incredibly unfair to remove parking as an option when there are so few other options. It seems to be very divisive and alienating those who cannot afford to live in Dulwich and walk to work (main of whom can't) but do work there.

This will make the whole Dulwich area impossible to get around considering the restrictions already in place. It is also hard to see, when schools are on holidays the current restrictions are still in place. This sort of thing, whilst making the CPZ area nice snarls up other areas and this area is very tricky to navigate at the best of times, let alone with further restrictions. This will also limit options to commute to work if the trains are not running properly as they were this morning as the track was wet. This CPZ will mean I will not be able to park in the school car park that I work at

Caring for parents I need to drive to them after work.

Current restrictions are fine. No need to increase.

Why are you trying to make everything so inconvenient for local residents and people who work locally? Or is it that you're trying to put all the shops in Dulwich Village, East Dulwich and Grove Vale out of business? The road closures, the confusing timed junction restrictions, the continual roadworks,... local people don't want all this. Fix the abysmal public transport system in Dulwich first and then try to encourage people to use it! The only thing you're encouraging people to do is shop online for everything. Biff- gone. Jigsaw - gone. White Stuff - gone. Almost nothing left in Melbourne Grove. You should be trying to attract good businesses and investment into our area, not making it even more impossible to visit. We need existing bus services to be more frequent and reliable, and we need more cross-town buses. Here's an idea- Nunhead to Herne Hill via east Dulwich rd. make the trains more useful - link east and North Dulwich to Brixton and or Forest Hill for the tube. Stop Peckham Rye being such a disgrace I can't let my 13 year old go through there. Twiddling with yet more parking restrictions won't do anything helpful for anyone, it will get in people's way and ultimately damage local businesses

It is very difficult to travel by public transport from my home to my place of work, and I have to be there early in the morning. Driving is the only practicable way and if I am unable to park locally I will have to find another job. It is important for the local area that such a large employer which is difficult to access by public transport should be accessible for employees which means giving them somewhere to park or parking permits.

I wish to object strongly to the proposal to implement a new CPZ in Townley Road, Gilkes Crescent, Gilkes Place, Calton Avenue and East Dulwich Grove. I cannot see how this will 'enable better management of school traffic'. How? These roads are already restricted in various ways, Calton Avenue has no traffic to speak of, and the reason that East Dulwich Grove is so congested is perfectly obvious: namely the closure of Calton Avenue, Court Lane etc. Further restrictions won't help with that.

What possible harm is done to anyone by allowing parking in Calton Avenue?

What you will do is hasten the decline and closure of the Village shops which are already struggling because of the decline in parking places. I do not understand why the impact on local businesses is consistently ignored by the Council.

I OBJECT to the Traffic Management Order (TMO2425-011) for the following reasons:

- .There is no parking issue
- .The cost to residents
- .Cost of public funds
- .Causing parking pressure where there is none.
- .Causing more people to pave over their front gardens for parking, with a resulting loss of
green habitat, and possible flooding issues with water run-off from Beauval Rd on to Townley Rd (Beauval is a hill) 2 more gardens were paved/ gravelled in Beauval Rd this month alone with a loss of a street tree.
- .Causing traffic jams on the south stretch of Dovercourt Rd , as it is narrower than Beauval Rd (with little to no front garden parking.) This means that two vehicles coming from opposite directions already find it difficult to pass one another.
- .I objected to the original consultation but have been ignored. 74% of residents on Townley Rd and 78% on Beauval Rd objected.
- . Mobility for all residents and around this area will be compromised.
- .I also object to the proposed new and increased lengths of double yellow lines DBL's
as outlined in the public notice for Dulwich village and surrounding CPZ.

I OBJECT to the Traffic Management Order (TMO2425-011) for the following reasons:

We strongly object because the proposals are flawed and liable to cause parking pressure where currently there is none

Causing our neighbours to rip up their front gardens and pave over them in anticipation of your every bullying announcement so that they can avoid parking fees and park right outside their houses

In doing so they probably take away two existing spaces – making parking easier for themselves but more difficult for other neighbours

In allowing this to happen the council is effectively saying that the rights of homeowners who can afford to pave over their front gardens

have more rights than their neighbours who love their front gardens more and don't mind the give and take of not parking directly outside their own homes and sharing the existing spaces on a far fairer system of first come first serve basis.

The folks who have paved over now of course want you to bring in the CPZ so that wardens will enforce no-parking lines in front of their beloved new driveways

What you are effectively doing is granting one set of folks permanent crossover rights ahead of their neighbours rights to park there previously

ie you are giving away sections of the highway which are owned by everyone - to a small section of individuals

THIS IS UNFAIR & MORALLY OBJECTIONABLE

YOU ARE ALSO DIVIDING OUR COMMUNITY

The other obvious objections are

- Cost and misuse of public funds
- Adding to local flooding when folks lay impervious surfaces to their front gardens – who polices this ???
- Loss of habitat and green spaces to absorb CO2

SPECIFIC OBJECTION

Extending double yellow lines further up Beauval Rd from corner of Towley Rd will only increase not decrease parking stress in both roads – its ludicrous.

People will still park on the corner even if you extend the lines – if you are serious about keeping visual splays around these corners – a couple of metal bollards will do the trick far more effectively or double red lines = better still

I would like to register my objection to this proposal. I believe that any reduction in parking spaces - used by non residents, will only encourage them to occupy spaces in adjoining roads, e.g. Court Lane, Woodward, Dovercourt, Beauval etc. This proposal is not going to solve the problem of the number of non residents using these roads.

I would like to know if the council has investigated and has data on, who the non resident drivers are?

If it is predominately staff at James Alleyns or JAGS, I think they should make provision for their staff parking within their own grounds.

I would like to register my objection to this proposal. I believe it will seriously affect the resident parking in the adjacent roads.

Is there any data/ information indicating it will deter/ stop non resident parking and who exactly is parking in these roads?

I believe that the majority of the non resident parking is by those working in the village, staff at Alleyns & JAGS & commuters using North Dulwich train station.

it has just been brought to my attention that you are consulting on double yellow lines at the junction of Dovercourt Road and Woodwarde Road – ref TMO2425-011 Dulwich Village CPZ. I have lived at xx for the last 14 years and my address is mentioned in the consultation. I am somewhat surprised that there has been no direct contact with me considering the impact that this will have on me. In the time that I have been in my home there have been no problems or concerns noted or raised in the road, and the remedy suggested appears to be highly excessive. The impact that this will have on dispersing traffic to other parts of the road will be big. As someone with mobility issues, I also need to have direct and close access to my front door. Can I suggest as a minimum that if yellow lines are needed, that they extend to the north west side before the driveway xx Dovercourt Road – this will lessen the impact, release space for me outside my home, and still give more than enough clearance from Woodwarde Road. The road itself has quietened since the introduction of road closures in the Dulwich Village area. I will be seriously and severely impacted by this change and would request your urgent consideration of this matter,

I OBJECT to the Traffic Management Order (TMO2425-011) for the following reasons:

There is no parking issue

The cost to residents

Cost of public funds

Causing parking pressure where there is none.

Causing more people to pave over their front gardens for parking, with a resulting loss of green habitat, and possible flooding issues with water run-off from Beauval Rd on to Townley Rd (Beauval is a hill) 2 more gardens were paved/ gravelled in Beauval Rd this month alone with a loss of a street tree.

Causing traffic jams on the North stretch of Dovercourt Rd , as it is narrower than Beauval Rd (with little to no front garden parking.) This means that two vehicles coming from opposite directions already find it difficult to pass one another.

74% of residents on Townley Rd and 78% on Beauval Rd objected.

Mobility for all residents and around this area will be compromised.

I would herewith like to express my objection to the above proposal with regards to double yellow lines on Woodwarde Road.

I have been living at xx Woodwarde Road for the past eight years.

Double yellow lines would unnecessarily increase parking pressure on Woodwarde Road. This would lead to increased traffic on the road, with drivers cruising around to find a parking space. I am also strongly against a resident parking scheme.

With regard to the above I would like to make the following comments:

1. Re. proposed CPZ affecting Townley Road, Gilles Crescent, Calton Avenue and East Dulwich Grove:

I fully support this proposal even though it is likely to displace parking on to Dovercourt Road, where I live. I was in favour of the proposed CPZ on Dovercourt, but was clearly in a minority. I actually have off street parking but was prepared to pay the annual fee regardless as I sometimes need to park on the street.

2. DYLS at various junctions, particularly those along the length of Woodward Road:

Again I am fully in favour of this proposal which is, in my opinion LONG overdue. There are several danger spots where visibility is seriously hampered by vehicles parked too near the corners of the junctions. Woodward is a major route for school children into Dulwich Village, who have to negotiate cars and, in particular, vans parked too near the corners. I am sure there will be resistance to this and representations by many to reduce/minimise the length of the DYLS. I sincerely hope that this will not be accommodated and urge you to install DYLS of the maximum length. We need to reduce our dependence on private vehicles, so any actions likely to further this are to be encouraged as far as I am concerned.

I strongly support the imposition of short term parking restrictions in around the proposed area as it will significantly reduce the large amount of mainly unnecessary drop-offs being undertaken by parents of local schools and thereby significantly increase the road safety for more pupils using active transport options. In a climate emergency it is critical that these largely non-essential journeys are reduced to the absolute minimum.

This plan will be a another disaster for our area, creating more traffic and in turn more pollution. With people shifting their cars around trying to find parking. The poor traders of DV will also suffer. The whole plan is wholly inappropriate for what is now a low traffic neighbourhood, apart from generating lots of money for the council, you have to ask yourselves at what cost? The last point is - no one wants this.

1. Southwark seems to be spending an unwarranted level of time & resource on matters that are relatively low priority compared to social care, housing, & education, and which have generated a great deal of unhappiness - stress & division - among DV residents & businesses, where none existed previously.

2. The LTN measures in DV have already significantly degraded people's everyday lives with no confirmed environmental or safety benefit. If anything it has made both issues worse by increasing congestion and the numbers of schools passed. Now, the new CPZ proposal, is patently an attempt to introduce the thin end of the wedge that leads eventually to a CPZ for the whole of Dulwich. LBS is deliberately trying to generate parking pressure where none exists, in order to manufacture "demand" for more parking interventions, with the ultimate goal of every resident paying an ever increasing fee for parking but to the detriment of people conducting their everyday lives eg use of tradesmen, delivery services, carer visits, friends & family visits, & hosting events at home such as U3A meetings where this is a common model. None of this will improve the lives of residents and business owners in DV. Furthermore, they also threaten the operation of amenities that serve the wider public, such as the public library, local shops & eateries, the chiropodist, the pharmacy, & access to Dulwich Park.

3. I object to the DV CPZ proposal as previous "consultations" showed that only Gilkes Crescent returned a majority for a CPZ, but the new proposal still includes East Dulwich Grove, Calton Ave & Townley Rd. All of these streets returned a clear majority rejecting a CPZ. So once again, LBS has not listened to residents. There is a lot of non residential kerbside in Calton Ave in particular (& Townley Road) which could be used for school parking by Alleyn's. It's almost as if you want to displace all that parking onto the roads where residents rejected a CPZ, to generate parking pressure where there has been none for the 32 years I have lived in Woodward Road. McAsh was I believe quite clear in stating that areas that did not want CPZ would not get them.

4. I object, in principle, not only to my council tax being used for road & traffic related projects, but the bullying posture adopted by LBS, where the majority of DV residents impacted do not approve, especially where there is no properly quantified justification nor clearly defined statement of benefits to tax payers. Where are the cost benefit analyses for these projects?

5. I also object to the never ending consultations (since at least 2019) on such projects for DV, where our reasonable views are repeatedly shouted down, dismissed, discounted and ignored. DV residents feel powerless in the face of this unreasonable form of aggressive attrition. Furthermore, the repeated works over the past 6+ years have disrupted the life and business of Dulwich Village for months on end.

6. Finally, I object to the proposal for DYL I have lived on Woodward Road for 32 years & am not aware of any road safety issues occurring along the road in all that time. And there has never been any pressure on parking, even with the schools, the park, the public library and local shops and businesses very nearby. In recent times, we have had the introduction of 20mph speed limits & the LTN which has meant that Woodward Road is no longer a "through

road". This has significantly decreased the flow of traffic along the road plus most, if not all, of the junctions along Woodwarde have dropped kerbs with tactile paving and it is already an offence to block these with parked vehicles. All of this has already made Woodwarde Road an extremely safe place for cyclists & pedestrians.

I support the introduction of double yellow lines (DYL) on the junction of Dovercourt Road and Woodwarde Road as this is a safety concern.
I do not support the introduction of DYL further south on Dovercourt Road, eg. by xx as this is not a safety concern and it will displace parking.

1. It may be too much for LBS to consider introducing a Happiness Index for the borough, but it should at least be focused upon activities aimed at improving the lives of people living & working in Southwark. Instead it seems to be spending an unwarranted level of time & resource on matters that are relatively low priority compared to social care, housing, & education, and which have generated a great deal of unhappiness - stress & division - among DV residents & businesses, where none existed previously.

2. The LTN measures in DV have already significantly degraded people's everyday lives with no confirmed environmental or safety benefit. If anything it has made both issues worse by increasing congestion and the numbers of schools passed. Now, the new CPZ proposal, is patently an attempt to introduce the thin end of the wedge that leads eventually to a CPZ for the whole of Dulwich. LBS is deliberately trying to generate parking pressure where none exists, in order to manufacture "demand" for more parking interventions, with the ultimate goal of every resident paying an ever increasing fee for parking on their own street. CPZs do not improve people's lives - they are (i) another, open-ended, council tax and moreover (ii) impose unnecessary restrictions on how people conduct their everyday lives eg use of tradesmen, delivery services, carer visits, friends & family visits, & hosting events at home such as U3A meetings where this is a common model. None of this will improve the lives of residents and business owners in DV. Furthermore, they also threaten the operation of amenities that serve the wider public, such as the public library, local shops & eateries, the chiropractor, the pharmacy, & access to Dulwich Park.

3. I object to the DV CPZ proposal as previous "consultations" showed that only Gilkes Crescent returned a majority for a CPZ, but the new proposal still includes East Dulwich Grove, Calton Ave & Townley Rd. All of these streets returned a clear majority rejecting a CPZ. So once again, LBS has not listened to residents. There is a lot of non residential kerbside in Calton Ave in particular (& Townley Road) which could be used for school parking by Alleyn's. It's almost as if you want to displace all that parking onto the roads where residents rejected a CPZ, to generate parking pressure where there has been none for the 32 years I have lived in Woodwarde Road.

xx was I believe quite clear in stating that areas that did not want CPZ would not get them.

4. I object, in principle, not only to my council tax being used for road & traffic related projects, but the bullying posture adopted by LBS, where the majority of DV residents impacted do not approve, especially where there is no properly quantified justification nor clearly defined statement of benefits to tax payers. Where are the cost benefit analyses for these projects? And where are the measurements that show concrete and undisputed benefits of such projects after several years of operation ?

5. I also object to the never ending consultations (since at least 2019) on such projects for DV, where our reasonable views are repeatedly shouted down, dismissed, discounted and ignored. DV residents feel powerless in the face of this unreasonable form of aggressive attrition. Furthermore, the repeated works over the past 6+ years have disrupted the life and business of Dulwich Village for

months on end. It is unacceptable in a modern democracy.

6. I have lived on Woodward Road for 32 years & am not aware of any road safety issues occurring along the road in all that time. And there has never been any pressure on parking, even with the schools, the park, the public library and local shops and businesses very nearby. In recent times, we have had the introduction of 20mph speed limits & the LTN which has meant that Woodward Road is no longer a "through road". This has significantly decreased the flow of traffic along the road plus most, if not all, of the junctions along Woodward have dropped kerbs with tactile paving and it is already an offence to block these with parked vehicles. All of this has already made Woodward Road an extremely safe place for cyclists & pedestrians.

7 So, finally, I object to the proposal for extremely long double yellow lines (DYL) at every junction along Woodward Road. This is clearly a measure intended to work with the proposed bigger than needed CPZ to ratchet up parking pressure along Woodward Road. They do not need to be 10m along each leg of a junction to be effective. If shorter DYLs are adequate for Court Lane Gardens then why not Woodward?

The CPZ seems very restrictive given your clear statement that that only a few Gilkes Crescent residents are asking for it and that there was huge objection to its introduction across the area. You do not make an adequate case for its introduction though its hard to believe that there is not a benefit in terms of revenue for the council.

The loss of 7 stop and shop parking spaces will impact local businesses who have already taken a huge hit from the many uncalled for changes around the Dulwich Village Junction. Maintaining parking spaces along the DV end of Turney road (outside of 8-9.30 3-5pm if necessary) would mitigate this in part, as would removing restrictions from the East side of Calton Avenue along the playing field. The CPZ seems very restrictive given your clear statement that that only a few Gilkes Crescent residenst are asking for it and that there was huge objection to its introduction.

The loss of 7 stop and shop parking spaces will impact local businesses. Maintaining parking spaces along the DV end of Turney road (outside of 8-9.30 3-5pm if necessary) would mitigate this.

The loss of parking in the Calton/ Gilks CPZ, and the restriction on returning in Calton Avenue will impact St Barnabas parishioners and visitors, their community outreach activities, as well as families supporting their children in sporting and extracurricular activities whether local or visiting. Better not to have it at all on

Calton Avenue, or just on the stretch of Calton Ave between DV and Woodwarde Rd, just on the west side of Calton Avenue, but if you must include the East side of Calton Avenue, for it to be a 2 hour limit.

DYL extensions are completely unnecessary, I strongly object to any that are > 5m, Please do not extend any existing DYL, indeed if any are > 5m, please reduce them to this minimum. DYL on a quiet, wide residential road like Dovercourt are completely unnecessary and most on Woodwarde would also be unnecessary if the existing dropped curb restrictions were enforced.

Paid for parking spaces are not needed at weekends in the village when businesses want to encourage visitors but if essential should be stop and shop. In terms of coaches, they serve local school which are important part of the local economy and educational community. Providing sensible parking spaces with rest spaces would reduce the CO2 emissions from them running their coaches through the day to keep warm, whether alongside the schools or playing fields and tennis facilities locally. They significant reduce the number of cars in the area.

I am writing to express my strong objection to the proposed Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) 'DV' in Dulwich Village. While I understand the Council's intentions to address parking-related concerns around local schools, I believe the proposal will have severe negative impacts on families, residents, and the safety of our children. I live 5 minutes away and have a child that goes to one of the foundation schools.

Danger to Children From Increased Traffic Restrictions

One of the most serious concerns about the proposed CPZ is the potential danger it poses to children. With the current LTN scheme already in place, many parents are forced to drop their children off in unsafe conditions, as they cannot easily drive or park near the school. Some parents have no option but to stop briefly on restricted roads, asking their children to jump out of the car in traffic, which is extremely dangerous. Children can easily be struck by cars, bicycles, or other vehicles in the chaos that now occurs during school drop-off times. The proposed CPZ will only exacerbate this problem, forcing more parents into risky behaviour and creating an even more hazardous environment around the schools. We must prioritise the safety of our children over restrictive parking measures.

Residents Purchased Homes Knowing Schools Have Long Existed in the Area

The schools in Dulwich Village, including Alleyn's and James Allen's Girls' School, have been well-established for centuries. Many residents bought their homes in this area knowing full well about the presence of these schools and the associated traffic. Indeed, some moved here specifically for the proximity to these schools. Therefore, complaints about school-related traffic and parking should not now be used as justification for imposing parking restrictions that unfairly penalise parents and children. These issues are not new and should not be treated as such.

The LTN Scheme Has Already Placed a Burden on Parents

The introduction of the Low Traffic Neighbourhood (LTN) scheme has already significantly increased the challenges for parents who need to drive their children

to school. Traffic has been funneled into certain streets, causing increased congestion and making the school run even more difficult for families. Furthermore, these schemes often prioritise affluent streets, effectively protecting wealthier areas while leaving others to bear the burden of increased traffic. This not only increases congestion in less affluent areas but also adds pressure to parents, many of whom are juggling full-time work and child care responsibilities.

Working Parents At Times Have No Choice But to Drive for School Drop-Off

For many families, particularly those where both parents work, driving their children to school is a necessity, not a choice. With many parents commuting to work straight after school drop-off, alternative methods of travel like walking or public transport are simply not feasible. If forced to abandon driving when needed, families will be left with no option but to arrange expensive alternatives, such as nannies or breakfast clubs. This imposes financial strain and reduces valuable time that parents can spend with their children.

Negative Impact on Women's Participation in the Workforce

The additional pressure caused by restricted parking disproportionately affects working mothers, many of us are already balancing work and childcare responsibilities. These schemes add further complications to school drop-off routines, and for some women, this could make returning to work even harder. The barriers created by parking restrictions and the logistical complexities they introduce are likely to push more women out of the workforce, exacerbating existing gender inequalities in employment.

Certainly! Here's a more polite and diplomatic revision:

In conclusion, the introduction of a CPZ in Dulwich Village will place an additional burden on families, contribute to congestion, and, most importantly, increase the risk to children's safety. I respectfully urge the Council to reconsider this proposal and explore more practical, safe, and equitable solutions that will benefit the entire community, including the schools, rather than favouring a select few, as we have seen with the implementation of the LTN.

I Object, makes it too busy on certain roads and difficult to get to work

I read your Statutory Consultation and would like to object proposed unreasonably long double yellow lines at all the junctions in Woodward Road and surrounding streets.

I have the following reasons for my objection:

Unreasonably long double yellow lines of roughly 10 metres of each side of each corner would mean that the residents of Woodward Road would lose many valuable parking spaces outside our homes. It is estimated that it would 113 m of yellow lines on our road. We residents believe that the shortest possible yellow line i.e. 2,5 m on each side of a junction would be sufficient and proportionate to Woodward Road.

Woodwarde Road is in a very low traffic neighbourhood with a 20 mph speed limit. Woodward Road has a limited passing traffic due to the already enforced time restrictions on entry to drivers. The road has many humps, so speed is lower than 20 mph. I have been living more than two decades on this street and don't remember any serious accidents, apart from one in 2023 when two cars were hit by a driver who fell unconscious. This can happen to any driver anywhere and yellow lines would make no difference.

Woodwarde Road is not comparable with busy Lordship Lane. And yet some roads off Lordship Lane have only 4 metres double yellow lines applied on their junctions.

Finally there is no indication of any evidence-led safety analysis as is generally expected for public expenditure.

As a resident of Woodward Road I believe that this is simply designed to reduce parking space available to residents, so we would change our mind about the rejected controlled parking zone scheme.

I am an employee of a school within the proposed parking restriction zone, and commute via car. My work requires me to travel across London to different areas throughout the year, and as such my commute requires private transport more often than not. The parking restrictions will significantly hamper my ability to undertake my duties, and there is no parking on site allocated to my role. I understand that a handful of business permits were granted, but this seems wholly inadequate, and near guarantees that the parking will just be pushed further from the school and become even more congested.

I would very much like to see how many businesses and local residents actually support this zone, and whilst I understand the clean air benefits this will bring, it is merely pushing and exaggerating the issue elsewhere.

Hello, I am currently not a resident of the village but for the past 12 years I have either lived there or had my kids in school there. During this time, I have seen a succession of proposals enacted that make it nearly impossible to be a working parent who lives outside the village pick up my children in or around there as it's now completely impassable to normal pickup school traffic. Dulwich is a community that exists and thrives because of its fine state as well as private schools but these plans do nothing to consider these non resident parents. This is a feminist issue. One needs to either be a housewife from the 50s with no job, or one needs to live directly in the village. Right now we live only 1.5 miles away from JAGS school in Upper Norwood, but need to now dedicate 90 minutes MINIMUM to make the school run in the morning and also again in the afternoon. This is insane and not remotely eco - walking would take as long given hills and bags, as would the very indirect buses. The lack of joined up planning in these proposals across the South London area is siloed and staggering ---traffic is only worsening for most people, increasing the environmental impact as we sit longer in traffic with no better solution. This is a social and diversity issue as it is turning Dulwich into even more of a privileged ghetto than it ever was. There is absolutely no consideration being made for the parents whose hard earned pounds (increasingly taxed by VAT) are supporting the existence of these schools and propping up the real estate values of certain people in the village, so keen to protect their investment through these NIMBYistic restrictions that one might say some are cutting off their noses to spite their face. (Happy to be wrong on that, not sure which residents oppose what!) Not everyone can afford not to work and send their kids to school in the village. Not everyone can physically ride a bike or ebike carrying small or larger children and bags. Not everyone can wait an extra 45 minutes to grab a crowded bus that takes them way way out of the way instead of taking a car. Not everyone can afford to upgrade their cars to electric -- the new VAT on private schools doesn't help with this push for cleaner vehicles, as it forces hard choices for families in the private school situation. The presumption that private school families can afford all this workarounds is total nonsense. They cannot. This proposal, which simply makes it harder to bring their kids to school and not easier, will ensure the schools and surrounding areas suffer, not improve. Sure, it will be momentarily more quiet and still at first, and then the bottom is going to fall out from under these schools who are already struggling to meet the VAT restrictions. Parents like us, those with choices to be made, will simply give up and move to the burbs and will NOT be replaced. This will be bad for everyone and the well intentioned but poorly thought out restrictions in this proposal and others we've seen will simply hasten this outcome. This plan is a disaster. My daughter is too young to safely commute on her own and what should be a fifteen minute journey has become a Kafkaesque nightmare. Stop overdesigning solutions, coordinate with other areas better! There are so so many better ways to do this: Car drop off areas, like they have in the US. Partnering with schools to create Rope lines for little kids in Dulwich Park where parents could drop off easily and kids could be taken to the school gate. Micro bus routes for kids rather than giant expensive coaches. The reality is some kids are commuters as well - not just parents. Make it easier for them without forcing them on a bike or a bus that is not an option! Think more expansively across the entire area rather than punitively with more and more restrictions in various patches as you go. This requires leadership, not more zones ! HUGE NO TO THIS.

The scope and lengths of these DYLS are massively disproportionate compare to the safety measures they claim to provide. This is a very quiet and safe low traffic Neighbourhood that doesn't require more DYLS.

I fully object to your proposal reference to the above
This is a LOW TRAFFIC NEIGHBOURHOOD and there is absolutely no requirement for you to close off parking spaces and add extremely long double yellow lines.
There is NO NEED for this. You are merely closing down parking spaces to then justify adding CPZ from residents frustration to park their cars.
I live on xx Turney Road in the local area and I wholly object to being bulldozed by ludicrous ideas from a council intent on ruining this area.
I am absolutely positive you will find a barrage of opposition to these ridiculous proposals.
Consider this a formal complaint to the council for being bullied (yes, bullied) into accepting blindly stupid proposals
If you want to, feel free to call me - xx

As a resident of Dovercourt Road I would like to point out that only Gilkes Crescent supported the installation of a CPZ, other roads rejected the proposal, and that extending the CPZ area will have serious implications for traffic and parking in Dovercourt Road.

The Road already experiences huge parking problems from Alleyn's School teachers and pupils and heavy traffic problems (frequently dangerous driving and three point turns) as parents bring and pick up school children from the School.

If Southwark Council analysed the demographics of the Road, it would see that there is a mix of young families with children and older households. The older households experience daily access difficulties with their cars. If they move their cars during the day, they cannot park near to their homes on return - some people have serious mobility problems. These difficulties can also mean that people are 'stuck' in their homes, deciding not to go out shopping, medical appointments, helping others out of their homes and so on.

While there is a safety need for the double yellow lines at the corners of roads: these are largely ignored as there is no supervision of them or any penalties for parking on them. Furthermore, if extended to 10 metres they might exacerbate the parking problems in Dovercourt Road.

I am writing to object to the implementation of CPZ status within Dulwich Village - specifically on Gilkes Crescent and Calton Avenue. These roads have already benefited by being awarded LTN status and are now requesting that parking be restricted on these public roads. There is no current problem with parking and creating CPZ zones on these streets will only force the issue onto neighbouring roads, many of which have already suffered the consequences of policies which have not been duly tested.

I live on Burbage Road which has seen an increase in traffic of circa 20% due to the Southwark 'Healthy Streets' campaign. The request of Burbage residents to make our street a healthy one as well has fallen on deaf ears, whilst any request made by more favoured roads seem to be met with immediate approval. There definitely appears to be a two tier system in Southwark planning, with policies

made in a piecemeal manner, never foreseeing the consequences on other parts of the community. Southwark desperately needs a coordinated plan, modelling any actions and anticipating community wide consequences. Sadly, this has been sorely lacking to date, and the implementation of CPZs on already privileged roads will result in displaced parking onto other roads. The only reason I can guess is the real purpose behind this proposal is to force the whole of Dulwich to become a CPZ zone, thus increasing revenue for the Council. This is a cynical policy and I object to it.

I am writing to register my objection to the revised CPZ scheme, and more specifically the effects of it on the residents of and pedestrian visitors to Great Spilmans. I live with my family at xx Great Spilmans, SE22 8SZ.

The proposed CPZ scheme has an overwhelmingly negative effect on the residents of Great Spilmans and its pedestrian visitors. All the surrounding streets are proposed to have restricted parking. Ours is a private street, which will not have CPZ restrictions. It is extremely obvious that, whilst we have signage notifying that we are a private road, we will become the default drop-off point for parents of children at the local schools, as there is literally no where else for them to drop-off/pick up in the near vicinity. We are immediately opposite James Alleyns Girls School, and just down the road from Alleyns and James Alleyn's Prep school, the two Charter schools, Dulwich Village and Hamlet Schools. In addition our street is a conveniently shaped cul-de-sac which means that cars can drive in one end from East Dulwich Grove, drop-off their child and rejoin East Dulwich Grove from the other end without having to reverse etc. It is all too easy for drivers to unlawfully use our street in this way if they cannot easily park in neighbouring streets.

Extra traffic in the street will cause safety risks- our street serves as a cut-through for a great number of school children (and teachers) walking on their way to school/home (as we link up at the back of the street via a pedestrian-only alleyway to Gilkes Crescent. The footpaths are very narrow, so almost all the children walk on the road. Having cars zooming round the two sharp corners at the back of the street is a very real risk to our (mostly child) pedestrian commuters. The CPZ scheme will directly compromise the Safer Routes to School philosophy by making what was once a widely used green and safe route very unsafe indeed. This is completely unacceptable. In addition, the street has a communal green adjoining the back of the road which over the years the street children have used as a street playground. Further traffic in the street will compromise the safety of any child residents playing, and we will lose one of the benefit of this community asset. We do not welcome the air pollution and noise disturbance that further cars will bring to the street.

Our street is narrow, the limited parking outside the houses is for guests visiting the houses in the street, not for unauthorised visitors dropping their children at school. It will make it harder for tradespeople etc to be able to visit our houses if more cars are using our street as a drop-off.

The residents of Great Spimans have to pay the Dulwich Estate for the upkeep of our road. Any extra traffic will cause further wear and tear and cost to the residents. In addition we should not have to police our own street to remind drivers it is a private road. Confrontations such as these put a strain on the residents, and

on occasion can become unpleasant. We should not have to pay for a private parking warden- this would put an unfair financial burden on our street residents which is a direct result of being enclosed by a CPZ scheme.

We would also ask the council to please also consider this from a Human Rights Act (right to privacy) perspective- in effect the council's plans will encourage the unlawful entry to our private road, and detrimentally effect the quality of life here. In summary, the proposed CPZ scheme will have a significantly detrimental impact to life in Great Spilmans for both residents and the local schoolchildren walking through to school and we would strongly urge the council not to impose it as currently planned.

I object to this proposal for the following reasons:

1. There is no need for a CPZ to be introduced in Dulwich Village. It is not being proposed for any proper statutory purpose, but instead for improper purposes, namely (a) to pursue Southwark's general policy of deterring cars, and forcing people to use other modes of transport - if they are available, which they are frequently not in this area; and (b) to provide another way of raising money.
2. The CPZ was opposed by the great majority of all the affected roads, with the exception only of East Dulwich Grove. Southwark is therefore disregarding the clear view of the people most affected by this proposal, and also breaking its promise that it would not impose CPZs against the wishes of the residents.
3. As regards the proposals to introduce double yellow lines at all the junctions in the Dulwich Triangle area, I agree that safety is important, and that there are some junctions where it would be helpful to have these. However, the proposals are for extremely long yellow lines at almost every junction. This is not necessary for the purposes of safety, and will significantly reduce available parking for local residents and visitors (including deliveries and tradesmen). Given that these DYs cannot possibly be justified on the claimed ground of safety, I consider that once again Southwark is abusing its powers and introducing these for the improper purposes of trying to reduce facilities for motor vehicles. Moreover, these proposals have been sneaked in under the cover of the CPZ consultation, without

bring properly identified. Residents have not been given proper notice of these proposals, and have not been adequately consulted on them.

The majority of these plans are making Dulwich and the surrounding areas difficult places to live, work and visit. Decisions such as these will see fewer and fewer families choosing to live in the area, and professionals to work here. We do not have the transportation infrastructure that many other parts of London have available to them which leads to a wider reliance on cars for residents and visitors. The removal of park and shop parking in Dulwich Village will reduce revenue for businesses in the village with customers who do not live in the village choosing to visit locations where access is easier and less expensive. And reliance solely on parking by phone is incredibly exclusive for those who are not adept at using technology in their day to day lives.

Reduction of currently available parking on the suggested scale will simply push cars to other non-permitted roads, creating parking issues where none currently exist. This is also true of the proposed DYLS which far exceed any potential need for safety reasons, although in areas of low traffic such as those involved the safety risk is minimal.

This is just another example of the Council wasting money and acting totally against the wishes of local residents. There is no climate emergency in Dulwich Village. The Council should stop spouting this nonsense. Councillor xx is totally unfit to be a councillor.

I would like for the CPZ in Gilkes Crescent to be between 12pm and 2pm Monday to Friday inclusive

The current lack of parking restrictions does not cause any problems. If restrictions are brought in, it will increase parked cars in the neighbouring roads, causing an issue when there currently isn't one.

Controlled parking absolutely not needed

I use the area around Alleyns for social and personal reasons, sometimes during those hours. I think the proposed scheme will adversely affect shops in and around the area

Residents parking is long overdue on Townley Road, as are other road restrictions. The road is straddled by Alleyn's school, with children crossing at various points to enter school and its opposite playing fields. There is another school (JAGS) at the end of the road including the entrance to its infants school. At the Lordship Lane end, there is a health centre where nurses require ready access. And all along the road are cars parked throughout the day by staff and pupils for the schools, as well as buses and cars dropping off children. Traffic restrictions are absolutely needed.

But I would also add there is a steady stream of traffic along the road, typically at >20mph even if they slow for the traffic bumps. This is not just at rush hours but throughout the weekend, with cars looking to cut through to avoid the south circular and East Dulwich Grove (both of which are A roads). This is another serious health hazard for the children and residents.

Removing parking may well result in more cars travelling along the road at greater speeds so I would strongly recommend monitoring the flow of traffic after the parking restrictions are introduced: if there is no improvement then further traffic restrictions should be introduced e.g. a "school street".

The proposal would place DYL's on the road directly outside our house. We use this part of the road to park our car which is incredibly important because (a) we don't have a drive; (b) we have young children and regularly have to place them into the car and load it; (c) this area of Dulwich is notoriously bad for car crime. In respect of (b), the proposed DYLS will restrict the location residents can park their vehicles and displace those vehicles to areas further away from their home. This places an unnecessary burden on residents (especially those who are disabled and/or have children) who require parking directly outside their home. It also presents a safety issue for young children having to potentially walk on a busy road to their car. In respect of (c), the ability to park vehicles outside our home offers some deterrence for car crime and residents can look over their vehicles. This is a terrible area for car crime and it will only increase if vehicles are left in locations further away from their owners

This proposal makes it impossible for parents to take their children to schools in the proposed area.

There are some children who are 4 years old and who are unable to cycle or scoot to school over several miles. They are too small to use coaches.

This implementation would effectively prevent these children from attending school (Alleyn's, JAGS, Dulwich Prep, Dulwich Ducks).

My son goes to Alleyn's junior school, and as a single parent working at Whitechapel hospital, I have to go to work after I drop him off. I currently park either on Calton Avenue and if these rules are introduced this will cause a big problem for me. And other parents who have to drive to school. It is not possible for us to travel by public transport, due to 1) the times of trains not enabling my son to get to early clubs on time, 2) unreliability of the train network, 3) not enough frequent trains after school to get to clubs and then home, 4) no suitable bus routes from my home to the school. These new rules will cause increased congestion on public transport which is not fit for purpose. If there is inconsiderate parking going on, I suggest installing more cameras rather than restricting parking. For some single parent working families, this makes our lives extremely stressful when we are working so hard. Furthermore, by reducing parking in the village, there will be massive impact on local businesses. This has not been thought through at all, There will be increased parking pressure on neighbouring roads,

causing congestion and more inconsiderate parking as people are desperate. Please reconsider. Cameras ought to suffice, and if not tried should first cannot be discounted.

I oppose this proposal. It will make the life for parents and carers of children going to school much more difficult. In these circumstances, we will all park in unsafe ways.

I have a child at JAGS, this should make for a calmer and safer school run

The coaches and parked cars make the road extremely dangerous

I support cpz we long as fines are implemented- the entitlement of parents driving around the school makes the street scary, dangerous, and it is very stressful to know my children attend their school on bikes/ foot, around those drivers. Thank you for taking action- also we need more school streets. Allyn park should be banned from motor vehicles.

My objections relate to the addition of double yellow lines on Dovercourt Road., where I live. While not objecting to standard double yellows on the corners of Dovercourt and Woodward, their length beyond this into Dovercourt would, by my calculation, take away 10% of parking spaces, putting more pressure on spaces outside our house, as CPZ and other parking control measures, are putting more pressure on places. I would like to object to their length.

Protected cycle lanes and secure cycle parking are essential on all main roads, routes to schools and shops.

Dulwich village and square are now a destination for shopping / cafes by bicycle. More families would cycle to school and shops if more segregated cycle lanes were in place. Red Post Hill intersection with E Dulwich Grove is particularly dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians.

Your reference: TMO2425-011 Dulwich Village CPZ.

Please see attached my response to the consultation. [Attachment is saved in the emails folder, regarding the report on informal consultation]

I am writing to you with a strong objection to putting 10 metre long Double Yellow Lines in the corners of Woodward Road and its turn-offs. That would cause severe shortage of parking spaces in our road and make our life miserable.

I am 74 years old and what should I do if I return from shopping and cannot park close to my house? Am I supposed to make repeated trips to and from the car to get the shopping bags? And a parking space might not be even in my road, nor neighbouring roads.

Like many people of my generation I need more frequent access to a toilet than younger people. What should I do if I arrive at home needing to use a toilet and cannot find a parking space?

Please remember you were given your post to care for people and not to cause them distress. Please use your given power to help and not to oppress. Please use it with consideration. One day you will be old too.

If you have to install DYL please make them of minimum length - 2.5 metres. That is much less likely to cause us undue suffering and the safer crossing of the roads will also be ensured. In this way more groups of inhabitants will be taken into account and you won't be accused of bias.

Our community is being destroyed. There will be no shops able to trade as there will be no people able to visit due to reduced parking. Disabled people and families are being penalised- how can they access the village the park etc with such poor transport links as an alternative. Carers cannot access their clients. All this money should be spent where it is needed in school, community groups and essential health services. The cost of the junction, the parking consultations etc is a disgrace.

We would like to register our strong objection to the retention of the proposal to put double yellow line restrictions at the junctions in Woodward Road.

One of the reasons for our objections to the CPZ proposals which have been substantively withdrawn in the face of local opposition was the reduction in parking spaces in the road that it entailed. The introduction of yellow lines as proposed will have just that effect - and have been consistently opposed both in the consultation for a CPOZ and in previous consultations. We fear that, given the withdrawal of the substantive CPZ proposals, many people will have assumed that that the yellow lines proposal had gone with it. We were certainly in that position until our attention was drawn to this anomaly very recently. To be blunt this has all the hallmarks of the Council sneaking through a proposal which it has tried and failed to introduce before, which it has never evidenced, and which is intended simply to make life more uncomfortable for car owners in the road. This retention of an element of the original proposal has not been transparently exposed in this further proposal and is therefore arguably procedurally flawed and reviewable.

There is no legal requirement to have yellow lines at these junctions. No evidence has been produced to justify expenditure on them. As far as we are there is no record - certainly in recent years - of any serious, or even minor, accidents at these junctions. This is a low traffic neighbourhood, with a 20mph speed limit and speed bumps every where. Moreover, the length of proposed yellow lines - which appears to be 10 metres on each side of each junction - is much longer than those at other junctions in the area and disproportionate by any standard. All these points were made in responses to the original proposals - and they are not addressed in this revised proposal.

It gives us no pleasure to raise these objections. We were pleased that the Council had appeared to listen to and take account of the opposition to the original proposals for a CPZ. We are sympathetic to much of what the Council is trying to do. It certainly has many, many other priorities much more important than this constant fiddling around with the roads in this vicinity - for which there is no call, no evidence and which have succeeded only in infuriating local residents!

Please accept that the opposition to the original CPZ proposals for Dulwich Village included clear opposition to the yellow lines at the junctions in Woodward Road.

That should have been the clear conclusion after the first consultation. Please drop them now.

Adding controlled parking should help make the space safer and less busy. I'd like to see further measures to improve cycling and walking in the area.

I would propose to include paid for parking bays on Calton Avenue and other streets as much as possible. Many parents of children attending nearby schools (I am one of them) do in some cases need to arrive to the area by car. Lack of parking may result in more parents stopping in front of the school which in turn increases risk to other children.

The proposed changes will make it much more difficult to park in Dulwich Village even for a short stop to drop off kids at James Allen Girls School and Alleyns.

This proposal is not justified by any pressure on available parking in the Townley road area, which would be the only lawful reason for imposing a controlled parking scheme at this location. The currently unrestricted parking on Townley road is rarely at capacity and provides vital scope for parents to stop safely away from school entrances to drop off young children, including those of primary ages. Imposing this measure will lead to children being dropped off more hastily, in less safe ways, closer to school entrances. The council should abandon this CPZ, as it has rightly done with other recent unjustified CPZ proposals.

There is no need for these restrictions. The proposed CPZ's will lead to significant safety issues as parents from the nearby schools will no longer have anywhere to safely park. Whilst it would be ideal for these parents not to drive, it is unrealistic to expect this to happen and these restrictions will only increase safety concerns as parents resort to parking illegally to drop their children off. This will also lead to significant disturbances for residents.

I think it should be safer to walk and cycle.

Parking isn't a problem, and we have various shops and cafes that rely on people being able to access them who are unable to walk or cycle.

Parking permits mean that commuters will not be able to park - There are not enough spaces around the area. Parking permits on a road where almost every house has a driveway means that the road would not be used and therefore is a waste. There is no reason why others cannot park if there is not a concern of the current habitants not having a space - these current owners of the houses usually park on their own driveway so no one would be parking on a wide double-sides road. It would require each house to have 3 or 4 cars to fill the road which i believe almost definitely not the case. This is particular for Calton Avenue where houses are only one 1 side of the road for half the road.

The shops in the village have already seen a decrease in number of clients due to the time restraints on entering the area, so this would mean even more decrease with the potential to losing income so shops cannot open. This would be detrimental to the area.

Hi to who it may concern, I object to this proposal, as I am employed by Alleyn's School. And unfortunately the school, haven't enough car parking spaces,.. And sometimes have to work, variable hours, and would find it very difficult to get to work. So would deeply appreciate Southwark Council, to reconsider this Proposal, as it will be really difficult to get to work. And if was to come in. Would probably would have to find new employees. Many thanks kind regards

I wholly object to the introduction of a controlled parking zone in the revised suggested roads, especially where I live in Calton Avenue. There is no issue with the current situation and there is no need to introduce the CPZ here. It will result in a significant reduction in the number of parking places, which is more likely to result in people parking in unsafe areas. It will result in a significant increase in financial costs for residents, visitors, tradesmen and people visiting local businesses. I do not see any advantages to the CPZ scheme which is likely only to result in more congestion on other surrounding roads outside the proposed very narrow CPZ. I urge you not to change the current position.

My child travels to school in the areas affected. She walks. I wholly approve of the attempts to make the roads safer for walking and cycling. It will need to accompanied by proper enforcement particularly around JAGS School where parents frequently park illegally.

I would prefer one CPZ time period in the middle of the day

'TMO2425-011 Dulwich Village CPZ' - Object

I have been clear about my concerns regarding aspects of the CPZ and double yellow line proposals during the original consultation, consistent with the majority of neighbours and residents across affected roads. As you have stated in your summary, there was extensive feedback and objection to the CPZ proposals and their impact, which outweigh the reasons and evidence you have put forward.

Whilst I might support some aspects of the wider street changes across Dulwich Village, I do not support the extent and wide ranging impacts of the introduction of the CPZ on a number of the roads (Gilkes, Carlton, Townley and East Dulwich Grove) and particularly the proposals for the introduction of such extensive length of double yellow lines across Woodward Road, Dekker, Desenfans, Druce, DoverCourt, Beauval and Eynella.

Safety. The roads within the proposal are generally residential and there are no records of incidents at a scale that would warrant the lengths of double lines (113m along Woodward for example) as put forward. Your stated reasons for junction protection are not a legal requirement, and not substantiated by incidents. As a result of Southwark's significant expenditure we are already a very low traffic neighbourhood with a 20mph speed limit and with speed bumps. There is no record of any serious or minor accidents to my knowledge, caused by close parking to the junctions.

There are occasions where a car might park over the corner of a road, but this of course is not permitted in any case where there are dropped curbs and parking tickets could be issued for such cases right now, without the need to introduce the new yellow lines. You can eliminate this nuisance without yellow lines, given the presence of parking enforcement officers who will be needed for the wider restrictions taking place across the village.

In the absence of evidence-led safety proposals for making such public expenditure, the double yellow lines should not be permitted, or limited to 2-3 meters maximum, not the 10m proposed.

Direct pressure on residents' parking

The houses on Woodward (and other local roads) are particularly dense and the frontage narrow. Many (the majority) do not have off-street parking and if unable to get a parking space, will no doubt look to create off-street parking by removing front gardens. The proposal to introduce such extensive yellow lines seems a deliberate attempt by Southwark to create parking pressure and to raise revenues and ultimately force a wider CPZ. None of this is justified or warranted. Residents have expressed their concerns and objections already and the Council continues to ignore us. You are intending to force through road signage that will cause us to lose about 10% (plus other local roads) of the present parking in and around Woodward road. Any double yellow lines if introduced should be minimised to the level that they protect junction corners only, in a more reasonable way, that is responsive to us as Southwark residents and consultees.

Financial

Southwark's approach is being interpreted as a deliberate focus to raise revenue from the local road changes that are being introduced.

Disturbance and Environmental – negative effects

I have already mentioned that many will be forced to pave over their gardens, which goes completely against maintaining a green and healthy air quality. This disturbance caused by excessive double yellow line meter lengths is unwarranted and counter-productive.

Dulwich is in a conservation area. The increasing road signage that is now present is not in keeping with such. The presence of confusing signs and road markings is contrary to the principles of maintaining such as area. Any yellow lines will need to be a muted yellow as has been undertaken in other conservation areas and minimised as already noted.

Traffic/Access

The proposals will cause more traffic for residents across a wider number of roads. If certain people need to be dropped off (for whatever reason) for schools, health centres, shops, caring and social support, then being able to pull in is a reasonable expectation and the proposals should not be forced through to simply make normal day to day activities and access a problem.

Southwark are knowingly creating this pressure and inflicting problems directly on residents, it would seem to raise finances rather than solve real problems.

Overall

Given the lack of evidence, this order goes beyond reasonable proposals to protect corners with double yellow lines. If double yellow lines go forward, they should be the shortest possible and not disproportionate in their length and restrictions. Signage should take account of conservation area principles. Southwark should be responsive to the feedback on this order from its tax paying residents but seems to deny the concerns being raised. Please think again and change this order and the extent of double yellow lines it indicates.

I have no choice due to Childcare timing restrictions to drive to work. Alleyns are unable to offer me a parking space on site due to planning problems and being unable to add any more parking so I am forced to park in nearby streets. I cannot leave my daughter in breakfast club until 7.30 and would have to leave by 7am to get a train to get me to work on time. Restricting free parking in this area is going to seriously affect my chances of getting ab parking space and make getting to work even more difficult than it is already

I support the restrictions as people are using gilkes Crescent to park for commuting, when going on holiday, and even for commercial purposes. The restrictions will not help with the parents abandoning their cars for the school run however, so the restrictions could be tighter still

As a parent of three young children, I'm supportive all measures that will reduce traffic in the area, to make it safer for us and our children to use the streets.

I work in one of the Dulwich schools and cycle to work from Beckenham. I support this proposal, to reduce the reliance teachers have on their cars. So many of my colleagues seem to think that they're somehow different to many other professions and cannot get to their place of employment without a car. It's entitled and ridiculous, in my opinion. Force the change on them and they'll soon see that they too, can use public transport.

I support the implementation of a CPZ in Gilkes Crescent. I do however think that the afternoon time period is not necessary . The main problem we have is long term parking ie cars and vans that stay for days, weeks and months. I would prefer a 2 hour slot for the CPZ between 12 and 2

I often have to drop off/collect children from Alleyn's school or attend meetings there on my way to /from work - for which I need my car. As do many other parents. Parking restrictions at this time of day will prevent this facility for many families of pupils

Please minimise signage. Given Gilkes Cresy is a closed Road signs at the East Dulwich Grove (north end) should suffice.

Given Dulwlch is a conservation area signage throughout the Village should be minimised. Follow Southwark's example on Winterbrook Road and Stradella Road.

The proposed changes to Carlton avenue would result in significant risk/disruption to dropping/collecting little children to school. We do not visit the school everyday but on occasion when we do, parking on Carlton avenue significantly helps in collecting little children especially during adverse weather and shorter days in winter. If the concern is that people park there for whole day, another measure that could be considered is to restrict free parking to 2 hours only with no return in 1 hour/2hours etc. This will ensure that residents have enough space through out the day.

I work in Townley road and myself and other staff member will be effected a lot with the parking as we will have nowhere to park and are worried about our safety. I personally start at 6am and I would not feel comfortable getting two night buses to get here

Trying to clamp down on the ability to park near the school's will seriously impact on the ability of some staff members to teach at Alleyn's and JAGS. Putting the permit holders only parking on Calton Avenue would have large affects on those who need to park near the schools for work, but are unable to get to school easily by other modes of transport. By putting this in, you will potentially weakening the offering of local businesses, which have more of a general negative effect on your residents than the very few who want parking to be limited.

The school will not be provided enough resident permits for the number of people who will need those spaces to be able to get to work.

We are writing on behalf of Alleyn's School, Townley Road, SE22 8SR which sits within the proposed Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) for the Dulwich Village Area to formally object to these proposals.

Before we list our objections to the proposals and our rationale, we want to put on record our thanks to Southwark Officers and Councillors for their engagement over the improvements to Townley Road. We are genuinely grateful for your support with this, and we firmly believe that working in partnership on this matter will lead to better safety for all in this locality. Thank you!

With regards to our rationale for objecting to the CPZ as proposed, these are as follows:

- In your original consultation document (Appendix A) on Page 6, you mention evidence of requests for a CPZ from local residents. There is no key or statistical legend to accompany this, so the map itself is misleading. The size of the orange dots does not correlate, and one is even on our school field, where there is no such property. (Your parking pressure map on Page 8, however, does show a key, so you are not presenting data consistently, which could be misleading.) We actively consult with our neighbours and know the strength of feeling against the CPZ, so believe that local desire for a CPZ is not as strong as the consultation document makes out. Why have the council not declared the actual number of CPZ requests per road?
- In the same document, you publish parking pressure data on page 8. Although this has a key with stress data figures quantified, again it does not state the volume of spaces available, so it does not make clear what the percentage actually is. For instance, Calton Avenue (80%) has a considerable amount of parking available, whereas Beauval Road (80%) has very little due to the number of houses with dropped kerbs. Parking directly outside your home is something most Londoners accept is not a right, and your statistics show there is parking available on all the roads you are proposing and, indeed, even more parking on Townley Road (60-80%).
- In your follow up letter of 08 March 2024 (Appendix B), which we only received through a staff member who lives on Townley Road (not actually through the council), you state that after careful consideration you have decided to implement a smaller scheme, stating the overall majority did not want the scheme, and that you are now focussed on school traffic, which residents have told you are the main contributor to parking pressures in the Dulwich Village area. Again, this is not a quantitative statement, but a qualitative one, with no evidence to back that up.
- In your statutory consultation (Appendix C), dated 02 September (again only seen by us for consultation due to our staff resident, and then statutory notices), you focus on the scheme enabling better management of school traffic, but have not clarified how this would be achieved other than blocking parking.
- The primary issue of school traffic management on Townley Road relates to coaches from the Foundation Schools Coach Service, for which we have agreed a new proposal already, and on which the council will consult shortly. Why has this not been implemented first, before resorting to a CPZ?
- Although we strongly support the rights of residents to park near their homes, this scheme fails to recognise the fact that the school itself is also a resident of this area. We are a major contributor to the economy of this part of South London, and we have been present in the borough one way or another for more than 400 years,

150 of which have been at Townley Road, before the vast majority of the houses nearby were built. The school owns and occupies all of the North Side of Townley Road, and just shy of 50% of the South Side. We also own and occupy 50% of the easterly side of Calton Avenue. If this part of the road were houses, rather than a playing field, we would likely occupy the equivalent square frontage of over 100 houses. We therefore feel that we are entitled to an active voice, and indeed there should be the right for our business to use this frontage, as much as residents are able to park outside their homes. However, currently, we are only being offered 20 business permits should the CPZ go ahead, which fails to reflect our position and size.

- Although Dulwich has a variety of connections through train and bus, it is still not the most accessible of locations. Our site operates almost 16 hours a day all week around. Over 70% of our staff use either active or green travel methods to come to school and we are very proud of this and actively encourage it. This number has grown year on year (it was only 51% six years ago), and we continue to invest in improving staff incentives and facilities to encourage and incentivise this.

However, some staff, are unable to get to work using public transport for very legitimate reasons (such as working time, childcare commitments, disability etc), and they need the right to be able to park. Alleyn's is lucky enough to be custodian of a significant portion of Metropolitan Open Land (MOL), but we have no real parking on site, and no areas which aren't MOL which can be developed for parking. This is quite unique to our site, and our nearby schools have greater provision. We are genuinely at a loss as to how to solve this problem for the relevant teaching staff and the impact it would have on our core job, of educating children, cannot be overstated.

- A knock-on effect of the proposed CPZ would be to disperse parking to other areas of the neighbourhood, which would exacerbate the problem, rather than solve it. Staff parking on Townley Road and the non-residential side of Calton Avenue does not impinge on neighbours.

- We will shortly be launching our Community Code of Conduct and our Green Travel Action Plan, which are included in Appendix D. We take our duty to be responsible neighbours and members of our local community very seriously and will publishing these two documents publicly so that we can be held accountable. We will also take reports of violation of our Community Code of Conduct seriously and these will be dealt with under the school's disciplinary procedures. We are already TFL Stars Gold Accredited but can do and have committed to doing still more. We take our obligations in this area seriously and are committed to enhancing sustainable travel wherever we can, but the fact remains that the proposed CPZ will impact our staff above any other group of people, and we are truly deeply concerned about the impact it has on the education of children.

- Finally, our experience and data has told us that the issue of school traffic is caused, not by the number of parked cars, but by the behaviour of drivers on roads themselves, alongside the documented problems of the road layout (being addressed through consultation). We thank the council for sending enforcement officers to assist in dealing with offenders.

In principle, the school does not object to the imposition of a CPZ when this is the right thing to do and in cases where it can help shift individuals to a modal change in transport. However, we believe this is not the case in this instance and, furthermore, that those teachers at our school who have no will be uniquely

impacted by the measure. We therefore repeat our request above that the council withdraw these proposals and ensure the effect of the proposed changes to Townley Road are properly studied before proposals are enacted.

I have worked at Alleyn's since 2006. I live in Balham and it is either two buses or two trains to get me to Dulwich. Reducing where staff can park is so unfair. There is already a bus gate to reduce traffic for safety. I always arrive before and leave after the pupils. It will be a financial burden having to pay extra to park. There isn't a problem at the moment and this is just another tax.

As a teacher in a school that offers many bursary places and outreach to hundreds of local children on a weekly basis, for which I am partly responsible in my role as xx (Outreach Choir with pupils from 5 local primary schools; Monday afternoon music provision for local primary schools), I feel that it is wrong to penalise local teachers within this new parking restriction. I worked at Streatham & Clapham High School before Alleyn's and a similar CPZ was brought in on the surrounding roads but the local authority allowed all teachers to purchase a parking permit, specifically because they were educating young people in the area. I live in xx SW18 and to get to Alleyn's via public transport takes me around 50 minutes each way, whilst a drive only takes me 30 minutes. Having to take public transport to my place of work every day, despite being an excellent thing for the environment, would greatly affect my work/life balance. I am a parent of two teenagers, who both need me at home in the morning and after school and an extra 40 minutes travel as a minimum would take its toll. I understand why the CPZ would make sense for some reasons but I don't think that the local school teachers should be

penalised. I think that we should all be allowed to pay for a permit annually, which is what Lambeth did for SCHS.

The roads in question in this proposal are critical for transport for everyone attending the schools in the area. The schools have been there since 1619 and are essential part of the community, restricting access to parking in these areas will have an impact on the schools and wider businesses.

There has to be a balance for everyone, fully restricting parking on the roads is not a reasonable solution. It will have a greater impact on the wider community, than it currently does for the local residents.

We are parents of children who attend the area for school. Due to health reasons, cycling is not feasible for our family and buses to the area are often are unable to take passengers in the morning because they full. This means that the only way to ensure our child reaches a school on time is by car.

Introduction of these parking restrictions would make things harder for families like ours who would not be able to afford £50 per week (approx £1,500 per year) to drop off and pick up our child. Given the cost of living crisis, this would have a significant impact upon our family finances, where I currently have to work overtime to make ends meet

My daughter is at Alleyn's school and whilst she normally gets the couch service to the school, there are occasions when we have to drop her off. Sometimes this requires us to park on the roads close to the school and walk to the gate. The proposed plans mean we cannot get close to the school and we do not want our daughter to have to walk by herself from far away. I am therefore very much against the added restrictions on parking in the roads surrounding the school.

The schools have been there for many years, for longer than any resident in an affected street has been there. They have always known that the parents of the children at the schools that create the atmosphere in the area that supports their house values, need to drop their children off or pick them up on occasion. Even a child taking public transport may need to be dropped off in the times anticipated or picked up in the afternoon times. Creating the restrictions is going to impact parents' ability to safely drop off or pick up their children at the schools in that area. Without alternative access being made available, the proposal should be rejected. Instead, the council should look to install CCTV to take photo evidence of cars parking illegally (e.g. too close to an intersection, across a drive way, etc) instead of imposing these restrictions.

My son does to school at Alleyn's. He plays lots of sport for the school and I often need to park to visit for educational and sport needs. I have to drop and collect early and late hours. These plans would affect the security of my son, his education and be expensive

The restrictions here are excessive in that they take too many 'free' parking spots and the prices charged to park are extortionate.

As a parent of 3 local children, there are occasions where I would need to park nearby to collect the children. Although they cycle 95% of the time, examples of car usage are (i) to collect a child who fractured his wrist (this happened to us 3 weeks ago) and (ii) to transport my 83 yo mother to see the school, where the invitation from the school was 4-5pm. My mother is not able to walk far.

I work at Alleyn's School and have to drive due to medical reasons and personal safety, especially given the nature of my role (with the hours I have to work) therefore public transport or parking far from the site simply cannot be an option.

The level of inconvenience for those who work at the school, and cannot get to work by public transport, will only get worse. By restricting where employees of the school can park, you are only going to push traffic out further onto very busy and congested roads. Those of us with children to drop off at school too will be inconvenienced, as leaving earlier in the morning is not always an option.

I have lived on Dekker Road xx for the past two years and have never had an issue with the parking nor the traffic. Since a month ago, I now live further away and commute in by bike when the weather is good and by car when it is not. I and many of the staff at the school need somewhere to park.

Far greater an issue and impact is the dropping off of students for which these parking measures will have zero impact.

The only issue with the area is the terrible timing of the traffic lights between Townley Road and East Dulwich Grove. Only around 4/5 cars are given time to move off Townley Road and onto East Dulwich Grove. The time given is short as it stands and the addition of the cycle traffic lights appear to have taken even more time away from it. This results in a tremendous back up of cars on both Townley Road and Calton Avenue, especially at the beginning and end of the day.

Hello, I am concerned about the introduction of the CPZ right next to Dovercourt Road because of the knock on effect on parking on our very narrow street. This, in addition to the introduction of double yellow lines on Dovercourt Road, will lead to a significant loss of parking. It feels like we are being punished for saying no, as a street, to a CPZ.

This will mean i will not be able to travel to work with my back issue or able to find suitable parking close to work at the School.

I Travel from Kent to Alleyns school which is in Townley if these parking restrictions imposed its gonna be very hard for.me park closer to school and I start early finish quite late some times

See uploaded file with detailed response [following is pasted from the attachment] Statutory Consultation – Dulwich Village Area Controlled Parking Zone (including the proposals regarding of Double yellow lines)

We wish to object to the selective and unwanted CPZ proposals. As stated by the Council in the statutory consultation document only Gilkes Crescent, of all the roads, during the informal consultation was in favour of the CPZ measures. Yet their introduction to other roads; namely Townley Road, Calton Avenue and East Dulwich Grove goes ahead unsupported by their residents.

The aim of the CPZ is to enable the better management of school traffic by controlling parking. Has any investigation into the ownership of the 'offending' cars been undertaken? Are the cars possibly owned by the residents in these roads – or even the staff from the nearby school and medical centre?

If the CPZ is implemented then any traffic seeking free parking will be displaced into the nearby, and by then non CPZ, roads – primarily Woodwarde, Dovercourt and Beauval – all of which are quiet residential roads currently providing sufficient parking for their residents but whose roadside parking spaces will now come under pressure because of the adjacent CPZ's- the vast majority of whom do not have off street parking.

The relatively restrictive catchment area of the junior and infant schools means that most pupils walk, ride or scoot to school. It would seem therefore that most of the school traffic in question is associated with the Dulwich senior schools. Would it not be more appropriate to request, make and permit the Dulwich secondary schools to increase/provide staff, visitors, pupils and 'drop off' facilities. We also object to the proposed double yellow lines (DYL's) around the junctions across the consultation area.

The length of the lines (which are unnecessary) is excessive for Woodwarde Road – a quiet residential road with ample parking for its residents and their visitors with a 20 mph. speed limit and traffic calming measures already in place.

Southwark Streetscape Design Manual – DS.002 Yellow line and tab waiting and unloading restrictions (Approved 8.2019)

2.1.1 states Around Junctions

Where heavy traffic or large vehicles are unlikely this value (10m) may be reduced to 7.5m or even 5m in very quiet residential roads.'

We would request that, if implemented, shorter DYL's be in place or restricted to known days/times when refuse vehicles operate i.e. Monday and Tuesday 8am – 12pm, as done by other London Boroughs e.g. Bromley

I have responded previously - this is a supplemental comment. I wholly support your proposals IF additional signs are kept to the absolute minimum and unnecessary street clutter is avoided. Dulwich Village is an important and much frequented conservation area with in the Borough. It is important for the vitality of the area that the character and individual nature is maintained. Signs can be avoided, for example, Gilkes Crescent now has only one point of entry and it is only necessary to have a sign at its junction with East Dulwich Grove. Nearby St Francis Road is an example of how this can be done. Signs on high posts between each drive way will be visually intrusive, an avoidable expense and a hazard to sight impaired pedestrians.

I understand the need for adding in permit holders for local residents in the area due to the amount of workers in the area can cause an issue for local residents. If we are putting in paid parking is there a way that if you work at a business in the area you can have a discount on how much you are charged to park. Especially for part time staff who need to drive into work. Also will this just be causing more traffic and parking issues up the side roads? The added stress of not being able to park somewhere and it being a safe place to park can be an added stress to many workers. I currently work at a school and the commute via train is not simple for myself and due to logistics of life to get public transport and having issues to be able to drive and park near work is a stress factor, is there a way for schools to have certain permits etc.
Thank you for your time.

My two children go to Alleyn's School and although they use the school bus service mostly, on occasion, I need to collect them from school for medical appointments or suchlike. I drive to the area and park to do do. This proposal would make that impossible.

Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) pose various challenges for staff at Alleyn's Junior School making them unhelpful for day-to-day operations. One of the main issues is the limitation of available parking near the school. Many staff commute from outside the immediate area and rely on driving to work. Personally, I cycle everyday come rain or shine but this may not always be the case - such as late working hours, or if I were to become pregnant- in which case it would take me over an hour by public transport. CPZs often force staff to park further away from the school, which can lead to long, inconvenient walks. This adds unnecessary stress, particularly when staff need to carry teaching materials or rush to prepare for the school day.

As we would not be able to personally secure permits or whose permits limit where they can park, there will be a constant anxiety about finding legal parking and avoiding penalties.

The restrictions imposed by CPZs can also affect the overall functioning of the school. Teachers and staff might arrive late due to difficulties finding parking or need to leave early to move their cars, impacting their availability for after-school meetings, clubs, or extra support for students. This disrupts not only the daily schedule but also the broader school environment, as staff are forced to manage their time around parking constraints rather than focusing fully on their work.

Although I understand your wish to reduce car use in Dulwich and in London more generally to decrease air pollution (which I support in theory), reducing access to (free) parking isn't an improvement - it just makes things harder for people to get around SE London and to get to work.

Will the restrictions and parking charges be term time only, or are they all year at all times?

Will there be a new and additional public bus route put in place at some point in the near future that Dulwich to Lower Sydenham/Penge? Not everyone can cycle everywhere (children/logistics/too many bags to carry) and not everyone can afford an electric car. Not everyone can afford the train service, which is at least £4 per journey according to 'mytrainpal.com' today (Penge East to Dulwich (any)). Current bus routes only cover part of the journey from Sydenham to parts of Dulwich, they are not regular enough and are often full at rush hour. Not everyone can work from home to reduce journeys. Not everyone has the luxury of additional childcare (let alone affordable childcare!) to lengthen the time it takes to get to work and be home again, and still do a full day of work.

What will happen to the money generated by the paid-for parking places? What happens to the money generated by the Permit Holder bays?

Although I support the idea of reducing car journeys in theory, there need to be more affordable public transport options available and in place before cutting off a vital method of transport.

Please see attached. [following is pasted from the attachment]

Response to Statutory Consultation – Dulwich Village Area Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ)

In response to your formal consultation regarding proposals for the reduced CPZ zone in Dulwich, The Dulwich Estate supports the reduction of emissions in the area, and the enhancement of pedestrian and cycling safety.

The Dulwich Estate responded to the informal CPZ consultation on Dulwich Village in January 2024.

At this time we requested an exemption for Dulwich Estate contractors and staff carrying out essential works between 8am – 4pm, to properties and land across the Dulwich Estate, including areas within the new CPZ. Please can you confirm this has been accepted.

We repeat the following concerns which have not been addressed in this latest plan and raise a new concern from our residents.

1.

We note a net loss of 8 parking bays in the Village, which we consider to be detrimental to trading conditions and business, as well as impacting accessibility for those with restricted mobility. We discussed this at our meeting on 27 June 2024, but our concerns appear to have been overlooked.

2.

We requested three hours of free parking for shoppers and note the proposal is for one hour. Our view is that this will potentially reduce dwell time and spend in the Village, again detrimental to trading conditions.

3.

We have had multiple representations from residents at Great Spilmans which falls outside the CPZ but in between Gilkes Crescent and Townley Road which are both subject to the new parking restrictions. This will funnel additional school child drop-offs and excessive parking on to this narrow private road. This is not sustainable for safety. We would request that you set up passage counters to measure the impacts of implementation on Great Spilmans road usage and safety. We do not wish the double yellow lines on Great Spilmans to be removed – please can they be left in place. These have been marked and paid for by residents for private parking management service.

4.

We request high visibility signage on implementation of any controlled residential parking in the area, and payment options for visitors and residents not using smart phones - often the elderly who are more reliant on cars.

I object to the parking restrictions being proposed as I have to park in order to get to work. There is no way I could financially afford public transport I can just about afford to put petrol in fortnightly. Driving is already made hard enough with road closures etc. Now to take away something that helps me with my main source of income as a single parent is a huge worry for me.

I do not suppose the introduction of a new CPZ

I am a long-standing resident of Beauval Road and wish to make a representation on the Statutory Consultation concerning the Dulwich Village CPZ.

I OBJECT to the Traffic Management Order proposals for the following reasons:

- The proposed restrictions on parking in Townley Road in particular will have clear spillover effects on Beauval Road (and Dovercourt Road), especially at the lower end of the road nearest Townley Road. This will worsen an already difficult parking problem in the lower half of Beauval Road.
- To make things even worse it will further encourage the removal of front gardens – to the detriment of the environment (and counter to Southwark’s objectives) - as home owners pave them over to make parking space for their vehicles (regardless of whether dropped kerbs are present). This is already a trend, accelerated by the prospect of more difficult parking in the road as a result of a threatened CPZ.
- Members of Alleyns School (staff, pupils with cars, etc.) who park in Townley Road (and Calton Avenue) all day will now seek to park in Beauval Road among others. This is also true for those who might come for only part of the day owing to the parking restriction times, e.g. restrictions from 3-5.30 pm force visitors to park elsewhere at these times.
- The restriction hours, especially 3-5.30pm, won’t deter drop-offs and pick-ups – instead of Townley these are now going to happen in Dovercourt and Beauval Roads, to the detriment of residents and parking in these roads.
- An acute problem arises from the Health Centre on the corner of Townley Road and Lordship Lane. Health workers and visitors compete for parking space in Townley Road which will now shift directly to Beauval Road causing yet more parking problems at the lower end of Beauval Road.
- A comprehensive local residents’ survey with a high response rate showed that over 75 per cent of residents did not want the introduction a CPZ, and this majority opinion was true of every road (around 30 roads) surveyed including Beauval Road and even Townley Road.

There is no need for further parking restrictions on Townley Road (among others). It will have no beneficial effects on traffic flows, local pollution or healthier streets. A far more effective policy for that would be to ban school coaches from parking there (especially as they typically run their engines for hours while waiting). It is obvious that the costs to residents on roads like mine from further parking restrictions have not been properly taken into account. There should be a formal evaluation of all the costs and benefits and it should be presented in a transparent way. Local democracy is not served well by sidelining the wishes of residents and without clear (and enumerated) overall benefits to the local community.

I hope that these considerations are taken fully into account and that a detailed response will be forthcoming. Thank you for your attention.

I do not support the proposal. The claims of displacing the problem and therefore wanting to push cpz on to even more roads despite objections even from most people who you have now included in the current cpz is completely against any democratic values. You really need to start listening to residents and stop introducing these traffic and cpz schemes! There should be free movement around the city which would mean that it does not require all these measures that of course have knock on effects elsewhere!

We do not have a major parking issue on our road, residents almost wholly have off-street parking so I do not want to pay for visitors to visit me. It also damages the business on the area which make it a lovely place to live.

I do not agree to these proposals as these proposals are only for the benefit of the residents living on those

Roads and cars will move to other adjacent roads. The parking spaces on Calton are on the opposite side of the street where houses which shouldn't affect residents and so these should be not be included in one hour restrictions at school pick up drop off times, and should meet the timings used in other areas of Dulwich (12-2), this would stop all day parking by commuters, your current timings are just going to affect safety when children are being dropped off, also there are road closures at certain times of the day on Calton/EDG junction, these measures are not going to stop people from parking and waiting at school pick up in their vehicles

Implementing this parking proposal will only create excessive parking overload on surrounding streets, the parking on the main road outside Alleyn's is generally fine but it will adversely affect the surrounding streets and cause a lot more congestion for workers of the school and local residents also. It will greatly affect commuters like myself who live far away and have to drive to work.

I am worried about the parking as I do late shifts for function and will be worried for my safety going to and from work without my car

EAST DULWICH GROVE RESIDENTS' RESPONSE TO CPZ

Response by EDG Residents Association to Southwark Statutory Consultation on Dulwich Village Area CPZ

October 1, 2024

Submission

The East Dulwich Grove Residents Association, representing householders between Dulwich Village Junction and Townley Road/Greendale, acknowledges that the proposed CPZ (Controlled Parking Zone) scheme aims to enable "better management of school traffic."

Unlike other roads included in the CPZ proposal, East Dulwich Grove is the primary school road of Dulwich, with three schools educating over 4,000 children from nursery to 6th form along its length.

While we welcome any scheme designed to protect the large number of children walking along the road, we believe the current proposal's benefits are limited. The proposal does not sufficiently address the fact that children are still at high risk of serious accidents along the road without the introduction of additional safety measures.

Speeding Concerns

Speeding along East Dulwich Grove is a significant danger to both residents and the numerous children traveling to school from North Dulwich and Herne Hill train stations. Vehicles frequently overtake while heading southbound before the road becomes two lanes at the lights. Similarly, drivers accelerate to skip the lights when traveling northbound towards the schools.

We propose the following additions to the CPZ scheme:

1. Speed Cameras: Install Siemens SafeZone average speed cameras outside JAGS school.
2. 20mph Speed Signs: Place multiple 20mph speed limit signs along the road.
3. Permit Parking Area: Designate a Permit Parking Area "PPA DV" for residents between numbers 158-164 to replace the current parking spaces. Several houses in this area have multiple flats that require parking facilities.
4. Island Refuges: Retain the island refuges at the Dulwich Village crossroads as a safety measure.

Pollution Concerns

Additionally, the proposal fails to address the issue of pollution along the road, which poses a serious threat to children walking to and from school. We urge the council to install a pollution monitoring system to ensure that pollution levels are safe on a road where so many children daily have to walk.

The amount of traffic being diverted on to East Dulwich Grove regularly causes a build-up of standing traffic which adds to the already high volume of pollution along this road.

Without these alterations the EDG RA cannot support this scheme.

I am a southwark council resident living in Peckham/camberwell. I strongly object to this proposal on the grounds of discrimination. My husband and I cannot afford to live in dulwich area and are just trying to give our kids the best education we can. I drive my kids to school in a very eco car, a smart car and I am a very conscientious driver and parker. I am upset to see that dulwich is trying to impose parking restrictions specifically targeting the school run which does not exist anywhere else in the council. There aren't any decent public transport methods that are direct or safe for my kids to take to school. I have suffered issues post pregnancy and therefore cannot ride a bike due health issues. It feels like this is direct discrimination against parents who are doing their best to try and give their kids a good education but don't have enough money to live in dulwich and walk their kids to school. I understand imposing a cpz zone like all other areas of soithwark council has done, 8:30am-6:30pm which is what is done in all other areas of Southwark council but this parking restriction feels very discriminatory and only in dulwich? It's very upsetting as a soithwark resident that the wealthy area of Southwark keeps getting revitalised (junction of calton Ave and village way- 3times being redone) whereas there are many other junctions in Southwark that could use redevelopment (Southampton way & Peckham road- to name just one) Southwark council should be ensuring that their policies around parking are equitable throughout the council and not giving special privileges to a small section of the council. Imposing the restrictions to start at 8am is just unusually cruel and unheard of. Even the parking by the hospital - kings hospital doesn't start until 8:30am. I find this utterly unfair and cruel.

As a resident in muschamp road we were promised parking zones would support / control parking in the street. It was a reasonable cost at under £100 in the first year. In one year the cost to the resident increased by 400%. This is a money making scheme which local residents pay for.

While I support measures to improve road safety as part of this scheme (e.g. yellow lines at junctions), the proposed CPZ will create significantly more problems than it solves, and bring additional harm to residents - at least in its current form. There is no evidence that bringing in the proposed parking controls on such a limited set of roads will have any effect in deterring school related parking. Parents will continue to drop their children, school staff and sixth form students will continue to travel in by car but will park on other nearby residential roads - in particular Dovercourt Road - the nearest to Alleyns and Jags that would now offer free parking. This CPZ offers little disincentive to car users, but major disadvantage to locals.

As a resident of the Dovercourt Road, I can say - with confidence - that it already suffers from parking pressures that are having a serious impact on residents (elderly, elderly visitors, residents with young children/mobility/back problems etc regularly suffer carrying heavy items from parking spaces far from their home). It also suffers from frequent backed up traffic at school opening/closing times, and for school events, given it is a single carriage road, often resulting in unpleasant and violent road rage.

It is abundantly clear that all these problems will get worse - and significantly so - if this CPZ goes ahead.

What is needed instead is a fully holistic and more strategic approach, that looks across the whole area, that works much more closely with the schools, and other stakeholders, and deploys a range of measures aimed at reducing school related

car use. This scheme fails to do this - or be based on sound evidence - and must be paused so it can be remodelled into an approach that would have the intended benefits.

The timing of restrictions will mean parents of children picking up children from late clubs or dropping to school post appointments will have no alternative but to leave children (some young) a distance from school . Similarly children will now need to walk a distance for collection . Some parents who live out of the Dulwich area have no choice but to drive to collect on occasions . It is often unsafe for younger (and older) children when the evenings are dark and I believe safety will be compromised .

Alleyns and JAGS schools create an unacceptable volume of traffic as parents and pupils choose to drive (generally enormous) cars to and from school. The sheer volume of vehicles, and their inconsiderate parking, makes it is dangerous for my son to cycle to his school (DVIS), and for me to cycle to work, every morning and evening. The problem is particularly bad at drop-off (8-9am), collection (3-4pm) and in the evenings (6-7pm). I support a CPZ. Limiting the area to a few roads will displace vehicles onto other roads in the area, including mine, making the problem worse. If you are going to introduce a CPZ, it should cover the whole area. Otherwise, it will improve things for some and make things worse for others (this means no net benefit, at a community level). It should also apply all day (up to 8pm), since there is a lot of traffic in the evenings when the schools hold sports practice.

I fully support the additional double yellow lines at junctions. But this needs to be enforced by the council. Every evening, there are dozens of huge cars parked on double yellow lines and at junctions, with parents sitting in them, waiting for their children to finish sports practice. The council must take action against this and issue fines to offenders. It is unsafe for other road users.

This will stop us visiting friends who live here as we won't be able to park near them, particularly on Calton Avenue.

Losing the parking spaces outside the shops will hurt the shops. Dulwich is a village and needs shops and customers and children to go to the schools. Any issues on Townley Road are caused by the ban on traffic at 8am which means that traffic backs up just before then. Please re-open the artery between East Dulwich and Dulwich Village- you are strangling East Dulwich just to benefit the rich on Carlton and Court Lane. The residents do not want an CPZ and neither do the schools so please listen to people. Spend the money on other things that the whole of Dulwich needs rather than harming the area.

Fully support the proposals

I am worried if these permits come into place that I will have to consider leaving my job as the public transport is not great from my house and I am worried for my safety when I do late shifts at work

This proposal continues with Southwark council's war on cars, which under the pretext of environmental concerns, is creating unmanageable levels of displaced traffic into mayor roads. I wholly object to this proposal, as it will continue to create 'cleaner' and less congested roads for a privilege few, while those living in neighboring roads or having to walk or cycle to the area bear the burden of pollution and dangerous road conditions created by the increase in slow-moving traffic.

This scheme will push traffic on to neighbouring roads, leaving Dovercourt suffering significant traffic and parking displacement from Alleyn's school. We will be made significantly worse off by the changes and I object to them in their entirety.

I object to the creation of a CPZ in Townley Road , Gilkes Crescent and Calton Avenue because it is contrary to the wishes of the majority of residents (measured overall for the neighbourhood and street by individual street) and will have a significant negative impact on neighbouring streets including the street where I live, Dovercourt Road. Parking will be displaced from these streets and even more vehicles will be parked on other adjacent streets which are narrower than the streets where it is proposed to introduce a CPZ. Calton Ave and Townley Rd both have significant stretches where there are no houses on one side of the road, they are wider than Dovercourt Rd, and the average house frontage is much greater. A majority of their residents do not favour the CPZ, and a high proportion already have off-street parking. The introduction of the CPZ will make it more difficult for residents to Dovercourt Rd to park near their homes, which will lead more to introduce off street parking (allowed for electric vehicles). This will further aggravate the street parking problem, and be worse for the environment with more run off from off-street standings in front gardens.,

It is disappointing that yet again the Council is planning to ignore residents wishes, and impose unnecessary and costly schemes. Please leave us alone! Find something more worthwhile to do! Every intervention so far has produced no environmental benefit, and led to a search for further interventions. Instead the Council should enforce existing restrictions, work with the schools to make them ban pupils from driving to school, and provide car parking for their own staff. Arrangements for the vehicles of the NHS Community Nursing service in Townley Rd also need to be addressed.

Please stop pretending to listen, while actually ignoring valid objections. Your actions also create divisions within our community in an area where the Council benefits from high Council Tax rates.

I am concerned that Southwark is implementing a CPZ in an area that was only supported by a number of residents of one of the roads. I am also concerned about the restriction of further parking putting in double yellow lines at junctions . If these have to be implemented please can these be kept as short as possible to lessen the space available for residents to park - while I am aware of safety of pedestrians which I am one there doesn't need to be more than 5 m of double yellow lines please

I object to this proposal. The complete loss of parking outside the xx terrace will cause considerable hardship for mobility impaired residents and visitors. It will cause hardship for residents who may find tradesmen reluctant to attend premises. The reduction of spaces on the street will provoke conflict between residents and also with residents on the adjoining streets if people choose to avoid purchasing a permit and park on those streets. There is no justification for imposing the CPZ. It was previously rejected by the residents so I find it difficult to understand why Southwark keep pressing the matter. If Southwark want to reduce traffic on the street then introduce camera gates with free passes for residents. A cynic might presume that this is nothing more than a revenue generating exercise.

I have lived in this property for 28 years and there has never been any issues with parking.

The reduction of parking may cause conflict between the residents of Townley Road and adjoining streets.

The loss of parking outside between 19 to 24 may cause hardship for mobility impaired residents and visitors.

I am concerned about the impact on tradesmen, delivery drivers and carers.

Previous CPZ proposals were whole heartedly rejected, I see no change of circumstance to warrant this new proposal.

The parking restrictions are needed to enable residents to park free from dumped cars and school traffic

The proposed CPZ will have the effect of displacing traffic and parking from Townley Road and Calton Avenue onto surrounding roads.

I live in Dovercourt Road and we are already at saturation point during the day and increasingly at weekends with non-resident car parking and traffic movement. This is a narrow residential road with few OSP spaces and slight bends at each end of the road which restrict vision. In the earlier CPZ consultation the Residents' Association canvassed all the households and the majority were against controlled parking as they believed parking and traffic problems were caused by living close to two large independent schools which take pupils from a wide catchment area , many of whom are driven to school each day or come in large coaches which add to congestion and are often parked in local roads during the day. Staff at these and smaller non fee-paying schools drive to work because they cannot afford to live in the Dulwich area and I sympathise with them. In parts of the area public transport provision is poor and our local MP and councillors appear to have no interest in resolving this problem with TfL.

We all understand that CPZs are an attractive solution for the Council as they generate much needed revenue but they are not the answer to traffic and parking problems in this area. Why not set up a working group with representatives from local residents who are immediately affected by the problem, from the schools and TfL to look at more workable solutions.

There is a general belief amongst residents that these current CPZ proposals are meant to make us change our minds about the earlier area wide CPZ scheme which was rejected by the majority. This is unlikely to be the result.

I see no way in which this current proposal will resolve this problem.

I commute into work by driving in each day. I'm unable to take public transport to and from work due to personal life commitments. I park on either Dovercourt or Beauval Road - both of which are already busy roads. Introducing the CPZ on Townley Road will only increase this, and end up pushing more traffic onto surrounding roads. It isn't going to solve any issues - only move them along.

On the corner of Dovercourt Road and Townley Road on the west side of Dovercourt road there should be a double yellow line/no loading/no stopping at any time marking. Nothing is shown there on the plan

I am a parent of a child who attends Alleyn's and one at Sydenham girls. The proposed changes will have significant impact on ability to drop and pick up children from the school. I live near a state school which have recently had parking restrictions enforced and I have personally observed that restrictions are not adhered to which causes chaos and all increase dangers for children. I understand the need for implementing some parking changes but would like school drop off times to be considered more especially as JAGs and Alleyns are attended by a significant percentage of pupils that do not live nearby.

I work at Alleyn's School. Whilst my primary mode of transport is by bike, I do occasionally car share with some colleagues. Not being able to park near the school would be a really negative thing in my opinion. For many people who work at Alleyn's, they have no choice but to drive given that transport links in South London are significantly worse than north of the river. Given that there is not enough on site parking for Alleyn's staff (and visitors), restrictions on what is already very limited parking would be really negative. If the council does push this CPZ through, then they must make an immediate effort to work with the school to increase the amount of on-site parking for those who need it, and allow planning permission to enable this.

The restrictions will affect me as I commute in to work everyday and having timings on the roads that I would normally park on would be problem as I would have to park further away. The restriction timing will be the time that I would need my car to be parked here.

Please find attached link to my assessment of the proposals for a CPZ in Dulwich Village. Whilst I'm completely supportive of a CPZ being introduced, and believe (if well-enforced) it could be an important tool to deter car journeys, I am disappointed on two counts:

- 1) that some elements are regressive, in that the current restrictions are stronger than what is proposed (see 'What's worse than current' section)
- 2) the design of the CPZ could be a more effective measure at reducing car journeys, there are missed opportunities (see 'What could be better with tweaks' section).

More generally I'm disappointed not to see any re-purposing of road space away from car parking towards green, sustainable purposes eg. cycle parking, rain gardens etc... Hopefully this can come in the near future.

I fully support the proposals for a CPZ in Dulwich Village, and look forward to double yellow lines being installed on the corners of Woodward Road for safety reasons with respect to pedestrians and cyclists. There are frequent near-misses at these junctions and I thought these DYLS were agreed some time ago. Regarding the CPZ, I welcome the hours of the restrictions to discourage driving at school times, but would ideally like to see them extended further, and to include Saturdays (and Sundays if possible) owing to the extraordinary volume of journeys made around the schools, especially during Saturday mornings. With thanks for pursuing these proposals to improve our safety and environment.

I am writing to express my concern regarding potential traffic restrictions near Alleyn's and JAGS. As a frequent visitor to the schools for concerts and holiday camp pickups/drop-offs, I believe that implementing additional restrictions could have a significant negative impact on the accessibility of these important community events.

While I understand the need to manage traffic flow, I believe that blanket restrictions could deter families from participating in these activities. These events provide valuable opportunities for children to socialize, learn, and engage with their peers.

I urge you to consider the potential negative consequences of implementing strict traffic restrictions. Instead, I propose exploring more targeted solutions, such as:

Designated parking areas for school events

Encouraging carpooling and public transportation use

We already do our best to minimize our impact on traffic by carpooling and using public transportation whenever possible. However, factors such as musical instrument transportation, transport delays or cancellations, and inconvenient connections can sometimes make it difficult to rely solely on these options.

Recent restrictions on traffic on Townley rd have made it more challenging to access the school during peak times. Unfortunately, relocating to the area is not a viable option for many families, including ours.

We believe that our children deserve to have access to the valuable educational and social opportunities that Alleyn's and JAGS provide. I urge you to reconsider any plans for additional parking and traffic restrictions and to continue working with the community to find solutions that balance the needs of all the people involved.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

This CPZ is not needed or wanted by the majority of residents. Only Gilkes Crescent residents were in favour. You have not listened to the results of the consultation, and you are not following the correct legal processes for introducing a CPZ. Please refer to the letters sent by Robert Howe KC for details.

I am xx at North Dulwich Tennis Club on East Dulwich Grove. We run after-school junior tennis coaching for ages 4-17, and being able to park close to the Club to drop children off and pick up is essential. Without the ability to park near the Club, many children will not be able to attend the Club and will be missing out on valuable physical exercise. Our classes run from 3.45-6.30pm weekdays. We also run holiday camps which start at 9am in the school holidays - these will also be impacted by the proposed CPZ.

I work at North Dulwich Tennis Club on East Dulwich Grove. I need to drive to work as I carry loads of tennis nets and equipment with me to different venues. So I need to be able to park near work. The proposed CPZ will really negatively affect my ability to get to work and make a living.

I do a long commute in my EV and public transport is not a viable option, if this CPZ goes ahead it would greatly increase my journey

My interest is in Gilkes crescent only, not the other roads.

We are strongly in favour of the parking restrictions in Gilkes as residents find it very difficult to park due to the number of semi abandoned/ long term parked cars and school and commuter traffic

A (or maybe more?) local school wrote to parents asking them to object on the grounds that the school couldn't run adequately if a CPZ came to force - I trust Southwark and relevant schools are working together to resolve differences. Fundamentally Southwark is out of step with the rest of London regarding the lack of CPZ's in the area and I agree, that they need to catch up with adequate number of pay for parking at certain timings available for those who need

As a resident living slightly outside of the affected streets, there is likely to be parking pressure in our roads during restricted times. Particularly with extended double yellow lines at the junctions. Will residents in nearby roads qualify for the parking permits so we can park in Townley Road if our road is full and there is no parking available near our homes.

Please don't do this. Many young families including ours visit the area for the tennis academy - in our case my 70 year old mum takes him after school and won't be able to walk it. There are many kids in a similar position - families with small kids, other kids in buggies, grandparents doing the school run etc - the business is dependent on exactly this demographic. If this goes ahead many children including mine will not be able to attend, which will affect both this much loved local business, as well as genuinely stopping children continuing with a much loved and healthy sport! Please reconsider. Thanks

We are unsure if our online response to these proposals were on the correct platform. Therefore we have forwarded our response to this consultation as an attachment. [pasted text from Word doc attached to email] Response To Statutory – Dulwich Village Area Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ)

Objection: We would like to strongly object to Southwark Council's CPZ proposal for double yellow lines (DYL) put forward for Woodward Road and its junctions.

Context: We have lived in xx for 20 years and previously in Beauval Road near the junction with Woodward Road for an additional 12 years. Our current house overlooks this junction, and our office area faces this road junction. We are home most days.

Grounds for Objection:

1. In the 20 years living in Woodward Road we have not been aware of any minor or serious road traffic accidents in our street (other than a cyclist falling off his bike at high speed when trying to corner into Beauval Road when the road had thick ice on it. He was not injured.)
2. We are not aware of any evidence base for this road being an accident "hotspot".
3. Woodward Road and its neighbouring streets are quiet residential streets, even more so since the imposed closure of the Carlton Road junction and timed exit from Townley Road.
4. Woodward Road currently does not experience parking pressure and residents park considerably near junctions.
5. The proposed 113.5m of DLYs in Woodward Road is excessive and would reduce parking for residents by over 10%.
6. This reduction is likely to cause unnecessary tension between normally very amicable and considerate residents.
7. Excessively lengthy DYL parking restrictions at junctions of Woodward Road with Dekker, Desenfans, Druce, Dovercourt and Beauval roads is paradoxically more likely to increase vehicle speed at these junctions as drivers take less care and race into corners. This will increase the danger to pedestrians (particularly the elderly and children) and cyclists.
8. There are already drop-down kerbs at the junctions with Woodward Road for pedestrians.
9. The proposal wording for Woodward/Beauval Road Junction is ambiguous about its intentions for DYLs. As residents on the South side of this junction we totally oppose restrictions on the south side of Woodward Road as it would severely impair limited parking spaces for residents. It is a wide junction with excellent visibility for vehicles and pedestrians.
10. DYLs are unsightly and out of keeping with a quiet conservation zone area.
11. One can only surmise that the result of the introduction of DYLs will create "artificially" induced parking pressure which fits Southwark Councils broader agenda to introduce residents parking permits which has been previously opposed.

Response To Statutory – Dulwich Village Area Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ)

Objection: We would like to strongly object to Southwark Council's CPZ proposal for double yellow lines (DYL) put forward for Woodward Road and its junctions.

Context: We have lived in xx for 20 years and previously in Beauval Road near the junction with Woodward Road for an additional 12 years. Our current house overlooks this junction, and our office area faces this road junction. We are home most days.

Grounds for Objection:

1. In the 20 years living in Woodward Road we have not been aware of any minor or serious road traffic accidents in our street (other than a cyclist falling off his bike at high speed when trying to corner into Beauval Road when the road had thick ice on it. He was not injured.)
2. We are not aware of any evidence base for this road being an accident "hotspot".
3. Woodward Road and its neighbouring streets are quiet residential streets, even more so since the imposed closure of the Carlton Road junction and timed exit from Townley Road.
4. Woodward Road currently does not experience parking pressure and residents park considerably near junctions.
5. The proposed 113.5m of DLYs in Woodward Road is excessive and would reduce parking for residents by over 10%.
6. This reduction is likely to cause unnecessary tension between normally very amicable and considerate residents.
7. Excessively lengthy DYL parking restrictions at junctions of Woodward Road with Dekker, Desenfans, Druce, Dovercourt and Beauval roads is paradoxically more likely to increase vehicle speed at these junctions as drivers take less care and race into corners. This will increase the danger to pedestrians (particularly the elderly and children) and cyclists.
8. There are already drop-down kerbs at the junctions with Woodward Road for pedestrians.
9. The proposal wording for Woodward/Beauval Road Junction is ambiguous about its intentions for DYLs. As residents on the South side of this junction we totally oppose restrictions on the south side of Woodward Road as it would severely impair limited parking spaces for residents. It is a wide junction with excellent visibility for vehicles and pedestrians.
10. DYLs are unsightly and out of keeping with a quiet conservation zone area.
11. One can only surmise that the result of the introduction of DYLs will create "artificially" induced parking pressure which fits Southwark Council's broader agenda to introduce residents parking permits which has been previously opposed.

Re: Statutory Consultation - Dulwich Village Area Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ)

Comments:

General Points:

There is a Bus Gate arrangement already in the area to manage school and other local traffic at the school arrival/departure times.

Noting the extension of the CPZ, as proposed, we would urge 'standardisation' of times. With the Bus Gate, Low Traffic Neighbourhood, ULEZ as well as the CPZ Terms, it would be simpler for local residents and drivers, passing through the area, to have similar time-restrictions for convenience's sake, for keeping traffic flowing and FINE-AVOIDANCE!

Suggestion:

A co-ordinated plan for street use would be helpful. Pedestrians and drivers alike could benefit from having detailed Southwark Borough street plans for reference. Other considerations affecting movement on the roads locally whether by car, van, delivery vehicle, building supply lorry and so on or by those on foot trying to use the area they once felt they know include the reliability, accessibility and cost of local bus and rail travel into the (CPZ) area.

It is important to keep the road use safe and cut down on harmful emissions.

Clear visibility and sight-lines contribute to safe road use. They also reduce parking space so that parents aiming to get shopping after dropping children off to school will have to negotiate the extra double-line area, if this proposal is agreed.

The situation can also be problematic for those with mobility-issues who may need to get out of a vehicle at a distance from their planned destination.

Query-cum-suggestion:

Is it not possible to develop a more 'holistic' approach to CPZs, Bus Gates, ULEZ and LTNs in any one area?

With regards to the above reference I disagree with the proposed parking enforcement. Already there is a controlled route through that area minimizing the use of cars and ultimately providing the area with its "Climate Emergency, Clean Air" targets met.. Eliminating parking around that area makes dropping off children to school and after school clubs in the same area (of which I have a child going to Jags and Dulwich College) a logistical nightmare and ultimately just pushes parking issues into streets further away and simple just passes the buck onto other areas; for example halfmoon lane in front of Judith Kerr which doesn't and won't have any support or enforcement. There has been no research or consultation regarding the knock on effects of doing this onto other streets, highlighting the selfish approach from the Dulwich community and clearly showing the lack of real care they have for climate emergency/clean air for other homeowners nearby. The issues raised with parking (rude parents etc) is such a small participant bias and there are already laws in place to solve this issue – such as parking enforcement officers and the police which clearly hasn't been tried or suggested enough.

Please see attached letter objecting to the proposals. [text pasted from pdf attached to email] Statutory

Consultation - Dulwich Village Area Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ)

I refer to your letter dated 2 September 2024.

I strongly oppose the proposed new CPZ covering Townley Road, Gilkes Crescent, Gilkes Place, Calton Avenue and East Dulwich Grove. According to the Record of Decision, the stated reason for it (indeed the only reason) is that “there has been a consistent theme raised by residents about inconsiderate and unsafe parking related issues linked to local schools and this issue is a particular concern on the roads that are included in the new smaller zone”. That rationale is deeply flawed.

First, if the residents of those streets are in fact concerned about inconsiderate and unsafe parking (for which the Council has provided no evidence), the residents of only one street, Gilkes Crescent, are sufficiently concerned so as to want a CPZ. The result of the informal consultation of the other four roads where the Council now proposes to introduce a CPZ was 73 against and only 27 in favour. The Council’s decision to press ahead with a CPZ in these streets is therefore completely contrary to the express wishes of a very substantial majority of residents. A Council that was “People powered” and actually listened would not take that approach. I note that the very limited support for a CPZ everywhere except Gilkes Crescent is not surprising given that many of the residents have off street parking for one or even two cars and that for substantial parts of Calton Avenue and Townley Road residential housing is on only one side of the road. Second, to the extent that inconsiderate and unsafe parking is in fact a significant problem around local schools, a CPZ is the wrong solution. The obvious solution to any inconsiderate and unsafe parking is to:

- deploy Civil Enforcement Officers to monitor school areas during peak times and issue fines for parking violations, such as double-parking, parking on yellow lines, or obstructing driveways.
- install CCTV monitoring near the schools to catch illegal parking and issue fines automatically to deter unsafe parking behaviour.
- issue Fixed Penalty Notices for dangerous parking, such as blocking pedestrian crossings or parking on pavements. Given the above, I am concerned that the Council’s principal reason for implementing a CPZ is not in fact to address concerns about inconsiderate and/or unsafe parking.

In this respect, the Council is well aware of parking pressures in Dulwich Village and relieving such pressures was at least part of its expressed rationale for originally proposing that the whole of Dulwich Village be included in a CPZ and subsequently that a CPZ be implemented for a smaller area. However, despite the parking pressures, Dulwich Village residents were, by a very large majority, against any CPZ in Dulwich Village.

The proposed new CPZ covering the roads referred to above, seems designed not to relieve parking pressure but to increase parking pressure on surrounding streets and/or raise funds for the Council by means of parking permits and fines. The Council has no power to implement a CPZ for those purposes under section 45 of The Road Traffic Regulation Act of 1984.

There are two further reasons that lead me to believe that the Council’s true intention with the new CPZ is actually to increase parking pressure (presumably to create a desire among other Dulwich Village residents for the CPZ to be extended to their own streets in due course).

These are, firstly, the changes to Dulwich Village junction where it is evident that a primary purpose has been to eliminate 20 or so parking spaces in Turney Road and Dulwich Village for no valid safety reasons and at a cost of no doubt hundreds of £'000 of taxpayers money. That was wholly unnecessary in the context of improving the so-called Dulwich Square.

Secondly, the clear (but poorly advertised) intention to extend double yellow waiting restrictions across the entire consulted area, the effect of which will be to eliminate yet more parking spaces.

I urge you to consider these points carefully and to reflect on the real reasons for, and legality of, what the Council is proposing and also whether, if implemented, they are more likely to detract from residents' lives rather than improve them and severely damage local businesses (all 45 of which were against the CPZ original proposals for very obvious reasons).

I am copying this to the two Dulwich Village Councillors in the hope that they will listen to what I and many other residents have been saying and use what powers they have to lobby against both the CPZ and the double yellow line proposals.

This is a response by Mums for Lungs to the Dulwich Village CPZ
CPZ are an important lever the Council has to disincentivise driving. Having declared a Climate Emergency, we urge the Council to deliver these in order to address the public health emergency of air pollution even against backlash. In an area with such a high density of schools, we are pleased to see the timings of the CPZ align with the school run. We believe an enforced CPZ that accounts for pick up and drop off will reduce the level of traffic when children are walking to and from school, typically a time when children are exposed to increased levels of air pollution.

However, we are very disappointed to see the new CPZ hours will discourage parking on East Dulwich Grove for a shorter period of time than the current situation, where single yellow lines are 7am-7pm, and the coach loading bays are no parking at all times.

We are concerned that not only does this reduction make it more difficult to cycle on East Dulwich Grove during weekdays and at the weekend, it will also affect the bus routes on that road, making them slower. On main roads, we believe the CPZ hours should include the middle of the day. We believe these amendments aren't in line with the Streets for People strategy of improving journeys for the majority who don't own a car.

In addition to this, we think to make the area around the schools safe, the CPZ should end at 6pm rather than 5pm, as this would take after school clubs into account, which contribute a high level of driving to the area. This makes it unsafe and unpleasant for the majority of children who do walk or cycle at this time.

We are pleased to see that visibility around some junctions is being improved, for example the double yellow lines on the side streets along Woodward Road. We believe these will improve visibility for children, making it a safer space for them to travel independently, meaning fewer parents will feel obliged to drive them.

Kerbside visibility is an important point when it comes to the public realm. Without it, it is not safe for children to travel independently. This often forces parents to accompany their children, which leads to a journey driven and the air pollution associated with that. The perceived 'right' of a homeowner or a visiting tradesperson to have a parking space should not trump a child's right to be able to see the road and safely cross.

I have lived in Dovercourt Rd since 1983, when the area was a quiet pleasant suburb with large areas of field, some of it MOL.

Alleyn's school on Townley Road conducted all of its business on its own site, including provision of parking for its employees. This scene changed with the removal of the car park from the school, with no assessment of whether there was enough space in the roads to accommodate so many cars. The quiet leafy suburb is now one vast car and coach park. It is unpleasant to travel through, the benefits of the MOL are hardly noticed behind the traffic, there are constant traffic jams in Dovercourt and Beauval Roads. Anyone doing building work here is severely inconvenienced and can easily lose work.

The reason
for

FIRST PART OF THIS LETTER WAS SENT EARLY BY ACCIDENT.

(Regarding emptying Alleyn's school car park onto the local streets)

The reason for the severe traffic problems in this area is obvious, because it does not happen for the 14 weeks of the year when the school is on holiday. I object very strongly to any plans to impose expensive CPZs on local roads to solve the problem. Many of these are planned despite majority objection from the roads concerned. Our ward councillors have assured us on several occasions that no one would be forced to have a CPZ if they did not want it. This is now happening. On another occasion, following the protest in the village when a majority opposition to the road closure was overturned by the council, the same councillors were observed congratulating each other on "succeeding at last with what we've wanted for ages." But not what those who they are supposed to represent want.

Dovercourt Rd may not be part of the CPZ, at least for the moment, but no road can be judged in isolation because of the knock on effect. With the present plan, there is still a group who have to go to work in Townley Road and who drive. Is this group to be disregarded because they don't ride bikes? Why can't they be returned onto their worksite somewhere, or have a park and ride arrangement from Dulwich College. Councillor xx puerile advice that they should get a job nearer home would rid us of cars but leave large gaps in the workforce. Making local residents pay so that employees of a local business are unable to park near their place of work is a strange way of thinking.

I am particularly upset by the insensitive way in which the cost of having a CPZ is delivered, as though the amount is insignificant. At a time when we are all coping with large increases in outgoing household costs, imposing another demand for money is unacceptable.

There are no parking issues in the planned area. This is just a money making scheme for the Council which will inconvenience local residents and create additional cost and stress to residents and visitors. The areas the parking restrictions are planned for are mostly schools, rather than houses, meaning there is even less issue with parking than in other streets in the Borough.

Restricting parking in this way will impact other nearby streets creating additional unnecessary pressure on parking, which is the slow scope creep that the Council want to try and impose restricted parking across Dulwich, even though parking just isn't an issue in this area currently. It makes no sense and is shameful conduct by the Council who are acting in an undemocratic way if they bring this in. If the Council need to raise additional revenue, they should find other ways to do it (e.g. raise Council tax).

I work at the school in Townley Road and do drive to work. My home isn't close to public transport links and this would result in making my 30 minute journey closer to an hour twice a day.

I note that under the proposals Calton Road would become permit only. I absolutely support more walkable neighbourhoods, but as a parent who brings their kid to school at Alleyn's, Calton Road along the side of the playing field is currently the only place I can park that doesn't squeeze out residents wishing to park outside their houses. I would love a direct bus or public transport to help us to get to school rather than driving, because at the moment our option is a train plus one or more buses which adds more than an hour and a half to our day compared to driving. Please reconsider that part of the proposal.

I do not agree with the residents parking zones.
I wholly object to the proposed punitive hours of operation.
I disagree with the proposed paid parking bays at the bottom of Gilkes Crescent funneling cars into driving up and down to the bottom, performing dangerous maneuvers to turn around, this is unsafe when this area is used by so many pedestrians and cyclists especially school children.
I do not think the planned parking bays as mapped proposed for Gilkes Place take until account pedestrian and cyclists safety, coming right up to the barriers on both sides. This area needs much more rethinking to avoid it impacting on safety of using this road as a pedestrian.
This plan seems to be the worst of all worlds.

I don't agree with the proposed CPZ and it's hours of operation. I don't think the design provides enough safety for pedestrians. There are too many cars driving to fast and motor bikes using the fire gate at the bottom of Gilkes crescent and gilkes place. These are used by Southwark Enforcement motor bikes which set a bad example.

Cynical money making

I do not think that the parking situation on Gilkes crescent warrants this. There are enough free bays most of the time. These measures would inconvenience my family from visiting each other. And therefore we would face additional financial penalties which other residents of Dulwich do not face.

I feel the CPZ will penalise people looking to make shopping visits in Dulwich village or drop kids at school rather than addressing long term vehicle parking which has been an issue.

I fundamentally object to the further introduction of paid for parking spaces particularly following the reduction of bays on D Village. I object to the no park / wait zones by the Gilkes Crescent gates. I object to two time slots for resident only parking on Carlton and Gilkes crescent. I am not convinced the proposals for East Dulwich Grove will materially improve the position, particularly for cyclists and pedestrians at peak times.

Approve controlled parking on Gilkes Crescent, Gilkes place and Townley Road due to inconsiderate parents parking, blocking driveways, running engines and tooting horns. Safety and health issues for local residents. Why aren't local schools stopping this and encouraging use of public transport and coaches

Having trapped us all in our streets - unable to get out during school hours - now restricting who can come to visit, make service / health care calls.
Time to start engaging with schools who cause the traffic and parking problems and ensure they manage their own staff and pupil parking in their sites.

Fully support the proposed parking restrictions.

Please also consider extending the no parking area (double lines) in front of and behind the emergency services gate on Gilkes Crescent. At the moment cars park very close to the openings for bikes, which makes it difficult and unsafe to cycle around it. Especially with little children. . Also, the gate itself seems rather dated and is locked with a bike lock. I expect that not all emergency services have a key to it. There must be a safer way to allow them to access our street from the other side of the road if needed.

These proposals are totally unnecessary and will crush the life out of the area. The proposed parking charges are outrageous and it will be the end a small local shopping area that works perfectly well now. Surveys by a local member of the community find that the vast majority of the shops are against the added restrictions.

As a grandparent if I am called on to provide childcare at short notice to enable their parents to go to work, the additional and unnecessary restrictions in Gilkes Crescent will make this impossible. I

As an octogenarian I do not propose to take up cycling as that would inevitably add costs to the NHS.

It is time for the council to:-

- Sort out the traffic chaos caused by the cycle lane at the lights approaching North Dulwich Station

Two schools are affected by the increased pollution and no monitoring is taking place. Why not?

- Ensure that the drains are unblocked as this nullifies all the work spent a few years ago on flood prevention measures.

- Clean up the graffiti which is an eyesore and a disgrace.

- Leave this area alone and spend the money cleaning up Peckham High Street and taking measures in conjunction with the police to put an end to graffiti and vandalism there.

- understand that the compact with the cycling lobby has come to an end. Cyclists in the area are now regularly ignoring red traffic lights, and regularly ignore the rule that they must stop at zebra crossings following the same rules as car drivers.

What is being done to ensure there are serious consequences for breaking laws that are in place for the safety of the public.

I refer to the public notice that has been on display in Woodward Road for the last few weeks, and in particular to item (p) (ii) about “increase[ing] existing or add[ing] new ‘DYLS’ for junction protection in the roads outside the new Controlled Parking Zone ‘DV’ “ This adds double yellow lines forbidding all parking at all times to all the corners of the roads at all the road junctions. Furthermore these are all about 10m in length from the corners.

I wish to record my objection to all the DYLS and to the 10m lengths covered by this item. My reasons include the following:

1 each 10m line will prevent at least one existing parking space. The total DYLS will prevent at least 25 parking spaces. This measure will remove more than 10% of all parking spaces in and around WWR.

2 Parking in WWR has already been declared by the council in earlier notices as being under stress. This measure will make the parking stress considerably worse.

3 Southwark has elsewhere stated that its parking policy is “... the council’s plan to tackle parking pressure and improve local streets for residents.” This measure instead totally contradicts both these objectives, increasing parking pressure and disfiguring this street (in a conservation area) with extensive DYLS, against the wishes of the majority of the inhabitants.

4 It will seriously degrade the wellbeing of many of the many old and/or infirm inhabitants of WWR and surrounding who depend on car transport, and will find it more difficult to park and further from their accommodation. WWR is in an area of poor or non-existent public transport availability in particular across the dispersed area of Dulwich itself.

5 The reason stated for the measure is it is for “junction protection”. This is a vague and meaningless reason. There is no legal requirement for this vague concept, The expenditure of public money – particularly at this time of financial pressure on the nation and on local authorities – with the main effect of increasing parking pressure is a waste of that public money.

6 If junction protection is meant to mean increasing safety, then the measure should be accompanied by an evidence based risk assessment. But there is no record of any serious accidents or any resulting in injury at junctions, resulting from lack of “junction protection. Until such an assessment has been made and shown to require such measures, there should be no further expenditure with probable misuse of misuse of public funds on this measure. In any event there should also be an impact assessment.

7 The 10m length may be based on a highway code recommendation for not parking within 10m of a junction. However, this is only guidance, not legally enforceable requirement, covering a wide range of conditions In circumstances of highways with speeds up to 60mph and much traffic such a 10m -or even more- no parking plainly can be seen to be almost certainly justified, to allow sufficient visibility to avoid collisions. But WWR is the complete opposite. It is in an a LTN with very little movement of traffic of any sort – either motor vehicles or cycles and there is a speed limit of 20mph enforced by speed bumps. It is widely acknowledged that 10m is not warranted in such circumstances.

8 It is also widely acknowledged in professional literature that reduced visibility in the circumstances of quiet residential areas, due for instance to parking, makes for more cautious driving, lower speeds, particularly at junctions and generally reduced accident rates and seriousness.

9 It is notable that Southwark itself does not stick to 10m DYLS consistently. In the

junction of Lordship Lane with Bassano Street there is a blue badge parking space about 4m from the corner. As this is acceptable there, with much more traffic and heavy pedestrian traffic, then this should be more than enough for the much quieter WWR. If the council insists that for whatever reason it is compelled to bring in "junction protection" then any DYLS should be confined to 4m or less.

10 Finally, for facilitating pedestrian crossing, dropped kerbs already prohibit parking and both provide enforceability and a real facility for all pedestrians and for prams and wheelchairs. This would be a more than sufficient "junction protection" placed near the junction corners and would be welcomed as a genuine improvement for residents

So to conclude I object to these DYL measures in Woodwarde Road for all the reasons I have stated above. I trust you will amend the TMO accordingly

I would like to object to any CPZ
I live on Dovercourt rd and the works to Townley Road and other parking restrictions in DV will cause further congestion on our road which is already very busy with too much parking
We already have a lot of parking for the school and this will make it worse
Should the other roads have parking restrictions introduced, so should Dovercourt though I do not want to have to pay for the privilege of parking on my road. A parking permit should be free along with at least 100 free passes for visitors per annum
The council is unduly fund making / profiteering from car users. Shame on Southwark Council

Controlled Parking is necessary only in Gilkes Crescent, where it is required by residents.

All other measures are unnecessary, wasteful extravagant and financially reckless, squandering future anticipated income from PCNs levied on victims of LBS' widely observed prejudices against so-called middle-class working people and retirees, whilst (reportedly) wastefully and irreversibly contracting for excessive numbers of traffic wardens. Will the latter be wfh via ANPR? Moreover, your unnecessarily Extended Double Yellow Line parking restrictions (especially in Woodward Road) are more than likely than not to defeat LBS' own objectives. In addition to LBS' planning department's penchant for approving the felling of trees in process of approving property extensions, residents oppressed by arbitrarily (rather than democratically) determined parking restrictions will foreseeably find it appropriate to remove greenery from their front gardens and convert these to less permeable car ports. This is in addition to LBS having already pushed through-AND local traffic onto already busy surrounding roads causing delays to the very public transport of which LBS quite reasonably and justifiably want to increase public usage. If LBS want to spend money then why not remove the traffic humps at the eastern end of Half Moon Lane which are audibly damaging the suspension of no 37 buses as they negotiate the humps?

Air pollution? You may have seen from widely used Weather Apps that Air Pollution (presumably averaged) in Southwark is usually comparable with elsewhere. This has been particularly noted on the coastal extremities of England, for example today the reported level of air pollution in Southwark is '2' whilst that of Lands End and Isles of Scilly is '3' ! Equality?

In one way or another, LBS' current traffic proposals and similar measures in recent years are not in accord with Human Rights & Equality Legislation, The Highway Code, access to and from and the efficiency of Health and Social Care facilities at a time when these are under increasing pressure.

LBS should keep their DYLS in accord with the Highway Code rather than adopting an idiosyncratic interpretation.

In considering the varying views and needs of residents vis a vis the representation of lobbying groups serving particular interests, vs national legislation and official nationally recognised guidelines, LBS would be well advised to respect Proportionality of their decisions; and if challenged, to articulate the latter. Any other course of action is Authoritarian and Divisive; is that what LBS seeks?