

**Appendix A1 – Representations made to the February 2019 IDM**

<b>ID No.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Decision</b>
1	Dear all, Was there any consultation regards parking in Southwark Park, just seen this on both fb Twitter lots of residents not happy? Hope it's not true especially if it covers weekends as it will just push Park users out on the streets outside the park as there is no Controls weekend or after 6 in the summer? [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	Objection not acceded to
2	I am interested to find out more about the parking in parks. I could not read the pdf attachment that I was sent by the Dulwich Park Friends. Will there be some free spaces, or an hour or so free?	Objection not acceded to

**Appendix A1 – Representations made to the February 2019 IDM**

ID No.	Comments	Decision
3	<p>I have just been notified by a neighbour and representative of the Turney Road Residents Association (TRRA) of the proposal that Charging for Parking in Southwark's Parks could be decided upon as early as Tuesday 5th March. There appears to have been a deliberate attempt at suppressing information of this initiative, and there has certainly been no consultation, as otherwise stated (or promised?), in the proposal document, "Car parking charges in parks".</p> <p>This has all the hallmarks of another revenue-making endeavour with no thought given to the consequences of parking charges in parks on surrounding streets, and in particular in exacerbating already over-crowded (and largely incomers') street parking. In Turney Road we already have a regular daily inflow of cars parking on the street, sometimes casually parked overlapping our driveways. These appear to be owned in large part by commuter drivers wishing to take advantage of nearby Zone 2 stations, Herne Hill and North Dulwich, or, at weekends, parents wishing to watch their children engaged in sporting activity run by the sports clubs on either side of the road.</p> <p>I hasten to add that the introduction of CPZs is not the default solution to this sort of regular parking activity. I consider it, yet again, an example of unnecessary bureaucracy and a revenue generation 'opportunity' (for the Council, that is) to which the residents are expected to contribute financially as well. The introduction of charging for car parking in Dulwich and Belair Parks will, I believe, add to the existing contagion of parked vehicles in Burbage and Turney Roads where drivers are keen to avoid the new parking charges.</p> <p>I take exception at the statement I have copied and pasted from the "Car parking charges in parks" document: "With the exception of those benefits and risks identified above, the recommendations are not considered to have a disproportionate effect on any particular community group." This seems hugely dismissive of and disrespectful to local residents' (and council tax payers') interests, on which we have not been consulted and, it appears, were not intended to be.</p>	<p>Objection not acceded to</p>

**Appendix A1 – Representations made to the February 2019 IDM**

ID No.	Comments	Decision
4	<p>I have recently heard about the proposal to charge to park in car parks within recreational parks such as Bel Air and Dulwich Park. I find this proposal as very concerning as surely this will push cars out into the street nearby in a ‘domino effect’ causing more problems for the local residents.</p> <p>Surely a way forward could be to allow a Free time period of maybe 2 hours so that regular park users can park and access the parks facilities within that time period. There is a similar scheme in Brockwell Park.</p> <p>This would certainly deter those that might park for longer periods (for instance I have seen individuals parking in Bel Air to then commute via West Dulwich train station), but not inconvenience those who want to continue to use the parks to walk, exercise, enjoy the environment etc. for short periods?</p>	<p>Objection not acceded to</p>
5	<p>Hi, I see that the park are introducing parking charges of £2.00 an hour from April. Have they been in contact about it? Surely we need a special deal since we are Southwark Park Bowls Club. If they are not going to give us free parking it could be the beginning of the end, people [REDACTED] Also what about people coming to play home games and competitions ? I can’t think of anywhere around the park which is not permit parking till 6:00.</p> <p>If they haven’t contacted us I think we need to be pro active.</p>	<p>Objection not acceded to</p>

**Appendix A1 – Representations made to the February 2019 IDM**

ID No.	Comments	Decision
6	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>It would be appreciated if one of you could comment on the consequences that this action will cause.</p> <p>"I have circulation problem with my feet whereby I need to walk a lot. My dog and I use Dulwich Park once a day and sometimes twice as it is flat and pleasant and does not put to much pressure on my metatarsal bones due to fat loss. It gives us both the exercise that Doctors recommend.</p> <p>Prior to Champion Hill closing it took me 10/12 minutes by car to reach the park. Now I am looking at 25minutes sometimes more to get there.</p> <p>Now that this charge is being brought in I will have to consider if I can afford to go for 2/3 hours a day combined with other factors.</p> <p>Before the normal comments are made if I have to take public transport, which involves 2 buses and walking the journey will take a min of 40 minutes or longer each way. That time depends if the bus/s turns up on time or at all. My house is situated in the middle of a hill away from public transport. So it is already difficult to reach a starting point.</p> <p>Combine that with having a dog and the prospect does not really appeal after testing it. Getting a bus with a dog presents problems as mothers with prams that look like tanks take up most of the limited space parking space and space between the seats is very limited.</p> <p>So looking to use my local park which I have done for almost 73 years a return journey will now take me around 90 minutes without the time spent in the park.</p> <p>Factor into that being tired after walking, and it rains having a wet dog on a bus which will not please some the park is really getting out of reach.</p> <p>6 days a week for me will cost £36 a week extra for something that I already pay towards with my Council tax, which if the talk is correct will be over £2000+ for this year. I cannot afford to pay to use my local park.</p>	<p>Objection not acceded to</p>

**Appendix A1 – Representations made to the February 2019 IDM**

ID No.	Comments	Decision
	<p>Some families will also have to make this decision.</p> <p>Locals in the Dulwich Park area can walk with no problem but others that are not and have have to travel with children, toddler bikes, scooters, toys and the family dog will have to consider if they can afford the park which is crazy. Getting on a bus is most of the time not an option.</p> <p>It might appear to some that the park and it surrounds is turning into a middle class ghetto which might just be used by only close residents. This is wrong.</p> <p>It is strange that Southwark keep pushing fitness but continue to make it difficult for many.</p> <p>Again another decision whilst looking at in a meeting has just not been thought through before putting it into operation."</p> <p>It does seem that the action was thought up by the young within Southwark Council without any idea of how this will impact the older generation or families that do not live round Dulwich Park. Still it looks good on paper and meets Southwark's let us hit the motorist/residents again with zealot green measures.</p> <p>It does appear that Dulwich Park is for close Dulwich residents within walking distance only.</p> <p>On speaking with many in the park over the last few days most regard this as another Southwark tax and not called for. This can be I feel be confirmed that the order was made under a TMO order, which I have never seen advertised for comment.</p> <p>As a cycling fanatic commented "If you believe the Council is being misleading the remedy is judicial review." People should cycle to the park or walk as using a car is a non essential activity in our opinion. Not knowing the reasons behind the car use.</p> <p>Most people do not have the time to play Southwark's games.</p> <p>I look forward to having one of you explain this situation.</p>	

**Appendix A1 – Representations made to the February 2019 IDM**

ID No.	Comments	Decision
7	In a few words: can you please have the first 3 hours free for those who want to enjoy the park/eat there/take children to the playground etc and charge after 3 hours? That'll deter commuters but not deter genuine visitors?	Objection not acceded to
8	Charges would be a very big deterrent for people like my elderly mother who doesn't have a blue badge but can't take the circuitous public transport route either.	Objection not acceded to
9	<p>██████████ We suspect that the introduction of parking charges for parking in the Peckham Rye Common car park will be a contentious issue.</p> <p>As we will receive queries can you let us know</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will parking charges be extended onto Strakers Road?</li> <li>• Where will the revenue from the charges go? Will the Park/Common benefit?</li> <li>• Has it been taken into account that introducing parking charges will increase parking onto nearby residential streets where there are already parking issues.</li> <li>• Will charges be extended to Park staff?</li> </ul> <p>Before pass this on to the committee re. the Parking issue –will the possible parking charge just relate to the car Park on Peckham Rye Common or along Strakers Road also?</p> <p>To Parks at Southwark</p> <p>Thank you for your response –</p> <p>Re the Strakers Road parking – we have concerns that the map is misleading –why are there red lines along Strakers road? It could indicate that Strakers Road is included in the parking measures –surely the red lines should only surround the car park area?</p> <p>Among other issues we would still have concerns re. pay by phone.</p> <p>██████████</p>	Objection not acceded to

**Appendix A1 – Representations made to the February 2019 IDM**

ID No.	Comments	Decision
10	<p>I have just seen the proposal for introducing parking charging in Southwark parks. Whilst I can see there are a number of proposed benefits to this scheme, I could not see an impact report looking at how this may affect the local residential streets, and I would have thought this is a vital factor which needs careful consideration and resolution before the proposal can be ratified.</p>	<p>Objection not acceded to</p>
11	<p>I have only just heard about the proposal to charge for parking in Southwark Parks and am appalled. My two local parks, Dulwich Park and Belair are wonderful outdoor spaces for people from all over the borough to enjoy and should be free. Surely we should be promoting the use of the parks for all not putting people off visiting because of parking fees. A lot of elderly people use the park and need transport to get to the park. Whilst Dulwich Park and Belair are situated in an affluent area where most residents can walk to the park the visitors to the parks come from all over the borough. Often families come in cars laden down with sports gear and picnics which would be difficult to transport on a bus. I think this is a very mean spirited act of the council when they should be promoting a healthy lifestyle for all not just those who can afford it. [REDACTED] - Dulwich Park and Belair are my local parks and I am lucky enough to be able to walk to them. However, many people travel from all over the borough to visit these parks and since public transport is not a feature of Dulwich it is not feasible if you are transporting children with the equipment they use in parks i.e footballs, cricket equipment, scooters, children’ bikes, picnics etc. Not everyone who has a car has unlimited income. Sometimes people with larger families find it is more economical to travel by car than it is to take public transport. The view that non motorists are paying for motorists is a ludicrous one. I don’t need to use the services which are offered to the residents of Southwark who have greater social needs and I wouldn’t dream of saying I shouldn’t have to pay towards that or that I shouldn’t pay towards state schools because I don’t have children. I find it so mean spirited and distressing that everything is measured in terms of money. Parks were created for the enjoyment of everyone, not everyone with that bit of extra income.</p>	<p>Objection not acceded to</p>

**Appendix A1 – Representations made to the February 2019 IDM**

ID No.	Comments	Decision
12	<p>I wish to lodge my strong reservations about the above proposal.</p> <p>Firstly the idea has not been thoroughly aired in this conservation area. Secondly such a plan will affect young families whose only chance to enjoy green spaces is in the parks.</p> <p>Thirdly such a move to generate revenue would push cars to parking on nearby roads.</p> <p>Can I also add that it would hasten the introduction of a CPZ in the area, which would be ghastly and unpopular. For the council to claim 'cuts' as the need for more revenue, is a bit disingenuous – there are many better efficiencies which could be made.</p>	Objection not acceded to



**Appendix A1 – Representations made to the February 2019 IDM**

ID No.	Comments	Decision
13	<p>Thank you for notifying [REDACTED] of the council's decision/s re changes to the park and forthcoming consultation on parking charges.</p> <p>On the issue of parking [REDACTED] have received comments which I feedback to you here and we'll feed into the following statutory consultation.</p> <p>Opinions are mixed, some members / residents support the introduction of parking charges some are against.</p> <p>The most common reason against is that parents / carers dropping off children at the schools adjacent to the park do not want to pay to park for a short time. While we understand encouraging park users to walk, cycle and use public transport is a good thing comments were also made that parking charges will discourage park use.</p> <p>The Surrey Quays Shopping Centre have informed via Rotherhithe Ward (police) Panel that they have a problem with commuter parking - it is cheaper to pay the fine than pay NCP in the city. We are therefore extremely concerned that the 4 hour maximum stay being removed from Southwark Park and it should be kept. Otherwise, parking in Southwark Park may become commuter parking not park user parking. We are also concerned that the £2 charge will be 75p cheaper than street parking and that could encourage the wrong user group who should pay more. It might be a proportion of spaces could be set aside for short stay / max 4 hour and longer stay. And Southwark should be in discussion with key parking providers in the area including Surrey Quays Shopping Centre.</p> <p>Everyone welcomes the free parking for genuine blue badge holders.</p> <p>Another comment made is that introducing parking charges into parks must be the very last place parking charges should be introduced, and elsewhere there is still free parking. Southwark needs to look across all departments to raise parking revenue.</p> <p>In our view the proposals would have been better drawn up in consultation with the recognised "Friends of" group for each park and we encourage Southwark Council to maintain productive respectful relations with "Friends of" groups because this will lead to better decisions and better change management / modernisation. And better relations with the community for the council and councillors too.</p> <p>If the council goes ahead then, in the case of Southwark Park, we suggest a review 12 months after the introduction of parking charges and careful monitoring of any commuter parking.</p>	<p>Objection not acceded to</p>
14	<p>I am a resident of Dulwich and I very much oppose the proposed parking charges for parks in our area. I agree that to prevent parking by non-residence there ought to be a time limit, say, two or three hours.</p>	<p>Objection not acceded to</p>

Appendix A1 – Representations made to the February 2019 IDM

ID No.	Comments	Decision
15	<p>It came to my attention only today that there is a motion in place to introduce charging in Dulwich Park. As [REDACTED] [REDACTED] this is of grave concern to me, since a significant proportion of our visitors use this car park, particularly over the spring and summer months. There is often a misconception about the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] that we are wealthy, but in fact we receive no regular public subsidy – not from government nor from the local authority - and therefore our financial sustainability is a constant challenge. Introducing charging in the park will directly affect our visitor numbers and income. Please can the [REDACTED] be included in the debate so that the full implications can be understood before a decision is made?</p> <p>I'd be delighted to talk to you about this in more detail and to show you the vital work that we do at the [REDACTED] to support the local community and the local economy.</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	Objection not acceded to

**Appendix A1 – Representations made to the February 2019 IDM**

ID No.	Comments	Decision
16	<p>I was shocked to hear that you are proposing that charges be made for parking in Dulwich and Belair park. I am writing to register my disgust at this proposal.</p> <p>I live at [REDACTED] and parking is already extremely heavy around the park and getting parking on our road especially at weekends and in good weather is near impossible. I recognise that this is part of the story of living close to the park but things are already pretty dire and your proposals will make them impossible. I have young 3 children and with drop offs to clubs and activities with the associated back and forths plus shopping trips this can be really rubbish. However with your proposal to make parking in the park payable you will take this 'off the scale'. People will inevitably try to avoid the cost of the parking and overflow more onto the surrounding roads leading to congestion, ridiculously reduced parking possibilities for local residents and these roads will become even more dangerous for our kids to cross and cycle around, as exasperated parents try to get places that don't exist!</p> <p>I take pleasure in seeing people from all social backgrounds having free and easy access to the beautiful parks of this area. In a world of division I treasure this mixture and diversity. In the Summer picnics abound and at the weekends football matches and training attract hundreds, literally hundreds, of children and their parents. By creating more financial barriers for disadvantaged people to access this amazing facility easily you are further separating social groups something I take real issue with.</p> <p>Please rethink these abusive changes. Between permit parking that is being imposed in East Dulwich (up to the top of our road on the East Dulwich side) and then making people pay for parking in the park you will be creating an overcrowded, sandwich pocket of free parking on our residential roads creating a small channel of parking and congestion. As a local resident with a young family I would believe it is reasonable to ask for your support in ensuring I have reasonable access to my home and not be obliged to search endlessly for rare parking spaces. It is already a challenge to find parking spaces within 2 roads of my house - you will be condemning me to God knows how many roads from my house to find a parking space!! Please rethink - you are creating stress in people's living environments and helping no one but your coffers.</p>	<p>Objection not acceded to</p>

**Appendix A1 – Representations made to the February 2019 IDM**

ID No.	Comments	Decision
17	<p>I'm emailing with my concerns about the proposals to charge for parking in Dulwich Park. Apparently a reason given for this measure is that commuters are using the spaces. I find that quite hard to understand, especially in the winter when the park is closed at the time most people are travelling, and because it is not particularly close to any of the local stations.</p> <p>My first concern is that it is a terrible shame if the people who have to drive to use the park; parents with young children, frail and elderly people, and people with disabilities - some of whom may not have concessions - are now going to have to pay to enjoy the park! The council should be providing that facility free of charge - and the parking for people who have to use a car to access this community facility.</p> <p>Many park users may not be able to afford to pay, and they will have no option but to look for spaces on nearby roads, including [REDACTED]</p> <p>Therefore my second concern is that the parking situation on my road is already extremely difficult, because of it's proximity to the library, shops, churches, a primary school AND the park. The existing difficulties would only escalate if park users are charged to use the park.</p> <p>I hope that my concerns can be taken into consideration please.</p>	Objection not acceded to

**Appendix A1 – Representations made to the February 2019 IDM**

ID No.	Comments	Decision
18	<p>Should parking charges be imposed as proposed, there will need to be strong mitigating measures taken in surrounding roads.</p> <p>At present, there is a significant amount of deeply antisocial and illegal parking in residential streets adjoining the park. On fine days, these often involve cars parked over dropped kerbs preventing access to residential drives, which could be a major problem in the event of a medical emergency. There is no attempt to police such parking.</p> <p>I suggest that, at the very least, there will have to be clearly marked parking bays giving residents unobstructed access to their drives. These will need to be actively policed by traffic wardens.</p> <p>Hopefully, this will mitigate the worst effects of a proposal which will, I think, only contribute to additional traffic chaos and the associated danger to children / pollution which these proposals will cause.</p>	Objection not acceded to
19	<p>I am fully supportive of council proposals to bring in parking meters in Dulwich Park with the following provisos:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Blue Badge holders - to be prevented from driving on the park's main carriageways, especially the Court Lane side of the park. Sadly, I have witnessed too many incidences in which much older drivers are a danger to small children, pets etc. They simply do not see them, go too fast, or can't stop in time. The parking bays near the Court Lane gate mean that drivers have to navigate almost the whole circle of the park. Please could the blue badge bays be either in the main entrance carriageway or just inside the carriage way?</li> <li>• As someone who chose to buy a property by a park I think it would be churlish to then complain about visitor parking [REDACTED]. However, we also have the pressure of vans and lorries from the nearby [REDACTED] so additional cars will only add to the pressure. Have you considered parking controls for roads around Dulwich Park?</li> </ul> <p>As an aside, I know only too well the pressures councils are under financially and it seems that parking fees would go some way to make the cost of running the park sustainable.</p> <p>I understand that residents' views are not part of the consultation process and I imagine a lot of [REDACTED] will be making contact, but hopefully you will find this email constructive!</p>	Objection not acceded to

**Appendix A1 – Representations made to the February 2019 IDM**

ID No.	Comments	Decision
20	<p>I was alarmed to be told about this badly-publicised consultation and hope I have not missed the deadline.</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>Looking at the consultation one of the first aims is to prevent commuter/non-leisure use of the car parks - commuters may be an issue for e.g Belair Park, not so much Dulwich. In Dulwich Park this could be resolved by introducing a 12-2pm charge, Monday- Friday, similar to roads in Herne Hill. This would not prevent families using the park outside school hours and at weekends.</p> <p>At weekends, and after school in the summer months, we see multi-generational family groups, who would struggle with the kit needed (buggies, wheelchairs, small bicycles, picnic) without car parking use the park for a day's fresh air and exercise. Car park charges would be a disincentive and would negate Southwark's attempts to improve residents' health.</p> <p>Court Lane is often used as an alternative to the South Circular, most noticeably when there are accidents or roadworks. Given that there will be an increase in parking as a ripple effect from the introduction of any East Dulwich CPZ and the impact of people parking rather than pay fees inside the park, congestion will be significant.</p> <p>Please reconsider.</p>	Objection not acceded to
21	<p>this is a bad idea...families need to use our parks...some travel along way to get here and carry bikes, scooters..buggies ..footballs etc...the council tax should pay for park facilities...all parks should be accessible to everyone FREE..stop trying to make MORE MONEY on the sly...southwark is a wealthy borough...use your money efficiently..stop employing too many people in the council and try to employ people who know what they are doing...I AM AGAINST ANY PARKING FEES FOR ANY OF OUR PARKS...think of the needs of people NOT PROFIT..what a greedy world we live in..money before people,s needs.i live in dulwich and have done for 50 years.access to the park should be free of any costs.</p>	Objection not acceded to

**Appendix A1 – Representations made to the February 2019 IDM**

<b>ID No.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Decision</b>
22	<p>I write to register my objection to the proposed introduction of parking charges to the parks in Dulwich area.</p> <p>How tedious it is that Southwark Council continue to railroad through their unimaginative and completely idiotic traffic management schemes. The junction of Court Lane/Turney Road/Carlton Avenue is only one example of the extraordinary amount of tax payers money which has been wasted in Dulwich recently. In this respect, the council have been responsible for designing one of the most preposterous and dangerous junctions in the whole of London.</p> <p>This latest ‘tragic management’ proposal is clearly just another money making scheme, which they seem intent on imposing on our local community even in the face of virulent objections from the residents who live here.</p> <p>They are spoiling the very essence of Dulwich Village. I wish they would leave Dulwich Village alone and stop this continual meddling with road works, parking restrictions etc.</p> <p>██████████ and am concerned about the knock on effect these measures will have on the surrounding roads etc...</p>	Objection not acceded to

**Appendix A1 – Representations made to the February 2019 IDM**

ID No.	Comments	Decision
23	<p>I read with interest the the report on Car parking charges in parks.</p> <p>Note 14 reads            There is a risk that new restrictions may cause parking to be displaced and, indirectly, have an adverse impact upon road users and neighbouring properties at that location. However this cannot be entirely pre-empted until the recommendations have been implemented and observed.</p> <p>I am sure that I’m not alone in thinking that it’s fairly obvious that making people pay for car parking will push them to park for free in neighbouring roads. Football teams, dog walkers, young families will all often drive to the park and will be reluctant to pay. It seems bizarre to even consider otherwise especially at weekends when carparks are full.</p> <p>Off street parking is tight in London as it is and finding somewhere close to ones house with a trunk full of shopping is challenging at the best of times, having the extra burden of park users outside your house will cause a great deal of stress and aggravation for local residents.</p> <p>If the recommendations are implemented I would like would like to ask:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What observations are you looking for and what criteria will you run your observations past in order to judge whether it is successful or not.</li> <li>2. What are your proposed time lines for implementation, observation and the resulting decisions on deemed success (or not).</li> <li>3. Who will be responsible for conducting points 1 and 2.</li> </ol> <p>I look forward to your prompt response.</p>	<p>Objection not acceded to</p>



**Appendix A1 – Representations made to the February 2019 IDM**

ID No.	Comments	Decision
24	<p data-bbox="297 276 544 316">[REDACTED]</p> <p data-bbox="297 352 1693 453">The introduction of parking charges to Dulwich and Belair parks will vastly increase the problems already suffered by residents in surrounding streets which are jammed with traffic and parked cars. Every individual public park has a completely different setting and environment, each of which should be taken into consideration separately.</p> <p data-bbox="297 496 1756 667">1. Belair car park is not used by commuters in the winter months because it closes at 4.30pm (it is busier in the summer months due to some commuters but also because people want to use the green space). However and most importantly it does provide a short stay safe drop off point for parents and children who attend the nursery school in Gallery Road and also Oakfield School on the crossroads of the South Circular and Croxted Road - both of which are overloaded and highly dangerous roads with nowhere to stop. The car park is very rarely full.</p> <p data-bbox="297 710 1771 922">2. Dulwich Park: if you go into Dulwich Park on a weekday when it is raining (as I do) you will find very few, if any, cars at all. Visitors to the Gallery use it for short term stays because there is no room in College or Gallery Roads. The people who really will be hit by charges are those who need a car and are elderly (but not sufficiently disabled to require a Blue Badge) or families with children, buggies, bikes and dogs who do not live within easy walkable reach. If Southwark is keen on healthy issues they might consider the effects on the health of those people who will be put off from using the parks, certainly on a regular basis.</p> <p data-bbox="297 965 1771 1066">Parking in the heavily residential streets around the parks will exacerbate problems and if they are turned into CPZs and the final knock on effect will be to empty the parks of regular users (the elderly and young families)- not the intention of those who donated the land for exactly that use.</p> <p data-bbox="297 1109 1771 1209">I do not need reminding about the Council's cash problems, and I understand the healthier options of walking and cycling I am writing because I feel extremely strongly that to make our local green spaces less accessible is not best serving your public and will have very little effect on solving Southwark's financial difficulties.</p> <p data-bbox="297 1252 488 1284">Yours sincerely</p>	<p data-bbox="1803 276 1977 347">Objection not acceded to</p>

**Appendix A1 – Representations made to the February 2019 IDM**

ID No.	Comments	Decision
25	<p>██████████</p> <p>I am writing to raise my objections to the introduction of parking charges in Dulwich Park. It is not necessary to charge for parking to discourage it as there is never any issue with finding a parking space in Dulwich park.</p> <p>The introduction of charging will however result in more traffic, parking and therefore pollution in the residential streets around the park where parking is unrestricted, particularly on the Court Lane side where there are more options for unrestricted parking.</p> <p>This is just a cynical fundraising ploy given there is no need to introduce charging to deal with excessive demand for spaces in Dulwich Park. It is also designed to put pressure on parking in residential streets in the hope that a CPZ will then not be opposed in residential streets around Dulwich Park. CPZ's make it more stressful, difficult and expensive for the Borough's residents to live and work in the Borough. I therefore object to both the proposed pay for parking in Dulwich Park and any CPZ in Dulwich.</p>	Objection not acceded to
26	<p>Dear Councillor,</p> <p>Notwithstanding that the fact that the income generated by the introduction of parking charges has been incorporated in the council's budget setting process for 2019/20, which suggests that this consultation process is mere "window-dressing" by the Council I wish to make some observations upon the Council's plan to introduce charges for parking cars in the Council's parks. It is my view that insofar as Dulwich Park is concerned such a step is misconceived and should be reconsidered.</p> <p>I am fortunate to live so close to the Park that I am able to enjoy its many facilities simply by ██████████ instead of using a car. The Park has been much improved by the efforts of the local community through the action of the Friends as well as the park workforce.</p> <p>I undertake regular exercise early in the morning in the park ██████████ the average age of which is well over 60 years. Dulwich is the only park in South London other than in Cheam, Surrey that hosts such a course. Owing to the inadequacy of public transport links many participants have to drive to the Park to be able to attend the thrice-weekly</p>	Objection not acceded to

**Appendix A1 – Representations made to the February 2019 IDM**

ID No.	Comments	Decision
	<p>60-minute sessions. Not everyone who attends them will be able to afford the cost of parking particularly as the time involved in doing a session, when taking into account the time taken before and after the session will probably be more like 90 minutes. On the basis of your stated charge rate this would mean that a participant would have to pay £4 per session for parking or £12 per week. Even if you were to fix the charge at £2 for 90 minutes the result will probably be that those who cannot afford the parking charge will stop exercising. You will be aware of the UK Chief Medical Officers’ Guidelines 2011 and, no doubt be as concerned as I am at this</p> <p>In more general terms I consider that the plan contains a number of flaws:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is inevitable that the imposition of charges for parking on Parks will lead to displacement of parking to the streets surrounding the park.</li> <li>• The park is already well-used by disabled people and unless you have real evidence to the contrary I doubt that scheme will make a significant impact on usage by disabled people.</li> <li>• Again, I doubt that parking in Dulwich Park by commuters is a significant issue given its distance from the two nearest mainline stations</li> </ul> <p>I do think that the scheme is misconceived and I would ask that it be scrapped. If, however, the scheme is to go ahead then I would ask that parking only has to be paid for after 11 am and or that the rate be set at no more than £2.00 for 1.5 hours and in any event that be the income that is generated should be hypothecated for use in the parks and not for general highway maintenance throughout the borough..</p>	
27	Common space should be free for all.	Objection not acceded to



**Appendix A1 – Representations made to the February 2019 IDM**

ID No.	Comments	Decision
	<p>allowing visitors to, for example, King's College Hospital, to park without incurring high charges.</p> <p>Surely this would be a reasonable plan to consider for the Southwark parks? Many people are regular users of the parking area at Belair park, for short periods in order to go to town from West Dulwich station; if hefty car parking charges are introduced all day there, all that will happen is that the parking will move up our roads [REDACTED] and make an already very difficult situation even worse.</p> <p>The other park that we regularly use is Dulwich Park and there are many people like ourselves who use the park for short periods of time - to attend [REDACTED] for instance, or to walk dogs, but who live too far from the park to reasonably walk there from home every time; again, the introduction of parking charges will simply mean more people parking on College Road and other adjacent roads. Is that really what you want? Parking charges would certainly deter us from [REDACTED]</p> <p>We note that the plan is to make payment for parking all done by 'paybyphone' - have you considered that there may be many people, especially the elderly, who do not have smartphones or indeed any mobile phone, who will be excluded from the possibility of enjoying the parks if they are unable to pay for parking? In addition, we understand that this is not a deterrent for the 'commuter parkers' who simply pay by phone from work!</p> <p>Finally, Belair Park is used by many mothers/ carers of children attending [REDACTED] Do you really want them to be forced to park on Gallery Road, which is already congested at school times?</p>	
31	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>Date March 2018</p> <p>An open letter in response to charge for car parking within Southwark parks</p> <p>I am concerned about the proposal to charge for carparking in Southwark parks, particularly in relation to my two nearest parks, Peckham Rye and Dulwich.</p>	Objection not acceded to

**Appendix A1 – Representations made to the February 2019 IDM**

ID No.	Comments	Decision
	<p>You state that the car parks provide a service for those who “choose to drive”. The Report gives no consideration of “need to drive” except for Blue Badge holders. For some with disabilities who do not qualify for a Blue Badge, distance from home to the park might be a key consideration. In your Community Impact Statement you state there will be no disproportionate affect on any community group, but you seem not to have considered Open Space Deprivation.</p> <p>I attach a screen shot of the map on page 44 of Southwark’s Open Space Strategy, showing distances from the nearest open space, with large areas of Open Space Deprivation in the South of the Borough, in particular the densely populated part of East Dulwich which is equally badly served by Peckham Rye and Dulwich Park.</p> <p>I see no mention in the Report of organised activities in the parks. In this respect my local parks may be no different from others across the Borough. In Peckham Rye and Dulwich Park, large numbers of young people routinely take part in organised sports. Neither does your Report mention that the Dulwich carpark directly serves the Francis Peek Community Centre with its range of community activities. Organisers of these activities need to bring equipment and therefore need to drive.</p> <p>Typically, any specific activity will have a far larger catchment area than a generic green space. Leaders and participants therefore need to travel, and some need to come by car. Community Centres form a borough-wide network. These community activities are very sensitive to cost and Community centres have to keep their charges low. Additional costs of parking might make the difference in the viability of some activities. Again, I think you need to review your Community Impact Statement.</p> <p>I understand from the Report that the proposal relates only to “off-street” car parks, and only inside the parks “within their boundary”, and therefore comes within your remit for a Single Member Decision.</p> <p>I am surprised, therefore that under Key Issues – Rationale, the Report states that revenue made from the introduced parking charges can be re-invested in “Highways maintenance and road improvements projects”, while the possibility of using the funding for the parks is mentioned later in the Report as a Community Impact afterthought, that the parking charge “could potentially serve as an addition stream of revenue for use for the betterment of the parks.” As the profit from this proposal will be more than £150,000 per annum, I would hope that a benefit to the parks and their associated activities would be higher on your agenda.</p>	

**Appendix A1 – Representations made to the February 2019 IDM**

ID No.	Comments	Decision
	<p>This Report acknowledges the probable result of this proposal of increased parking pressure for residents in nearby streets. Such repercussions cut both ways. The proposal for Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ) in East Dulwich is also a Single Member Decision, but proposes specific parking bays directly associated with a range of community facilities, which surely come under your remit. I ask you to look closely at those CPZ plans and consider the risk they pose to the provision of services by those facilities.</p> <p>According to National Statistics, local car ownership is 0.71 cars per household, and streets are currently parked to comfortable capacity by residents while accommodating the necessary parking for community facilities. The proposal involves the loss of many parking spaces to double yellow lines, particularly notable in the streets surrounding the East Dulwich Community Centre. The resulting parking space will be insufficient for the current resident owned cars and planners of the CPZ have stated that Parking will be displaced.</p> <p>The bays to be placed in front of community facilities will be available for payment, but also will be open to residents. The scheme therefore will allow residents to block the parking spaces in front of every community facility. Indeed, since the CPZ planners have not denied that they might sell more Resident Permits than there are spaces available, residents may have no alternative but to occupy all the spaces intended for community facilities. For those who need to drive to a community building, once the CPZ is in place, even if they able to pay, they will not be able park anywhere in the vicinity.</p> <p>This Report states that charging is an effective way of reducing demand for parking spaces. Perhaps so, but it discriminates only according to ability and willingness to pay. It will favour the lifestyle-drivers and will likely force out the most financially vulnerable services in our community centres and reduce access to our parks to those who most need it.</p> <p>The first point in your Report as the “Rationale” is that “Off-street car parking within our parks provides a small but appreciated service to the low proportion of visitors who choose to drive by car to our parks.” I am sure you intend that as a simple statement of fact. It does however read more like an intention that your plans will favour a lifestyle-driver elite.</p>	
32	<p>We have seen that you might start charging for people to park in Southwark Park.</p> <p>Do you have any more information on this as it will affect our visitors, staff and parents who drop off and collect their children.</p>	Objection not acceded to

**Appendix A1 – Representations made to the February 2019 IDM**

ID No.	Comments	Decision
33	<p>I am writing as [REDACTED] regarding the new measures of parking charges to be made in Southwark Parks. There will certainly be a knock-on effect of cars parking in roads around the parks. Specially around Dulwich Park. [REDACTED] is already becoming highly polluted with heavy traffic passing through.</p> <p>I understand the value of the parking space in the park and I am not opposing to that but if the Leisure Department of Southwark Council is taking this measurement, I am also strongly in favour of putting restrictions in all the adjacent streets to the park, since putting parking control in the park, will create more environmental impact in Court Lane and the others streets leading into it. In that way it will be fair for everybody who is affected. Otherwise, it will have a disproportionate effect upon residents living close to the park entrance, contrary to the specifications presented by that department.</p> <p>It will increase parking in [REDACTED] especially during warm days, sometimes people do not respect even the space off the driveways. Consequently, it will increase traffic and it will also jeopardise the road safety, especially for people crossing to the park, that is already difficult for many families with prams; children with scooters, cyclists, particularly for toddlers, vulnerable old people and disables all together.</p> <p>I am very much in support of the idea of parking restrictions since it will help to diminish traffic and help the environment. Also, it will stop vans using the road as free parking when they are not local residents.</p> <p>[REDACTED] is currently focused on delivering a new cultural plan for Southwark. She is overseeing an extensive investment program across sports, parks and play facilities as part of regeneration plans in Southwark, but she is not an environmentalist! Where is the investment on better and cleaner air for everybody? Why parking control only in the park? She should take the new measurements by considering the repercussions that will have on the rest of the community. Furthermore, in February 2019 the Cabinet approved this introduction of car parking charges in parks for implementation from 1st April 2019, have the council consulted the residents? Any notice by e-mail or public meetings?</p> <p>In any case, it seems to me that consultations are all a masquerade and a lot of people in Dulwich agree with this, because always the results are opposed to what the residents want; for instance, the village junction is a real mess of confusion!</p> <p>Furthermore, in the case of traffic, it also seems that the surveys are taken during half terms or summer holidays; which does not reflect an accurate result.</p>	<p>Objection not acceded to</p>



**Appendix A1 – Representations made to the February 2019 IDM**

ID No.	Comments	Decision
	All transport and council schemes should aim to improve the traffic, environment and safety of the people.	
34	<p>I have been informed that there will be hourly parking charges enforced in Belair car park. This is utterly ridiculous and completely dangerous for the small children who go to [REDACTED] opposite this car park. The parents only park here for 10 mins in the morning and all leave by latest 9.30am. If there is any charge to be enforced, at least push the start time to 10am. If you charge during school drop-off time, then parents who refuse to pay this ridiculous charge, are going to be causing massive congestion by parking all along gallery road and along the surrounding streets. It will be dangerous, especially to the children who are crossing the roads. Small children aged 3 to age 5 will be dropped off here and this traffic and congestion has already been increased by the recent double yellow lines which have been put in gallery road. Now there is hardly any parking at all near the school. The belair car park is the only place to safely park, not to endanger the lives of the small children. Please I urge you to reconsider this parking charge. It will cause undeniable safety issues for the very young children at the school.</p> <p>Kind regards</p>	Objection not acceded to
35	<p>Please can you forward me the information regarding the consultation result for the parking charge that will be enforced at Belair park in Dulwich.</p> <p>There are many people using this car park to drop their children to school. As you know the parking is already restricted with The yellow lines that have been placed on Gallery road. I feel this is just another money making opportunity for the council.</p>	Objection not acceded to

**Appendix A1 – Representations made to the February 2019 IDM**

ID No.	Comments	Decision
36	<p>I am deeply disappointed to hear about the introduction of parking charges at Bel air park. This park is such a focus for families who live in the area and also those who attend local schools. This is going to have such a detrimental effect on the social cohesiveness of the area.</p> <p>I am totally opposed to this, as is everyone I have spoken to. I hope there will be a public consultation before such a negative implementation.</p>	Objection not acceded to
37	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Did a consultation to this proposal take place? Was a consultation review listed in the GW1? If so, with which resident and business groups? Where is the quantitative feedback?</li> <li>2. Has Southwark undertaken a safeguarding review, given the high proportion of nurseries and schools in the area? Where is the report?</li> <li>3. Has Southwark undertaken a review of how many people use Bel Air carpark and, of that number, how many are parents dropping off young children who cannot negotiate public pavement on their own?</li> <li>4. Has Southwark estimated the rise in child accidents as a result of parents parking further from local nurseries and schools to avoid parking charges in Bel Air Park?</li> </ol>	Objection not acceded to
38	<p>████████████████████</p> <p>I understand that there is going to be a possible charge of £2 per hour for parking in Belair Park &amp; 4 other parks in Southwark.</p> <p>There are numerous people that use the park for a variety of activities &amp; these particular people only stay in the car park area for 2- 3 hours . Although I appreciate you need to make extra money I believe a compromise is necessary . Allow 2-3 hours of free parking &amp; there after one has to pay a fee to remain parked in the car park .</p> <p>Therefore those of us who do not abuse the car parking area can continue to feel that Southwark council supports the many activities that occur in the park that helps many people’s physical &amp; mental health .</p> <p>The negative side of your proposal will mean car drivers causing havoc in parking their cars in Gallery Road &amp; the surrounding Roads in SE21. This would be a nightmare &amp; certainly cause many other problems , not only for the car driver but for the residents living in the area .</p> <p>Let common sense prevail &amp; offer 2/3 hours free parking in Belair &amp; the 4 other Southwark parks .</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>	Objection not acceded to

**Appendix A1 – Representations made to the February 2019 IDM**

ID No.	Comments	Decision
39	<p> <span style="background-color: black; color: black;">[REDACTED]</span> My dog and I use Dulwich Park once a day and sometimes twice as it is flat and pleasant and does not put to much pressure on my metatarsal bones due to fat loss. It gives us both the exercise that Doctors recommend.                 </p> <p>                     Prior to Champion Hill closing it took me 10/12 minutes by car to reach the park. Now I am looking at 25minutes sometimes more to get there.                 </p> <p>                     Now that this charge is being brought in I will have to consider if I can afford to go for 2/3 hours a day combined with other factors.                 </p> <p>                     Before the normal comments are made if I have to take public transport, which involves 2 buses and walking the journey will take a min of 40 minutes or longer each way. That time depends if the bus/s turns up on time or at all. My house is situated in the middle of a hill away from public transport. So it is already difficult to reach a starting point.                 </p> <p>                     Combine that with having a dog and the prospect does not really appeal after testing it. Getting a bus with a dog presents problems as mothers with prams that look like tanks take up most of the limited space parking space and space between the seats is very limited.                 </p> <p>                     So looking to use my local park which I have done for almost 73 years a return journey will now take me around 90 minutes without the time spent in the park.                 </p> <p>                     Factor into that being tired after walking, and it rains having a wet dog on a bus which will not please some the park is really getting out of reach.                 </p> <p>                     6 days a week for me will cost £36 a week extra for something that I already pay towards with my Council tax, which if the talk is correct will be over £2000+ for this year. I cannot afford to pay to use my local park                 </p> <p>                     Some families will also have to make this decision.                 </p> <p>                     Locals in the Dulwich Park area can walk with no problem but other that are not and have have to travel with children, toddler bikes, scooters, toys and the family dog will have to consider if they can afford the park which is crazy. Getting on a                 </p>	<p>Objection not acceded to</p>

**Appendix A1 – Representations made to the February 2019 IDM**

ID No.	Comments	Decision
	<p>bus is most of the time not an option.</p> <p>It might appear to some that the park and it surrounds is turning into a middle class ghetto which might just be used by only close residents. This is wrong.</p> <p>It is strange that Southwark keep pushing fitness but continue to make it difficult for many.</p> <p>Again another decision whilst looking at in a meeting has just not been thought through before putting it into operation.</p> <p>I am against any charge being made to use my local park.</p>	
40	<p>I disagree with the charge of £2 per hour to park in Southwark park. I do not drive but I do use the park everyday. And I feel that if you bring this law in people with children who want to spend two or three hours in our park</p> <p>It will cost them a lot of money it would be £6 for the children to enjoy their self. And if they should want to buy something from the new cafe that is going to be even dearer. So people will not come to our park. As the park was a cheap day out. And now it will be a dear one.</p> <p>We want to bring people to our park not chase them away. Also Southwark council should remember the park was given to the local people. For them to enjoy not for the council to make a money out of it.</p>	Objection not acceded to

**Appendix A1 – Representations made to the February 2019 IDM**

ID No.	Comments	Decision
41	<p>Southwark park is my local park. I walk and cycle there for recreation, both doing circuits and as part of a longer ride/walk. I always access the park on foot or by cycle. I am also an occasional volunteer [REDACTED]</p> <p>I have had a look at the car park plan, accessible from Hawkstone road. it is unclear from what I have seen whether there will continue to be permitted parking along the carriage drive that bisects the park. And what arrangements are planned for delivery to the cafe galleries; the new cafe; equipment and works essential for maintenance of the park and buildings within it; essential vehicles associated with events (all of which will affect users, costs, safety, costs, revenue air quality)</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from you</p>	Objection not acceded to
42	<p>I personally think that parking for people hiring the Francis Peek Centre should be free. The venue charge has already increased and therefore, I think free parking should come with the hire charge.</p> <p>Could this be considered?</p>	Objection not acceded to
43	<p>Thank you My only question was why has a time limit not been set on length of stay?</p>	Objection not acceded to
44	<p>Dear Sir / Madam, We have recently been made aware by a resident that Southwark Council intend to introduce Controlled Parking Measures across various parks including Honor Oak Park Sports Ground. From the available material, we can see that the current intention is to implement controlled parking 7 days a week. Our understanding is that controlled parking implies end users</p>	Objection not acceded to

Appendix A1 – Representations made to the February 2019 IDM

ID No.	Comments	Decision
	<p>paying for car parking spaces.</p> <p>██████████ object strongly to this proposal for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. ██████████</li><li>2. Honor Oak Park is not a 'destination park', it is a recreation ground. Park users are dog walkers, playground users and sports facility users. There is no lake, café, pathways, gardens, cultivated areas etc.</li><li>3. The car park is used additionally by visitors to the cemetery. You will be charging residents to visit their dead relatives.</li><li>4. The main car park users at the weekend are parents and coaches of children who are playing sport, specifically football ██████████</li><li>5. Coaches will be specifically impacted as they need to bring kit to the ground. Remember, to date that Southwark Council has consistently refused ██████████ store kit on site. Therefore the coaches – who are unpaid volunteers – will be the ones who bear the cost more than most. If the club loses coaches, there will be less children in Southwark who are getting football at the weekend. Given the deep cuts across education and the impact this has on children – including less sport in school – is this really a sensible strategy when you look at the wider picture?</li><li>6. Residents will be driven to park on local roads and access to the area will become congested as people arrive and realise they have to pay and drive around looking for spaces, dropping people off, turning around in the access etc. Manoeuvring around the area is already fairly tight and to complicate this further may increase the risk of accident at a time when foot traffic – especially children will be particularly high. There are around 300 kids and their parents and families using the ground from our club every Saturday and around 200 on Sundays.</li><li>7. The access road into the car park from Honor Oak Park is a single width carriageway, with no passing areas. At present this can cause cars to back up on to Honor Oak Park Road, which is a dangerous stretch where cars travel at speed, downhill and around a corner.</li></ol> <p>We ask that this proposal be either dropped entirely at Honor Oak Recreation Ground, or, as an alternative, that controlled parking is not in place at the weekend.</p>	

**Appendix A1 – Representations made to the February 2019 IDM**

ID No.	Comments	Decision
45	<p>Dear Parks Team,</p> <p>Thanks for sending your parking proposals through. We run [REDACTED]</p> <p>We understand the council's need to charge for parking, but request that we as a [REDACTED] receive 2 parking permits for our visitors, as our guests, suppliers, contractual staff and contractors heavily rely on parking access within the park usually for full days while they work with us on site.</p> <p>I'd be keen to discuss our needs with you in more detail, perhaps by phone if this is easiest for you? Do advise.</p> <p>Thank you and best wishes</p>	<p>Objection not acceded to</p>