

<p><b>Appendix 2 - redacted version of each representation</b></p>
<p>People park for days outside my building. A car has been there for several months.</p>
<p>I am happy with current arrangement and do not want this changed . I see no merit whatsoever by having parking permits in the King Stairs / Elephant Lane as we don't have parking issues</p>
<p>This is at least the third attempt by Southwark Council to impose parking restrictions in our cul de sac. Each time the majority of residents has objected. The system at present works perfectly well and we are very happy with it. It will not advantage residents in any way, in fact it will be a detriment as it will make access for carers, workmen, family and friends very difficult indeed. In conclusion there is no need and no justification to introduce a parking deterrent or to punish residents financially.</p>
<p>My objection is regarding the proposed 'Permit Parking Area (PPA 'RV')' applied to King Stairs Close. Currently, there is no controlled parking in the street. We have a close-knit community where neighbours know each other well. Introducing a controlled parking zone will attract people parking and blocking our driveways outside the controlled hours, causing inconvenience to the local residents. I strongly object to the application of the permit parking area (PPA 'RV') to King Stairs Close.</p>
<p>This seems unnecessary for a quiet residential street which does not appear to have a problem with parking. The proposal will be restrictive and expensive for residents, visitors and workers' vehicles without actually doing anything useful or helpful for the residents.</p>
<p>I fully support this proposal</p>
<p>I warmly welcome the proposals.</p>
<p>The proposal will unnecessarily complicate the parking situation in Rotherhithe, without providing any material environmental impact (as announced).</p>
<p>We live on Elephant lane and wholly support this proposal. The introduction of no waiting at any time bays at points 'I' and 'C' will help alleviate issues where contractors and non-residents routinely block footpaths and sometimes make it difficult for us to access our drive way at number xx. This will also help minimise the traffic along the street as well.</p>
<p>I very often struggle to park outside my own home, while seemingly unused cars languish on the street for weeks at a time. Or folks looking for a free place to park drop their cars and use public transport, as the parking seems to open up on the weekends. I'm not sure why it's taken so long to get a permit for this area when the surrounding areas are all CPV -- I feel like it's long overdue, especially being so close to two main train stations. I'd love the CPV to be for longer hours to keep the non-residents at bay &amp; give me a chance to park when I get home at night! Someone even approached me to ask if I had recently seen his car as it was stolen - he wasn't sure when it was stolen, nor did he live nearby - just that he had parked his car in the free area and "within the last two or three weeks" his car had disappeared. There's a porsche currently sitting outside the estate that has not moved in over a month.</p>

I would support the conversion of some of the proposed parking spaces to additional cycle sheds and parking for hired scooters and bicycles (coupled with measures for stronger enforcement of their use).

On behalf of our business (Sands Films Studio and Rotherhithe Picture Research Library) we do not object to the principles of the CPZ plan. In the details however, we have a few objections: 1) both the Studio and the Mayflower pub need loading bays. In our case the best, natural loading area is on south west side of our building, on Tunnel Road. 2) in the proposal there is no clarity over what is the criteria to qualify as a resident: most properties in the area have a parking spaces facilities; will properties without such facilities be given some sort of priority? 3) in the same vein: will Southwark be transparent about the number of permits issued against the number of parking spaces actually available? 4) there is only one charging point in the area; we would suggest that the new parking scheme provides more charging facilities. All the best xx

Can you please also repaint the double yellow lines from the pergola opposite 48 to 51 Elephant Lane and opposite 52 to 62 and where the fire gates are, they are not very clear anymore.

I am writing regarding the introduction of permit holder parking at Isambard Place. While I understand the need for regulated parking, I have concerns about the potential impact this might have on residents like myself.

Currently, I am already facing challenges with vehicles parking directly outside my fence for extended periods. This creates several issues:

It blocks access to our rubbish bins, making it difficult to dispose of waste. Every Thursday, bin collection trucks struggle to access the bins, further disrupting the process.

I am particularly concerned that the introduction of a new parking zone may encourage even more cars to park in this unmarked area outside my fence, exacerbating the existing problems. Without clear restrictions or markings in place, this area will likely be the first choice for many permit holders, worsening the current situation.

I kindly request that the council consider implementing measures such as marking no-parking zones or placing necessary restrictions to ensure access to essential services and waste collection remains unobstructed.

Thank you for considering my concerns. I look forward to hearing how the council plans to address these potential issues.

We have responded to the consultations and are happy with the proposals.

The caveat is that this then needs to be monitored.

We currently have two parking issues which we have raised many times with Highways and xx has also supported, but nothing has happened.. I also discussed both of these with officers who came to Elephant Lane to encourage us to complete the consultation.

Issue 1---feint double lines opposite 42 Elephant Lane

Parking here obstructs the refuse lorries. Apparently, the lines are too feint for the warden to ticket and there has never been a sign on the lamppost.(pic attached)

Issue 2---feint double lines along the delivery bay in Elephant Lane alongside The Ship pub

Parking here results in the dray lorry being unable to park and deliver, blocking the road (which is a cul de sac) for upto an hour—(pic attached). Again apparantly the lines are too feint for the warden to ticket and the sign on the lamppost is too small for those parking to notice---so it seems. Parking in the bay also obstructs vision of the high risk Ship junction resulting in regular cyclist collisions. This is also awaiting action by Highways.

So, if the current situation cannot be resolved and the warden cannot ticket (lost income to LBS) residents are not convinced that the CPZ will make any difference to the current regular illegal parking.

I am writing to you in response to the Controlled Parking Zone proposals so far as they affect King Stairs Close where I live.

Your plan is to impose a "permit holders past this point" system in which I understand parking bays would not be marked but where cars with a valid permit could park at any unmarked part of the kerbside.

I think this is a solution in search of a problem which does not exist, because there is no pressure on parking in King Stairs Close.

But it will create a set of problems of its own.

Residents will not need to buy permits because the houses all have driveways and most of them still have garages.

So it will not raise much revenue, nor discourage car ownership.

But it will nevertheless penalize us and make our lives more inconvenient because you will be charging friends to visit us or workers who we might need to come here.

There is a troublesome detail in your plan.

The blue line of the proposed parking zone does not extend to the end of King Stairs Close, presumably because the area of land there is not a public highway.

So if there is a pressure on parking, it will be one of your own creation - a free parking area in a permit only zone.

This is the latest council attempt to change the parking rules in King Stairs Close.

The residents rejected double yellow lines at the last consultation.

Nothing has changed since to persuade me we were wrong.

I think you should listen to us this time too.

Further to my previous note, I see that your consultation document did not include King Stairs Close in the CPZ that is now proposed.

So you have not in fact properly consulted us on your plans this but rather re-drawn the map post hoc.

In addition, as I have pointed out, your 'permit holders past this point' system for King Stairs Close will have the unintended consequence of creating a free for all at the end of the road because your zone does not, and cannot, include the section of the road between nos xx, as below.

Excellent idea to make the area safer and less blighted by anti-social parking

I object to the proposition of CPZ at Isambard Place.

This area was designed for residents parking only.

It has been massive obstacle for the residents, with vehicles being parked at the middle of the square, many times without permission.

On many occasions we have had vehicles parking on the kerbs on the entrance to the square.

It causes difficulties for all of us living here.

I categorically disagree with your proposal to extend CPZ to our square.

King Stairs Close is a narrow road. We have no problems regarding parking. If there are yellow lines or prohibited hours it will prove difficult to get workmen to come to the property in the case of emergency repairs. We already encounter problems due to restrictions in Rotherhithe Tunnel. It will prevent our friends from visiting us. It will make it difficult for our family to come. Our driveway is narrow and short. There is only space for a car. Family and friends call when they are around the neighbourhood, they come from a distance, often with grandchildren, so have to drive. Any restrictions will mean they will be unwilling to come and see us. This is an ill conceived and unnecessary plan. It will cause great inconvenience to us and other residents and make living in the area difficult. It will cut residents off from family and friends, leading to isolation issues and mental health issues. It will also make it even more difficult to access workmen for electrical, plumbing and other maintenance and repairs. Our workmen have already told us they do not work if there are parking restrictions, it causes them too much hassle. There are parking restrictions on Elephant Lane, Some houses have longer driveways and the flats all have parking bays and many houses have places for off street parking. Those that don't park on the street. This they will have to continue with. There is no need for further restrictions.

I oppose the proposal of a controlled parking zone, on the basis that it would obstruct access to my business, which is a healthcare facility, for clients, and particularly those with access needs. It would also create issues for all deliveries and services that my business requires, as well as for myself. I view the proposed CPZ as obstructive, cumbersome, costly and wholly unnecessary.

There is no need for further restriction on parking in elephant lane. There are already Very few places to park and none of these creates any obstruction. The council's proposal is simply a money grab. Do not allow it to be. Implemented

I am a resident of Isambard Place London XX. In your proposal you indicate and promote that Isambard Place is available for public parking.

Isambard Place is wholly privately owned and is not available for public parking. You should have checked this in Land Registry for this information prior to releasing this consultation.

I object the promotion of public use of private land for parking. And it is also, illegal to promote use of private parking for the public.

I live in Elephant Lane and do not park on the streets nearby. Nor do my visitors.

The solution to excess restrictions is not to increase restrictions. The "informal consultation" included a comments block that allowed far too few characters for a sensible reply. I entered a link to a text file, but I have no doubt that you could not be bothered to read it. I therefore quote it in its entirety.

>

> In 2016, by your own admission, you tried to impose parking  
> restrictions. You are now trying the same thing again. How many of the  
> parking restrictions that have been imposed have been subject to  
> consultations about removing or relaxing them? As far as I can tell,  
> none. Unless and until all such restrictions have been subject to a  
> repeat consultation with a view to removing or relaxing them, it is  
> wrong for you to try again only where you did not get your way the  
> first time.

>

> In my response to your 2016 consultation, I wrote:  
> "Page 9 of the faq denies that this is done to make money. The vaunted  
> ring-fenced accounts are not available on your appalling web site  
> after 2012-13, and tables 48 & 49 give the lie. "Although there is a  
> cost to running the service the income is greater and a surplus is  
> created". Your words, not mine. In none of the five years listed in  
> the last available document is the surplus less than the income from  
> parking permits. It cannot be denied that the free issue of parking  
> permits would still result in a surplus. Therefore, the claim that  
> this is not done to raise money is false on its face. The "ring fence"  
> is nothing of the sort; table 50 makes it clear that most of the  
> surplus is spent on pork barrel projects that have nothing to do with  
> parking.

>

> "Even if the misleadingly allocated expenditure listed in table 50  
> were to be included, there is still a surplus of £900,000.00 allocated  
> to the "parking reserve account". I can find no breakdown of the  
> general expenditure, but in the face of such false accounting (a  
> criminal offence), it is impossible not to suspect that similar  
> wrongdoing is taking place. Having more money than you can spend, you  
> still want more. It is hard to find words to describe such greed."

>

> Your response to this has been to remove what little information there  
> was from your published accounts. I have no doubt that you have the  
> information internally, and your failure to publish it either in your  
> accounts or in the consultation document makes the consultation so  
> biased as to be invalid. Further, I have no doubt that the surplus has  
> grown, since you are obviously even more ashamed to admit to it than  
> you were in 2016. My point that parking permits could be issued  
> without charge while still making a surplus remains valid.

>

> I quote another part of my response to the 2016 proposals:  
> "The consultation document makes no mention of where the cars

> currently creating the disputed pressure will go. Unless this is  
> addressed, the invention of new crimes for people to commit will serve  
> no useful purpose. Better than the current proposals would be to  
> build car parks, as we were promised in the '60s would be done with  
> the revenue from parking meters. The consultation acknowledges that  
> the alleged pressure is a result of similar action elsewhere. It is  
> therefore inevitable that this action will add to pressures in other  
> places. This project proposes nothing to reduce the overall pressure  
> on parking, merely shifted around until ordinary people are driven out  
> of work by government restrictions that generate no benefit."  
>  
> The latest consultation document repeats this failing. Page 6  
> acknowledges that restrictions that have been imposed are responsible  
> for moving the problem around. Page 4 claims reduced car use as an  
> "advantage" without giving any justification either for the claim of  
> reduced use or justification for claiming it is an advantage.  
> Reference is made to commuters. People do not commute for pleasure,  
> but to take part in productive economic activity. If the claim of  
> reduced usage is valid, which I do not for a moment believe, it must  
> have come via the destruction of productive economic activity. This  
> may well be Southwark Council's goal, but you might at least have the  
> honesty to say so.  
>  
> The consultation document also fails to suggest any support for owners  
> of private land who might find it used without their permission due to  
> Southwark Council increasing restrictions. This has happened, and many  
> sites in & near Elephant Lane have been driven to expense to protect  
> property rights. These costs should be borne by Southwark Council.  
>  
> Southwark Council's reaction to the 2016 consultation was to paint  
> double yellow lines in and around Elephant Lane in places where they  
> can have absolutely no benefit. Mention is made of the restricted  
> parking nearby. I have seen the bays in Cathay Street and Paradise  
> Street full only when there has been building work or when they have  
> been filled by Southwark Council vehicles. I have never seen the bays  
> in Fulford Street as much as half full. All these harmful restrictions  
> should be removed or relaxed before new restrictions are considered.  
> They certainly increase the pressure on parking that the document  
> claims increased restrictions will solve.  
>  
> Further, in my response to your consultation on bicycle hangars, I  
> suggested several places where they could be placed without taking up  
> parking spaces. Southwark Council's reaction was to take up parking  
> spaces. Again, these should be moved and the parking spaces freed up.  
>  
> I have mentioned breathtaking greed and economic destruction as  
> possible motives; a third is restricting private property to the Inner  
> Party. Any and all of these three may be true. Your actions mean that  
> your stated motives are transparently false.  
>

The proposed changes involve allowing parking in locations currently prohibited by double yellow lines. This makes it clear that the creation of the double yellow lines was, at best, unnecessary. Far more probably, it was malicious.

The informal consultation gave as an excuse commuter parking near Rotherhithe station. There was no evidence to suggest that the problem extended as far as Elephant Lane (where I live) and the grouping of the two seems, following the failed 2016 attempt to bully us into paying, to be another case of malice.

There is no new documentation with the formal consultation. The claim that the majority prefer a certain action cannot be scrutinised and the suspicion must remain that it has been maliciously chosen. Response statistics should have been released, split by affected area.

The consultation has, from start to finish, been conducted improperly. The accounts for the parking department, including the suppressed "parking reserve account", must be released as part of any such consultation so that the consulted can see the avaricious nature of Southwark Council. No consultation should attempt to restrict the number of characters a respondent can use.

Before introducing further restrictions which will, undoubtedly, create more problems that they solve, the current restrictions should be reduced. The unnecessary double yellow lines should be erased. The unused nearby residents' parking bays should, at least in part, be released for free parking. Then, perhaps, a consultation might be useful, provided it were properly conducted.

Why does this area need any parking changes at all? Is this just a money-making venture on the part of the Council? Having said this, as a resident of King Stairs Close, it is important to consider the impact of parking restrictions in the area as a whole. If this street is left out of the scheme, cars will clog up our cul de sac, which would be terrible.

I'm concerned by the wording of the inclusion of Isambard Place, Clifton Place & King Stairs Close with reference to part 2c of the Public Notice where it says that any vehicle with a permit "may be left at any unmarked part of the kerbside". As there are no kerbside areas at all in Isambard Place, what does this actually mean for residents of that street? Are residents of other areas going to assume Isambard is a free for all carpark for any permit holder?

The other point I'd like to raise is that I feel there should be some "pay by phone" spaces available in the section of Brunel Road between Salter Road and Rotherhithe Street. That road is usually empty and could provide extra income as well as providing available spaces for visitors to the dentist etc..



I feel the current parking situation is working and that the new CPZ will be detrimental to the community within it.

My first objection is that the new CPZ will result in less parking spaces for residents, as some of the currently available parking will be given over to loading only and paid-for parking spaces. This will therefore not improve the available parking for residents.

Secondly, most of the housing within the scheme is social housing and having to buy an annual permit - for a car that is often a necessity for either work or caring responsibilities - at currently £247.50 a year is adding an extra financial burden for residents who are already struggling with cost of living pressures.