

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A business

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 East Dulwich parking zone

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

This scheme will deter shoppers from visiting my store, was rejected by the majority of residents and business's and is being imposed upon us. I note also that the compromise of a 2 hour zone has also been ignored and moved to an all day restriction. This is not how democracy should work.

[Title]

[Redacted]

[Firstname]

[Redacted]

[Lastname]

[Redacted]

[Telephone_number]

[Redacted]

[Email_address]

[Redacted]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

As a resident I wholly object to the proposal.

The current design will not only not solve the issue of alleged commuter parking, but will make it harder for residents and visitors to park. Cars will be displaced by the current design, making some roads far busier than usual, and others within the CPZ empty. It will create more problems than it solves.

A whole day restriction is unnecessary to solve the alleged issue of commuter parking, the 2 hour restriction that has been discussed would work far better without penalising residents and visitors. This idea should be explored further. Our high street will be negatively impacted by the proposed scheme as visitors are discouraged from stopping here altogether.

I also feel there should be no discrepancy between permit costs for petrol to diesel vehicles, as both would only occupy one space, emissions do not feature in this debate.

Dear Traffic Orders Team

'East Dulwich area parking zone 'ED'

I would like to object to the proposals that were sent to me on 27 Sep by Joanna Lesak.

I live at [REDACTED]

I object to the proposals for Elsie Road on the grounds that the proposals on use of double yellow lines and controlled hours are disproportionate. They will have a serious and significant detrimental impact on the quality of life of residents probably without a balancing reduction in visitor/commuter parking.

Double yellow lines. The use of double yellow lines across dropped kerbs is unnecessary, over restrictive and inappropriate for a small, residential street.

There are 23 dropped kerbs in Elsie Road which makes our road quite unlike other roads in the CPZ. Residents request the use of single yellow lines across dropped kerbs to allow parking for residents during out of controlled hours. Apparently this is standard practice in the boroughs of Lambeth, Lewisham, Wandsworth, Croydon and even Westminster. Double yellow lines are not used.

Control times. We have consistently requested a 2 hour controlled parking slot for Elsie Road. All day control is overkill for this road and will unnecessarily restrict flexibility in our daily lives. As much of the CPZ has 2 hours control we suggest Elsie Road be included in that zone. It is suggested that initially the road has a two hour controlled slot and if evidence emerges that this is ineffective in reducing visitor parking, then the slot could be increased.

Best regards

[REDACTED]
Elsie Road

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

East Dulwich area parking zone 'ED'

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

there are more houses and flats than available parking spaces, we will be paying for permits but will still have the problem of finding parking spaces. during the weekdays of school holiday periods our visitors would not be able to park whereas now parking is always available during holiday periods. currently its more difficult to park at night than day time, permits during the day period are not going to solve the problem

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich Parking Zone

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

I object to this proposal as the the parking displacement from adjacent roads will make Chesterfield Grove even harder for residents and shoppers to park in. It will be used by commuters and have a negative impact on residents and local businesses.

The only way to avoid this is via a 2 hour CPZ.

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A business

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone'

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

As a business owner I believe that any such implementation will have negative impacts on my business and that of many others.

A two hour restriction has previously been discussed, and this would be less harmful for businesses, but equally effective. Additionally, this idea would be far more widely supported by the community.

The CPZ should not be designed to maximise income at the expense of the high street.

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 East Dulwich

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

I give support to the parking proposals however would raise the letter written to the council by our neighbour at [REDACTED] Which had support from a significant number of residents regarding the stop and rest proposals, furthermore my own email citing the impracticality and unacceptability of the stop and rest spaces to derwent grove.

To Traffic Orders

I write expressing my opposition to both sets of proposals for the East Dulwich (ED) and Peckham West parking zones.

I have read through the rationale for the proposals and feel that in both cases there is an extremely slim majority in favour of the proposals. I think that this should call into doubt the benefits of going ahead. Being a regular in both areas I don't regularly see a parking issue therefore do not believe that there is a need for such a scheme in either case. In particular I don't feel that your use of the statistics for the Peckham West zone stands up to scrutiny. Essentially a majority are only in favour if a neighbouring zone goes ahead - so it's rather self-fulfilling. Otherwise there is no majority support. I don't believe that the zones are useful or necessary.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A business

[Whichconsultation]

East Dulwich area parking zone 'ED'

Order 201*

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

Ironical after several meetings and a 67% majority against this proposal the council still wants to go ahead with this proposal.

I am strongly opposed to the zone being implemented on Matham Grove se 22 as you did not consider the wishes of the entire residents . Also this will have a domino effect if implemented on the opposite streets which is what the council WANTS !!

The council asked the whole of EAST DULWICH and not a select minority streets about the original consultation and the response from the the residents and business was a good 67 % objection to this . It looks like democracy does not prevail within Southwark Council's agenda ! This maybe b will be decided by the High Courts if that is what the council's wishes .

I would like to object to the proposed plans for the East Dulwich parking zone.

The proposals will adversely impact the whole area by increasing the traffic and parking pressure on the roads that have not been included in the new parking restrictions that you wish to introduce.

This is the second time in recent years that the residents of East Dulwich have been asked about the introduction of controlled parking and both times the vast majority of residents have rejected this.

The wishes of the majority of residents are being ignored by choosing to look at a small subset of streets which gave the answer the council wanted to get from this survey.

It seems to be an underhanded way to attempt to introduce controlled parking to the whole region by gradually making life more and more difficult for residents who are not within the restricted parking zones until none of us have any choice but to agree to whatever the council are proposing.

It seems extremely unfair to the large number of residents in East Dulwich when these decisions seem to be based on the desires of 69 respondents of areas surrounding the proposed zone while ignoring the wishes of the rest of the community. This seems an extremely selfish act on behalf of these residents ignoring the needs of the wider community who will be negatively impacted by these parking restrictions.

Please reconsider these proposals. We do not want controlled parking in East Dulwich.

Best wishes

A black rectangular redaction box covers the signature area. Below the box, there are some faint, illegible marks that appear to be remnants of a signature or stamp.

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO 1920-025 E Dulwich Parking Zone

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

The recent consultation indicated that the majority of residents and businesses in this area do not want a CPZ. Therefore this is being implemented against the wishes of the majority. There is not an issue with parking in this area that requires such draconian measures and the payment of parking fees by residents in order to support the Council's actions is not warranted. How can this decision have been made when over 60% of residents voted against it? And why would the council enforce it thereby being unsupportive of people commuting from East Dulwich station. This needs to be stopped now before it causes irreparable damage to small businesses in the area as well.

Dear Joanna and colleagues,

I am writing to formally object to these proposals. We are residents at [REDACTED] Chesterfield Grove, SE22 8RP.

1) Clearly introducing these parking zones will put additional pressure on the adjacent roads, including ours.

2) Clearly this is a ploy to get us to ask for our own parking permits because we will never be able to park again - nobody will want to pay the residents or visitors parking, they'll come into one of the adjacent streets, including ours, instead. I have not had a problem without residents' parking for the 22 years we have lived here, now I'm going to have one - I object, because the problem will be of YOUR making, not the traffic situation.

3) This needs to be fully considered in your Equalities Impact Assessment, I believe it will seriously impact vulnerable residents in non-resident parking areas, as they may now have to park very far away from their home. Please email the Equalities Impact Assessment you have done.

4) The plan was never to do full day parking, but to introduce residents or paid-for visitor parking for, say 12-2, as in Herne Hill, or maybe a different 2 hour slot during the day - enough to stop commuters but not stopping residents, their friends or contractors (e.g. boiler check) from parking.

5) If you introduce part-day residents/visitors paid-for parking, e.g. 10-12, in the roads mentioned, then we would like the same in Chesterfield Grove.

Can you confirm:

- when the decision will be taken
- at what council meeting
- how I get to speak at this meeting

thank you

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

East Dulwich area parking zone "ED"

Melbourne Grove

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

If Melbourne Grove are to have an all day parking control, this will have a knock on effect in to Chesterfield Grove and Ashbourn where already we have a big parking issue. I would like to see controlled parking on Chesterfield Grove from 8.30-11am to discourage commuters or if necessary 12-14.00 as Herne Hill has implemented and which seems to work. This then also protects the shops and restaurants. If we have to do a school run and then get to work we currently rely on being able to park on Melbourne. We have to contend with all the estate agents cars as well as the car wash parking cars on our road.

Dear Southwark Council

I wish to object to the above proposal on the following grounds:

1. The council has failed to take into account all relevant information before making its decision

I live on Melbourne Grove South and experience extreme difficulty parking anywhere near my home. Delivery drivers (including Royal Mail and Parcelforce) making deliveries to this area are never able to park legally anywhere nearby and I have witnessed them receiving verbal abuse from other drivers who are frustrated with them for blocking the road (which they are forced to do quite regularly). Obstructions such as this cause regular frustration and disruption and present a risk to residents of Melbourne Grove South (and the surrounding area) as emergency vehicles cannot guarantee a clear route. This could disproportionately impact on vulnerable people in the area such as those who rely regularly on medical transport or the emergency services.

2. The council has delegated its decision-making powers by the over reliance on a public consultation with a relatively low response rate

50 out of 145 properties in Melbourne Grove South responded to the consultation. The adjusted figures suggest that 48% are in favour or undecided and 50% are against. Even with a low response rate, it is obvious that residents are fairly split on this issue. In these situations, it is for the Council to take the lead on parking management in the area and devise a strategy that will deal with the kind of issues identified in paragraph 1. The report itself states that, "it should be noted that in some streets the total number of households/residents was low which means that the overall response for the street is influenced by only a small number of residents."

3. The methodology of the consultation the council relies on is flawed

No explanation is given as to why Melbourne Grove responses are split into north and south. And in fact, the proposed parking zone includes parts of Melbourne Grove South. Some residents on Melbourne Grove South will be permitted to purchase parking permits and some will not. No adequate reasons have been provided for this decision. The council has acknowledged that there may be an impact on other areas and that this would have to be monitored after implementation, but you already have evidence of parking difficulties in Melbourne Grove South, even before any potential adverse impact of a new neighbouring

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

East Dulwich CPZ

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

I wholly object to these new paid for parking spaces such will unfairly impact poorer residents and people with children who need a car. Southwark should wait until after the ULEZ has been introduced as that may reduce the amount vehicles in the borough.

zone is considered. This should be considered before the introduction of a zone which is likely to exacerbate an already difficult situation for a number of residents.

Yours sincerely

 Melbourne Grove

London



[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A stakeholder group

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone'

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

A two hour restriction is more than enough

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A business

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

Should a CPZ be necessary it should be for a 2hr restriction only.

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

If CPZ should be imposed it should be for a 2hr restriction only

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A business

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

The CPZ should only be for 2 hours from Monday to Friday.

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A business

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

Should a CPZ be necessarily imposed it should be for a 2hr restriction only and ideally alternating roads so each road would be at a different time. So one road 9-11am restricted, the next would be 10-12am, then 11-1pm etc etc.

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A business

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

If CPZ should be imposed it should be for a 2hr restriction only

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

LBo Southwark Notice of Proposals_2019 East Dulwich area parking zone 'ED'

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

As stated before, the answer is not always to restrict but to find solutions where needed. There those who need to drive but do not strictly qualify for disable badge nor live near any restricted zone. They may just wish to park for a short period but installing pay meters cripples (financially) those that cannot afford the already exorbitant cost of living in the East Dulwich area.

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

trossachs rd

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

the motorbike parking on Trossachs rd will be used by Pizza Gogo's 8 x scooters if this is what you desire then why can't it be nearer to pizza Gogo

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident,A business

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025E

[overallresponse]

4. I object to part

[response]

The 8 till 6 pm is wrong for the zone a midday proposal of 2 hours would be correct

then be able to buy one permit for an additional non-commercial vehicle for family/visitor use. This would ensure - as far as possible - that genuine Estate residents have at least a single parking space available. There have been a number of times recently when we have been unable to park our own small car in the Estate and have had to park some distance away - knowing that many spaces are being used by non-Estate residents. However, since we would not be residents in any other road, other than our own, we would then be quite unable to park anywhere locally without penalty.

My husband is over 70, has had two hip replacements and is receiving treatment for Cancer and so is unable to walk any great distance without difficulty and he is not the only resident in such circumstances. In our small "Way" (Delft Way) alone, out of 9 dwellings, at least 5 residents are elderly and have a variety of mobility issues.

Since none of this appears to have been taken into account when the Consultation was made, we strongly object to the current proposals with this oversight. Should these objections not be taken into account or an alternative means of equitable parking found, it would have considerable impact on the life of our small community.

From:

[REDACTED]
Delft Way

Delft Way

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A business

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone'

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

This will kill the highstreet.

If it is to go ahead then it should certainly only be for 2 hours.

This is a copy of the communication already submitted via the Southwark Council Web Site.

Name: [REDACTED]

Telephone: [REDACTED]

Email address: as above

A Resident

I object to part of the proposal, but support or am neutral to other elements of it.

Details of our response:

The new CPZ does not include the private access road into the East Dulwich Estate ('EDE' or 'Dutch Estate') from Thorncombe Rd because it has been excluded from the consultation in question. This access road is currently open to everyone to access and park although this has always been intended for the exclusive use of residents - in previous years, residents were even allocated their own parking bay with individual lockable access.

We currently experience considerable difficulty in parking in this space because it is used by non-estate residents e.g. those from Thorncombe Rd and Alleyns School staff and parents. This access road does have a lockable gate provided by the Council to prevent such non-resident access. However, this gate has not worked since its installation a number of years ago and the proposed CPZ in Thorncombe Rd will greatly exacerbate this problem since any vehicles unable or unwilling to park in the CPZ will inevitably utilise this currently "free" area making it almost impossible for Estate residents to park their vehicles. There are a number of elderly residents locally on the Estate who rely on their vehicles for transport and others who do not own vehicles but depend upon spaces being available for family and carers. Apart from the restrictions of the CPZ in Thorncombe and adjacent roads there is the proposed extension to the Charter School, the Medical Centre which will open in April, 2020 and the reduction of "free" parking for commuters in East Dulwich Grove, all of which will add even more to the enormous pressure on the currently-free Estate parking space in question.

We suggest, for the reasons above and for reasons of equity for all estate residents - i.e. it is known that some residences have at least 2 vehicles to park - that this Estate space be subject to a Resident's Parking Scheme where Residents may be allowed to park one *non-commercial vehicle* (we know of at least one non-resident's *commercial* vehicle is often parked here) - with or without charge - and

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

East Dulwich area parking zone 'ED

[overallresponse]

4. I object to part

[response]

I object to the overall idea of CPZ in the whole area as I fail to see how such measures will ease the current issues of parking.

I do however, agree areas near schools should be limited during school drop off times but feel other measures should be considered to handle this i.e more to be done to encourage parents not to drive or better public transport services to handle the pressure of school travel combined with rush hour. Or simply, as one road already does near Goose Green Primary school, close the road to traffic during school drop off/collection times.

I fail to understand where any figures can clearly suggest areas near the station identify those parking in this area are commuters parking and leaving their vehicles all day. Just by walking to the station myself, I have rarely seen a car arrive or leave the area during rush hours which suggests it is not commuters that use this space but residents and workers in the area.

The timing of this exercise is poor - With the development and opening of the new school and medical centre to the area where the introduction of CPZ is proposed there can be no possibility of predicting the pressures to the area nor gives any room to be able to adapt/change things easily once CPZ is in place. Proposals will become irrelevant and outdated to the needs of the area.

There of course will always be the concern of surrounding areas struggling further with parking and drivers seek to park elsewhere. Any consideration to extend the zone, if needed, should not be taken lightly. It is certainly not a case of "all or nothing" meaning if most roads are forced to have CPZ then everywhere should have it too. The result would be, as it is now, pushing the problem somewhere else instead of finding a way to tackle the issue of parking and cars in general. Where would the line be drawn?

I doubt very much CPZ will be the answer.

overwhelmingly supported the introduction of a CPZ. However, to achieve the reduced CO2 levels the Council intend, which are fully supported, a CPZ needs to be carefully designed taking account of the needs and design of individual streets.

For Tell Grove:

1. **Bringing forward the timing of the CPZ by just 30 minutes to 8.00am through 6.00pm on Monday to Friday will remove the likelihood of parking on Tell Grove from either the Charter School or Dulwich Community Hospital.**
 - 2.
 3. **Tell Grove is a wholly inappropriate street for 'stop and rest' for these reasons:**
 - The houses in Tell Grove are late Victorian predominantly terraced where over 60% have front doors that open directly onto a narrow pavement.
 - Only 8 houses on Tell Grove have front gardens and even these are less than 6 feet deep. In such circumstance 'stop and rest' is an intrusion on residents private space.
 - The street is occupied by many families with young children of both school and pre-school age. Foxes are a continual problem where in addition to the very real dangers to children of fox excrement on streets and pavements, residents have had to chase foxes from out of their houses.
 - Any additional litter or waste from discarded 'take aways' which have been common occurrences around 'stop and rest' elsewhere will only make the fox situation worse to the detriment of all residents.
 - The technical guidance ('Manual for Streets') produced by the Department of Transport in conjunction with the Department of Communities and Local Government focusing on lightly-trafficked residential streets recommends detailed impact assessments and community impacted support stating: "seating should be considered where people congregate" and "seating can attract anti-social behaviour and therefore should be located where there is good lighting and natural surveillance." None of these conditions are met by the Tell Grove proposal for 'stop and rest'.
- In the event that the Council is intent on introducing a 'stop and rest' for Tell Grove, it should only be implemented after a full impact assessment and be located outside the Church on the north side of Tell Grove close to the junction with Melbourne Grove. This will ensure no intrusion on any resident and meet the criteria for street seating in accordance with 'Manual for Streets' 10.2.2 and 10.2.3.**

The proposal for double yellow lines on the inside of the 90° corner in the middle of Tell Grove will meet the concerns of the dustbin men whose lorries have been stopped from cornering as a result of bad parking.

The proposal for double yellow lines on the outside of the 90° corner in the middle of Tell Grove is unnecessary. It will not impact any vehicle turning the corner and may lead to cars driving at higher speed down Tell Grove. It will also remove at least 3 parking spaces and importantly increase the likelihood that Tell Grove will become a 'rat run' between East Dulwich Grove and Melbourne Grove

The introduction of a CPZ offers the opportunity to radically change the parking and road usage of those streets within the zone. It is important that the CPZ changes

driver behaviour removing the current incessant speculative parking throughout the day on Monday to Friday and does not lead to Tell Grove becoming a short cut between East Dulwich Grove and Melbourne Grove. Most importantly it must lead to improved air quality and reduced CO2 in Tell Grove and the other streets within the zone.

[REDACTED]

Director

[REDACTED]

Mobile

[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025E

[overallresponse]

4. I object to part

[response]

The East Dulwich parking zone will be restricted to a number of roads in close proximity to East Dulwich station. I live in Chesterfield Grove ~~which~~ which is already one of the prime streets for parking in the area with its close proximity to Lordship Lane and North Cross Road. The parking situation in this road is exacerbated already by the car wash at the junction of Lordship Lane / Chesterfield Grove - as they park cars they have washed in any available space in the street while their owners go shopping.

The proposed parking zone laid out in the document will make the parking situation in Chesterfield Grove even worse than it currently is. People unwilling or unable to park in the controlled zone will seek spaces on the external periphery of the zone including Chesterfield Grove.

The edge of the zone should be extended further from the station. Mathematically, the further the zone extends from the station, the more will be the number of free parking roads outside the zone periphery and thus the parking irritation experienced by occupants mitigated at least to some extent. I suspect Southwark Council will be unwilling to refactor its plan to this extent and so, I would like the Council to extend the parking zone to include Chesterfield Grove - preferentially with a 2 hour restriction from 08:30 to 10:30 every weekday or 08:30 - 18:30 as an alternative.

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025E

[overallresponse]

[response]

I don't agree that Chesterfield Grove is treated differently in the CPZ rollout and believe that a 2hr CPZ would work for our road. Thank you.

**PARKING – ROAD TRAFFIC & HIGHWAY SCHEMES – RESPONDING TO STATUTORY
CONSULTATION NOTICE REF: 1920-025 E DULWICH**

I welcome the opportunity to comment on the statutory consultation on the proposals for the East Dulwich Area Parking Zone "ED" under TMO 1920-025 E Dulwich.

I fully support an all day CPZ on Monday through Fridays as proposed and would seek consideration of the points below in respect of the implementation within Tell Grove. In doing so I would highlight that the specific proposals for Tell Grove, 'map 1' excludes the 'Cycle Hanger' situated midway on the west side of Tell Grove close to East Dulwich Grove. This has had the effect of removing 2 parking spaces and has been ignored by the planners who classify it on the map as a parking place.

Tell Grove is a short street of less than 25 houses with a tight 90° corner in the middle. It has suffered from commuters using it as free parking for East Dulwich station for several years and more recently by teachers from The Charter School. Pressure will only increase as the Dulwich Community Hospital comes on stream. Tell Grove

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

2019 East Dulwich are parking zone 'ED'

[overallresponse]

4. I object to part

[response]

Restrictions to parking on Elsie road are onerous thru use of double lines and huge reduction of spaces. The all day time limit for the whole zone is also overkill. My calculations suggest that with these proposed restrictions in place there will not be sufficient parking spaces for the cars of current residents

Subject: Concerns about this CPZ with particular reference to [REDACTED]

We are very unhappy about the negative impact on our street from the implementation of the CPZ.

The issues are:

1. Double yellow lines. The use of double yellow lines across dropped kerbs is unnecessary, over-restrictive and inappropriate for a small, residential street. There are 23 dropped kerbs in Elsie Road which makes our road quite unlike other roads in the CPZ. We request the use of single yellow lines across dropped kerbs to allow parking for residents during out of controlled hours. This is standard practice in the local boroughs of Lambeth, Lewisham, Wandsworth, Croydon and even Westminster. Double yellow lines are not used.
2. Control times. We have consistently requested a 2 hour controlled parking slot for Elsie Road. All day control is overkill for this road and will unnecessarily restrict flexibility in our daily lives. As much of the CPZ has 2 hours control we suggest Elsie Road be included that zone. Or perhaps the whole zone could have 2 hour restriction for the 6 month trial period. I believe that has been successful in the Herne Hill CPZ.
3. Residents parking. We will be losing around 30 parking spaces in our small road. A neighbour has carried out a parking survey which reveals that there will not be enough spaces for residents. Single yellow lines instead of doubles across dropped kerbs would release 23 spaces to be used outside controlled hours. There may be more spaces to use between the dropped kerbs on the east side of the road.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]
Elsie Road

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025E

[overallresponse]

4. I object to part

[response]

I live in [REDACTED] which is already one of the prime streets for parking in the area with its close proximity to Lordship Lane and North Cross Road. We often have to park two or three streets away as there is almost never space for residents to park in the street.

The proposed parking zone laid out in the document will make the parking situation in Chesterfield Grove even worse than it currently is. People unwilling or unable to park in the controlled zone will seek spaces on the external periphery of the zone including Chesterfield Grove.

I'd rather there wasn't a CPZ at all but given that it's likely to go ahead, I would like the Council to extend the parking zone to include Chesterfield Grove with a 2 hour restriction from 08:30 to 10:30 every weekday or 08:30 - 18:30 as an alternative.

I share the concerns and suggestions outlined in my neighbour Jan Reeves' email of today. I hope you will appreciate our views and amend the proposals in relation to Elsie Road. As things stand it appears to me that I will have to pay an annual fee in order to have a reduced chance of being able to park in my street. That doesn't seem right. I accept that a CPZ will be enacted and may well suit the needs of the other streets but the current proposals do not suit Elsie Road. Surely there is a way of adapting the plan rather than having a one plan suits all when clearly it doesn't.



[redacted]
[Telephone_number]
[redacted]

[Email_address]
[redacted]

[Areyou]
A resident

[Whichconsultation]
TMO1920-025 E Dulwich Parking Zone

[overallresponse]
4. I object to part

[response]
I object to the proposal. If you are to continue with it in its current form all you are going to is displace all the traffic in Melbourne Grove and local roads into Chesterfield Grove, Ashbourne Grove which can not be your objective as you do not solve the problem and simply move it to a new location within the same overall area. Therefore a better solution if CPZ is to continue is to make it a time limited one similar to HErne Hill. These roads will be significantly impacted and it makes no logical sense to penalise these street and have financial impacts to these families main asset.

at this point unsuitable for our residential streets. It is a tick box exercise for the council without considering the potential impact on our lives.

In terms of making our streets more accessible there is much that could be done. This includes getting bins off pavements (which is a huge issue on Derwent Grove), addressing pavements so the surfaces are more even especially around tree pits and thus more accessible to those with mobility issues, carrying out enforcement activity to stop people parking across dropped kerbs and to prosecute drivers breaking the 20mph speed limit. Once these steps have been carried out and when our roads are no longer a cut through for traffic is when we should consider adding seating, rather than now in a clear attempt to meet a defined quota.

On behalf of the following residents of Derwent Grove:

[Redacted signature block]

[Title]

[Redacted title]

[Firstname]

[Redacted first name]

[Lastname]

Response to statutory consultation into CPZ plans for East Dulwich with particular reference to Derwent Grove.

We write in response to the plans to include 4 'stop and rest' locations on Derwent Grove. Whilst I understand that they are an attempt to improve accessibility i am writing in opposition to these stop and rests on behalf of the residents detailed below. Our opposition is based on the following points:

1. These stop and rests were not included in the original proposals, therefore it feels disingenuous to include them at this point, once the initial consultation has already taken place. It is our understanding that once the TMO is granted, there will be some detailed design but that there is no requirement to consult further with residents after this point before whatever is determine appropriate is installed. This does not feel an appropriate approach. To the extent that such stop and rests are to be implemented, they should be properly consulted on. This consultation process has not been followed and therefore this is the primary reason for our opposition to these stop and rests going ahead within the existing TMO in addition to the points detailed below.
2. Whilst the 'aims' of the stop and rests, to improve accessibility, are laudable, the reality of them is very different. The council has a stated aim to have suitable rest points every 50m, but is including low walls on private property in this calculation such that no roads nearby have even one stop and rest point. Whilst we can understand how such points would be helpful in shopping areas and are supportive of them on streets such as Lordship Lane or Northcross Road, they are wholly unsuited to our residential streets as they stand today.
3. We understand that the final design will be made in conjunction with advice from the Met Police as to suitability and that on this basis they will not cause any issues with antisocial behaviour or increased noise pollution for residents. Unfortunately we are unable to share in your confidence in this regard, in addition the decreases to police numbers locally will mean that in the event of issues, there will be no chance of getting issues dealt with.
4. The locations set out in the plans for the TMO include in front of people's ground floor flats and next to their bedroom windows. For the reasons set out above we consider that their placement will have a negative effect on their right to quiet enjoyment of their properties.

The end of Derwent Grove at Grove Vale already has some issues of people drinking in the street, sitting on low walls with drinks from the off license. In addition some neighbours have reported drug dealing concerns to the police. Its hard for us to conclude that the same people wouldn't prefer a seat rather than a wall and that this activity wouldn't carry on into the night. Again, the number and airing of seating on the pavements or build outs is

I also request clarification, as to why on the previous plan we had a parking space outside our house ([REDACTED]), and in the latest plan this has been moved next door to outside [REDACTED]. We now not only have double yellow lines across our driveway but also on the road outside our house, I would hasten to add that there is a tree on the pavement outside number 15, and on several occasions sizeable branches have been damaged or broken off the tree by larger vehicles parking in this part of the road.

I hope you will reconsider your proposed plan, and implement the changes mentioned above for our street, as I fear the quality of our lives will be severely compromised if your proposed plan is allowed to go through in it's present form.

Many thanks

[REDACTED]


To whom it may concern

Re:- Proposed CPZ - ~~Elsie Road, Herne Hill~~

I am writing with my concerns about the almost finalized plan for CPZ in our area, and in particular concerns about our street which as you are already aware has a special set of circumstances in relations to other streets in the area. I therefore request you to look again at what has been proposed bearing in mind the following issues.

The issues are:-

1. Double yellow lines. The use of double yellow lines across dropped kerbs is unnecessary, over restrictive and inappropriate for a small, residential street.

There are 23 dropped kerbs in Elsie Road which makes our road quite unlike other roads in the CPZ.

We request the use of single yellow lines across dropped kerbs to allow parking for residents during out of

controlled hours.

This is standard practice in the local boroughs of Lambeth, Lewisham, Wandsworth, Croydon and even Westminster.

Double yellow lines are not used.

2. Control times. We have consistently requested a 2 hour controlled parking slot for Elsie Road. All day control is overkill for this road and will unnecessarily restrict flexibility in our daily lives. As much of the CPZ has 2 hours control we suggest Elsie Road be included that zone.

Or perhaps the whole zone could have 2 hour restriction for the 6 month trial period. I believe that has been successful in the Herne Hill CPZ.

3. Residents parking. We will be losing around 30 parking spaces in our small road. A neighbour has carried out a parking survey which reveals that there will not be enough spaces for residents. Single yellow lines instead of doubles across dropped kerbs would release 23 spaces to be used outside controlled hours. There may be more spaces to use between the dropped kerbs on the east side of the road.

Our serious concerns for the proposed CPZ parking on Elsie Road are as follows:

Firstly: Full day restrictions, during the week and the weekend, will affect our ability to invite over friends and family. When my elderly parents visit I want them to be able to park easily outside my own house. An early two hour restriction would be preferable. It would reduce the amount of commuter parking which is what the parking restriction is supposedly for.

Secondly: putting double yellow lines at the bottom of dropped drive ways will seriously and unnecessarily limit my neighbours' parking options, and this in turn will limit ours (no dropped drive). As you already know, many houses on Elsie Road have dropped drive ways and it would not be an exaggeration to say we will end up with more double yellow lines than parking spaces. We will have to end up parking in neighbouring streets which is farcical.

We at number 28 would appreciate it if you could give these points some serious consideration, and then let us know what you think.

Best wishes,

 Elsie Road

Dear Sir,

I'm writing with comments relating to the East Dulwich area parking zone, 'ED', specifically in relation to the way in which the scheme, as proposed, may affect parking in my street, **Tintagel Crescent** and the adjoining street, **Elsie Road**.

1. Likely displacement of parking from Elsie Road to Tintagel Crescent

Many properties on Elsie Road have off-street parking, facilitated by dropped curbs. From my knowledge, many of these Elsie Road households have 2 vehicles, parking one on the driveway and one on the street in front of their own dropped curb or immediately adjacent to it.

Introduction of double-yellow lines on Elsie Road as part of the ED scheme removes a significant number of on-street parking spaces. Hence, it is highly probable that affected Elsie Road residents will move the second car to the nearest-available residents' parking within the ED zone, namely, Tintagel Crescent. Given this likely displacement, the benefits of the scheme for Tintagel Crescent residents may be offset by competition from Elsie Road residents seeking a place for their second vehicle.

Might it be possible to allow Elsie Road residents to park in front of their own dropped curb in order to dissuade them from seeking space on Tintagel Crescent (or elsewhere within the ED zone) for their second vehicle?

2. 'School Spaces' on Tintagel Crescent

The entrance for Goose Green Primary School is located on Tintagel Crescent. How many permits have been issued to the School for members of staff, if any?

3. Streets at the edge of adjoining parking zones, ED & PW

Tintagel Crescent is located at the edge of the ED parking zone where it borders the proposed PW (Peckham West) zone. Currently, residents not finding a space in Tintagel Crescent or Elsie Road have the option of parking in streets which will be part of the PW zone, eg. Copleston, Oglander, Ondine and East Dulwich Roads. This displacement is normally temporary, as vehicles are moved back to Tintagel Crescent at the first opportunity.

If the boundary between the two zones is hard, removing the option to park in the PW streets named above, Tintagel Crescent residents will be forced to seek spaces at even greater inconvenience elsewhere within the ED zone or outside it.

Has consideration been given to making streets at zone borders 'dual zone' streets, thereby giving greater flexibility in these areas?

4. Balancing measures

I understand that the annual charge for a parking permit within the zone would be reduced if I had an electric vehicle. What measures are planned to introduce charging points in Tintagel Crescent and elsewhere within the ED zone?

Are there any plans to increase the number and quality of bicycle parking racks / stands in the area?

I look forward to hearing from you in due course.


Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

release 23 spaces to be used outside controlled hours. There may be more spaces to use between the dropped kerbs on the east side of the road.

Kind regards

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

Concerns about this CPZ with particular reference to .

For your information I am resending a letter signed by all the residents of Elsie Road (except 2 who were away) which was sent to councillors on the 5th June

Our requests for changes to the consultation results remain the same as those in the letter as they have not been resolved..

I have previously written on the 6th May to the councillors and to Joanna Lesak on the 21st June and the 3rd July.

Other residents of Elsie road have also sent letters of concern.

We are very unhappy about the negative impact on our street from the implementation of the CPZ.

The issues are still;

1. Double yellow lines. The use of double yellow lines across dropped kerbs is unnecessary, over restrictive and inappropriate for a small, residential street.

There are 23 dropped kerbs in Elsie Road which makes our road quite unlike other roads in the CPZ.

We request the use of single yellow lines across dropped kerbs to allow parking for residents during out of

controlled hours.

This is standard practice in the local boroughs of Lambeth, Lewisham, Wandsworth, Croydon and even Westminster.

Double yellow lines are not used. (I have previously sent photos of examples)

2. Control times. We have consistently requested a 2 hour controlled parking slot for Elsie Road. All day control is overkill for this road and will unnecessarily restrict flexibility in our daily lives. As much of the CPZ has 2 hours control we suggest Elsie Road be included that zone.

Or perhaps the whole zone could have 2 hour restriction for the 6 month trial period. I believe that has been successful in the Herne Hill CPZ.

3. Residents parking. We will be losing around 30 parking spaces in our small road. A neighbour has carried out a parking survey which reveals that there will not be enough spaces for residents. Single yellow lines instead of doubles across dropped kerbs would

We write to reiterate our concerns about this CPZ and detailed provisions, specifically in [REDACTED]

We have written twice previously on 26th June and 25th July 2019 (and attached our detailed survey of parking in Elsie road, the findings of which are referred to below).

We remain deeply concerned that the CPZ as drawn will be counter productive except in so far as restricting commuter traffic. The key issues with the detailed proposals in Elsie Road are as follows:

1. Use of double yellow lines: The introduction of double yellow lines across dropped kerbs are unnecessary and over restrictive. We suggest the use of single yellow lines across dropped kerbs to allow out of controlled hours parking in these spaces.
2. Controlled parking Timing and duration: 8.30-6.30 seems far too long, suggest 8.00-5.00 to allow at least some use of the spaces for visitors etc.
3. Reduction of parking for residents: there are insufficient parking spaces for overnight parking of residents in this street. Our study carried out over many weeks revealed a minimum of 39 cars parked, on street, overnight in Elsie Road. This is considerably more than allowed for in the proposed CPZ. There is capacity for more spaces between the dropped kerbs on the east side of Elsie Road, than currently shown on the CPZ map

There are of course more detailed issues which should be addressed by your engineers

but these are the principal concerns.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]
Elsie Road

Sent from my iPhone

[REDACTED]
East Dulwich area parking zone 'ED'

Practicality would be far better observed by using the extant template of Quorn/Pytchley/Ivanhoe et c, immediately to the north of East Dulwich station, viz '11am till Noon Mon-Fri', than the proposed 8.30am-6.30pm Mon-Fri

 Friern Rd

East Dulwich



[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone number]

[REDACTED]

[Email address]

[REDACTED]

[Are you]

A resident

[Which consultation]

TMO 1920-025 East Dulwich area parking zone

[overall response]

4. I object to part

[response]

I strongly object to the decision to extend the timing of the parking zone from 8.30am-6.30pm Monday to Friday. The originally agreed 2 hour time span is better for the neighbourhood as a whole. As a resident on Melbourne Grove who doesn't drive a car, I am dependent on the local shops which will be negatively affected by the parking restrictions at the Grove Vale end of Melbourne Grove as well as in Lordship Lane. Therefore I request that the original decision by the cabinet member to only restrict parking for two hours per day is implemented.

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

East Dulwich area parking zone ED Order 201

[overallresponse]

4. I object to part

[response]

I object to the controlled parking zone being a whole day restriction. (08.30-18.30). Restricting commuter parking around East Dulwich was the major concern for residents. A, two hour, parking restriction, that is already in place, in St Francis Road for example, will stop the all-day depositing of vehicles in our roads close to East Dulwich Station.

We are not in competition with shoppers, or cinema goers in this quarter of the borough. The CPZ should be proportionate to meet our local needs. Staff attending the expanding school and the new medical centre would be deterred by a 2 hour parking restriction and would be encouraged to use public transport. Also drivers who have deposited vans for several days in our roads would also be deterred.

Finally, a 2 hour parking restriction would be consistent with the adjoining areas and still allow us to look after our elderly. The council have argued that they are responding to local demands, but they are aware that even in the streets close to East Dulwich Station there was a variance in response, in the for and against, to the original proposal.

If the CPZ, is going to be implemented in this quarter of the borough, there should be a vote, by those residents and business owners etc, specifically, on the type of CPZ be put in operation.

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich Parking Zone
Chesterfield Grove

[overallresponse]

4. I object to part

[response]

Chesterfield grove is already at 100% occupancy of parking bays from your initial report for the original CPZ. I object to any implementation of a parking zone in any nearby streets unless Chesterfield grove is also included. If the new amended proposal is going ahead I believe it is imperative that CG be included. Chesterfield grove to also be included as any displacement of vehicles from neighbouring roads will only make our situation even worse and the fact that we then cannot park in the neighbouring streets as wouldn't be able to purchase a resident permit.

I also would like you to consider the option of having one annual resident permit and one annual visitor permit per household therefore we could have carers for elderly and children in the street who park on our road daily able to do so at a reasonable cost to the household.

[Title]
Ms

[Firstname]
[REDACTED]

[Lastname]
[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]
[REDACTED]

[Email_address]
[REDACTED]

[Areyou]
A resident

[Whichconsultation]
TMO1920-025 E Dulwich Parking Zone

[overallresponse]
4. I object to part

[response]

The proposed CPZ stops at the end of our street. Originally Chesterfield Grove was included but then later excluded. We strongly object to this - parking is already impossible on our street due to M&S, car wash and Lordship Lane parking. With the introduction of the CPZ up to the border of our road residents will be massively disadvantaged. We believe that the majority of residents on the street are of the same mind. A combined objection was rejected by your office.

Our Ashbourne Grove neighbours, also now excluded largely have driveways and much less impact from M&S and no carwash impact.

In the strongest possible terms we wish our street to be included in the CPZ in some way - ideally 8-6 but if not then at least middle of the day.

Please reconsider making it impossible to live on our street and use a car for necessities - I am an NHS consultant obstetrician who needs to get to patients in the middle of the night. If my car is parked 15 minutes walk away from my house I am not able to meet my obligations to them. My elderly neighbours will not be able to access their vehicles.

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich Parking Zone

[overallresponse]

4. I object to part

[response]

I'm objecting to this plan because I am concerned about displacement from adjacent roads that will worsen our ability to park in chesterfield grove significantly.

I would approve your proposal IF you give us a 2 hr CPZ in chesterfield grove also.

I live at [REDACTED]

I am very unhappy with the proposed CPZ restrictions. I would like the council to reconsider the following as they will all negatively impact on the lives of those living in [REDACTED].

The issues are still;

1. **Double yellow lines.** The use of double yellow lines across dropped kerbs is unnecessary, over restrictive and inappropriate for a small, residential street. There are 23 dropped kerbs in Elsie Road which makes our road quite unlike other roads in the CPZ. We request the use of single yellow lines across dropped kerbs to allow parking for residents during out of controlled hours. This is standard practice in the local boroughs of Lambeth, Lewisham, Wandsworth, Croydon and even Westminster. Double yellow lines are not used.
2. **Control times. We have consistently requested a 2 hour controlled parking slot for Elsie Road.** All day control is overkill for this road and will unnecessarily restrict flexibility in our daily lives. As much of the CPZ has 2 hours control we suggest Elsie Road be included that zone.
3. **Residents parking. We will be losing around 30 parking spaces in our small road. A neighbour has carried out a parking survey which reveals that there will not be enough spaces for residents.** Single yellow lines instead of doubles across dropped kerbs would release 23 spaces to be used outside controlled hours. Loss of these spaces will impact on the parking in other non-CPZ areas in the surrounding district.

Thank you.

[REDACTED]

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich Parking Zone

[overallresponse]

4. I object to part

[response]

There will be significant impact on Chesterfield Grove as a result

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

Chesterfield Grove

[overallresponse]

4. I object to part

[response]

With you stopping the CPZ abruptly on our neighbouring roads cars will be forced to park on our road which is already severely oversubscribed. I have two small children and am frequently having to park two or three roads away and carry them both (often with bags of shopping) from several roads away. This has been very difficult and is increasingly distressing and impacting on our health (my back) and well being. There is a disabled lady on our street who struggles to walk with her walker and daughter's help to wherever her car is parked far away. My children's grandparents also struggle when they come to visit and our increasingly put off coming at all. We understand that the CPZ needs to stop somewhere so would ask for a compromise and that our road has a two hour parking restriction in the middle of the day. This would prevent commuters (pushed from neighbouring CPZ streets) or cars dumped for days/weeks and allow residents With appropriate permits to park or consumers wishing to use the high street for much of the day and therefore not negatively impact the high street. Please, please consider this as an appropriate compromise. Thank you.

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

~~Chesterfield Grove~~

[overallresponse]

4. I object to part

[response]

I agreed with introduction of parking zones, this appears to not have been an overall majority however introducing parking zones to all adjacent roads will make it impossible to park near my house. Please include Chesterfield grove in the proposals. The majority of houses on Ashbourne grove have driveways so would be less affected.

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

Quote ref TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking

[overallresponse]

4. I object to part

[response]

I support the CPz but object to the stop and rests on DERWENT grove due to the anti-social behaviour that already exists and they will further facilitate. Furthermore, they were not part of the cpz consultation.

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

Re CPZ - ~~Derwent Grove~~
Topic: Stop & Rest benches

[overallresponse]

2. I support this proposal

[response]

I support the implementation of a CPZ in the roads surrounding East Dulwich Station. However I am dismayed to find stop and rest benches have suddenly appeared in the latest plans. I object to these on the basis that there has been no consultation with residents. I am worried also about the impact these benches could have on a residential street. Can you provide examples of benches in other local residential streets and their impact? These benches are positioned outside bedroom windows in Derwent Grove, even someone having a lengthy conversation on their telephone late at night would wake residents. We have dangerous uneven pavements due to large tree roots and a huge problem with bins constantly left on pavements which need addressing before money is spent on benches. After the pavements and bin issues have been addressed, I would prefer planters to attract wildlife rather than benches placed outside bedroom windows in a residential road.

With kind regards,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]

[Redacted]
[Redacted]

Dear Officers

Please see below the comments of Dulwich and Herne Hill Safe Routes to School on the East Dulwich area parking zone proposals. Our comments are designed to ensure maximum safety for children walking and cycling to school.

We support all-day hours, but, given that many of the local schools accept pupils from 8am, we would prefer 8am - 6pm.

Given the maximum loading / unloading time is as much as 40 mins, loading restrictions must be applied to all double yellow lines near schools.

Jarvis Road

1. The school entrance on Jarvis Road should have school yellow zig zags, of the statutory length. This is extremely important as this is the only pedestrian and cyclist entrance for all the school children on this site.
2. Given the main school entrance is on Jarvis Road, the double yellow lines on the corner of Jarvis Road and Melbourne Grove need to be extended to 10 metres to ensure pedestrian visibility and safety. We cannot tell if this is the case from the map.
3. We support the no loading restrictions on the double yellow lines at the junction with Melbourne Grove.

Melbourne Grove

1. We support the extension of the double yellow lines at Melbourne Grove and East Dulwich Grove and would like to see no loading restrictions there to prevent vehicles waiting and thus blocking the crossing and sight lines for pedestrians.

East Dulwich Grove

1. We would like to see and support no loading restrictions along the length of the existing double yellow lines on EDG at the junction with Greendale.

2. Is it possible to make clearer the current no loading restrictions on East Dulwich Grove existing double yellow lines outside The Charter East Dulwich?

2. The existing zebra crossing markings need to be refreshed.

Thorncombe Road

1. We would support additional no loading restrictions on all existing and proposed double yellow lines, in order to prevent parents from parking dangerously to drop off or pick up children.

Hillsboro' Road

1. We support the introduction of loading restrictions on the existing and proposed double yellow lines at the junction with Thorncombe Road.

2. School yellow zig zags are needed to replace the existing double yellow lines outside the Alleyn's Lower School entrance, at the East Dulwich Grove end of Hillsboro' Road. If this is not possible, they should have loading restrictions.

3. The Public Notice does not mention loading restrictions on the East Dulwich Grove end of Hillsboro Road, although the map shows this. Please note we support loading restrictions at the East Dulwich Grove end of Hillsboro.

Greendale

1. We support the proposed double yellow lines in front of the JAGS vehicle entrance. Loading restrictions are required.

[Title]
Mr

[Firstname]
[REDACTED]

[Lastname]
[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]
[REDACTED]

[Email_address]
[REDACTED]

[Areyou]
A resident

[Whichconsultation]
TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking

[overallresponse]
2. I support this proposal

[response]
I think the controlled time should be two hours in the middle of the day to deter commuter parking, support local businesses and allow friends and family to more easily park in Tell Grove without having to pay our access an app every time.

Hi,

I am writing to oppose the suggesting parking restrictions from 8:30am to 6:30pm, on my road Glengarry Road. These restrictions are far too long and are unreasonable and will be too expensive.

While I would prefer no restrictions, if there are restrictions, surely it would make more sense to have restrictions for a couple of hours in the morning to prevent people from parking and leaving their cars indefinitely. While from a marginal point of view, more residents in these roads wanted 8:30am to 6:30pm, if the choice was between say 9am to 11am, and 8:30am to 6:30pm, I would think 9am to 11am would have more support as anyone who wanted no restrictions, would prefer 9am to 11am than 8:30pm to 6:30pm.

Kind regards

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the sender's name.

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

East Dulwich area parking zone 'ED'

[overallresponse]

4. I object to part

[response]

We voted in favour of CPZ in our street, Chesterfield Grove, for 2hrs per day. By excluding us from the parking zone but introducing it next door, you are making our terrible parking situation even worse. Please reconsider and introduce for our road also, as the majority of our residents request now also.

[Title]

[Redacted]

[Firstname]

[Redacted]

[Lastname]

[Redacted]

[Telephone_number]

[Redacted]

[Email_address]

[Redacted]

[Areyou]

A resident,A business

[Whichconsultation]

East Dulwich cpz consultation
Glengarry road.

[overallresponse]

4. I object to part

[response]

It would be far more beneficial for local residents to have cpz in place yes, to prevent people parking all day who don't live here.

By doing a 2 hour cpz from 9am to 12 noon or 12 to 2 pm.

Your current proposal of 8.30am to 5.30pm lea's our repairs teams in social housing won't be able park do repairs.

We disabled we require grocery delivery they won't be able deliver anymore if you go ahead with 8.30am to 5.30pm cpz in East Dulwich glengarry road area and surrounding roads.

A 2 hour cpz would stop people being able park all day go off to work who don't even live in East Dulwich.

Lots social hpris tenants in our area etc use car due illness not classed as able have disa8 badge but enough 'eed access car mums with arthritis doing all day means they have get rid there cars and not be able get shopping without carrying it long distance this causes alot pain.

Why penalise charge residents by a all day charge of permit when cpz for 2 hours is way more effective and means resid can just move there car for 2 hour no parking window. A far better option all round east dulwich.

'High streets should be a focus for investment as they are sites well equipped to deliver Good Growth – they are inclusive, shared and diverse, as well as destinations for harder-to-reach Londoners and vulnerable groups. Given the multiple ways through which high streets deliver value to Londoners, investment, advocacy and policy development focused on high streets has the potential to impact all three strands of social value: the economic, the social and the environmental'.

13. One of the Report's recommendations is that local authorities ought to 'recognise the social value of high street economies' because on high streets 'the economic is so often also the social'.

14. Among other recommendations, the TfL Report proposes the following: 'It is crucial that the support for high streets includes support for high street users (making high streets more attractive and valuable places for Londoners) as well as for businesses (ensuring high streets remain viable and accessible places for employment and enterprise).

THE LOCAL PLAN

15. The Local Plan reflects these concerns and requires active support for the high street.

16. The emerging Local Plan for Southwark singles out the value of the High Street. One of its Strategic Policies, SP4: Local Economy, requires: We will work to make sure that Southwark has a strong economy where all of our existing and new residents and workers benefit. This will be achieved through:

...

2 Making Southwark a place where the town centres and high streets thrive and are a place to do business in the London and global economy, where business owners know this is the borough where their enterprises will grow and prosper;

17. The Emerging Plan specifies that Lordship Lane is a high street that deserves support. The Plan's 'Area Vision' for East Dulwich recognises the significance of Lordship Lane as follows (emphasis added):

AV.07 East Dulwich Area Vision

AV.07.1 East Dulwich is:

- A predominantly residential area characterised by mostly suburban density housing, including many family homes. Many parts of East Dulwich have retained historic character and it includes several conservation areas and iconic modern buildings such as Dawson's Heights.
- Home to the town centre destination of Lordship Lane which has many diverse, independent shops, restaurants, cafes and bars for daytime and evening activities and entertainment. Local shops at Northcross Road Market, Grove Vale and Forest Hill Road and on Lordship Lane at the Plough and at the junction with Dulwich Common are also highly valued.
- An area with rail connections from East Dulwich and Honor Oak stations along with recently improved bus services, walking and cycling routes. It has no tube connection and is not as well served by public transport as many other parts of Southwark.

18. Southwark's 'Movement Plan: Setting a Direction for Transport' (April 2019) reflects these priorities, by including 'Mission 6 – Support business to prosper' and specifying further the following 'Actions' (at p. 21):

'Action 12: Movement to, within and from town centres is easy, safe and accessible for all.

Action 13: Make town centres attractive, thriving and diverse places for people and businesses

19. Southwark's 'Economic Wellbeing Strategy' 2017-22, states that among the Council's 'ambitions' are that:

- Southwark town centres and high streets are accessible and well connected, both physically and digitally
- Southwark town centres are thriving and diverse with a strong sense of identity, and are great places to visit and shop
- Businesses and their employees are drawn to high streets and town centres as great places to work and trade

20. In order to achieve these - and other – 'ambitions' the 'Economic Wellbeing Strategy' states that it will:

Support thriving business communities in our town centres by protecting business space, encouraging growth through planning policies and effective management of our property portfolio

21. By promoting the CPZ the Council is failing to comply with its commitment to the well-being of the high street, as we explain in detail below.

THE NEGATIVE IMPACT ON THE HIGH STREET

22. The proposed Order will create serious new burdens for the high street.

23. It will restrict parking in designated areas for residents and visitors, according to the detailed map set out in the TRO. Although the areas do not now include Lordship Lane itself, they include many side streets in the northern part of Lordship Lane, so that accessibility to Lordship Lane will be affected.

24. The proposed Order will in effect increase the cost of parking in most parts of the relevant area for residents, businesses and visitors, according to Schedule 5 of the proposed Order.

25. Residents will be liable for a fee of £125 annually (Schedule 5, par 2(iv)). Businesses will be liable for a fee of (£577.50 for an annual business permit for one car. (Schedule 5, par 3(c)). This is a very serious additional burden for all independent businesses.

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone

[overallresponse]

1. I wholly support

[response]

I support the introduction of the revised East Dulwich CPZ. The issues of parking caused by the school / new health centre will not be addressed by a two hour restriction in the same way they were in Zone Q or will be in the Peckham West CPZ we're commuter parking is the main issue.

Good Morning

I have received a leaflet regarding the Parking in East Dulwich reference 'East Dulwich area Parking Zone' as a resident at 3 Isel Way. With a number of spaces being taken up by parents in the morning and after school it has become increasingly hard to leave home in the morning or even park on my return from work so some action taken is indeed a good thing, however having to pay for a parking permit to park outside my own home is somewhat not a good thing.

By approving the above it will cause more congestion on surrounding roads such as 'Townley Road' Gilkes Crescent and Dulwich Village. I do have one proposal for yourselves which is the residential car parks in the vicinity (there is one on Hillsborough Road – the one I use, opposite the school entrance) – every morning we have parents parking up, as well as the school delivery lorries blocking the entrance and causing it a nightmare to get out and I feel that with the new restrictions this will only cause more trouble, so to avoid this the gate should be locked and only residents having access to enter and exit either with a key or a fob.

I look forward to hearing from you and I can be contacted either via email or phone on [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Relationship Manager

Don't forget you can obtain quotes via [REDACTED] if you require your company log in details please get in contact

We are open Monday – Friday from 08:00am – 18:00 pm and Saturdays from 09:00 till 17:00 (please call on Saturdays as my emails are not monitored)

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

East Dulwich Area Parking Zone 'ED'

[overallresponse]

3. I neither support or object

[response]

I wish to raise a serious issue with regards to your proposed East Dulwich area parking zone ED. I live in Velde Way on the Dutch Estate which is dissected by East Dulwich Road. There is a parking area on the estate running parallel to Velde Way and Delft Way. This area is meant for the residents who all pay a service charge. Over the last 2-3 years this parking area is being used by an increasing number of non-residents who use the parking area Monday to Friday, some non-residents have also used this area for long term parking. This has resulted in residents not being able to park anywhere near where they live. I can provide a map of the exact parking area I am referring to.

If your proposed East Dulwich area parking zone ED is implemented, this estate parking area will be the only area that is free to park, resulting in even more non-residents seeking to park there. I am very concerned that this has been overlooked by the council.

This area should be a separate controlled zone for estate residents only. There was a proposal for this area to be controlled about 2 years ago but this included residents on the other side of East Dulwich Road who have no parking issues there.

This parking area needs to be protected for the residents of the estate whose service charge contributes to its up-keep.

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A business

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

In the current 'situation' of small high street businesses struggling against large corporations and massive online outlets, any small reduction in customer count could result in the closure of someones livelihood. My concern is very real and more so that the implementation of a small area of CPZ in East Dulwich will pave the way for the slow expansion over time.

As a small business owner, carefully balancing things coming at me from all sides, nibbling away at our meagre takings, it is simply another thing to keep us up at night. We want to feel supported by the council (who we pay huge business rates too already) that they want to keep a vibrant local shopping area in existence, but this is simply not the way to do this. Life is hard enough as it is, do not make things harder for us!

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A business

[Whichconsultation]

Melbourne grove parking

[overallresponse]

[response]

The parking restrictions will effect trade in the area and create displacement parking to surrounding residents

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking

[overallresponse]

1. I wholly support

[response]

I also support the clarifications and edits requested by the Vale Residents Association (VRA) letter

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED] - [REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking

[overallresponse]

1. I wholly support

[response]

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■ ■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking

[overallresponse]

1. I wholly support

[response]

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 East Dulwich parking

CPZ around station

[overallresponse]

1. I wholly support

[response]

Strongly in favour of the proposed CPZ but request change of times from 8am to 6pm to deter parents from driving (short distances for) school drop-offs.

Also request that wardens patrol around the schools during drop off times as parents tend to stop on the road leaving engines running and creating pollution and congestion.

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone

[overallresponse]

1. I wholly support

[response]

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking

[overallresponse]

1. I wholly support

[response]

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A stakeholder group

[Whichconsultation]

'East Dulwich area parking zone 'ED'

[overallresponse]

1. I wholly support

[response]

I am the headmaster of the local secondary school, based on Jarvis Road/East Dulwich Grove. We already have more than 600 students entering and leaving our school site at either end of the school day; this number will grow to more than 1,600 over the coming years. I strongly support the application for a CPZ in the interests of making the roads around our school safer for students journeying to and from school.

[Title]

[Redacted]

[Firstname]

[Redacted]

[Lastname]

[Redacted]

[Telephone_number]

[Redacted]

[Email_address]

[Redacted]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

Chesterfield Grove - proposed CPZ East Dulwich

[overallresponse]

1. I wholly support

[response]

I'm a resident of Chesterfield Grove in East Dulwich who has been following the development of the CPZ proposals. As a family find it difficult, almost impossible, to park on our road regularly. A toddler in tow means that we would, in an ideal world, like to be able to park in the vicinity of where we live.

East Dulwich Hospital, East Dulwich Station and the new school have increased parking pressure on Chesterfield Grove and surrounding roads. Every morning as I leave my house to go to work, I see commuters trying to park on Chesterfield Grove who then walk to East Dulwich station or their place of work. Having lived in a CPZ in the past, we thought this may be the best solution to the problems we, and a large number of our neighbours face.

The new proposal which excludes Ashbourne, Chesterfield and South Melbourne is the worst possible outcome for us. Living on one of the first 'free parking' roads outside the new proposed CPZ, yet still close enough to destinations like the station, hospital, school and places of work on lordship Lane, for people to park, means that we now face a worse situation than before. If the purpose of the new CPZ is to discourage commuters and to encourage use of public transport, surely you need create a CPZ that is big enough to make commuters/ workers not to drive?

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking

[overallresponse]

1. I wholly support

[response]

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

'TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking'

[overallresponse]

1. I wholly support

[response]

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E. Dulwich parking

[overallresponse]

1. I wholly support

[response]

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking

[overallresponse]

1. I wholly support

[response]

Parking is a major issue, not just for can I park my car issues, but because it creates such a pinch point on the road when it's completely parked up that we get lots of aggression and horn beeping (and car damage) from frustrated car drivers or huge lorries trying to navigate our street, plus we now have the school and shortly the health centre which will not only add to pressure but also put more vulnerable pedestrians on our street. Thank you for listening to us and doing something about this.

Traffic Order Consultation

Project Manager – Highways (Transport)

Environment and Leisure

Southwark Council

PO Box 64529

London

SE1P 5LX

14th October 2019

REF: PMO 1920-025

Dear Sir/Madam,

Regarding the proposed introduction of CPZ in the East Dulwich area:

We would like to express our pleasure that our road and the roads in the surrounding area are not having the introduction of CPZ.

Whilst preferring to have no CPZ in East Dulwich, we are pleased that our area has been left free. We feel that this is best for both the residents and the commercial enterprises in Lordship Lane.

We would appreciate being kept informed of any future developments.

Many thanks,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted signature]

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

East Dulwich and Peckham West controlled parking zone

[overallresponse]

2. I support this proposal

[response]

I live on Chesterfield Grove, which is just outside the proposed new restriction zone and strongly object to not being included in the zone. This will mean all those wishing to park in the local area, including those using East Dulwich Station will now park in the streets just outside the zone. Chesterfield Grove is only 5 min away from the station and right in the middle of the busy shopping area. If this goes ahead, residents will never be able to park on their own street.

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

CPZ - Dulwich and Peckham

Spurling road

[overallresponse]

2. I support this proposal

[response]

The parking restrictions being brought in will inevitably lead to more cars parking in the Roads not included in the CPZ. Spurling Road where I live is already full of Cars of the Commuters going to the Station.

It only need to have controlled parking for a couple of hours, say 11am - 1pm , which would stop the computers parking all day, and sometimes from Monday to Friday .

All you are doing is pushing the problem onto other areas. I fully support the introduction of the CPZ but would like it extended to included Spurling Road.

Also I would like you to improve the disabled parking in Spurling Road, it is badly marked and non blue badge holders are always parking in the disabled bays.

Also there is a burger van parked in Spurling Rd for the last 2 years it has never moved, it seems to be taxed but is creating a problem as stuff is dumped by it.

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

The ED CPZ which includes Tell Grove

[overallresponse]

2. I support this proposal

[response]

Hi. Please include some free, short stay parking in your plans for Tell Grove. My parents come to our house every week to collect and drop off our children. It would seem that under your proposals, even stopping for a few minutes will require us to pay for them to stop using a visitor permit. I believe there are spaces nearer the shops which allow half an hour free parking. Why can we not have these too in Tell Grove? Does the council think it is more important for people to go to the shops than grandparents visit their grandchildren?

Surely the council has lost sight of the purpose of this CPZ. The intention was to deter commuters from using our roads as a station car park, not to prevent people visiting friends and family in the area.

I think the best solution would be for the spaces on the opposite side of the road from numbers 1 to 9 to be shared use: free for 30 minutes, or free all day for resident permit holders.

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

Zenoria street cpz(east Dulwich cpz)

[overallresponse]

1. I wholly support

[response]

In fact hope eventually Saturday can be included as the health centre will have weekend opening

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

Zenoria street cpz(east Dulwich cpz)

[overallresponse]

1. I wholly support

[response]

In fact hope eventually Saturday can be included as the health centre will have weekend opening

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

East Dulwich area parking zone 'ED' by 17 October 2019

Not an objection but just to say we are delighted that there will potentially be a stop and rest spot in front of our house. As a household of cyclists who do not own a car, we supported this proposal on environmental grounds. There has been some chat re: street residents not being keen, or, wanting this relocated to the other side of the street. May I say that if it is located in front of our house, it will be in the sunshine, and, is welcome. I believe [REDACTED] is also in support - another non-car household keen to make changes for the environment and discourage car usage.

[overallresponse]

1. I wholly support

[response]

Not an objection but just to say we are DELIGHTED that there will potentially be a stop and rest spot in front of our house. As a household of cyclists who do not own a car, we supported this proposal on environmental grounds. There has been some chat re: street residents not being keen, or, wanting this relocated to the other side of the street. May I say that if it is located in front of our house, it will be in the sunshine, and, is welcome. I believe [REDACTED] is also in support - another non-car household keen to make changes for the environment and discourage car usage.

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking

[overallresponse]

1. I wholly support

[response]

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking

[overallresponse]

1. I wholly support

[response]

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking

[overallresponse]

1. I wholly support

[response]

I write on behalf of 'Clean Air for Dulwich', a local grassroots campaign working hard to raise awareness and bring about changes which will reduce air pollution in the area.

With regards to the East Dulwich parking zone, we are delighted with the proposals and wholly support them, with the recommended alterations below.

We support all-day hours of operation, but recommend the hours are amended to 8.00am-6.00pm, instead of 8.30am-6.30pm. Students at many of the local schools start the school day before 8.30am. This change is therefore very important as it aligns the hours of operation to the school day and will have the maximum impact in determining whether parents/carers continue to drive to the local schools or instead switch to 'active modes' or public transport.

We are pleased to see 'At Any Time' loading restrictions being added to double-yellow lines around all schools in the zone, which will prohibit vehicles waiting, including for the purposes of loading and unloading. With enforcement, these restrictions will deter parents from parking and waiting, often with the vehicle engine idling close to school entrances. We recommend these loading restrictions are also put in place on double-yellow lines around EDG Nursery at 31 East Dulwich Grove, with the rear entrance on Matham Grove. Additionally, we recommend they are installed on ALL double yellow lines on Hillsboro and Thorncombe Road as we have repeatedly seen parents parked, sometimes idling, on double yellow lines in all areas of these two roads when collecting children from the nearby school.

Many thanks,

 (on behalf of Clean Air for Dulwich)

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

reference 'TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking'

[overallresponse]

1. I wholly support

[response]

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

reference 'TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking'

[overallresponse]

1. I wholly support

[response]

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking

[overallresponse]

1. I wholly support

[response]

100000

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking'

[overallresponse]

1. I wholly support

[response]

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking

[overallresponse]

1. I wholly support

[response]

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

'TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking'

[overallresponse]

1. I wholly support

[response]

██████████

15 JULY 2004

A resident

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking

1. I wholly support

[response]

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

East Dulwich parking including Derwent Grove

[overallresponse]

1. I wholly support

[response]

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich Parking Zone

[overallresponse]

2. I support this proposal

[response]

I would like the council to consider extending CPZ to Chesterfield Grove by creating a two hour period in the middle of the day when non permit holders would not be able to park in the road. I am v worried about the knock on effect from CPZ being implemented in nearby roads. Commuters are already using the road to park for the whole day and this can only get worse once the CPZ is implemented.

I write on behalf of the Vale Residents' Association, which represents an area of around 300 households, of which 100 households are active members, comprising residents of Melbourne Grove (northern section), Jarvis Road, Derwent Grove, Elsie Road and Tintagel Crescent. This is our response to TMO1920-025 East Dulwich parking zone statutory consultation.

General points:

1. Timing - we request the hours of operation are brought forward slightly, from proposed 8.30am-6.30pm to 8.00am-6.00pm to discourage and reduce the number of parent's dropping children off at schools within the CPZ with a school day start time before 8.30am.
2. We are pleased to see 'At Any Time' loading restrictions around school entrances which will prohibit vehicles waiting, including for the purposes of loading or unloading. These would also be useful on the double-yellow lines around EDG nursery (car park entrance on Matham Grove).
3. Eligible addresses to apply for permits - we notice some newer developments included in the list of 'eligible addresses' which we believe are subject to a planning agreement restricting the grant of permits, please can these be checked - all flats above 18-22 Grove Vale, and all flats part of 72 Grove Vale.

Errors on map:

Melbourne Grove (North)

- a. at Jarvis Rd junction - double-yellow lines were extended earlier this year and are not shown as such in the drawings
- b. the disabled bay shown outside no 22 is incorrect, should be no 26

Derwent Grove


- a. the disabled bay outside no 11 on the map is no longer used by the resident it was installed for.
- b. there is a permit and paid bay outside no's 19/21 Derwent. These bays would probably be better placed at the end of the road (eg nearer to shops) and additionally this specific section of road is actually a marked disabled bay which is missing from the plan
- c. there are double yellow lines outside no 42 Derwent. There is no driveway or gate there so this is an error and should be removed.

Street specific comments:

Melbourne Grove (North) - we are pleased to see double-yellow lines extended to 10m at junction with ED Grove, this is much needed to improve sightlines for pedestrians at this busy junction.

Derwent Grove - the 4 proposed 'Stop & Rest' locations for Derwent Grove have been added in without proper consultation and we believe no further public consultation will happen once the TMO is granted. There are concerns from many residents that even with single seating options this could lead to anti-social behaviour, especially noise nuisance at night which policing in this area will not have capacity to deal with. Alternative opportunities to make the street more pedestrian-friendly would be welcomed, such as build outs with planting to calm traffic.

Elsie Road – we note the letter submitted separately from many residents on Elsie Rd requesting single-yellow instead of double-yellow lines across driveways, and whether there is any additional scope to increase number of spaces between dropped kerbs (acknowledging the 7 additional added to the design since the original consultation).

Many thanks 

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

The London Borough of Southwark (Parking places) (Parking zone 'ED') (No. *)
Order 201*

[overallresponse]

2. I support this proposal

[response]

I live on Nutfield Road. Parking is always difficult (usually from 9-6 Monday-Saturday), sometimes requiring a wait of 30 minutes; more often finding parking places in adjacent streets.

I note that Nutfield Road was one of the few that changed its view when asked to consider the impact of a parking zone being implemented on an adjoining street. I'm not sure how many of the respondents have cars, but that change reflects the very real difficulties that we face. Parking zones the Melbourne Grove and West Peckham areas will make a bad situation substantially worse.

I have no doubt that the ambivalence is due in part to a desire that the much valued local business should not be harmed by the scheme, so I would ask you to consider including Nutfield Road (and perhaps some of the adjacent roads) in a limited extension to the Melbourne Grove Zone, perhaps including only one side of the street, or having a limited number of permit-only bays, and then only during business hours. It seems to me that this would strike a fair balance between the needs of the car-owning residents, visitors and local businesses.

Dear Joanna

**PARKING – ROAD TRAFFIC & HIGHWAY SCHEMES – RESPONDING TO STATUTORY
CONSULTATION NOTICE REF: 1920-025 E DULWICH**

I welcome the opportunity to comment on the statutory consultation on the proposals for the East Dulwich Area Parking Zone "ED" under TMO 1920-025 E Dulwich.

I fully support an all day CPZ on Monday through Fridays as proposed and would seek consideration of the points below in respect of the implementation within Tell Grove. In doing so I would highlight that the specific proposals for Tell Grove, 'map 1' excludes the 'Cycle Hanger' situated midway on the west side of Tell Grove close to East Dulwich Grove. This has had the effect of removing 2 parking spaces and has been ignored by the planners who classify it on the map as a parking place.

Tell Grove is a short street of less than 25 houses with a tight 90° corner in the middle. It has suffered from commuters using it as free parking for East Dulwich station for several years and more recently by teachers from The Charter School. Pressure will only increase as the Dulwich Community Hospital comes on stream. Tell Grove overwhelmingly supported the introduction of a CPZ. However, to achieve the reduced CO2 levels the Council intend, which are fully supported, a CPZ needs to be carefully designed taking account of the needs and design of individual streets.

For Tell Grove:

1. **Bringing forward the timing of the CPZ by just 30 minutes to 8.00am through 6.00pm on Monday to Friday will remove the likelihood of parking on Tell Grove from either the Charter School or Dulwich Community Hospital.**
- 2.
3. **Tell Grove is a wholly inappropriate street for 'stop and rest' for these reasons:**
 - The houses in Tell Grove are late Victorian predominantly terraced where over 60% have front doors that open directly onto a narrow pavement.
 - Only 8 houses on Tell Grove have front gardens and even these are less than 6 feet deep. In such circumstance 'stop and rest' is an intrusion on residents private space.
 - The street is occupied by many families with young children of both school and pre-school age. Foxes are a continual problem where in addition to the very real dangers to children of fox excrement on streets and pavements, residents have had to chase foxes from out of their houses.
 - Any additional litter or waste from discarded 'take aways' which have been common occurrences around 'stop and rest' elsewhere will only make the fox situation worse to the detriment of all residents.
 - The technical guidance ('Manual for Streets') produced by the Department of Transport in conjunction with the Department of Communities and Local

Government focusing on lightly-trafficked residential streets recommends detailed impact assessments and community impacted support stating: "seating should be considered where people congregate" and "seating can attract anti-social behaviour and therefore should be located where there is good lighting and natural surveillance." None of these conditions are met by the Tell Grove proposal for 'stop and rest'.

In the event that the Council is intent on introducing a 'stop and rest' for Tell Grove, it should only be implemented after a full impact assessment and be located outside the Church on the north side of Tell Grove close to the junction with Melbourne Grove. This will ensure no intrusion on any resident and meet the criteria for street seating in accordance with 'Manual for Streets' 10.2.2 and 10.2.3.

The proposal for double yellow lines on the inside of the 90° corner in the middle of Tell Grove will meet the concerns of the dustbin men whose lorries have been stopped from cornering as a result of bad parking.

The proposal for double yellow lines on the outside of the 90° corner in the middle of Tell Grove is unnecessary. It will not impact any vehicle turning the corner and may lead to cars driving at higher speed down Tell Grove. It will also remove at least 3 parking spaces and importantly increase the likelihood that Tell Grove will become a 'rat run' between East Dulwich Grove and Melbourne Grove

The introduction of a CPZ offers the opportunity to radically change the parking and road usage of those streets within the zone. It is important that the CPZ changes driver behaviour removing the current incessant speculative parking throughout the day on Monday to Friday and does not lead to Tell Grove becoming a short cut between East Dulwich Grove and Melbourne Grove. Most importantly it must lead to improved air quality and reduced CO2 in Tell Grove and the other streets within the zone.

[Redacted signature]

Director

PRC

~~Mobile: 01753 622000~~

[Redacted]		[Redacted]	[Redacted]
[Redacted]		[Redacted]	[Redacted]



[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025

[overallresponse]

2. I support this proposal

[response]

The proposed CPZ will result in significant additional non-resident parking on streets not included in the CPZ in particular Chesterfield grove (CG) due to its close location to lordship lane and Marks and Spencer's in particular. it is already very difficult to park in CG during weekdays and Saturdays (especially when Marks and Spencer's open) and families frequently have to park on other distant streets. The CPZ will disproportionately negatively affect CG making parking here even more difficult which will reduce the quality of life living in this street. If a CPZ is implemented then it should affect surrounding streets equally. Also Resident opinions were not canvassed on the basis of the now proposed CPZ boundaries and so the impact of a CPZ close to a non-CPZ was more difficult to estimate. The timing of when the CPZ occurs should be the same as the ED station proposed times. A repeat review of resident opinions should be sought. I note that a collection of residents opinions on CG has been compiled and submitted and these should be taken into account. A final decision should not be based on the number of eform submissions as people are less likely to use this approach thereby underestimating the number of people who disagree with the proposals.

Overall I and my partner who also lives at this address fully support a CPZ but only if it includes Chesterfield grove

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking

[overallresponse]

2. I support this proposal

[response]

I am supportive of the CPZ in East Dulwich but as a resident of Melbourne Grove South near Tell and Ashbourne Groves - I would like the CPZ boundary extended to include the whole of Melbourne Grove.

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

H CPZ

[overallresponse]

2. I support this proposal

[response]

My wife and I live and park in Dalkeith Road and will suffer increased difficulty parking due to the LACK of restrictions. We would ask for you to consider controlled zone parking being extended out to the South Circular . This would dramatically reduce people driving into this area, parking free for the day and going into London on public transport, it fits with the ULEZ roll out next year and supports people like us who live and work in SOUTHWARK and Lambeth . It would force commuters onto public transport outside the south circular and reduce pollution and congestion. Thank you

PARKING – ROAD TRAFFIC & HIGHWAY SCHEMES – RESPONDING TO STATUTORY CONSULTATION
NOTICE REF: 1920-025 E DULWICH

I welcome the opportunity to comment on the statutory consultation on the proposals for the East Dulwich Area Parking Zone “ED” under TMO 1920-025 E Dulwich.

I fully support an all day CPZ on Monday through Fridays as proposed and would seek consideration of the points below in respect of the implementation within Tell Grove. In doing so I would highlight that the specific proposals for Tell Grove, ‘map 1’ excludes the ‘Cycle Hanger’ situated midway on the west side of Tell Grove close to East Dulwich Grove. This has had the effect of removing 2 parking spaces and has been ignored by the planners who classify it on the map as a parking place.

Tell Grove is a short street of less than 25 houses with a tight 90° corner in the middle. It has suffered from commuters using it as free parking for East Dulwich station for several years and more recently by teachers from The Charter School. Pressure will only increase as the Dulwich Community Hospital comes on stream. Tell Grove overwhelmingly supported the introduction of a CPZ. However, to achieve the reduced CO2 levels the Council intend, which are fully supported, a CPZ needs to be carefully designed taking account of the needs and design of individual streets.

For Tell Grove:

1. Bringing forward the timing of the CPZ by just 30 minutes to 8.00am through 6.00pm on Monday to Friday will remove the likelihood of parking on Tell Grove from either the Charter School or Dulwich Community Hospital.
2. Tell Grove is a wholly inappropriate street for ‘stop and rest’ for these reasons:
 - The houses in Tell Grove are late Victorian predominantly terraced where over 60% have front doors that open directly onto a narrow pavement.
 - Only 8 houses on Tell Grove have front gardens and even these are less than 6 feet deep. In such circumstance ‘stop and rest’ is an intrusion on residents private space.

- The street is occupied by many families with young children of both school and pre-school age. Foxes are a continual problem where in addition to the very real dangers to children of fox excrement on streets and pavements, residents have had to chase foxes from out of their houses.

- Any additional litter or waste from discarded 'take aways' which have been common occurrences around 'stop and rest' elsewhere will only make the fox situation worse to the detriment of all residents.

- The technical guidance ('Manual for Streets') produced by the Department of Transport in conjunction with the Department of Communities and Local Government focusing on lightly-trafficked residential streets recommends detailed impact assessments and community impacted support stating: "seating should be considered where people congregate" and "seating can attract anti-social behaviour and therefore should be located where there is good lighting and natural surveillance." None of these conditions are met by the Tell Grove proposal for 'stop and rest'.

- In the event that the Council is intent on introducing a 'stop and rest' for Tell Grove, it should only be implemented after a full impact assessment and be located outside the Church on the north side of Tell Grove close to the junction with Melbourne Grove. This will ensure no intrusion on any resident and meet the criteria for street seating in accordance with 'Manual for Streets' 10.2.2 and 10.2.3.

The proposal for double yellow lines on the inside of the 90° corner in the middle of Tell Grove will meet the concerns of the dustbin men whose lorries have been stopped from cornering as a result of bad parking.

The proposal for double yellow lines on the outside of the 90° corner in the middle of Tell Grove is unnecessary. It will not impact any vehicle turning the corner and may lead to cars driving at higher speed down Tell Grove. It will also remove at least 3 parking spaces and importantly increase the likelihood that Tell Grove will become a 'rat run' between East Dulwich Grove and Melbourne Grove

The introduction of a CPZ offers the opportunity to radically change the parking and road usage of those streets within the zone. It is important that the CPZ changes driver behaviour removing the current incessant speculative parking throughout the day on Monday to Friday and does not lead to Tell Grove becoming a short cut between East Dulwich Grove and Melbourne Grove.

Most importantly it must lead to improved air quality and reduced CO2 in Tell Grove and the other streets within the zone.

Sincerely

[REDACTED]
Tell Grove

[REDACTED]

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

'TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone'

[overallresponse]

2. I support this proposal

[response]

Elsie Road needs:

- more sleeping policemen
- 2 stretches of narrow street to slow down cars, this can be done by widening pavement or by having very large plant pots on both edge of the street.

Also, parking permit fees should be linked to the car size and engine.

[Title]

[Redacted]

[Firstname]

[Redacted]

[Lastname]

[Redacted]

[Telephone_number]

[Redacted]

[Email_address]

[Redacted]

[Areyou]

A stakeholder group

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

66% of residents in Chesterfield Grove, SE22, object to this proposal on the grounds that it will make parking in our street WORSE than it has ever been, due to displacement of parking by commuters, residents, their visitors and suppliers, and shoppers from all the adjacent roads which are proposed to have CPZ.

In particular we are concerned about the effect on those most vulnerable and in need of car transport but who may not have a disabled parking space, e.g. disabled gentleman, a number of elderly residents.

Residents whose opinions have been collected have in the majority opted to ask the council for a CPZ of 2 hrs per day only (like Herne Hill) as their first preference; as a second preference to have a CPZ as proposed in adjacent streets, i.e. 8.30-6.30 Mon-Fri.

As I cannot upload documents here, I am emailing all the signatures with details to traffic.order@southwark.gov.uk separately.

Please note I am merely the channel of communication from the residents, not some official representative - the forms emailed contain almost all email addresses, so you can correspond with them directly if you wish.

round and round to find these free parking spots for the times of which they need to momentarily park their car.

3) Objection is made on the grounds that there has been a mislay of information/thoughts: It was originally noted from dialogue in meetings with members of Southwark and EDIBA that assumptions had been drawn that cars were driving into the area and then parking around East Dulwich Grove and surrounding roads, with their drivers walking to the East Dulwich station and then commuting into the city to go to work. – our nursery's investigation on a day into this, shows that those walking out of a train from central London arriving in East Dulwich from 5:15-6:35pm that are walking to a car to drive home further are none.

An envisioned solution to the problems above would of been to leave the stresses that we have experienced over the last few years, spread over the whole of Dulwich as they have been all these years - without the CPZ, rather than the plans that will front load to the east side of Lordship Lane where a greater number of cars will now be looking for a parking spaces in this area and in turn make these residents frustrated.

Unless, the CPZ campaign is part, financially focused and driven, then a suggestion would maybe consider parking restrictions that are just for 2 hours a day in the middle of the day say between 12-2pm or 10am-12pm to prevent anyone parking and travelling up to the city to work also for 'the (whole) day'.

It is totally understood if there are disgruntled residents on Matham Grove, Tell Grove or Elsie Road as one would feel the same if they were looking from their stance and struggling to find a parking space to their property in proximity, but we feel based on the proposed plans, that the council may not be thinking too much of the areas of E.Dulwich that are not greatly affected at the moment on the dense parking demand - and will instead bring pressure and frustration that may amount in the future to these areas.

overwhelmingly positive with many people reporting longer stays and more spend in town. The Council also reported that interest in letting units was on the increase.

32. The Portas Review made the recommendation that:

9. Local areas should implement free controlled parking schemes that work for their town centres and we should have a new parking league table.

33. The proposed Order seeks to do the opposite of what the Portas Review recommends. Rather than making car parking easier, it is making it harder.

34. While we understand that there are powerful reasons both of public health and environmental protection in promoting walking and cycling, such goals need to be balanced against the harm caused to the high street. Such measures need to be proportionate and choose means that are the least harmful.

35. The Council's Report to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and the Climate Emergency, authored by the Director of Environment, ('DoE Report') of 23rd July 2019, which provides reasons for the Decision, relies on two arguments to address the detrimental effects on the high street.

36. First, the DoE Report suggests that there is a 'large body of international and national evidence that 'traders routinely overestimate the importance of car drivers and passengers to trade'. The report, however, cites no such evidence.

37. The comparison with international or national examples is entirely inappropriate.. East Dulwich is part of London's complex and highly competitive commercial environment, where the pressures against the high street are well documented, as we described above. Each location depends on the way it relates with the areas that surround it. Local conditions are paramount.

38. Second, the DoE Report suggests that:

'TfL has produced an evidence base on this for London, references to which were provided with the consultation material and a 2015 high street study conducted by Southbank University found that 22% of visitors drove to Lordship Lane. A recent survey conducted by the council in March 2019 found that an even smaller proportion of visitors to Lordship Lane and North Cross Road drove or used a taxi: 4% in the week and 9% at the weekend'.

39. None of these provide good reasons to disregard the effects on the high street. The Southbank University report entitled 'Southwark High Streets', on which the Council has relied in order to give the figure of 22% of visitors to Lordship Lane travelling by car, is not reliable. Its methodology involved just two days of observation, Tuesday and Saturday, in the same week in February 2015. It was not done by a commercial research company, but by a team of undergraduate students under the guidance of a university lecturer.

40. The purpose of this study was to compare eight separate high streets locations in Southwark, which were all assessed at the same time. It was not to study Lordship Lane in any depth. The 'Southwark High Streets' Report itself, in a section entitled 'Summary and Overview of Findings', states that the results are not

26. Visitors will be required to pay parking charges (where applicable) in respect of vehicles left in selected 'stop and shop' parking places and 'shared-use' parking places at a rate of £3.25 per hour (diesel fuelled), or £2.75 per hour (non –diesel fuelled). The available spaces will be far fewer than are currently available.

27. Potential shoppers to the high street will therefore be disadvantaged in three ways.

a. First, those who arrive by car from outside the area may be unable to find any available space in the limited number of 'stop and shop' parking places and 'shared-use' parking places. The possibility of not finding such spaces may be sufficient for them not to attempt the journey, preferring out of town shops with free parking. There is no underground or other organised car park in East Dulwich.

b. Second, even if such spaces were available, shoppers may find the parking costs too expensive, compared to free parking in shopping centres only a few minutes away.

c. Third, drivers may be unable to find available parking in the areas outside the designated CPZ, as a result of the displacement of parking from that zone to the nearby areas of free parking (something accepted by the Council's DoE Report at par. 54). Moreover, as a result of this displacement it is very likely that the CPZ will in due course be thus extended to cover the whole area of East Dulwich, which was in any event the Council's original intention.

28 The report 'Re-Think! Parking on the High Street: Guidance on Parking Provision in Town and City Centres' by Ojay McDonald (London: Association of Town & City Management, 2013) found that locations with a greater number car parking spaces are more prosperous.

29 It concluded that there is a clear relationship between the quantity of car parking and footfall. It said (p. 23) :

'Towns with higher footfall (and therefore a higher spend and better quality of offer) have more parking spaces...'

30 The government backed 'Portas Review: An independent review into the future of our high streets', which was published in 2011, concluded that parking considerations were a major reason for the loss of business in the high street. The Portas Review said that:

'to go head to head with the out-of-town offering, high streets need to have a more flexible, well communicated parking offer.'

31 The Portas Review cited approvingly the case of Swindon as follows:

Case study: Changes to car parking charges in Swindon In response to a concern from retailers, the Council took decisive action and reduced short stay car parking charges in the three premium rate 'pay on foot' multi-storey car parks and all car parks in Old Town for a fixed period of time. The revised charging structure encouraged a four hour stay. Feedback from both retailers and customers was

secure: 'In aggregate however the data presents a reasonably close representation of the Southwark demographic, which in any case may be biased by time of day, and day of week on any particular high street' (p. 3).

41. In any event the figure of 22% is significant in itself. If half of those shoppers failed to turn up, the effect on profitability margins could be catastrophic for many shops and businesses.

42. The DoE Report also mentions a 'recent survey' that was conducted in March 2019. This is wholly unknown to the Association. Had it been a reliable survey the Council would have shared it with others and published it.

43. In any event, it is highly unfair and undermines the whole statutory consultation for the Council to rely on research that is not publically available.

44. Finally, the Decision refers to 'evidence base' provided by TfL. It is not made clear what this evidence is. It is possibly the document 'Mayor's Transport Strategy: Supporting Evidence Outcomes Summary Report' (July 2017). There is no reference there to East Dulwich or Lordship Lane.

45. It is also possible that the reference is to TfL's document 'Walking and Cycling: the Economic Benefits'. Indeed this was referred to in the first consultation letter of 08 January 2019, by Joanna Lesak, Project Manager.

We expect the zone would result in a reduction in commuter parking, based on experience with other zones, which would provide space for improving the environment and encourage walking and cycling. This would have benefits for the high street and wider economy, as research has shown in other places (<http://content.tfl.gov.uk/walking-cycling-economic-benefits-summary-pack.pdf>).

46. Nevertheless, this document lends no support to the Council. It outlines the benefits for high streets once shoppers have chosen to get there on foot or by bicycle.

47. Yet, the TfL paper does not address the question whether reducing the availability of parking leads shoppers to walk or cycle. Common sense tells us that it is perhaps more likely that they will just choose to drive elsewhere, for example to a shopping centre with free parking.

48. The question, therefore, is not whether walking and cycling are beneficial. There is no question that they are. The question is whether a number of current shoppers on Lordship Lane will switch to cycling or walking to Lordship Lane, once car use becomes more unattractive there – while it remains highly attractive in out of town shops. There is absolutely no evidence that such shoppers are likely to abandon the car. In fact, all the evidence points to the opposite direction.

49. Southwark's own 'Evidence Base Report', which was published in May 2019, after the original round of consultation regarding East Dulwich had been completed, provides ample evidence in support of the common sense conclusion that some shoppers will abandon Lordship Lane in case parking becomes more difficult (see

Southwark Council, 'Movement Strategy: Evidence Base Report' (May 2019). The Evidence Base makes it transparent that East Dulwich has poor public transport connections, compared to other places within Southwark:

50. The Evidence Base also shows that in the area around East Dulwich, bus connections are particularly unattractive, so that buses are not going to be a ready substitute for car use. Propensity to use buses is lower than the London average in the immediate area.

51. This general picture is consistent with anecdotal evidence about the effect of similar controlled parking zones in nearby places.

52. The reality is that East Dulwich benefits from a fragile micro-economy. Lordship lane is largely made up of small, independent businesses, most of which do not have deep pockets and cannot call on reserves in the event of a downturn. The council's assertion that the CPZ won't have a direct impact on business contradicts our daily experience. It took almost 20 years following the arrival of a superstore on Dog Kennel Hill for the lane to recover to where it is now.

53. The success of East Dulwich is reflected in the Evidence Base, which confirms that Lordship Lane is a very significant centre of city life with great social value. In the terminology chosen by TfL it is a 'city hub', one of few such places in Southwark. The classification is based on extensive research by TfL, which divided up London streets into nine categories, from 'core road' to 'city place' (see attached table). The development of Street Types involved more than 400 experts from TfL, the GLA and London's boroughs.

54. Our Association has spoken to retailers along Grove Vale about the impact of the recently implemented CPZ in Dog Kennel Hill, on Champion Hill. They have told us that the immediate loss of footfall has seen business fall by 30% in a matter of weeks.

55. The Council has provided no detailed analysis and no cogent reasons to challenge these common sense assumptions about the likely effects of new parking restrictions, based on unequivocal findings of extensive research on the British high street.

56. The common sense argument that follows from this evidence is simple. Because East Dulwich is an area poorly served by public transport and because the nearest tube station is not within walking distance, many of the high street's customers that arrive by car from nearby boroughs will simply stop coming to Lordship Lane. This is because there is no underground car park and bus connections are inconvenient.

57. Introducing a Car Parking Zone from 8.30 in the morning to 6.30 in the evening will create a significant disincentive in many of those customers who already use a car to go to East Dulwich, even if some bays will be made available for their use. Their most likely reaction is not to abandon their cars, but to abandon Lordship Lane.

58. Given the size of some of the independent shops on Lordship Lane, with very small margins of profitability and little in the way of reserves, even a small reduction in revenue, may prove fatal for them.

59. These concerns have not been examined in any detail by the Council. None of the evidence relied upon above features in the Council's reasons.

60. Given the significance of the area not just to Southwark but to London as a whole, there must be robust evidence to show that the impact on local businesses has been properly considered and will not be severe. The Council has failed to provide any such evidence.

UNCERTAIN POSITIVE IMPACT

61. The Council believes that there will be some positive impacts as a result of the proposed CPZ. Yet, it does not explain in any detail how they will come about.

62. If there are any such effects, they are highly uncertain, even according to the Council's own account. It would be wrong, though to proceed with such a harmful measure, merely on the basis of speculative assumptions and in the absence of detailed studies about ends and means.

63. The DoE Report does not specify what exactly the aims of the scheme are. It refers to the Council's general aims in its 'Movement Strategy' which are the following:

Action 7: Reduce the number of cars owned in the borough Action 8: Use kerbside efficiently and promote less polluting vehicles Action 9: Manage traffic to reduce the demand on our streets Action 12: Movement to, within and from town centres is easy, safe and accessible for all Action 13: Make town centres attractive, thriving and diverse places for people and businesses Action 15: Reduce exposure to air pollution

64. We accept that the proposed CPZ will reduce demand for parking in the relevant streets. Nevertheless, commuter parking will likely be displaced to the nearby areas so it is unclear how Action 9 will be met.

65. The Report does not explain, however, how any of the other aims are to be achieved through the scheme. If transport links are poor, residents are not going to abandon their cars.

66. Since the Council has not commissioned a dedicated study on these matters. It is highly uncertain whether the CPZ will reduce pollution or congestion, or if it will have any effect on traffic or car ownership. In any event, the Ultra Low Emissions Zone (ULEZ) is being brought in to reduce air pollution.

A CPZ HAS BEEN OVERWHELMING REJECTED BY EAST DULWICH

67. The Council is ignoring the overwhelming rejection of the Order by the residents and businesses in East Dulwich.

68. The Final Consultation Report shows that the rejection of the CPZ has been overwhelming. The Report states:

‘The overall response for the whole study area showed the majority of those who responded (69%) were against, 25% in favour of, and 6% were undecided about a parking zone in their street. Results were very similar when excluding visitors to the area (68%, 25% and 7%).’

69. The Final Consultation Report also record the opposition of businesses: The vast majority (91%) of the 98 businesses that responded were against the zone which reflects the sentiment expressed in two business meetings in which traders voiced concerns about impact on footfall, the cost of business permits and workers not being able to park. Traders also raised the concern that if only a section of the study area was to be implemented, that this would cause parking displacement on surrounding roads and the zone would eventually be expanded.

70. The Report also states that the numbers do not change significantly when one is asked if they would support if there was a CPZ in an adjacent street. Supports climbs to 37% as opposed to 25% and opposition fall to 61%, from 68%.

71. Nevertheless, the DoE report chooses to focus instead on the responses received from the streets located within the proposed CPZ. The figures given there are as follows:

72. It is obvious, however, that the effect of a controlled parking zone will be felt throughout East Dulwich, through displacement parking and through the effects on the high street as shown above. Moreover, given the likely displacement parking, the most obvious next step would be to extend the CPZ throughout the original area.

73. In effect, the Council proposes to give effect to the views of 447 residents, by ignoring the views of more than 2,200 residents on the same issue.

NO REASONS FOR REJECTING THE RECOMMENDATION

75. The DoE Report offered detailed reasons –which our Association finds in any event inadequate – in support of a two hour parking restriction from Monday to Friday, not a whole day restriction. The DoE Report stated unequivocally that the ‘two hour parking zone restrictions are considered adequate and operationally sound’. Nevertheless, the Member’s Decisions departed from the recommendation, proposing a whole day restriction, a much more burdensome scheme for local businesses. He did not offer any cogent reasons addressing the question why the more burdensome scheme was necessary or proportionate.

76 The DoE Report dismissed any concerns there were about parking around the hospital by saying that 'a post implementation review in 2018 of North Dulwich and Denmark Hill zone (P) found that the majority of respondents were satisfied with the two hour zone operation despite the zone being close to major NHS medical services....'. It also noted that two hour zones were not 'systematically abused' by commuters.

77 Nevertheless, the Cabinet Member rejected this argument without reasons. He said that 'more weight' should be given to the reasons concerning the station, hospital and school.

78 He offers no reasons for this assessment, even though he acknowledged that 'these points regarding the hours of operation relating to the station, hospital and school are covered in the report'.

79 The Cabinet Member correctly does not endorse the statement that the Dulwich Community Council with 'asked' an all day CPZ, as suggested by the representation by Councillor McAsh, which the Cabinet Member otherwise appears to accept. The Community Council has no decision-making powers on these matters. For this reason, for example, no minutes have been published regarding the meeting of 27 April 2019.

THE ROAD TRAFFIC REGULATION ACT 1984

80. The aim of reducing car ownership or of encouraging cycling, which appear to be the dominant reasons for the Council are not aims that can be lawfully pursued through a Traffic Regulation Order, under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (the '1984 Act').

81. Under s. 1(1) of the 1984 Act a TRO must serve one of the following purposes: (a) avoiding danger, (b) for preventing damage to the road or to any building on or near the road, (c) facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians), (d) preventing the use of the road by vehicular traffic, (e) preserving the character of the road in a case where it is specially suitable for use by persons on horseback or on foot, (f) preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs or (g) for air quality.

82. Encouraging a healthy life style is something we wholeheartedly support but it is not something that can be lawfully pursued through the 1984 Act.

83. In addition, s. 122(2)(b) of the 1984 Act requires a local authority to exercise its functions under the act to ensure that it would secure expeditious, convenient and safe movement of 'vehicular and other traffic', having regard 'to the effect on the amenities of any locality affected'. By failing to commission professional studies on the effects of the proposed Order to the local shops and businesses, the council has failed to comply with this statutory duty.

Conclusions

84. East Dulwich has a vibrant high street in Lordship Lane, which is currently being threatened by increasing rent costs as well as changing consumer behavior, increasing online shopping and out of town shopping opportunities.

85. Only last Monday, the British Retail Consortium (BRC) and the Springboard data company released research which shows that the number of shoppers heading to UK high streets, retail parks and shopping centres has fallen by 10% in the last seven years. The latest research shows the trend was echoed in September, when retailers came under renewed pressure after heavy rainfall and Brexit worries kept consumers away. Retail footfall dropped 1.7% last month compared with the same month last year, and 1.6% on a three-month basis.

86. In this challenging commercial environment, even a small increase in parking costs to potential shoppers, such as the one being proposed by this TRO, may cause a significant shock.

87. The Council has failed to take into account the harmful consequences of the proposed Order on the high street. Even a small reduction in revenue, will be sufficient to make them unviable. The loss of a vibrant High Street will be a huge loss for East Dulwich and London as a whole.

88. For all these reasons we wholly oppose this Order.

89. Given the significance of this matter, in the event you are not able to agree with us and withdraw the proposal, we believe that the matter should be referred to a public inquiry.

Yours sincerely,



For and on behalf of the East Dulwich Independent Businesses Association

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

Controlled parking is a self defeating effort as all it does is cause displacement of cars and traffic to the next available streets and the whole process starts again lining only the pockets of the council. I strongly disagree with its introduction as it will detrimentally affect all surrounding streets in the area.

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

Unfair continuation of the CPZ proposal after the majority of the vote of 69% of the people are against this.

An all day, 6 day per week CPZ is too harsh and not voted for.

Green incentives have not been brought in such as removal of disused bays, more electric car charging ports, more bike stands are needed as there are very few in the area and needed near the station.

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A visitor

[Whichconsultation]

'TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone'

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

I Wholly Object To This Proposal. In our collective submission we can then add that should a CPZ be imposed it should be for a 2hr restriction only.

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A business

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone'

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

I Wholly Object To This Proposal. In our collective submission we can then add that should a CPZ be imposed it should be for a 2hr restriction only.

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A business

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

There was a democratic vote. These proposals go directly against the outcome.

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

There was a democratic process that found the residents of East Dulwich categorically rejected the in whole the implementation of a CPZ. Changing this to "well this street and this street wanted it" is akin to letting some parts of the UK remain in the EU after a national referendum saying leave! Outrageous! By adding CPZs to large swathes of ED you are effectively pushing the problem onto the streets that dont have it. (and, surprise surprise, a few years later those residents then want it and you get your way after all!)

[Title]



[Firstname]



[Lastname]



[Telephone_number]



[Email_address]



[Areyou]

A business

[Whichconsultation]

'TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone
Grove Vale and surrounding streets

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

As a healthcare provider in the area immediately affected by the proposed 08:30 - 18:30 CPZ I feel that as there was an overall objection to a CPZ by 68% of residents, that the council does not have a mandate to impose this proposal. I have heard the area 'Peckham West' has a 2 hour restriction proposed and it seems punitive to residents, businesses and visitors to impose such a long restriction within such close proximity. As a primary healthcare provider I feel the current proposal for East Dulwich area will make access to our services, (and also the others businesses in the area that the community relies on), very difficult, and, in some cases of patients in acute pain, impossible as they are sometimes unable to walk, cycle or take public transport. This is especially true for some of our patients over the age of 65 as we provide a heavily discounted and therefore affordable clinic for this demographic within the local community and some of these patients are only able to access the clinic by car. Of course overall the proposal will affect our viability as a business that has been established in the area for over 20 years. The proposed cost of a parking permit for businesses seems punitive, increasing the already heavy burden of expenses incurred by traders in the area. Regarding the subject of air pollution, and its affect on children in particular given there are 2 schools within the proposed CPZ area, the controls will make no difference to this as most of the air pollution is caused by moving traffic on main and side roads roads who do not intend to stop which will remain unchanged, and by slow moving cars who may now be moving more slowly whilst they look, and potentially wait for a limited number of free and paid for parking bays.

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

The proposed CPZ will discourage customers from outside the area to come to East Dulwich to shop and eat.

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■-■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A business

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone'

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

East Dulwich is a destination for many visitors and these proposals will seriously harm the shops in the area as visitors are deterred with no where to park. There is no need for an all day parking restriction to deter commuters from parking their cars. A one or two hour window solves this problem whilst leaving space for genuine visitors to the area who will bring much needed business to the shops and restaurants in already very tough times

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A business

[Whichconsultation]

TMO 1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

The proposals will severely restrict parking for business and customers.

The proposals will reduce business and trade in the area.

It will impose a financial burden on business in the area.

I am writing to object to the plans for the CPZ in East Dulwich.

I do not believe that this proposal to charge people to park in a residential area will prevent pollution, it will increase it as people drive around the area looking for parking spaces.

It will also make the streets outside the parking zone more congested and harder to park on, which defies the 'purpose' of Southwarks proposal.

This is unfair on all of the other residents in East Dulwich and is not wanted by the majority of residents or businesses.

This is a scandal and is being implemented against the will of the majority of residents.

[REDACTED]

~~2020-05-10 10:00:00~~

~~2020-05-10 10:00:00~~

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

There is currently no need for this zone to be implemented and the money spent to install the required infrastructure should be spent on other methods of reducing petrol/diesel car usage such as installing electric charging points and encouraging residents to trade in vehicles for hybrid/electric vehicles.

The CPZ will create hostility between road users and residents, businesses and the council. The implementation of a small area will push any congestion to another area, eventually resulting in the CPZ expansion.

In my opinion the council should not have control over every parking space in the borough - which is the way things seem to be going - but should be investing this time, energy and money in far more important things.

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A business

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

PWC recently did a survey saying that 16 high street shops close every day. An all day CPZ in East Dulwich will mean many more businesses in the area will close. You are directly contributing to the death of the high street if you introduce these. You will put people OUT OF BUSINESS and I and many others will no longer be able to provide jobs for local people.

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A business

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

This CPZ will be detrimental to the success of our high st and I believe the presented evidence for other enforced CPZ s was not comparable to our unique high st that customers travel to from far and wide.

[REDACTED]

A business

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone

5. I wholly object to

Controlled parking will be very detrimental to our business. Please don't destroy our small business

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone'

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

There is no legal fact or basis that suggests that you need to make the CPZ for a whole day. This is clearly a money making exercise and you have no concern for the your responsibility to protect the local businesses and highsteet.

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A business

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone'

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

you will kill our business and the high street

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone'

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

You will kill our lovely high street. A CPZ is not necessary and has only been asked for by a small minority. If you are to pursue this you should only be doing the 2 hours and not the full day as Livingstone seems set on.

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A business

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

It s detrimental to my business and the other businesses on the lane. You will have no high streets left if you continue to do things like this to us. It's heart breaking.

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A business

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

Adverse affect on parking, and customer access. We have traded here for over 40 years and the high street is struggling enough with internet business, which in tern creates an excess of delivery vehicle!

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A business

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

The CPZ will be very detrimental to the staff and clients of The Neighbourhood Vet.

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A visitor

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025

E Dulwich parking zone

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

I visit the area daily as I take care for my disabled mum who lives in east Dulwich.

I also work 2 days a week on lordship Lane.

This will make coming to the area and working in the area extremely difficult and expensive.

My mother was forced into retirement due to bad health and would not be able to afford the extra costs of parking.

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A business

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

The proposal is trying to solve a problem that does not exist. The CPZ will be the root cause of the demise of many businesses in the area, we may not see this effect immediately, we will likely see many business owners and employees struggle and suffer for some time before eventually collapsing, meanwhile the council line their pockets with permits purchased by residents that will never ensure that they have better/more available parking than they do now. Residents are told that they can purchase more than one permit for each property, that's nice, where are the council getting all these extra parking spaces from?

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A business

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

Hello, 69 % of people voted against the CPZ which is a majority democratic vote against this scheme. All day 6 days per week as a CPZ was not asked for and would be devastating to the shopping and business area. Ten thousand people signed a petition again this scheme.

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone'

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

I think a two hour restriction is enough as any more will harm our High Street !!

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

<https://www.southwark.gov.uk/assets/attach/10536/East-Dulwich-area-parking-zone-ED-notice-dated-19-Sept-2019-.pdf>

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

It will be bad for local businesses

Dear Sirs,

I write in connection with the statutory consultation notice referenced above.

As a representative of a local employer, I would like to register our objection to the proposed introduction of the Controlled Parking Zones in local streets. With over 400 staff on our payroll, Alleyn's School is a medium sized organisation which inevitably requires support from a wide range of external businesses, suppliers, contracted support services etc.

The grounds of the objection are as follows:

- Vehicles needed by tradespeople and contractors will be unable to park in the side streets close to the school to carry out their legitimate business. Many cannot perform their function without a vehicle, so attending site by other means is not an option. A significant proportion of these service providers may be on site for several hours. The proposed CPZ hours of 8.30 – 18.30 seem therefore unnecessarily punitive; cannot the aim of preventing commuter parking be achieved equally by the introduction of a much shorter CPZ operation of, say, 2 hours in the middle of a day?
- It seems probable that local streets that do not have CPZs introduced, will become more intensively parked than at present by some of those displaced from the East Dulwich parking zone. This would make it even more difficult for those mentioned above to carry out their business, as well as creating significant difficulties for staff (not just of our organisation, but for others similarly affected) who cannot for various reasons choose to come to work early in order to secure an on-street parking space. This would include parents of children that may need to be delivered to school first – or more than one school - those with carer's responsibilities or those with health difficulties.

I very much hope that Southwark will be able to reconsider its current proposals.

Yours sincerely,

Bursar

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.A blacked-out signature.

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

Lordship Lane and surrounding roads

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

It's very detrimental to local businesses and trades for very little benefits.

114

[Areyou]

[Whichconsultation]

[overallresponse]

```
[response]
```

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A visitor

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

I think that doing an all day parking zone is totally ridiculous because a handful of residents have objected to it. A 2 hour slot would work. But no thought has been given to the people that work in the area or the 69% of residents that have objected to the proposed scheme. It would seem that it is all money related to screw as many people over for as much money as you can. And I bet the handful of people that want the all day parking scheme LI drive 4x4 and have said they want it all day to save the environment!!!!

[Title]
Ms

[Firstname]
[REDACTED]

[Lastname]
[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]
[REDACTED]

[Email_address]
[REDACTED]

[Areyou]
A resident

[Whichconsultation]
East Dulwich proposed cpz parking zone

[overallresponse]
5. I wholly object to

[response]
Bringing cpz or paid for parking zones to east dulwich would decimate both the high street/lordship lane and also the residential areas. The area does not need this proposal, please cancel it!

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A business

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

This parking zone will severely negatively impact on clients and staff for this very vital service to the local community

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A business

[Whichconsultation]

Ashbourne road

TMO1920-025

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

Would make it possible for me to continue with working there due to the expense

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A visitor

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

I work on lordship lane & there's no space so I normally have to come into work early to park

A business

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone

5. I wholly object to

It would be incredibly detrimental to our business (The Neighbourhood Vet) to have parking restrictions. We employ 40 staff and have more than 4000 who will be affected if they cannot park close to the practice. Thanks, Suzanne

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A business

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone'

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

This will affect our businesses for customers and our deliveries which we receive on daily basis

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone'

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

never had or have issues parking and always can find parking at any time of the day

[Title]

[Redacted]

[Firstname]

[Redacted]

[Lastname]

[Redacted]

[Telephone_number]

[Redacted]

[Email_address]

[Redacted]

[Areyou]

A stakeholder group

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

East Dulwich Independent Business Association [Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Traffic Order consultation
Highways, Southwark Council
Environment and Leisure
P.O. Box 64529
London SE1P 5LX

By post and email to: traffic.orders@southwark.gov.uk

16th October 2019

Dear Sirs,

Statutory Consultation: TMO1920-025 E Dulwich Parking

1. This is the response of the East Dulwich Independent Business Association to the Statutory Consultation regarding a proposed Controlled Parking Zone in East Dulwich (TRO).

2. We wholly object to this proposal.

INTRODUCTION: THE ASSOCIATION

3. The East Dulwich Independent Business Association ('the Association') is an unincorporated association with one hundred and four members, some of which have been based in the area for decades.

4. The Association supports the Council's work on improving air quality, reducing congestion and improving cycling opportunities in the borough. It does not, however, agree that radically reducing parking provision around the hub of Lordship Lane will assist in achieving any of these aims.

5. We have campaigned against the proposed CPZ since its first consultation in January 2019. The Association organised a petition of 9674 signatures in opposition to the then proposed scheme which was made up of 4906 local residents and 4768 visitors. We presented our petition at the Council Assembly on 27 March 2019. We also participated and voiced our objections with detailed submissions at the Dulwich Community Council meeting of 27 April 2019.

6. We welcome the fact that the current proposal covers a smaller area than that originally envisaged in the Council's proposals in January, but we are still unable to support it.

7. If implemented, the proposed scheme will be seriously harmful to the high street.

THE HIGH STREET AS A COMMON ASSET

8. At the heart of our submission lies the Association's belief in the social value of a vibrant High Street.

9. Our members are aware of the great significance of a high street as a place to connect, to seek opportunities and employment and to share in London's vibrant social life. The shops and businesses in and around Lordship Lane in East Dulwich are a community asset, not merely a source of income for their owners.

10. The social value of London's high streets has been confirmed by the recent paper issued by the Mayor of London, 'High Streets for All - Report' (Greater London Assembly, 2017) ('TfL Report'), where it is said:

'London's High Streets serve a wide range of Londoners in multiple and inclusive ways. They are highly social, diverse and accessible spaces, and have a crucial role in supporting social economic and environmental benefits across London's neighbourhoods'.

11. The TfL Report, which is informed by extensive and up to date research, observes that the High Street is under increasing commercial pressures from changing consumer behavior:

'The Centre for Retail Research underlines that across the UK, the share of consumer spending occurring on high streets will have declined from 50 per cent in 2000 to 40.2 per cent by the end of 2018. The rise of online retail and out-of-town shopping are factors contributing to this decline'.

12. The TfL Report observes that high streets in London are 'increasingly facing affordability pressures'. It recommends that:

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A business

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

I believe the proposed changes to parking in the area has been put forward under false pretences and is only a money making venture which will penalise the residents of East Dulwich.

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A business

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

This will disrupt clients of the neighbourhood vet putting their pets who need urgent care at risk. This is not acceptable

[Title]



[Firstname]



[Lastname]



[Telephone_number]



[Email_address]



[Areyou]

A business

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

1. 69% of residents rejected this proposal and therefore the decision to introduce CPZ is not democratic. We were assured on numerous occasions that should there be a 'groundswell' against the proposal it would not be implemented. This vote was the largest in the council's history and there was clearly a groundswell against it - yet here we are!

2. There is no reference to the High Street in the document despite Southwark's published policy to ensure that town centres 'thrive'. This proposal will damage the local economy and there is overwhelming evidence to support this while Southwark have absolutely no relevant evidence to the contrary.

3. There has been no effort to compromise and introduce controlled parking slowly and gently to prevent business closures. The clear lack of understanding of the local economy beggars belief and reflects scant knowledge of the locale and, even more problematically, an ignorance of the national trend where Councils are trying to re-introduce parking in town centres that are desolate due to lack of access. There is a story every week in the national press to illustrate this and so one wonders if this is ignorance or these stories do not fit the Council's agenda and therefore this evidence is merely ignored.

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A business

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

This is a wholly undemocratic process. 69% of respondents to the consultation rejected the scheme and it should have been abandoned there.

The CPZ will creep way beyond the initial area and is likely to have a profoundly negative impact on Lordship Lane, one of only 3 "City Hubs" in Southwark according to TFL.

Southwark have a duty to protect and promote the interest of Lordship Lane as a key social and community hub and should put an end to this proposal at once.

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A business

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

Controlled parking in Blackwater Street is not necessary.

Having run this business since 1992 we have observed the availability of parking spaces here for a long time. We still feel that controlled parking is not desirable for businesses and residents alike.

We are sure that controlled parking will affect our customers ability to deliver and collect heavy & delicate computer equipment. We are worried that this will affect our viability as a business.

The council has already "stolen" one parking space, now used by a Cycle Shed, outside Hepburns Solicitors - our neighbours without consent. This has no use for the businesses in the area.

A bad decision has been made overriding local objections with an executive decision.

Please don't make another bad decision.

Sincerely

■

pp System Solutions.

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone'

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

The reason is this going to kill the high street and a lot of people come to shop in this area currently.

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

Glengarry Road

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

Despite two prominent schools in close proximity and two train stations within 10 minutes' walk, free and flexible parking really does work on Glengarry Road and the surrounding areas. Enforcing parking zones to make more money for Southwark council seems greedy and unnecessary.

I object to the proposal as parking on Glengarry Rd has never been an issue for me, there is always a space at any time of the day any day of the year.

Regards, Jim.

--



Director



Dear Sir / Madam,

I live at ■ Tell Grove and I'd like to register my objections to the proposed stop and rest on my road. I am concerned that this will not be used as intended and may attract people to congregate late at night and cause a disturbance in the street. It was also take up two very limited parking spaces.

I would also like to object to the double yellow lines on the corner of Tell Grove. Clearly people should not park on the corner and presumably will receive a parking ticket for doing so. Perhaps a sign warning people not to park there would be better.

Thanks,

Heather

Sent from my iPhone

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■k

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

Glengarry Road/ east dulwich

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

1) CPZ will not help the situation as there are more dwellings than the proposed available parking spaces. We carried out parking survey on our road , the number of car parked are similar during the days and late evenings. only way to ease the situation is by removing the unnecessary double yellow lines which were introduced early in the year.

2) There are absolutely no parking problems during school holiday periods, Permit is certainly not required around these times.

3) It is extra financial burden on a household.

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A business

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

The introduction of a selective parking zone will impact on the Neighbourhood Vet by shifting parking from the surrounding streets. This will have an adverse effect on business and potentially certain case outcomes where emergency access is required on medical grounds.

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A business

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich Parking

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

From the perspective of someone who has grown up, gone to school, and have set up business within the SE22 postcode, a personal perspective from reflections of the council's plans and overview of talking to local residents with the surrounding area to East Dulwich Grove and lower parts of Lordship Lane, it is now clear to of general differing perspectives of thoughts of the councils decision to enforce a CPZ.

The grounds of which my objection to any CPZ , is based upon:

1) There is little evidence to say that the scheme that has been proposed will not bring further annoyance to the East side of Lordship Lane, creating even greater build ups of 'traffic' flow looking for parking spaces as one can only imagine a dense span of visitors/workers/cars who have no option but to look for spaces on this side and in turn making it so stressful for these residents living here who also need a space to park with proximity to their front door or road. This will again create more dispute/objections and plans that will have to be reviewed, take up more resources and time from every party involved.

2) Objection is made: as from what has been spoken by members of Southwark in public meetings from Wednesday 20/02/19 onwards, the CPZ is not for financial gain and is primarily to help the residents and area of East Dulwich with regards to: improving air quality, reducing congestion and improving cycling opportunities in the borough. From the perspective of a business owner, this will only upset parents of our business (nursery) to have financial penalties for stopping off to drop off or collect their children in the morning, at lunch or afternoon/evening. Limited parking zones will only increase a higher concentration of cars on specific roads circling

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

I feel the shops on Lordship Lane would be adversely affected and the business owners already have high rates and rents. I don't want the high street to end up full of chain stores because the small businesses can't afford to stay. There seems to be no reason for this proposal aside from council income ! It's certainly not going to benefit anyone else

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A business

[Whichconsultation]

TM01920-025E

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

I object to the councils heavy handed approach,their complete lack of respect for democracy and the public wishes.The irresponsible linking of revenue raising to environmental issues.The arrogance that a decision that could affect jobs is taken by one man with questionable self interest The fact that elected council members can take to Social Media to mount anti-business pro cycling campaigns is a disgrace This decision is damaging our community yet our elected representatives with personal agendas have ignored every piece of evidence pleased before them

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A business

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

Having parking restrictions in this area will dramatically reduce footfall to my business and all the local businesses in the area.

Highstreet vendors are struggling enough in the present economy with rising rents/rates etc. We should be encouraging people to visit Lordship lane not making it more difficult for people to visit.

There are no positives to having parking restrictions of any kind in and around Lordship lane.

I live in [REDACTED] and wish to re-iterate the objections I have already registered with regard to the CPZ proposals for Elsie road.

The CPZ was rejected by the residents of Elsie Road during the consultation. This has been ignored.

My preference would be the status quo in which we have a dynamic balance between residents and those using local businesses who benefit from stopping for a short while in Elsie Road. This has worked for many years. I would hope the council would re-consider the entire scheme. In the absence of that I make the following observations.

(Others have informed you of the many detrimental impacts the current proposals will have on our street so I won't repeat all those comments.)

Double yellow lines across dropped kerbs are unnecessary. There is no safety case for them, they are not used in other Southwark CPZ. They impose an unwarranted restriction on visitors, repair personnel stopping out of controlled hours etc.

Having the controlled hours from 8:30 to 6:30 makes it very difficult or costly for residents (many retired) to have visitors during the day. This impacts on friends visiting and people coming to service boilers etc. (This is exacerbated by the low number of parking bays to be available in Elsie road according to the current proposals)

If the CPZ is imposed on Elsie Road then some of the reduction of amenity value for residents would be mitigated if:-

- 1. Controlled hours are limited to a 1 or 2 hour period, not all day**
- 2. Double yellow lines should NOT be used across dropped kerbs**

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Elsie Road, SE22 8[REDACTED]

I live in Velde Way on the South side of the East Dulwich Grove Estate. **I object to the proposal for a Controlled Parking Zone** in this area mainly because it is not equitable for residents of the EDG estate. 75% of respondents from this side of the EDG estate are against a CPZ, even after adjustment. My more detailed reasons are:

1. Houses on our estate do not have direct public highway access. We therefore have a private access road (which is accessed from Thorncombe Road) which provides parking bays for residents of Velde Way, Delft Way, Arnhem Way and Isel Way – so for about 40 properties in total.

The upkeep and maintenance of the access road and parking bays are covered by the residents' service charge, but parking here is currently not enforced and many non-residents and visitors use it on a regular basis, especially around peak times. There is therefore a real risk that following implementation of the CPZ, those drivers who do not have a permit or who do not want to pay for a permit, will continue to park on this estate road, potentially depriving residents on the estate of a parking space reasonably near to their homes. Therefore, residents on the estate are not set to benefit from the introduction of a CPZ – in fact the opposite: if the scheme goes ahead as planned, there is considerable risk that for estate residents in particular, the parking situation will get worse. I therefore do not agree with the finding at paragraph 35 of the consultation report:

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.

I don't know whether this issue was given any consideration during the consultation as it is not mentioned at all in the report. The report does however show that 75% of respondents from this side of the estate are against a CPZ, even after adjustment. I therefore believe that the CPZ should only be implemented in the roads surrounding East Dulwich Grove Estate if at the same time the estate is granted an estate parking permit scheme, or if some other way of restricting access for non-residents is introduced. Estate residents should also not end up having to pay for two permits – for an estate permit and a CPZ permit – especially as we already pay for upkeep of the access road through our service charge.

In response to the CPZ proposals, there is now some support among residents on this side of the estate for an estate parking permit scheme and we are going to explore this.

2. My second reason is that one of the policy goals of the consultation is to reduce exposure to air pollution – the consultation even has 'healthier streets' in its title. However, the proposals actually do nothing to improve air quality on the East Dulwich Grove Estate. Air quality in this area is negatively affected by large volumes of private car school traffic at peak times every day – parents dropping off/picking up their children at JAGS and Alleyn's schools in particular – which is unlikely to change. It could even be argued that the CPZ will make it worse as parents would just stay in their cars and leave them idling, rather than parking the car. I therefore don't see how the CPZ will make any improvement on air quality in this area.
3. My third reason is that I believe the restrictions are disproportionate and that the CPZ does not need to apply all day. It seems that parking issues are caused mainly by school staff and

traffic and it would be completely sufficient to introduce permits in the morning only (for example from 9 am to 11 am). This would also relieve any issues for our private estate road, as set out above.

Contact details:

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

East Dulwich area parking zone 'ED'

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

No major parking issues in the area. Totally not needed.
Money making and another war on motorist.

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident,A business

[Whichconsultation]

northcross road (business) and tarbert road (residential)

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

I am a local business owner and we rely on outside trade - if that reduces (i.e. people don't park here as they have to pay) we won't survive :(

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A business

[Whichconsultation]

Parking Zone ED

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

CPZ in Parking Zone ED with parking restriction between 8.30am to 6.30pm will bring more traffic in around our business area. which will effect running of our mosque significantly.

However parking restriction between 11am to 12 noon Monday to Friday but not during school holiday will cause less harm to the daily business, but no restriction would be preferred

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TM01920-025E

Dulwich Parking

[overallresponse]

4. I object to part

[response]

I strongly OBJECT to the last minute addition of 4 stop and rest areas on Derwent Grove without proper consultation. None of these featured in the original consultation.

I do not understand the rationale for this significant change. I am concerned about improper use by people eating chicken, drinking and loitering. Surely stop and rests are more suited to more main roads? If Melbourne/Elsie roads already have suitable places to rest why wouldn't people who need to rest use these roads instead? What evidence do you have that people want/need to use stop and rests on Derwent Grove? I also support the submission made [REDACTED] on behalf of a group of Derwent Grove residents.

I strongly SUPPORT the proposals for a CPZ in the roads around East Dulwich station.

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A business

[Whichconsultation]

east dulwich cpz

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

This proposal will have a serious effect on footfall in the high st.

Lordship Lane thrives because it can attract customers from a wider area beyond our local customers.

The introduction of parking controls and the displacement of cars to surrounding areas to the control zone, will make parking more difficult and there is no alternative parking provision in the area. transport especially East -West and vice versa are poor.

This will act as a deterrent to visitors who may otherwise come and spend the day shopping, eating and socialising.

There are too many pressures on small business at the moment to add another obstacle.

[Title]

■

[Firstname]

■

[Lastname]

■

[Telephone_number]

■

[Email_address]

■

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

east dulwich CPZ

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

As a lifelong resident I would be really sorry to see parking controls introduced locally and have no doubt, that if passed, this would only be the beginning of further cpz across the area as cars are displaced from this cpz.

Charging hurts the poorest the hardest and there is enough obstacles to working people on average wages living in this area already

[Title]

[REDACTED]

[Firstname]

[REDACTED]

[Lastname]

[REDACTED]

[Telephone_number]

[REDACTED]

[Email_address]

[REDACTED]

[Areyou]

A resident

[Whichconsultation]

TMO1920-025

Chesterfield Grove

East Dulwich

[overallresponse]

5. I wholly object to

[response]

We need controlled parking in Chesterfield Grove we are affected by commuters who park all day and are unable to park in our street. We particularly need this as streets around as are getting the restrictions we will be swamped with cars. I always voted for the parking restrictions and still want them. I speak on behalf of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] as well





k

A business

TMO1920-025 E Dulwich parking zone

5. I wholly object to

should a CPZ be imposed it should be for a 2hr restriction only