

Fish, Jonathan

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 December 2015 09:15
To: parkingreview; Fish, Jonathan
Subject: RE: H/ND/TMO1516-032 - North Dulwich and Denmark Hill area

Hi Jonathan

Thanks for the feedback. I have reviewed the details that you've provided but I am still very unhappy with the decision and do not feel my concerns have been adequately addressed hence I'll still like to register this as a formal objection to the statutory traffic order consultation on behalf of myself, [REDACTED]

Regards

From: parkingreview@southwark.gov.uk
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: H/ND/TMO1516-032 - North Dulwich and Denmark Hill area
Date: Fri, 18 Dec 2015 14:53:28 +0000

Dear [REDACTED],

Thank you for your email regarding the North Dulwich and Denmark Hill consultation.

In response to your comments below.

- The format of the public notice is dictated by the statutory consultation process which we must follow when publishing the traffic order required to introduce new parking controls. It's a requirement that the notice is written in this format. Less technical information regarding the introduction of the parking zone has previously been provided as part of the original informal consultation and in our subsequent letter to residents informing them of the decision. This information is also available on our website at www.southwark.gov.uk/parkingprojects.
- Further information about the traffic order process can be found at www.southwark.gov.uk/trafficorders. Details of the current consultation can be found at https://www.southwark.gov.uk/downloads/download/2558/traffic_orders.
- The decision to proceed with the new parking zone was made by the Cabinet Member for Environment and the Public Realm, based on the results of our informal consultation and following discussion at Dulwich Community Council and Camberwell Community Council. Details of the decision, including a copy of our consultation report can be found at <http://moderngov.southwark.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=5509>.
- The hours of operation for the zone were selected based on responses to the informal consultation and as part of the above decision making process. We have found that in practice, a two hour restriction discourages all day parking by commuters and frees up parking space for residents, while allowing residents greater freedom to park during the day or to schedule visits (e.g. for friends/relatives or maintenance workers).
- The permit cost of £125 is in line with costs in neighbouring London Boroughs. This cost is set at cabinet level by the London Borough of Southwark and is not something that we can change as part of this consultation process.
- The discount for Blue Badge Holders may only be applied to one vehicle per household.

If you have any further questions regarding the North Dulwich and Denmark Hill parking zone, or regarding the consultation process, please let me know by emailing parkingreview@southwark.gov.uk.

Please let me know by 21st January 2016 if you are satisfied with the responses to your queries and therefore are happy to withdraw your objection, or if you wish for this to be registered as a formal objection to the statutory traffic order consultation.

Regards,

Jonathan Fish, MILT

Project Engineer

Highways

Environment

London Borough of Southwark

E: Jonathan.fish@southwark.gov.uk

DD: 020 7525 1515



From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Friday, December 18, 2015 12:08 AM

To: traffic orders

Subject: REF: H/ND/TMO1516-032 - North Dulwich and Denmark Hill area

To Whom It May Concern,

I have a few points I would like to make on the North Dulwich and Denmark Hill permit parking controls due to be implemented.

- The Public notice which has been put around the area is extremely difficult to follow. It's filled with technical jargon embedded with the actual content that your average person would struggle to decipher what you're referring to.

- I understand that a response rate of 23% is apparently higher than usual but considering 59% were in favour of the parking restrictions and 32% were not, I personally don't feel this is a good enough majority to make such a decision. My household counts for 3 cars but we only have the one vote which makes things even more frustrating.

- From someone who's been living in the area for quite a while now, the parking problem has never been during the day, rather it's been moreso in the evenings so personally I feel this makes the exercise redundant.

- I understand a local area has parking restrictions between 12am-2pm but Camberwell and Denmark Hill have restrictions between 8:30am-6:30pm and surely if we're forced to be paying a staggering £125 per year for a permit, then surely we may as well do it properly rather for 2 hours for week especially when the majority of people will be at work during this time. A how day restriction would prevent people from leaving their car there overnight which would be a better result.

- £125 is not an amount that your average person can afford to do without. I feel this is just an extra expense on top of everything else and it has targeted the wrong period during the day. **Question: Will blue badge holders be allowed to use their discount for all cars within the household?**

- I can't stress how much I am opposed to this change. I think it's slightly misguided plus I don't feel it is actually addressing the parking issue.

Regards

The email you received and any files transmitted with it are confidential, may be covered by legal and/or professional privilege and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this in error please notify us immediately. If you are not the intended recipient of the email or the person responsible for delivering it to them you may not copy it, forward it or otherwise use it for any purpose or disclose its contents to any other person. To do so may be unlawful. Where opinions are expressed in the email they are not necessarily those of Southwark Council and Southwark Council is not responsible for any changes made to the message after it has been sent.

Fish, Jonathan

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 January 2016 17:39
To: parkingreview
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: North Dulwich and Denmark Hill parking project - objection to parking arrangements

Categories: ND/DH CPZ

Dear Mr Fish,

Thank you for your response to our email

We are writing to let you know that we are not satisfied with the responses to our query and do wish for this aspect of the proposal to be registered as a formal objection to the statutory traffic order consultation.

We do appreciate that shared use bays restrict parking in the local area between 12 and 2 pm, however we do not think that the allocation of shared use to the entire frontage of our home offers us the same access to residents' parking which is available to other residents in Danecroft Rd:

- Other residents have residents' parking outside their homes, this will not be available to us;
- The small number of shared use bays in the street (outside our house only) means that these will be at a premium for all tradesmen working in these and adjacent streets. This will create significant pressure even if commuters do not abuse the system;
- The situation in Holmdene Avenue is not comparable as all spaces in the next street, Hollingbourne Rd, are given over to shared use;
- Houses in Holmdene Rd where shared use bays are in operation are not adjacent to the frontage of any homes (i.e. front doors do not open onto Holmdene Rd).

We understand that the design has been the subject of a lengthy approval process. We are not requesting material alteration to the scheme. We did however raise our concerns at our earliest opportunity and have spoken to your team informally several times. The proposed scheme does not treat our needs equitably and at this stage we have no further option than to raise a formal objection.

Yours sincerely

From: Fish, Jonathan [mailto:Jonathan.Fish@southwark.gov.uk] **On Behalf Of** parkingreview
Sent: 13 January 2016 11:12
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: North Dulwich and Denmark Hill parking project - objection to parking arrangements

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your email regarding the North Dulwich and Denmark Hill parking project.

Shared use parking bays are being provided at a number of locations in the proposed parking zone, including the streets adjacent to yours, Elfindale Road and Casino Avenue. The locations of these shared use bays can be seen on the [plan of the proposed parking zone](#). This design was approved by the Cabinet Member for Environment and the Public Realm in October 2015. Details of this decision can be found [here](#).

The shared use parking bays will operate from Monday to Friday, between 12Noon and 2pm. Those eligible to park in these shared use bays will be:

- Holders of residents parking permits/visitor parking permits
- Vehicles for which a payment to park has been made (via the pay by phone service)

In summary, the proposed shared use bay in Danecroft Road is prioritised for residents, but offers the flexibility for someone else to make payment to park short term who is visiting the area, i.e. a shopper, relative, tradesman. This is only applicable during the 2 hour controlled period.

Shared use bays are situated across Southwark's 21 parking zones, including the nearby Herne Hill (HH) zone. It is extremely rare for the shared use bays to be misused. For example, during the public consultation some concerns were raised by residents about the possibility of commuters parking in the shared use bays. This is very uncommon; we generally find a commuter would rather change their parking behaviour (i.e. find a nearby uncontrolled street) than having the daily inconvenience of parking and having to make payment in a shared use bay. If shared use bays were being misused, our parking operations team are able to take action.

Given that this design has been approved, we are not proposing to change it at this time. This design approach is similar in the nearby HH parking zone, including Holmdene Avenue and has worked well for a number of years.

Please let me know by 21st January 2016 if you are satisfied with the responses to your queries and therefore are happy to withdraw your objection, or if you wish for this to be registered as a formal objection to the statutory traffic order consultation.

Regards,

Jonathan Fish, MILT

Project Engineer

Highways

Environment

London Borough of Southwark

E: Jonathan.fish@southwark.gov.uk

DD: 020 7525 1515



From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Friday, January 08, 2016 5:09 PM

To: parkingreview

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: FW: North Dulwich and Denmark Hill parking project - objection to parking arrangements

Dear Parking Review Team

Following our representations in person and in writing as part of the consultation process in 2015, telephone messages left with your office and conversations with the parking review team on 05.01 and 07.01) we have been advised to write to you and put our objections to the current parking proposals formally in order to have these addressed as part of the consultation process.

While we accept that parking restrictions have become necessary in this area and support the proposals in the main we have objections to the way in which the parking zone will be implemented outside [REDACTED].



The proposal is that the whole of Danecroft Road become a resident permit holder's zone. The only exception to this is the street outside our house which has been designated as shared use.

- Other residents have an area directly outside their homes where parking is restricted while we do not, despite having to pay the same fee for a permit;
- At the consultation meeting we were informed that no shared use bay had been designated opposite as this is directly outside residents' homes. This is equally the case outside [REDACTED];
- It is clear that there is potential for a number of cars to park on this stretch of the street and devoting one further space to residents' parking would not prevent shared use completely;
- Not providing the minimum sufficient residents' parking will force us to park on occasion outside our neighbours' homes and risks upset within the community.

We have been informed that shared use elsewhere does not crowd out residents and that we will find ample parking within these bays. We are by no means convinced of this – if it were so then shared parking could be applied in the houses opposite. No other shared use has been imposed in this street or for any other residents in the area.

For these reasons we think that a residents' parking place should be incorporated into the design outside 51 Herne Hill and we would request that you review this decision urgently

Yours faithfully

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

The email you received and any files transmitted with it are confidential, may be covered by legal and/or professional privilege and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this in error please notify us immediately. If you are not the intended recipient of the email or the person responsible for delivering it to them you may not copy it, forward it or otherwise use it for any purpose or disclose its contents to any other person. To do so may be unlawful. Where opinions are expressed in the email they are not necessarily those of Southwark Council and Southwark Council is not responsible for any changes made to the message after it has been sent.

Fish, Jonathan

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 January 2016 15:24
To: traffic orders
Subject: Consultation response

Categories: ND/DH CPZ

[Title]
[REDACTED]

[Firstname]
[REDACTED]

[Lastname]
[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]
[REDACTED]

[Email_address]
[REDACTED]

[Areyou]
A resident

[Whichconsultation]
North Dulwich and Denmark Hill Area:
Introduction of permit parking controls.

Ref: H/ND/TMO1516-032

Casino Ave.

[overallresponse]
5. I wholly object to

[response]

As resident of Casino Ave I wholly object to the implementation of the Traffic order in Casino Ave. In particular the the placing of double yellow lines outside nos. 19 to 29 and 63 to 73 which will reduce the number of residents parking spaces and create further congestion in the surrounding streets. This will restrict access in an already congested street and make the streets unsafe for pedestrians and other users.

Fish, Jonathan

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 January 2016 19:31
To: traffic orders
Subject: Consultation response

Categories: ND/DH CPZ

[Title]
[REDACTED]

[Firstname]
[REDACTED]

[Lastname]
[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]
[REDACTED]

[Email_address]
[REDACTED]

[Areyou]
A resident

[Whichconsultation]
North Dulwich & Denmark Hill Proposed Parking Order

[overallresponse]
5. I wholly object to

[response]
Proposal to introduce parking permits is not necessary. There is not sufficient parking congestion in this area to justify the proposed measures. With regard to specific proposals, double yellow lines on Casino Avenue between 63-73 and 19-29 are completely unacceptable, as they will reduce the number of resident parking spaces.

Fish, Jonathan

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 February 2016 09:35
To: Fish, Jonathan
Subject: Re: Consultation response

Dear Mr Fish,

Thank you for your response. I'm sure that you will not want to continue discussing this issue, but I feel that I must respond now I have been informed of the rationale behind the proposal to have double yellow lines at the end of the cul-de-sacs. In fact there is no need whatsoever for people parking there to reverse into the 'main road' (although I would hardly classify the main part of Casino Avenue as such). Firstly there are many driveways with dropped pavements which residents use to turn in order to avoid reversing into the main part of Casino Avenue. Secondly, the entry of the cul-de-sacs widens, enabling turning without entering the main part of Casino Avenue.

Finally can I again say that all local residents of our area are concerned that the far fewer parking places will be available when the new zone is introduced, as evidenced by several circulars we have received from tenants/residents groups, and from a meeting of people living in our cul-de-sac on the issue. Please do not reduce our parking facilities, already full at times, by removing 4 spaces from each cul-de-sac.

Many thanks,

From: "Fish, Jonathan" <Jonathan.Fish@southwark.gov.uk>
Date: Friday, 29 January 2016 11:18
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Consultation response

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your correspondence regarding the proposed new parking zone in the North Dulwich and Denmark Hill area.

The cul-de-sacs at Casino 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. 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.

Your concerns regarding the loss of parking space due to the introduction of the above yellow lines have been noted and will be passed on to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Public Realm for consideration of the options available for the Casino Avenue cul-de-sacs. I will contact you by email to inform you of the decision once it has been made.

We acknowledge your objection below. Should you wish to withdraw your objection, please contact me by email via parkingreview@southwark.gov.uk by Friday 5th February 2016.

Acknowledgement of objection to notice given in respect of proposed parking zone in the North Dulwich and Denmark Hill area.

I am writing to you in regard to the above matter, following receipt of your correspondence, included below, received on 17 January 2016.

Statutory consultation

Statutory consultation is carried out in accordance with regulations 6 and 7 of the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.

The proposals were advertised in the London Gazette, Southwark News and by street notice on 17 December 2015.

Any person wishing to comment or object to the proposal was invited to do so by 21 January 2016.

The council will now consider your representations before deciding how to proceed.

Determination of an objection

We have a duty to consider all objections as well as a commitment to make those decisions transparent to the public.

The decision of how to proceed is considered of a non-strategic nature and, in accordance with the council's constitution, will be determined by the Cabinet Member for Environment and Public Realm.

This decision will be taken by way of a formal report that outlines the background to the proposals, your comments and an officer's response to those comments. You are reminded that your details may be considered of relevance to the decision and may be published within that report.

Next steps

Prior to taking the above decision, we may contact you to discuss the matter further. If you wish to contact me, I can be reached by email or telephone using the details below.

The council's decision

Once a decision has been made in regard to this matter we will write to you to inform you of the outcome and the reasons for that decision

Regards,

Jonathan Fish, MILT
Project Engineer
Highways
Environment
London Borough of Southwark
E: Jonathan.fish@southwark.gov.uk
DD: 020 7525 1515



-----Original Message-----

From: Administrator, Information

Sent: Monday, January 18, 2016 1:52 PM

To: traffic orders

Subject: Consultation response

[Title]

█

[Firstname]

█

[Lastname]

█

[Telephone_number]

█

[Email_address]

█

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

North Dulwich and Denmark Hill area:introduction of permit parking controls

[overallresponse]

2. I support this proposal

[response]

I note from your website that the plan includes siting of double yellow lines outside nos. 19-29, and nos. 63-73 Casino Avenue. This provision was not part of the original plan when the public consultation took place. I object to this provision on three grounds. Firstly because there was no consultation with residents on this proposal, and secondly because they will greatly reduce the parking places in this immediate area which already has insufficient places for local residents. Thirdly they serve no purpose. A fellow resident contacted your department about this proposal and was told that the restrictions were intended to allow space for ambulances to turn. On the rare occasions when emergency vehicles come into these cul de sacs they reverse in to allow a simple exit. This is far easier and quicker than attempting to turn in restricted space, even allowing for the addition space that these double lines would provide.

Note that I fully support the overall idea of parking restrictions but find this proposal to be unacceptable. I have consulted with the residents of the cul de sac in which my house is located and all agree that the proposal is unacceptable.

The email you received and any files transmitted with it are confidential, may be covered by legal and/or professional privilege and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this in error please notify us immediately. If you are not the intended recipient of the email or the person responsible for delivering it to them you may not copy it, forward it or otherwise use it for any purpose or disclose its contents to any other person. To do so may be unlawful. Where opinions are expressed in the email they are not necessarily those of Southwark Council and Southwark Council is not responsible for any changes made to the message after it has been sent.

Fish, Jonathan

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 19 January 2016 10:55
To: traffic orders
Subject: Consultation response

Categories: ND/DH CPZ

[Title]
[REDACTED]

[Firstname]
[REDACTED]

[Lastname]
[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]
[REDACTED]

[Email_address]
[REDACTED]

[Areyou]
A resident

[Whichconsultation]
H/ND/TMO1516-032 North Dulwich

[overallresponse]
5. I wholly object to

[response]

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. I also object to the high cost of the permit which is far more than is needed to cover the cost of supplying it.

Fish, Jonathan

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2016 7:47 PM
To: Kirby, Anne; Lyons, Jane; Mitchell, Michael; helen.hayes.mp@southwark.gov.uk
Subject: Proposed controlled parking zone in casino Avenue SE24 9PQ
Importance: High

Dear All,

I am writing to raise my objections to the above proposal on the following grounds:

I object to the whole of the proposal because:

1. it will result in a decrease in available parking places and loss of resident parking places
 2. we do not have a parking problem in the Casino Avenue Cul de sacs
 3. it will displace any parking problems in Casino Avenue to other areas of the borough
 4. it will increase parking congestion reducing the flow of traffic and access for emergency vehicles
 5. the consultation process was poor with many residents unaware of the plans
 6. the decision to go ahead and implement the parking order is based on the most minimal response and is not a reflection of the views of the majority of residents
 7. the proposed double yellow lines at the end of the Casino Avenue Cul de sacs between house numbers 19 - 29 and 63-73 will reduce resident parking and will not enable emergency vehicles to turn they will still need to reverse out.
 8. The Cul de Sac opposite Sunray Avenue does not have double yellow lines in the bay and has lost no parking spaces so the proposals are inconsistent.
 9. The cost of visitor permits is extortionate and unreasonable.
 10. This is social housing council estate and not all residents can afford the permits for their own vehicles and/or visitors.
 11. The plans are inaccurate because they only show two dropped curbs in Casino Avenue Cul de Sac nearest Hene Hill road there are in fact 3 so proposal need to be redone to amend this inaccuracy
- I would greatly appreciate your support in putting a stop to the proposed controlled parking in Casino Avenue.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

Fish, Jonathan

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 19 January 2016 22:56
To: traffic orders
Cc: Mitchell, Michael; Lyons, Jane; Kirby, Anne; helen.hayes.mp@parliament.uk
Subject: North Dulwich & Denmark Hill
Categories: ND/DH CPZ

To Traffic Orders Officer

Ref: H/ND/TMO1516-032

I am writing to express my opposition to the implementation of the North Dulwich & Denmark Hill Traffic Order, in particular the impact this will have in Casino Ave.

I am a resident of Casino Avenue and my reasons for opposing this Traffic Order are as follows:

1. The parking order will reduce the number of resident parking spaces.
2. It will increase the congestion in the surrounding streets which are already very congested and as a consequence:
 - It will reduce the flow of traffic between Red Post Hill & Herne Hill Road making access for emergency, delivery and refuse collection vehicles more difficult.
 - It will reduce visibility for pedestrians crossing the road especially children on their way to and from school or to park (Sunray Gardens) more dangerous.
3. It will increase disputes between residents over parking spaces.
4. More specifically I oppose the placing of double yellow lines outside Nos 63 to 73 and Nos 19 to 29 with the loss of a number of parking spaces. See the attached illustration.

Although it would appear there is a loss of 4 parking spaces the effect will be even greater for the reason given in item 2.

I understand that the use of double yellow lines is an attempt to provide a turning head at the end of the street, possibly for emergency vehicles.

Currently the parking arrangements work for all concerned and should not be changed. Emergency and refuse vehicles reverse into the street.
5. I would note that the Council's revised plans are not proposing double yellow lines for the cul-de-sac of Sunray Ave and Casino Avenue should be treated in the same manner.
6. The increase number of street signs will add visual clutter and will be detrimental to the conservation area.
7. I am dissatisfied with recent works undertaken by the council highways depart in the area - namely the traffic islands as traffic flow measures on Red Post which have made the matters worse rather than better.

With this in mind I have no faith that the above measures will improve the living conditions in the area.

8. Further more the consultation process has not been adequately publicised and cynically the latest notices were displayed during the Christmas holiday period, when many residents were away and unable to respond.

I have taken the opportunity of copying the local councillor's and MP so that these concerns will be given serious consideration.

Regards

██████████



Fish, Jonathan

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 19 January 2016 23:30
To: raffic.orders@southwark.gov.uk; traffic orders
Subject: H/Nd/Tm01516-032

Categories: ND/DH CPZ

To whom it may concern

I am writing with regard to the parking restrictions to be introduced in Casino Ave.

I am against the loss of 4 resident parking spaces between nos 63 to 73 and 19-29. To introduce a parking fee and reduce parking availability seems ludicrous, especially as there appears to be no valid reason for this.

It has been suggested that this was for ambulances to turn.. I can assure you that ambulances will always reverse in a cul de sac such as ours, as there isn't sufficient room to turn even if all car park spaces in the bay of the cul de sac were kept free of cars. An ambulance would still have to reverse into the close. The consultation was not carried out properly as there is no knowledge of the close and how it is used. The initial proposals were so bad that the drafts didn't really match the street we live on and had to be redrafted after complaints at the consultation.

At the consultation, myself and my partner complained about the economic disparity regarding the restrictions. Requests for the planned restrictions were voiced in Danecroft, Frankfurt, Elfindale, all where properties are privately owned and can afford the fees involved. We were told that Casino was the street which was not in agreement. The reason why that is is

A). It's expensive, unaffordable by those who are in social housing and/or on a low income.

B). Disagree with transport used to carry out business be charged an extortionate rate in comparison to domestic vehicles. Why charge more. It seems discriminatory, particularly against small businessmen/women who carry out a trade. It is an attack on the working class.

C). The high cost of the visitors parking permit. £5 for two hours (per day). On top of what we pay for a permit? Why so high? At the consultation we raised this amongst other issues stated. We asked about profits, and how much it costs to run such a program. We were told they don't know. Later they finally admitted that previous models in other areas had raised a significant profit, in the region of 8 million in profits per year. There is no real reason apart from greed to set such high costs. It is a huge money making scheme at the expense of residents.

D). The consultation was clearly not set up to listen to the people's opinions. We felt ignored. Clearly we were as none of the proposals we suggested have been taken into account.

I believe that the consultation process was not geared towards people where English is a second language, or people who cannot read or write. No one knocked on our door and spoke to us. No one came to look at the street in which we live and how it is used. What about the aged and the ill, how do people care for them at such a cost to themselves. It's a discriminatory consultation procedure, and needs to be carried out more fairly, not dictated by the few vocal wealthier few (23%!).

Who oversees the response

E). It's a conservation area, we do not want big machines and signs in our quiet streets. I understand that we have more parking issues than we did in the past, but there are ways of dealing with it.

Double yellow lines on street corners needs to be implemented without a doubt. However I do not believe that the costs are fair. They ought to be based on what people can afford, not how much they can get away with charging. The costs are prohibitive, and will put some families in financial crisis. £50 per annum would be a more manageable sum. Could it be means tested, or reduced? Visitors parking tickets should be far less, given the numbers of lonely people of all ages, in an ageing society. To enjoy the Company of others in your own homes should not be monetary.

F). There does not appear to be any car club spaces. A clear indication of less concern about the environment, but more for profit.

What I would like to know is where is the evidence of the nature of the response as well as the numbers. Who oversees this? How much money goes towards the roads, as has been suggested. Who decides on any plans for the roads. Red post hill is a complete disaster. Is that the kind of 'consultation' that our money and your profit goes towards. We had no real say in that, it was implemented against our will. This is not a democratic

review. It requires proper, thorough consultation in the true sense of the word before it is implemented.



Fish, Jonathan

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 January 2016 09:06
To: traffic orders
Subject: Consultation response

Categories: ND/DH CPZ

[Title]
[REDACTED]

[Firstname]
[REDACTED]

[Lastname]
[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]
[REDACTED]

[Email_address]
[REDACTED]

[Areyou]
A visitor

[Whichconsultation]
North Dulwich and Denmark Hill parking controls

H/ND/TMO1516-032

[overallresponse]
4. I object to part

[response]

I object to the blanket imposition of parking bays and associated restrictions and charges in this area. I park on these streets regularly during the week and there is no difficulty in finding spaces. I am concerned that the consultation on these proposals was timed so as to overlap with extensive Council refurbishment works on nearby houses, as a result of which a number of parking spaces were either rendered unavailable or were occupied all day by workers involved with that project. The consultation therefore gave an artificial impression of the situation. Since those works were completed it has again become clear that the parking spaces available are sufficient and regulation/charges do not need to be introduced. The imposition of charges is a significant additional cost on families and businesses wishing to park in the area who can currently do so for free, and potentially greatly disruptive to the current arrangements of those who are not willing to pay those charges. I note that this area has been subjected to consultation on this issue several times in recent years.