

Summary of representations made following publication of the decision to be taken

Ref	Representation	Officers response
Rep 8	<p>I understand that there is a small window of time in this publishing period for members of the public to make representations before you make your decision regarding the recent statutory consultation for QW7, and the objections made.</p> <p>Please do not approve the overriding of the objections without further consideration.</p> <p>The general reason is that the responses to the objections made in the published report <i>Quietway 7: Elephant and Castle to Crystal Palace - determination of statutory objections</i> dated July 2017 are inadequate, and do not inform you properly. They do not seriously address the details of several of the objections. I give further details below.</p> <p>These issues need to be properly thought through to give good decisions that may command the support of the local community and be of net public benefit.</p> <p>I apologise for the length of this letter, but these things need to be addressed. Please take these matters very seriously. This may be a last opportunity for a long time to get things right.</p> <p><u>The details</u></p> <p>Parking restrictions from new double yellow lines in Calton Avenue (at the DV end, roughly from junction with Gilkes Crescent)</p> <p>About five or six parking spaces opposite and near the shops in CA will be lost. These are about 25% of all the spaces near the shops in the north half of the Dulwich Village high street.</p> <p>These spaces are commonly used by elderly infirm and others dependent on car travel for access both to the shops in CA and to the important pharmacist/post office just round the corner in DV-N. Dulwich Village is not well served by public transport (just one bus N-S (P4) and none E-W).</p>	<p><u>Parking and loading restrictions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The loading and parking restrictions will: improve sight lines, provide clear access for pedestrians crossing the road .This is consistent with the council's borough wide junction protection approach. • Improve safe access for two-way traffic and remove pinch points which cause delays, safety issues and altercations during the rush hour period. • The restrictions considered with a balanced and considerate approach, to reduce any adverse impact on parking needs of local residents and consistent with policies set out in paragraph 15 of report. • A new loading bay is to be introduced on Calton Avenue to accommodate business activities <p>As part of post implementation monitoring, the parking demand and safety operation at this location will be monitored. A concession could be to introduce a single yellow line operating Mon-Fri 7-10 and 3-7 with parking permitted outside these times – thus ensuring no parking during busiest cycle commute times and school times. This will allow two extra parking spaces on Calton Avenue, between Gilkes Crescent and proposed loading bay</p>

Ref	Representation	Officers response
	<p>The removal of these spaces will add to parking stress and difficulty for the public, for no corresponding gain. Another serious adverse effect will be on the nearby shops particularly those in CA. It is recognised that the shops in the north half of Dulwich Village are under stress already. This proposed loss of parking spaces will just add to that. It is not consistent with LBS Policies to support high streets.</p> <p>These adverse effects on the community might have to be born if there was a real gain in public safety or convenience elsewhere. But no such gain has been clearly identified.</p> <p>The officers responses simply refer to vague general safety issues and an alleged bottleneck. I will not repeat here the details of the objections made – they can be seen under ref Obj 3 representation in the officers report, but in short, a) there is no bottleneck on this length caused by the existing parking – I know, I have been using this length for many years, b) there is no record of accidents safety issues here- I have looked at 10 years of collision records on TfL website without finding a single accident on or close to the proposed yellow line length.</p> <p>Regrettably the officers response is based on vague generalities and without examining the locality properly.</p> <p>If the officers and TfL really wish to go ahead with this damaging double yellow line proposal you should get them to justify it properly.</p> <p>Gilkes Crescent junction with Calton Avenue Another two nearby (to the shops) parking spaces will be lost here. This is a very short cul de sac (~25m long, with no serious access traffic in it. The officers suggest the <i>number of pupils crossing the junction necessitates the need for safety improvement</i> There is no safety or visibility issue here, the officers' comments show complete lack of analysis of the situation. No emerging car will be at speed to cause an accident with such a short approach. This is again a damaging and unconsidered response based on vague generalities.</p>	<p><u>Gilkes Crescent junction with Calton Avenue.</u> Parking occurs close to Gilkes Crescent junction with Calton Avenue. Although this is a cul de sac, the number of pupils crossing the junction necessitates the need for safety improvement</p> <p>1. The alternative design for Dulwich Village junction championed by a group of local residents and stakeholders has been discussed extensively at meetings with them and both borough officers and TfL. The consensus of these meetings is that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The alternative design is at a very early stage and will require significant review and expenditure. • The consulted design will deliver safety benefits for all road users and is deliverable within programme and budget. • The consensus was therefore to proceed to implementing the consulted design. This position is advocated by TfL, the funding body of the scheme. <p>The segregated cycle lane and change in priority will be trialled 8-9 months post implementation, to allow sufficient time to 'bed in', and a report of the impact of this feature and the way forward will be discussed with stakeholders.</p> <p><u>Road Humps</u> Design of road humps is consistent with road humps regulations and current council standards. Road hump will ensure borough wide 20mph speed zone</p>

Ref	Representation	Officers response
	<p>Proposed new segregated cycle lane in Calton Avenue – consideration of alternatives</p> <p>There are two main issues about this. The first is that this cycle lane is part of the original official QW7 proposal for the DV junction. But we have offered you an alternative arrangement. You required in your decision last year <i>“that officers and Transport for London consider such alternative [community] proposals in parallel with preparing for implementation of the schemes currently designed”</i></p> <p>In follow-up correspondence you assured the community that these alternative proposals would be properly considered for possible implementation.</p> <p>We the community have raised and spent a lot of money (including a contribution from LBS, for which thanks) based on that assurance to further develop the alternative proposals.</p> <p>We have indeed had meetings with Officers and representatives from TfL. TfL acknowledged that the official design was two years old and not really in line with the current thinking, as seen in the new MoL draft transport strategy (for example, there is no change in priority to give pedestrians and cyclists first priority over motor vehicles, as expected by the Healthy Streets initiative).</p> <p>But they took the view that looking at the community proposal (which is aligned with the new Healthy Streets approach) would take too long. The implication is that they would prefer to press on with a flawed plan rather than take time to get the junction right.</p> <p>This is reflected in the Officers’ comment dismissing it - <i>The alternative design is at a very early stage and will require significant review and expenditure.</i></p> <p>But this is not good enough! Your own decision required them to “consider” the proposal. Of course “consideration” requires “review and expenditure”. We in the community have spent our money to try to get a better result. The authorities should be prepared to do the same! You should not accept this superficial dismissal, without a serious detailed and documented response to our proposals.</p>	<p>is self-enforcing.</p>

Ref	Representation	Officers response
	<p>If our proposal is said to be at an early stage, that is because there has been complete lack of official action on the alternative, which has been with LB Southwark in concept for about 18 months. But in any event, we or you could have drawn up a detailed design of the proposal at least three months ago.</p> <p>Please ask for a proper unbiased <u>report</u> on the comparative merits of the alternatives before making any decision on this issue.</p> <p>Proposed new segregated cycle lane in Calton Avenue – temporary trial layout - or not?</p> <p>There are well-based fears that the proposed cycle lane and changed priority will lead to serious additional congestion during peak periods (by reducing the traffic approach lanes to the lights from three to two lanes so losing at least 1/3 of the capacity).</p> <p>While your officers suggest modelling say all will be well, elsewhere they have accepted that this part of the junction is almost impossible to model properly – and there is previous experience of the two lane idea before the last reconstruction – massive rush-hour queues were normal.</p> <p>Officers response to the risk of excessive resulting congestion is that <i>This feature [segregated cycle lane] will be trialled with temporary material to assess its impact. Any changes will be carefully considered.</i></p> <p>But the official drawing of the cycle lane construction says nothing about temporary materials. Previously it was said that only the priority here would be trialled.</p> <p>So please make sure this is going to be genuinely temporary - and potentially reversible - before approving going ahead with this alternative.</p> <p>Proposed speed bumps</p> <p>This one is not a fundamental part of the QW issue, but is another area where the proposed approach is out of date and inappropriate.</p> <p>The official proposal is for full-width and 100mm high road humps. But such humps are bad for cyclists, deplored by fire brigades ((Fire Safety Guidance Note: GN29), and to the distress and risk of ambulance</p>	

Ref	Representation	Officers response
	<p>patients. Only today there has also been Government guidance on reduction of air pollution by removal of speed bumps - see next item. These 100mm humps are justified by your officers on the grounds that <i>Design of road humps is consistent with road humps regulations and current council standard</i>. There are other far better ways of achieving your very good borough-wide 20mph policy. These bumps may have been needed when 20 mph only applied to individual streets and had to be highlighted , but they are the wrong approach where the whole borough is at this speed limit.</p> <p>If LBS absolutely insist on speed bumps, then at least follow the recommendations of GN 29 and limit them to 50mm.</p> <p>Air Pollution This is not a direct part of your present decision process. But you will be aware that the Government has today brought out a new air quality strategy proposal, reported in one newspaper as including <i>The air quality strategy urges local authorities to first try to reduce emissions by retrofitting the most polluting diesel vehicles, changing road layouts and removing speed humps</i>.(Daily Telegraph on line accessed 26/7/17)</p> <p>One of the benefits of the community alternative layout is just this – that it changes the road layout to reduce air pollution at the DV junction by enabling a continuous-flow low speed traffic environment in place of the highly polluting stop-start flow of the present and proposed traffic lights arrangement.</p> <p>Before you make any final decision to go ahead, please examine the alternatives to give best mitigation of air pollution at this sensitive junction, surrounded by schools and schoolchildren.</p>	
Rep 9	<p>Please reconsider the proposal to restrict further the parking arrangements on Calton Avenue.</p> <p>Business is already difficult with high rents and a sharp rise in business rates and many traders are close to tipping point.</p> <p>Please do nothing that would adversely affect the convenience of our</p>	<p><u>Parking and loading restrictions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The loading and parking restrictions will: improve sight lines, provide clear access for pedestrians crossing the road .This is consistent

Ref	Representation	Officers response
	<p>patrons in this crucial time A better idea would be to provide more cycle racks.</p>	<p>with the council's borough wide junction protection approach.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve safe access for two-way traffic and remove pinch points which cause delays, safety issues and altercations during the rush hour period. • the restrictions considered with a balanced and considerate approach, to reduce any adverse impact on parking needs of local residents and consistent with policies set out in paragraph 15 of report. • A new loading bay is to be introduced on Calton Avenue to accommodate business activities <p>As part of post implementation monitoring, the parking demand and safety operation at this location will be monitored. A concession could be to introduce a single yellow line operating Mon-Fri 7-10 and 3-7 with parking permitted outside these times – thus ensuring no parking during busiest cycle commute times and school times. This will allow two extra parking spaces on Calton Avenue, between Gilkes Crescent and proposed loading bay Officers will review locations for cycle racks and introduce them where possible</p>
Rep10	<p>I would like to make the following representation for consideration before you make your IMA decision on the implementation of Quietway 7.</p> <p>Independent School Coaches</p> <p>In an email of 5 May I wrote:</p>	<p>The meeting was helpful, TfL are being constructive and in the opinion of officers, a deliverable way forward for removing coaches has been identified. Whilst we would like to be nearer to having this solution implemented, we see no reason why it cannot be implemented prior to the QW7 works being completed. It is worth noting the helpful</p>

Ref	Representation	Officers response
	<p>'Surely it makes sense to pause the Dulwich Village junction part of Q7? The simple fact is that, unless the school coach problem is dealt with, there is no possibility whatsoever of the DVJ part of Quietway 7 succeeding, no matter what scheme is introduced'.</p> <p>and you wrote in reply, in your email of 8 May:</p> <p>'I agree with your sentiments entirely'.</p> <p>Since we understand that at a recent meeting (which Helen Hayes attended) it became clear that TfL remained unhelpful about a new crossing on the South Circular and have no plans to implement one, I assume that the Dulwich Village Junction section of the proposed Quietway will be 'paused'.</p> <p>Parking</p> <p>The final plans for Q7 show double yellow lines on both sides of Calton Avenue as far as Gilkes Place and reduced parking in front of the shops on Dulwich Village. This would have two adverse effects:</p> <p>Reduce the footfall still further in shops that are already struggling. <i>This goes against the Council's own 'Dulwich Area Vision' (p93) 'Development in Dulwich should protect the independent character of shops and services in the Dulwich area.'</i></p> <p>Give through-traffic (both motor vehicles and cyclists) unimpeded opportunity to speed to the traffic lights, to the detriment of the local community pedestrians, including many schoolchildren. <i>This goes against the whole tenor of the mayor's 'Healthy Streets for London'.</i></p>	<p>interventions of both Helen Hayes, College and Village ward Cllrs on this matter. It is also the opinion of TfL that the QW cycle route can operate even if the coaches are not removed from Calton Avenue – although clearly the preference would be to remove them.</p> <p>Since the public consultation was undertaken, there is an additional LOSS of 3 parking spaces (approx.) proposed in the statutory consultation:</p> <p>One of these spaces is in relation to the 'echelon' parking outside the shops on Dulwich Village. This was a specific response to concerns raised by the road safety auditors.</p> <p>Two of the spaces relate to additional restrictions on Calton Avenue. These additional restrictions were in response to concerns raised in public consultation. As part of post implementation monitoring, the parking demand and safety operation at this location will be monitored. A concession could be to introduce a single yellow line operating Mon-Fri 7-10 and 3-7 with parking permitted outside these times – thus ensuring no parking during busiest cycle commute times and school times. This will allow two extra parking spaces on Calton Avenue, between Gilkes Crescent and proposed loading bay</p> <p>Officers don't accept the assertion that the scheme will encourage speeding to the detriment of the local community. Keeping this stretch clear gives cyclists the space they need to prevent them being</p>

Ref	Representation	Officers response
		squeezed by motor vehicles
Rep 11	<p>We have seen the plans for extensive double yellow lines to be placed on Calton Avenue and we are frankly appalled.</p> <p>Local businesses like ours depend on the availability of parking spaces for our customers - we trade seven days a week and losing the ability to park on any of those days will hit this business and others in the parade, very badly. Sunday is a busy day for us, and the loss of parking will hit us badly.</p> <p>A consultation process was held and objections to this have been loudly raised. It seems that the council has little concern for the survival of local shops which form a backbone of the local community. Removing the amount of parking spaces will simply serve to drive more people to buying on-line - and therefore increasing the number of goods vehicles on the local roads.</p> <p>I have spent twenty years being subject to the council's attempts to manage the traffic around this junction and I would say they have all failed miserably. While I appreciate that provision should be made for cyclists, it surely cannot be at the expense of the rest of the community? I would point out that you have already made the crossings much less safe for pedestrians. The zebra crossing has been removed at the foot of Court Lane - drivers simply do not recognise the raised platform as somewhere they should give way to pedestrians.</p> <p>Removing parking spaces will speed up the flow of traffic down Calton Avenue - it is already fast, and frequently impatient. Allowing traffic - and I include bicycles - to go down that route even faster, will endanger pedestrians - and there are thousands of children crossing that junction every school day. Surely the answer has to be to stop the flow of school coaches down the road?</p>	<p><u>Parking and loading restrictions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The loading and parking restrictions will: improve sight lines, provide clear access for pedestrians crossing the road .This is consistent with the council's borough wide junction protection approach. • improve safe access for two-way traffic and remove pinch points which cause delays, safety issues and altercations during the rush hour period. • the restrictions considered with a balanced and considerate approach, to reduce any adverse impact on parking needs of local residents and consistent with policies set out in paragraph 15 of report. • A new loading bay is to be introduced on Calton Avenue to accommodate business activities <p>Since the public consultation was undertaken, there is an additional LOSS of 3 parking spaces (approx.) proposed in the statutory consultation:</p> <p>One of these spaces is in relation to the 'echelon' parking outside the shops on Dulwich Village. This was a specific response to concerns raised by the road safety auditors.</p> <p>Two of the spaces relate to additional restrictions on Calton Avenue. These additional restrictions were in response to concerns raised in public</p>

Ref	Representation	Officers response
	<p>Bookshops like ours are few and far between on Britain's high streets. We know this shop to be a much loved educational resource in the area. Your plans put the business at severe risk and I would urge you not to implement them.</p>	<p>consultation. As part of post implementation monitoring, the parking demand and safety operation at this location will be monitored. A concession could be to introduce a single yellow line operating Mon-Fri 7-10 and 3-7 with parking permitted outside these times – thus ensuring no parking during busiest cycle commute times and school times. This will allow two extra parking spaces on Calton Avenue, between Gilkes Crescent and proposed loading bay</p>
Rep 12	<p>I write to express my dissatisfaction and, indeed, dismay that the Council has decided not to accept the need for an alternative design to Dulwich Village junction as an integral part of the Quietway 7 implementation. As you are aware there is considerable support amongst local residents, evidenced by the funds raised to finance the alternative design, for a junction that reflects current concerns about the need to reduce the use of cars. The Mayor of London's strategy in <u>Healthy Streets London</u> is getting Londoners to reduce their reliance on driving. It outlines some practical steps to achieve this, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • improving local environments by providing more space for walking and cycling, and better public spaces where people can interact • prioritising better and more affordable public transport and safer and more appealing routes for walking and cycling • planning new developments so people can walk or cycle to local shops, schools and workplaces, and have good public transport links for longer journeys. <p>I, and other members of the Dulwich Village Forum, strongly believe that the alternative junction design would have helped to deliver this strategy, and fear that the consulted design may well produce a better outcome for</p>	<p>The alternative design for Dulwich Village junction championed by a group of local residents and stakeholders has been discussed extensively at meetings with them and both borough officers and TfL. The consensus of these meetings is that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The alternative design is at a very early stage and will require significant review and expenditure. • The consulted design will deliver safety benefits for all road users and is deliverable within programme and budget. • The consensus was therefore to proceed to implementing the consulted design. This position is advocated by TfL, the funding body of the scheme.

Ref	Representation	Officers response
	<p>cars than pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>I note that the Council's <i>'position is advocated by TfL, the funding body of the scheme'</i>. It seems that in funding a, by now, out-dated scheme TfL are missing an opportunity to implement in Dulwich their current Healthy Streets policy.</p>	
Rep 13	<p>I understand that there is a small window of time in this publishing period for members of the public to make representations before you make your final decision.</p> <p>I'd like to make two requests.</p> <p>In the officers' report (summary conclusions), it says that the change of priority from Court Lane to Calton Avenue in Dulwich Village will be trialled and carefully monitored so that the priority could be reversed if there is significant adverse impact. Similarly, the segregated cycle lane will be trialled to assess impact on the junction. Would you very kindly consider adding a recommendation for a fixed timescale for the trialling and monitoring for both these features – perhaps six months, followed by a formal report?</p> <p>Secondly, I would like to ask you to reconsider the double yellow lines on both sides of Calton Avenue from the junction of Dulwich Village to Gilkes Crescent. The officers' report talks of a balanced and considerate approach to reduce any adverse impact on local parking needs. But I think we have ended up with a proposal that benefits cars driving through rather than those who see the village as their destination. The shops at the north end of the village are all suffering from a reduced footfall, as you know. But many, like the chemist's shop which is also now the village post office, are extremely important to the local community – including those who, because of age, illness or disability, find it hard to walk or cycle. My own special plea, as a writer, is that we don't introduce restrictions that take business away from the bookshop on Calton Avenue. We are extraordinarily lucky to have an independent bookshop in the area that</p>	<p>The segregated cycle lane and change in priority will be trialled 8-9 months post implementation, to allow sufficient time to 'bed in', and a report of the impact of this feature and the way forward will be discussed with stakeholders.</p> <p><u>Parking and loading restrictions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The loading and parking restrictions will: improve sight lines, provide clear access for pedestrians crossing the road .This is consistent with the council's borough wide junction protection approach. • improve safe access for two-way traffic and remove pinch points which cause delays, safety issues and altercations during the rush hour period. • the restrictions considered with a balanced and considerate approach, to reduce any adverse impact on parking needs of local residents and consistent with policies set out in paragraph 15 of report. • A new loading bay is to be introduced on Calton Avenue to accommodate business activities <p>Since the public consultation was undertaken, there is an additional LOSS of 3 parking spaces (approx.)</p>

Ref	Representation	Officers response
	<p>caters for both adults and children of all ages, and I would be very sad if parking restrictions made it impossible for very young children, or the elderly or disabled, to be able to visit.</p>	<p>proposed in the statutory consultation:</p> <p>One of these spaces is in relation to the 'echelon' parking outside the shops on Dulwich Village. This was a specific response to concerns raised by the road safety auditors.</p> <p>Two of the spaces relate to additional restrictions on Calton Avenue. These additional restrictions were in response to concerns raised in public consultation. As part of post implementation monitoring, the parking demand and safety operation at this location will be monitored. A concession could be to introduce a single yellow line operating Mon-Fri 7-10 and 3-7 with parking permitted outside these times – thus ensuring no parking during busiest cycle commute times and school times. This will allow two extra parking spaces on Calton Avenue, between Gilkes Crescent and proposed loading bay</p>
Rep14	<p>On behalf of the Calton Avenue Residents Association I would like to make the following representation for consideration before you make your IMA decision on the implementation of Quietway 7.</p> <p><u>Report: Quietway 7: Elephant and Castle to Crystal Palace - determination of statutory objections</u></p> <p>In summary, the report you have been provided with is not an adequate basis on which to reject at least two objections dealt with below. I would therefore ask you to consider a delay in the scheme as a whole pending the resolution of the coach issue and remove the proposal for additional parking restrictions between Dulwich Village and Gilkes Crescent on the grounds that they are unnecessary and, on safety grounds,</p>	<p>Recent meeting with TfL was helpful. TfL are being constructive and in the opinion of officers, a deliverable way forward for removing coaches has been identified. Whilst we would like to be nearer to having this solution implemented, I see no reason why it cannot be implemented prior to the QW7 works being completed. It is worth noting the helpful interventions of Helen Hayes, College and Village ward Cllrs on this matter. It is also the opinion of TfL that the QW cycle route can operate even if the coaches are not removed from Calton Avenue – although clearly the preference would be to remove them.</p>

Ref	Representation	Officers response
	<p>counterproductive.</p> <p>Coaches – our information is that you have received incorrect advice</p> <p>As I explained in my email to you of 22 June 2017, I understand you agree that Quietway 7 will not achieve its objectives unless the problem of the school coaches has been satisfactorily resolved. I and others asked that you delay going ahead with the scheme until this has happened. By way of dismissal of my objection (number 5 in the Appendix to the Officer’s report under the above heading) and in paragraph 13 of that report, you are advised as follows:</p> <p><i>“Calton Avenue school coaches rerouting: Council officers are working closely with TfL and the foundation coach service to find the best possible resolution of this issue. A meeting was held recently with key local stakeholders and TfL where 5 alternative options were considered, three of which were rejected. A preferred option has been shortlisted and borough officers and TfL are working on delivering this option in as short a timescale as possible, funded by TfL.”</i></p> <p>Our understanding (on the basis of information from those present at relevant meetings, information provided by our local MP and local councillors) is that contrary to the quoted paragraph 13:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> TfL is not doing anything to further the objectives of the Quietway that they are funding by addressing the issue of the coaches with effective action on the South Circular <input type="checkbox"/> And this situation has been the case now for over a year. <p>It therefore seems to me that TfL have put you in a position where to decide to go ahead with the scheme would be to spend money on something that won’t work: whether it be TfL’s money or LBS money, the question arises as to whether the conditions exist for such expenditure to be <i>intra vires</i> if the Officers’ advice is wrong.</p>	<p>As part of post implementation monitoring, the parking demand and safety operation at this location will be monitored. A concession could be to introduce a single yellow line operating Mon-Fri 7-10 and 3-7 with parking permitted outside these times – thus ensuring no parking during busiest cycle commute times and school times. This will allow two extra parking spaces on Calton Avenue, between Gilkes Crescent and proposed loading bay</p>

Ref	Representation	Officers response
	<p>Parking restrictions – double yellow lines both sides of Calton Avenue from Dulwich Village to Gilkes Crescent; Dulwich Village is a place to be, not just a junction to get through.</p> <p>In my email to you of 22 June 2017 I also explained the extreme pressure on residential parking space in Calton Avenue, especially at the Dulwich Village end.</p> <p>The proposed introduction of double yellow lines on both sides of Calton Avenue between the junction of Dulwich Village to Gilkes Crescent will reduce parking for local residents and local shops all day and night. The existing single yellow restriction on the north side of Calton Avenue between the junction and Gilkes Crescent is sufficient to avoid pinch points on that stretch of the road. Meanwhile parking on the south side actually serves to mask the junction slightly from westbound traffic so that there is no encouragement for much faster light traffic (well over 20mph by the way) outside peak hours and at night to rush it to make the lights at Dulwich Village.</p> <p>So in terms of the table in Figure 2 on page 4 of the report, these double yellow line restrictions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> are not at pinch points so don't help when traffic is congested and <input type="checkbox"/> when traffic is light, would provide longer distance sightlines that encourage traffic to speed up, not slow down. <p>And this is all apparently in aid of a Quietway?</p> <p>Furthermore, and contrary to the Southwark plan to foster local community, support local shops and make life easier for pedestrians, these plans seem deliberately aimed at getting traffic <i>through</i> Dulwich Village rather than supporting those wish <i>to be in</i> Dulwich Village – to live here, shop here and walk or cycle to school here.</p>	
Com 3	I have been mandated by the Burbage Road Residents' Association	The council approved the implementation of

Ref	Representation	Officers response
	<p>(representing 200 households at the heart of Dulwich Village) to voice our objection to this scheme in its current format.</p> <p>We completely support encouraging cycling, promoting healthy streets and safeguarding road users of all kinds, but feel that Quietway 7 will actually undermine these objectives and so will represent a misuse of earmarked public funds.</p> <p>The route is ill conceived as a Quietway, the supporting conditions (redirecting coaches) are not in place, displacement of parked cars will exacerbate existing congestion. We have the opportunity - and the will - to look at a more holistic solution for Dulwich but have literally put the cart before the horse.</p> <p>Please reconsider your support before it is too late</p>	<p>Elephant and Castle to Crystal Palace Quietway in November 2016 subject to statutory procedures, detailed design and safety review.</p> <p>The principle of the route choice is clearly set out in this report, paragraph 8:</p> <p><i>The first phase of Quietway routes across London were chosen for the following reasons:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met the Quietways criteria • Buildable by March 2017 • Included a good geographical spread linking key destinations across 17 London boroughs • Demonstrated different Quietways characteristics, e.g. routes through parks, existing cycle routes, different levels of interventions needed, or complementing existing and planned infrastructure. <p>http://modern.gov.southwark.gov.uk/mgDecisionDetails.aspx?IId=50008539&Opt=1</p>