

Appendix 1 – Responses to objections

Ref	Objection	Officer response	Action
1.	Loss of parking in the three cul-de-sac areas in Casino Avenue and Sunray Avenue	<p>The cul-de-sacs at Casino Avenue and Sunray Avenue pre-date the current popularity of the motor car and were not designed for heavy use. Parking space was provided on one side of the cul-de-sac with a turning area at the end furthest from the main road. These turning areas are now used as parking space by residents. The minimum amount of double yellow lines have been proposed in these turning heads in order to ensure space for cars to turn around so that they do not need to reverse on to the main road.</p> <p>The turning head on the Sunray Avenue cul-de-sac is smaller than the one on Casino Avenue and the parking arrangements by residents are different. In the Sunray Avenue cul-de-sac up to three cars park in the turning head area, parked perpendicular to the kerb at its south-western extents. Pictures of the current parking arrangements for each of these cul-de-sacs can be seen in Appendix 2.</p> <p>The proposed double yellow lines in Sunray Avenue ensure sufficient space for cars to turn around and exit safely. In the Casino Avenue cul-de-sacs, up to six cars are parked on the sides of the cul-de-sac area. The installation of double yellow lines in the proposed design results in the loss of two spaces for each turning head in the Casino Road cul-de-sacs.</p>	Review design presented in Appendix 3

Appendix 1 – Responses to objections

Ref	Objection	Officer response	Action
2.	Concerns raised regarding consultation process and decision making	<p>The consultation methods and study boundary were agreed at both Camberwell and Dulwich community council meetings in March 2015.</p> <p>The informal consultation which took place in June 2015 included a mail delivery to all properties in the consultation area. This document provided details of the proposals and a questionnaire asking residents and businesses if they wanted a new parking zone in their street. Notices advertising the consultation were placed on lamp columns in all roads in the consultation area and a banner advertising the consultation was installed on the railings of Sunray Park on Red Post Hill. Information was also posted on our website at www.southwark.gov.uk/parkingprojects</p> <p>Details regarding this consultation and the decision making process can be found here. http://moderngov.southwark.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?Id=5509</p> <p>The Statutory Consultation which ended on 21 January 2016 was originally advertised on 17 December 2015 in the London Gazette and Southwark News. Street notices were installed on lamp columns in every street in the area and information posted on the Southwark website.</p> <p>A statutory consultation of this type is required to allow a minimum of 21 days for objections to the proposals to be made. As this consultation did include the holiday period, the objection period was extended to 21 January 2016 for a total of 35 days.</p>	N/A

Appendix 1 – Responses to objections

Ref	Objection	Officer response	Action
3.	It will increase congestion and reduce visibility making the streets unsafe for pedestrians and reducing access for emergency vehicles	<p>It is expected that the number of parked vehicles in the area will be reduced by the removal of commuter parking and prevention of displacement from the nearby Lambeth CPZs. From the parking stress survey undertaken in January 2015, approximately 17% of parked vehicles in the area were commuter vehicles.</p> <p>The parking zone will include double yellow lines at junctions; these will restrict parking at junctions, improving visibility for road users and pedestrians. This includes sections of double yellow line on Red Post Hill outside Sunray Park.</p> <p>It is expected that the parking zone will result in a reduction of commuter parking during weekdays and also will discourage displacement of parking by residents in the nearby Lambeth CPZs. This will result in greater availability of spaces. Commuters alone make up approximately 17% of parked vehicles in the area.</p>	N/A
4.	The cost of permits	<p>The cost of residents and visitor parking permits is the same throughout the London Borough of Southwark. This is set by Cabinet and is not something that can be changed as part of this consultation process. These permit costs are in line with those of other inner London Boroughs.</p> <p>Further details regarding parking permits in Southwark can be found on our website at http://www.southwark.gov.uk/parkingpermits. Details of permit costs were included in the consultation materials, so respondents to the consultation could make an informed decision.</p>	N/A

Appendix 1 – Responses to objections

Ref	Objection	Officer response	Action
5.	Concerns about street clutter (lines and signs) in conservation area	<p>While the introduction of new parking controls will inevitably be accompanied by new road markings and signs, Southwark Council have a policy of keeping the amount of signage down to the minimum required to ensure that the parking controls are clear to road users and can be enforced. All road markings (double yellow lines or parking bay markings) will be installed as lower profile 50mm lines and the yellow road markings will be primrose yellow. These would be the same type of road markings as used in streets in the adjacent HH parking zone, e.g. Holmdene Avenue.</p> <p>75% of the new signage will be fixed to lamp columns; where no suitable lamp column is available, low (max 1.2m height) posts positioned at the back of the footway on property boundaries will be installed.</p> <p>As part of the current proposed parking zone, Gylcote Close and the cul-de-sacs off Casino Avenue and Sunray Avenue will be designated as Permit Parking Areas (PPAs).</p> <p>PPAs reduce the visual impact of parking controls by removing white parking bay lines. They allow permit holders to park in the locations they think are appropriate but without the pressure of commuters. Signs are installed at the entrance to the area and at repeated intervals. Yellow lines will still be used to indicate where it is unsafe to park.</p> <p>These types of schemes are extremely successful at minimising the impact that parking zones may have, as they greatly reduce the requirement for road markings and signs. However, because the signage is very limited, they do work best in small, contained areas and not on extensive road networks.</p>	N/A

Appendix 1 – Responses to objections

Ref	Objection	Officer response	Action
6.	There is not sufficient parking congestion in this area to justify the proposed measures.	<p>The responses to the consultation showed that 61% of respondents in the area of the proposed parking zone supported the proposal. (See page 47 of the North Dulwich and Denmark Hill consultation report)</p> <p>The responses to the question “What time of day do you or your visitors have difficulty parking” included responses from 63% of respondents stating that they had difficulty parking between Monday and Friday during the day and 62% stated that their visitors had difficulty parking during this period.</p> <p>The council commissioned parking stress surveys which showed that average parking stress in the area varied between 34% in the least stressed roads up to an average of 107% in the most stressed roads. (Higher than 100% parking stress normally indicates that vehicles are parked illegally, eg on double yellow lines). Details of the parking stress surveys can be found with the North Dulwich and Denmark Hill parking study.</p>	N/A
7.	It will displace any parking problems in Casino Avenue	<p>Currently there are vehicles parked along the whole length of Casino Avenue, including at junctions, reducing visibility for road users and pedestrians.</p> <p>It is expected that the number of parked vehicles in the area will be reduced by the removal of commuter parking and prevention of displacement from the nearby Lambeth CPZs. This will lead to an increased availability of parking space in Casino Avenue.</p>	N/A
8.	I dispute that fact that the proposed CPZ will improve residents ability to park, many of the streets in this area are full at weekends as much as during school hours.	<p>The times of operation were selected based on residents response to the informal consultation undertaken in June 2015.</p> <p>The responses to the question “What time of day do you or your visitors have difficulty parking” included responses from 63% of respondents stating that they had difficulty parking between Monday and Friday during the day and 62% stated that their visitors had difficulty parking during this period. Only 32% of residents stated that they had difficulty parking at weekends.</p>	N/A
9.	It will increase disputes between residents over parking spaces	With the removal of commuter parking, more parking space will become available to residents.	N/A

Appendix 1 – Responses to objections

Ref	Objection	Officer response	Action
10.	Lack of car club spaces in design	During the informal consultation, the council received no requests to consider a car club bay in the study area. It is noted that this particular request came from a resident living in Casino Avenue. It would be better practice to consider providing a car club bay should there be further requests or demonstrable need once the parking zone is operational.	N/A
11.	Replace part or all of the shared use bay outside No. 51 Herne Hill on Danecroft Road with a resident permit holders only bay	<p>This proposed shared use bay is located outside one property. It allows for parking by residents permit holders and also paid for parking via the Pay by Phone service. This provides additional options for visitors and shoppers during the hours of operation of the parking zone. Similar bays are located on streets throughout the proposed zone.</p> <p>Experience with similar shared use bays in the nearby HH zone indicates that a shared use bay at this location is unlikely to be fully utilised by paid for parking, leaving space for residents.</p> <p>The proposed resident permit holders only bays along this road are also not expected to be fully utilised, which would also permit the residents of No. 51 to park nearby.</p>	N/A