

**APPENDIX B - PROPOSED NEW STREATHAM HILL EAST CPZ (ZONE M) - STATUTORY REPRESENTATIONS AND COMMENTS CORRESPONDENCE**

**REPRESENTATIONS IN SUPPORT OF THE PROPOSALS**

Ref No.	Representation Details
1	<p><b>Downton Avenue</b> I wanted to email you in support of the proposed CPZ in Streatham Hill East.</p> <p>As I have previously stated the area is currently one of the few spots in south London where the parking is not controlled. As a result residents in surrounding areas that are not on the electoral roll and do not want to pay for a parking permit or commuters travelling from the local over and underground stations use the road to park their vehicles which results in restricted parking for local residents.</p> <p>This often includes large unsightly white vans and commercial vehicles that park on the road for many days, blocking light and resulting in residents - many with children or elderly - having to park 10-15 minutes walk away from their home or paying to park in controlled areas.</p> <p>The CPZ needs to be implemented along with other measures to stop the A,B,C, D roads being used as a cut through from vehicles that speed - often overtaking - despite the 20 MPH limit causing a danger to local residents.</p> <p>I live on Downton Avenue and there have been many car accidents at the roundabout at the junction of Downton Avenue and Faygate Road due to careless driving. The road is wide with inadequate speed bumps which causes cars to speed and it is only a matter of time before there is a fatality.</p>
2	<p><b>Downton Avenue</b> I would just like to express my strong support for the proposed parking restrictions. The combined effect of commuters and commercial vehicles which seem to be parked for the long term means that it's often impossible to park anywhere near our house. With three small children under five, this makes life very difficult. I very much hope that the plans are implemented soon.</p>
3	<p><b>Cricklade Avenue</b> Thank you for your communication delivered this week on the statutory consultation for a Streatham Hill East Controlled Parking Zone.</p> <p>This is to confirm my ongoing strong support for the proposed CPZ covering my road, Cricklade Avenue, with Monday to Friday coverage. Since the earlier stage one consultation at the beginning of the year, the situation has only become more challenging to park around here. A number of waste disposal lorries are now using the end of Cricklade avenue as a lorry-to-lorry sorting and transfer area, further exacerbating the problem.</p> <p>You have not made any mention of the likely cost of the scheme. I trust that this will be proportionate based on reasonable costs of administering the scheme, rather than a revenue-raiser to subsidise other areas of the council's business.</p>
4	<p><b>Daysbrook Road</b> Thank you for your recent communication.</p>

	I write to confirm that my husband and I fully support the proposals as presented.
5	<p><b>Amesbury Avenue</b></p> <p>My household are for the above mentioned proposal for the Zone M area. During the weekdays and Saturday it can be virtually impossible to park your car near your home, sometimes being necessary to go to parallel neighbouring roads or more towards the top of Amesbury Avenue. Our road (Amesbury Avenue) has/is frequently used by commuters using the Streatham Hill train station and more recently by shoppers in Streatham Hill i.e M and S, Superdrug, StarBucks and now Leylands. We welcome the proposal and hope it will be introduced very soon.</p>
6	<p><b>Amesbury Avenue</b></p> <p>Agree with CPZ, as proposed by the majority, Monday to Friday, on a 2 hour option.</p>
7	<p><b>Amesbury Avenue</b></p> <p>To reiterate our household is fully in support of the proposed CPZ for Streatham Hill East.</p>
8	<p><b>Downton Avenue</b></p> <p>As regards the proposed CPZ in Streatham Hill East; I am completely in favour of it and do want it much bigger than the proposal. In terms of climate change, we need to have less cars moving on our roads. <a href="https://www.independent.co.uk/environment/air-pollution-uk-transport-most-polluting-sector-greenhouse-gas-emissions-drop-carbon-dioxide-a8196866.html">https://www.independent.co.uk/environment/air-pollution-uk-transport-most-polluting-sector-greenhouse-gas-emissions-drop-carbon-dioxide-a8196866.html</a></p> <p>In terms of lung health we need less cars. <a href="https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2019/apr/10/vehicle-pollution-results-in-4m-child-asthma-cases-a-year">https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2019/apr/10/vehicle-pollution-results-in-4m-child-asthma-cases-a-year</a></p> <p>In the “ABC” streets we have far too much rat running, even with Thames Water blocking Palace Rd and Leigham Vale. Cars regularly speed along here at 40/50mph. It is impossible to park locally most of the week. If, as is happening, neighbouring areas get a CPZ, we would be inundated with displaced parkers making our streets impossible to park in.</p> <p>People who use the overground and bus services drive to here and park their cars on our streets.</p> <p>The CPZ would encourage drivers to leave their cars at home, creating less traffic, less pollution and less danger. Providing ever increasing space for cars creates ever increasing car use. So reducing the ease that drivers have in parking will reduce car use and thus car created pollution. <a href="https://auto.howstuffworks.com/percentage-of-air-pollution-due-to-cars.htm#mkcpgn=kaw1">https://auto.howstuffworks.com/percentage-of-air-pollution-due-to-cars.htm#mkcpgn=kaw1</a></p> <p>Motor vehicles emit a number of pollutants. Perhaps the most damaging is particulate matter, a combination of organic material and inorganic substances. But just how much pollution do cars produce? Seventy-five percent of carbon monoxide emissions come from automobiles. In urban areas, harmful automotive emissions are responsible for anywhere between 50 and 90 percent of air pollution. Obviously if there are less cars moving there would also be less accidents <a href="https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2019/oct/03/collision-course-pedestrian-deaths-rising-driverless-care">https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2019/oct/03/collision-course-pedestrian-deaths-rising-driverless-care</a> <u>Many pollutants come from not from cars exhaust but from tyres and road surface.</u> <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/air-quality-statistics">https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/air-quality-statistics</a></p>

**Details**

This publication summarises the concentrations of major air pollutants as measured by the Automatic Urban and Rural Network (AURN). This release covers annual average concentrations in the UK of:

- particulates (PM10 and PM2.5)
- nitrogen dioxide (NO2)
- ozone (O3)

The release also covers the number of days when air pollution was 'moderate or higher' for any one of five pollutants listed below:

- particulates (PM2.5)
- nitrogen dioxide (NO2)
- ozone (O3)
- particulates (PM10)
- sulphur dioxide (SO2)

The datasets associated with this publication can be found here [ENV02 - Air quality statistics](#). For additional information on concentrations of air pollutants visit [UK-AIR](#).

CPZs also can reduce collisions and thus make walking and cycling far safer.

[\(1\) Philip Boucher-Hayes on Twitter: "Our imaginations are being held hostage by the car. https://t.co/C28JzMnm3Q" / Twitter https://twitter.com/i/status/1189115715808354305](#)

the space created by Walking and cycling reduces traffic jams and frees up road space. [https://twitter.com/fietsprofessor/status/1188475439775440896?s=20](#)

Report predicts radical scheme could cut air pollution by a quarter as other cities including Seattle prepare to follow suit [https://www.theguardian.com/cities/2019/sep/10/barcelonas-car-free-superblocks-could-save-hundreds-of-lives](#)

***Why cities with high bicycling rates are safer for all road users***

[https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2214140518301488](#)  
[https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2019/oct/03/collision-course-pedestrian-deaths-rising-driverless-care](#)  
[https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2214140518301488](#)  
[Addresspollution.org](#)  
[https://twitter.com/fietsprofessor/status/1188475439775440896?s=20](#)  
[https://sensible.politics.blog/car-free-carbon-free-transport-network/](#)

I hope this helps.

**Wyatt Park Road**

9

I am very pleased to see that the consultation results for residents parking in the Streatham Hill East zone have supported the application for residents parking from 10-12 from Monday to Friday.

I would like to strongly support this application for the following reasons:

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Currently people park on these roads and then take public transport into town. In addition to that workers at the bus garage also leave their cars parked on these roads. The result is that cars pollute this area and local people are unable to park.</li> <li>2. When the new ULEZ is extended in 2021 higher emission cars will not be able to enter the inner city area. Streatham Hill East zone lies on the new ULEZ boundary. We need to ensure that people do not drive to this area to park their cars on the roads adjacent to the South Circular Christchurch road and take public transport from there. It is important that we do not become a park followed by public transport area.</li> <li>3. Currently as the road is so heavily parked there are no passing places and the roads between Wyatt Park, Daysbrook, Wavertree and Normanhurst get very congested regularly causing road rage.</li> </ol> <p>In conclusion I hope that the introduction of the new CPZ will reduce traffic in this area. I would strongly like to support the introduction of a CPZ in this area.</p>
10	<p><b>Wavertree Road/Daysbrook Road</b> I support this for my street. thank you</p>
11	<p><b>Wavertree Road</b> I would like to write in support of the proposed CPZ. Our street is a car park for anyone that works in the area and too many dumped cars</p>
12	<p><b>Not provided</b> As a Streatham resident, I would like to write in support of the proposed CPZ</p>
13	<p><b>Not provided</b> I would like to write in support of the proposed CPZ.</p>
14	<p><b>Cricklade Avenue</b> I write to express my support for the proposed CPZ.</p> <p>I am a resident of Cricklade Avenue and the current situation in the lower section of my street (closest to Streatham Hill) has become dire in terms of dangerous parking/driving behaviour. Vehicles are often double parked or waiting for parking, restricting driving lanes which compromises visibility for other drivers, as well as safe access for pedestrians crossing the road.</p> <p>There is often vehicle congestion around the T junction where Cricklade Avenue meets Streatham Hill, due to drivers waiting for parking spaces to become available, or drivers driving blind around double parked vehicles at this point. This is especially dangerous for pedestrians crossing here.</p> <p>There are also instances of untaxed/unused vehicles being dumped or “stored” in roads (including Cricklade Avenue) where there are no parking controls. This makes the area appear run down and encourages fly tipping and other anti social behaviours.</p> <p>On a personal level it is also very frustrating having to double park my own vehicle in order to drop off larger/heavy items to my home. I have also been blocked in by a double parked vehicle where the driver was no where to be seen, which is extremely frustrating.</p> <p>I support the introduction of a CPZ wholeheartedly.</p>

15	<p><b>Barcombe Avenue</b> My family agrees (FOR) with the proposal of placing control parking on Streatham hill east. Specially on the ABCD roads.</p> <p>We have a home on Barcombe avenue and have young children. There have been many times where we have to park in other streets and bring the grocery shopping or children with school bags etc. back to our home. Also, people that do not live in the area use the ABCD roads as free parking all day because they commute to work from streatham hill station. Furthermore, it is unfortunate that some residents take advantage of the free parking where a neighbour, who lives in a 2 bed flat, has 4 vehicles (1 of them his belonging to a family member who does not live here). Another neighbour runs his auto mechanic business on the street and uses the car spaces to place the cars he is working on. Our family cannot wait for the parking meters to be placed, specially on Barcombe avenue.</p>
16	<p><b>Not provided</b> I am just writing to yourselves regarding the proposed CPZ in Streatham Hill East. This will be a great addition to the area and I believe it to be a fantastic idea. After the introduction of a CPZ into Streatham Hill West, there has been a marked increase in parking in this area by non-residents.</p> <p>Having a CPZ in this area would help improve the overall safety and traffic flow within this area, by allowing residents to be able to park near their homes.</p> <p>It will discourage those from driving in form outer London and parking in the streets, so that they can use the nearby train station. Hopefully this may encourage them to utilise the nearby car park.</p> <p>Furthermore, it may stop the 3 estate agents nearby parking in the ABC streets with their company cars - thus reducing parking availability further for residents.</p> <p>Personally, I would have preferred longer operating hours during the day, but I am still pleased a CPZ is being introduced into this area.</p> <p>Hopefully the next step would be to implement the low traffic volume within the ABCD roads, to discourage 'rat running' from the South Circular.</p>
17	<p><b>Downton Avenue</b> We refer to the Proposed Controlled Parking Zone Streatham Hill East Area Statutory Consultation. In particular, the proposal to introduce a new Streatham Hill East "M" CPZ operational Monday – Friday between 10am – noon.</p> <p>It is clear from the consultation results that the residents who live in the proposed Streatham Hill East "M" CPZ support the proposal. We live on Downton Avenue and support the proposal as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Parking in our road, between Monday – Friday, is problematic for those living on our road. This is because people treat our road as the Streatham Hill Station car park while they are at work.</li> <li>- Matters have become worse since the introduction of CPZs in the neighbouring areas. In particular, there has been a notable increase in commercial vans parked on the road often for days / weeks at a time.</li> <li>- The proposal made, in our view, is a sensible compromise between the needs of Downton Avenue residents and local businesses. It stops people parking on Downton Avenue all</li> </ul>

	<p>day while they are at work, but will still allow people to park on the road while popping into shops on the High Road.</p> <p>-</p>
18	<p><b>Wyatt Park Road</b></p> <p>I am a resident of Wyatt Park Road and I confirm my strong support for the introduction of the CPZ as soon as possible. Parking is currently extremely difficult and dangerous and this will alleviate the problems.</p>
19	<p><b>Wyatt Park Road</b></p> <p>We are in agreement with the proposals as layout out in the Lambeth Proposed Controlled Parking Zone, Streatham Hill East Area Statutory Consultation 1 Nov - 29 Nov 2019.</p> <p>We support a CPZ within the proposed Streatham Hill East Zone</p>
20	<p><b>Barcombe Avenue</b></p> <p>I would like to take this opportunity to <b>fully support</b> the introduction of controlled parking in Barcombe Avenue and surrounding areas.</p> <p>There exists a significant problem for residents such as myself to park in the area near to my home; this has become noticeably problematic since controlled parking was introduced on the other side of Streatham High Road, Telford Park area. It is inevitable that these parking difficulties will continue to increase in proportion to the new housing developments on Streatham High Road and commuters parking for Streatham Hill Station. This is a normal situation in a busy inner city neighbourhood hence as residents we need to support this proposal and stress the importance for controlled parking.</p> <p>There are a number of Disabled Bays in this street that further restrict residents parking and I am aware that some of these disabled bays are “obsolete” in that the residents of the properties to which the disabled bays are allocated do not own cars or indeed no longer occupy the property.</p> <p>I work for the NHS as a community clinician and hence need to drive to work daily. I am unable to park on my return from work on a regular basis and often can only find parking several roads away from my home. My son works in a pub (he is a full time student) and when he returns home from a late shift he is often circling the blocks looking for parking. We are grateful that at last there is some possible resolution to this problem.</p>
21	<p><b>Wyatt Park Road</b></p> <p>I live on Wyatt Park Road and confirm my strong support for the introduction of the CPZ in Streatham Hill East as soon as possible.</p> <p>Driving on our narrow (one lane) road has become exceptionally dangerous with angry drivers driving in an unbelievably dangerous, erratic and agitated manner. People cannot park legally so they park anywhere and everywhere, including on occasion, in the middle of the road for up to 20 mins with no cars able to pass. People park all day in the ‘passing’ spaces meaning that cars, too frustrated to allow an oncoming vehicle the right of way, face off with one another just sitting in the middle of the road honking their horns for dozens of minutes. I even witnessed a frustrated driver recently forcing an ambulance to reverse down Wyatt Park Road - utterly disgraceful.</p> <p>Parking is horrific - made exponentially worse by the introduction of parking restrictions in the surrounding roads. It is a regular occurrence to circle up to 10 times around the block before</p>

	<p>being able to park anywhere nearby. Cars circle all day, speeding to reach empty spaces, driving erratically to battle with other oncoming vehicles to reach a space first.</p> <p>Please ensure that this time, we get the parking restrictions that our road voted for in the first consultation.</p>
22	<p><b>Downton Avenue</b></p> <p>I support the proposal to restrict parking from 10 am to 12 pm as the number of commuters parking their cars means that it is not possible a local resident to park my car.</p>
23	<p><b><u>Downton Avenue</u></b></p> <p>I refer to the statutory consultation to implement a CPZ in the Streatham Hill East. I wholeheartedly endorse this proposal. I live in Downton Avenue, and previously submitted objections to the Council's proposals to implement a CPZ on the west side only (a copy of which is provided below).</p> <p>Since the below, the problems mentioned in those representations have continued to worsen. It is virtually impossible to park near my house between the hours of 9-5. Spaces remain taken by commuters and vans and vehicles that remain on the road for weeks. The proposal to implement a time limited CPZ should therefore alleviate the issues caused such users, but also enable residents and their visitors/tradespeople to park safely. It should also cause no issues to local business owners.</p> <p><b><i>Copy of Representation from March 2018</i></b></p> <p>I refer to the Council's proposals to implement a CPZ at Streatham Hill West only. I live on Downton Avenue, located in Streatham Hill East. Since we moved here in 2016, we have found it increasingly difficult to park within a 50 metre radius of our house. There are many families living on our road and the inability to access your car quickly with small children (also bearing in mind that that the road is busy and on the P13 bus route) increases the difficulty and danger of what should be a straightforward task.</p> <p>People who do not live in the area already exploit the ABCD roads (of which Downton Avenue is one) for their proximity to the station and bus routes servicing Brixton. It is one of the very few areas left that offer good commuter links with no parking restrictions. As a result , the roads are permanently busy, an issue that has been compounded of late due to the London Square development directly opposite these roads.</p> <p>The inevitable consequence of your proposal will be to only exacerbate these issues. The flaw in this plan is self-evident, and it is highly concerning that the Council are disregarding entirely the displacement effect of such proposals on Streatham Hill East.</p> <p>Of greater concern is that the details provided in the consultation were entirely silent on the prospect of splitting the wards in the event that an overall consensus was not reached on both sides of the High Road. Had it been made explicit (or even mentioned at all) that a CPZ might be introduced on one side only, then it is highly likely that this would have produced a different outcome, and certainly would have encouraged more people to participate on the East side.</p> <p>Given the flaws and limitations of the original consultation, the Council must either re-consult or implement an equivalent CPZ on the East side without further consultation</p>

24	<p><b>Downton Avenue</b></p> <p>I am writing to support the introduction of parking regulations in my area (Downton Avenue) as it has become increasingly difficult to find a parking place anywhere near my home. The road is clearly used by commuters during the week as there are spaces on Saturdays and Sundays. It is frustrating to be unable to park particularly when I have shopping, dogs and/or young children with me and it cannot be good for the environment to have to circle around hoping someone will drive away. In addition two visitors in recent weeks, both aborted coming to see me as they could not find anywhere to park,</p> <p>All these factors impact on a declining quality of life and I do hope the introduction of parking restrictions will rebalance this</p>
25	<p><b>Cricklade Avenue</b></p> <p>I write in support of the proposed Streatham Hill East CPZ.</p> <p>Since the West of Streatham Hill CPZ was installed it has become difficult to park on Cricklade Ave where I and my family live. Clearly commuter parking has migrated across the road to the remaining tariff free area near to Streatham Hill train station. I fully support this proposal</p>
26	<p><b>Wyatt Park Road</b></p> <p>I write in support of the proposed new CPZ for Streatham Hill East. Parking stress and the accompanying road rage incidents on Wyatt Park Road have worsened considerably since the CPZ was introduced to Streatham Hill West. This can only worsen further when the ULUZ comes to the south circular in April 2021. We will then have many more cars that aren't ULUZ-compliant using our roads as a car park while the drivers get public transport into town from nearby. The proposed changes to the A23 in Streatham Hill will also possibly lead to further rat-running.</p> <p>Please don't wait until this happens - we need the CPZ now.</p> <p>If we are serious about getting people to dump their cars and have less pollution and more active transport, it's essential to get CPZs in place across the whole of Lambeth. We have good public transport here - cars aren't essential.</p>

## REPRESENTATIONS COMMENTING ON THE PROPOSALS

Ref No.	Representation Details
27	<p><b>Wavertree Road</b></p> <p>I support the introduction of the CPZ.</p> <p>It will help to reduce car use by preventing commuters from using their cars for all or part of their commute. It will help to improve air quality. It would be better to have a longer duration than just two hours as. Two hours is insufficient. I would favour 8-12.</p> <p>This consultation has been very slow. A rapid introduction of the CPZ would be good.</p>
28	<p><b>Daysbrook Road</b></p> <p>Thank you for the Statutory Consultation Document re the proposed controlled parking zone in the above area.</p>



***We completely support this proposal, however we believe that the restricted hours should be Monday - Friday 9am - 5pm.***

\* these streets are used by parents taking their children to Streatham and Clapham School on Daysbrook Road and so the proposed hours 10am-12noon would not relieve any pressure during school pick up and drop off times - parents often double park and just drop off their child.

\* these streets are also used by the staff at Brixton Hill Bus Garage who mostly work shifts and so once again a 2 hour restriction would have little impact on the way they use these streets to park and as most of our local bus routes are 24 hours their journey to work would be possible using public transport.

I refer to the consultation document " With regard to the preferred hours of operation, a majority of 45% prefer a 2 hour option" - surely 45% is not the majority - I urge you to reconsider extending the times of the restriction.

I wonder if this decision is based purely on the cost - as a 9am-5pm restriction would obviously be more expensive to manage - this is supposed to be for the benefit of the local residents who will be actually paying to be able to park near their properties but with only a 2 hour restriction this will have little impact on our ability to be able to do that.

I suggest that Lambeth properly monitor who actually parks in Streatham Hill East. Many thanks for your kind consideration , I look to your response.

**Amesbury Avenue**

I am resident at XX Amesbury Avenue.

I fully support the introduction of controlled parking on my road but am concerned that the hours proposed are not long enough.

Two hours (10am - noon) may help alleviate some of the parking issues for residents but I do not feel it will completely deal with the problems, especially closer to the high road, as, for example, we have quite a lot of estate agents locally along the high road who use my road and Barcome/Cricklade etc as free parking. They can easily avoid the 2 hour window but still be parked for the rest of the day and into the evening, meaning residents who live nearer to the high road can not park when returning from work. Also, other people who are not resident will also be able to continue to park and go to the station/shops etc and residents will not be able to park.

29

Considering how much we will be asked to pay for residents permits I believe the only fair solution, that will actually address the parking problems completely is to have longer restricted hours, from 8.30am - 6.30pm. I also believe that having the restrictions on a Saturday would benefit the residents, as Saturday's are often as bad, if not worse, than weekdays.

I hope that you take these comments into consideration, as I live close to the high road and often can not park anywhere near my home, even on a weekend, as a result of the various issues (some highlighted above). As my vehicle is essential to my employment I have no choice but to drive and not being able to park close by has a negative impact on my live and work, as I often have to unload and load things from my vehicle daily. Also, as it's a van, it is at risk of being broken into, this risk is increased if I cannot park close to home and keep an eye on it.

Many thanks for taking the time to read my concerns and I hope that longer hours and even days will be implemented.

30	<p><b>Daysbrook Road</b></p> <p>With regard to your Statutory Consultation notice 1 November 2019 - 29 November 2019, I wish to firstly confirm my wholehearted support for the proposed Streatham Hill East CPZ. I cannot speak for other residents but I certainly find it increasingly difficult to find parking in or around where I live and often have to drive around surrounding roads in order to find a space. However, whilst I support the proposed days of operation of Monday - Friday, I object most strongly to only a 2 hour restriction. I cannot honestly see the point of only a 2 hour time band between 10.00 and 12.00 hrs when the problem for residents exists throughout the day. Moreover, Daysbrook Road is used as a cut through by vehicles between Streatham Hill and Christchurch Road and vice versa, and is so congested with parked cars that vehicles find it difficult to pass each other, resulting frequently in arguments.</p> <p>I would ask that the Council seriously reconsider the proposed 2 hr time restrictions and introduce a much longer restriction between 08.30 and 06.30 hrs.</p>
31	<p><b>Amesbury Avenue</b></p> <p>I'm a tenant living on Amesbury Avenue streatham hill and im emailing to inform lambeth council that im in great favour of parking restrictions to be put in place. And i hope it will go into effect shortly. Us tenants are suffering greatly with having to park very far from our properties.</p> <p>I hope it will be parking restrictions of Mon- Fri 8:30 - 5:30 in hope it will alleviate the parking issues we are having.</p> <p>Thank you for reading</p>
32	<p><b>Wyatt Park Road</b></p> <p>Thank you for the proposed controlled parking zone information letter regarding the Streatham Hill East area. I am a resident living at Wyatt Park Road SW2 3TW and I am fully supportive of the scheme.</p> <p>My only objection is the timing of the scheme. According to the letter 45% of residents prefer a 2 hour option meaning the remaining 55% preferred the more restrictive timings of longer hours and weekend inclusion of parking restrictions.</p> <p>If the total of the more restrictive timings is 55% why is the middle option not being implemented?</p> <p>i.e we can deduce that those who voted for the most restrictive timing slot would accept the middle option</p> <p>I do not believe that a 2 hour cpz on the roads ( Wyatt Park Road, Wavertree Road, Daysbrook Road and Normanhurst Road) surrounding Streatham &amp; Clapham Prep school to be adequate.</p> <p>The cpz should be more restrictive to include school drop off and pick up time. At these times the roads are congested with cars often parked on the double yellow lines and drivers allowing their cars to idle.</p> <p>This is a significant opportunity for the council to reduce congestion and more importantly air pollution in this area by increasing the timings of the cpz to discourage people from using their cars to drop children off in an area with excellent transport links.</p>

	I hope you will take into consideration that whilst I am fully supportive of the cpz I believe the timings need to be reconsidered.
33	<p><b>Not provided</b></p> <p>It is frustrating to daily encounter those who do not live here eg parents, bus drivers, delivery drivers etc to tightly park their vehicle head to tail along the road I live.</p> <p>I have lived on my road for many decades. Residents should not be charged for parking their vehicle in front of their house because we live here and already pay a lot to the council.</p>

## REPRESENTATIONS IN OPPOSITION OF THE PROPOSALS

<u>Ref No.</u>	<u>Representation Details</u>
34	<p><b>Wavertree Road</b></p> <p>I am in receipt of your statutory consultation leaflet for the proposed controlled parking zone for Streatham Hill East. I wish to oppose the CPZ for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There are a number of dependent residents who rely on the help of carers who, for the sake of efficiency, use cars to visit them - in some cases several times a day.</li> <li>2. Streatham Hill is already the dowdy end of Streatham. The centre reservation improvements afforded to Streatham High Road up to the Odeon already puts us at a disadvantage aesthetically. Shoppers can park for free on the side roads off Streatham Hill. If they have to pay to park they may choose to shop elsewhere and this would have a devastating effect on local businesses.</li> <li>3. Locally employed drivers who are currently parking in the area could be given an incentive to use public transport by the council. The bus garage, whose drivers park on Wavertree Road, could be encouraged by their employer to use their free travel passes to travel to work, and help improve our environment.</li> <li>4. While 21.0% of residents responded to the first consultation and felt there was a problem in the area, it was only mere 11.7% of residents who supported the CPZ. That is surely not enough to impose it.</li> <li>5. Enforcing a CPZ in this area will impose a very unwelcome expense. I feel those who are supporting it do so because they can afford it. This is not the case for many of us.</li> </ol> <p>I hope you will consider these objections and withdraw the proposal.</p>
35	<p><b>Lanercost Road</b></p> <p>I literally cannot sleep, so troubled am I by the letter received today regarding the new CPZ arrangements for the area. I thought that therefore now was as good a time as any to write this email to you.</p> <p>I live on Lanercost Road and I recognise that a majority of respondents in this proposed zone 'J' stated they did not currently wish to be within a CPZ - albeit I note this comprised a response rate of just 14.5%.</p> <p>I therefore appreciate that, as matters stand, the introduction of CPZ measures here is not appropriate. However, what troubles me is the decision "not to re-consult this area for the</p>

	<p>foreseeable future”. This is utter madness when our road will presently be one of the very few roads in the locality left without controls - and just 5 min walk from Tulse Hill station. We will now be even more inundated with commuters than we are already, and our driveways constantly over parked in consequence.</p> <p>Indeed, in just the period of time that has passed since the stage 1 consultation closed in mid February and before surrounding measures have even come into force, the parking situation here has already become substantially worse. Our own driveway is now regularly over parked about 2-3 times a week. In the space of a year it has gone from being a rarity to the norm. It is not fair on residents, particularly those who have already indicated a need for control measures, to introduce such extensive CPZ measures in the neighbouring streets with no follow up to our own once the impact can be properly taken into account. There should surely be a review of the situation 6mths or a year down the line? I simply beg it of you.</p>
36	<p><b>Lanercost Road</b></p> <p>I live in Lanercost Road and I was very disappointed with the council’s decision to exclude my Road from the Streatham Hill restricted controlled parking zones. I think the council should think again about excluding my road and to think about saving residents, who voted not to introduce the restrictions, from themselves.</p> <p>With restrictions in the Streatham Hill area and Probyn Road being introduced it is inevitable that the current parking in these roads will be transferred to our and other roads where there are no parking restrictions. A similar knock-on effect happened when a restricted parking zone in Streatham Hill area A was introduced. No doubt the residents in those roads who voted to introduce the scheme have obviously been effected by the introduction in area A. Therefore will you please press the council to either introduce the same parking restrictions in Lanercost Road or to have another future consultation once the new scheme has bedded in. I suggest after 12 months of the scheme going live.</p>
37	<p><b>Hillside Road</b></p> <p>I’ve just received plans for your proposed parking zone extensions within Streatham.</p> <p>We have just moved to Hillside Road which is outside of the proposed zones and part of the ‘consultation results representation area’ that was strongly opposed to the idea. A quick glance at the map explains why this was the case.</p> <p>With controlled parking zone to the left and right of us everybody in the area without a parking permit will park on our streets making it impossible for us to do so.</p> <p>I would have thought it obvious that if you are considering a controlled parking zone in these areas that a parking zone also be introduced to cover Hillside and Palace Road. Without this you are creating a serious parking situation for all taxpaying/car owning residents here.</p> <p>Hillside Rd is already an unofficial ‘rat run’ for the whole of Streatham and the surrounding areas. Add to this Palace Rd being permanently gated at the top and the Unnecessary P13 bus stop less than 100ft from the next stop and you are potentially making an already dangerous and untenable situation considerably worse.</p> <p>Please advise on your next steps.</p>
38	<p><b>Barcombe Avenue</b></p>

	<p>We write in relation to the above CPZ proposal. We have live at 198 Barcombe Avenue for 3 years and very rarely have trouble parking. The only time there is ever an issue is a Sunday, when the church is busy and this is not addressed by the CPZ. However, we do not want the CPZ extending to Sunday and do not want it at all.</p> <p>The costs of this consultation are absolutely ridiculous and an irresponsible use of Council money. In turn, we will be forced to pay for an annual permit (plus guest permits) to cover the excessive consultation cost and parking wardens.</p> <p>We continue to oppose it. It is not necessary and will be an inconvenience to us and other residents.</p>
39	<p><b>Hillside Road</b></p> <p>I am writing to express my concern at the proposed new Streatham Hill East CPZ. We have just moved to Hillside Road, and on street parking in the area is already tough, but manageable. Should you go ahead and introduce this new CPZ area, experience in other parts of London has shown that many people who live in the CPZ, but adjoin the Hillside Rd/Palace Rd non-CPZ area (as well as the commuters who currently park in the area), will simply park there for free rather than pay for the annual permit. This in turn will make it impossible for us to park even vaguely close to our house.</p> <p>I am currently expecting twins, and the idea of having to walk for blocks from where I can park my car, to the house, with two babies and all the associated kit, is a nightmare. Worse still is the worry that we may not be able to find a parking spot at all if the non-CPZ streets become heavily parked up.</p> <p>If you insist on going ahead with the new CPZ, then please also implement one for Hillside Road, otherwise we will find ourselves unable to park in our own street.</p>
40	<p><b>Cricklade Avenue</b> <b>First Representation</b></p> <p>I have various objections to this. Three keys ones to start with are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The letter giving details of the counsel's decision to proceed with this says "Objections must only relate to the elements of the scheme that are subject to statutory consultation". How is anyone supposed to know what these are in order to properly object? What if someone had a legitimate objection, in common sense terms, but it isn't "subject to statutory consultation"?</li> <li>2.</li> </ol> <p>2. My main complaint is that I was told as part of an attempt to complain about the lack of proper consultation (see my point 3 and the 21% response rate) that this is going to cost ALL local residents a disproportionate amount of money to pay for a permit, and this is basically a fund raising scheme for the counsel. I can't find anywhere details of how much this will cost. This key to whether the consent (regardless of the very low response rate) is informed or not. A cursory understanding of the Streatham Hill East area will include knowing that the vast majority of the area are completely free of parking issues. It is only residents close to Streatham High Street that have issues. Those unaffected by parking issues I doubt would object in principle to restrictions being introduced to help their neighbors at that end of the area. However, if the cost of doing so is as much as I've been told, I'm sure most people would object. So where is this information? Support for the restrictions is otherwise fundamentally flawed.</p>

3. I heard nothing about the initial consultation that finished in February 2019. Since then local residents sought to reopen the consultation to allow more than 20% of residents to have a say. Why is there no mention of this in the information we've been sent? I understand the majority of people consulted as part of the second wave opposed the CPZ. This feels like a stitch up that is going to cost me money for no benefit.

***Second Representation (response to Cllr Atkins)***

To take the points slightly out of order, on 3., I think it would have been helpful to have included details of the different rounds of consultation and extensions - if for no other reason than I was aware there were multiple rounds, and I got the impression the extension was being ignored. I'm personally very upset it looks like this proposal is going ahead, so anything that makes clear a thorough and proper process is being followed (e.g. multiple consultations and extensions) is going to help me think it isn't a stitch up!

On point 2., £36 to £312 is pretty misleading - unless its an electric car a permit is at least £130. In any event, I think the cost should be put in bold somewhere obvious (and I don't think it has been). If it was made clear to residents that it will realistically cost them £150-£250 to park their own car on their own street (and friends and family £5 a day and any traders £20 a day) then I'm pretty sure the vote would have been different; as far as I'm concerned the pros and cons have not been clearly explained to residents, and the support you refer to is therefore fundamentally flawed.

I would like to have my objection registered (including my belief that the support/consent is flawed due to lack of clear cost / benefit for residents). Please can this objection be registered by email (I think I included the correct reference in the subject line)?

I haven't sent a letter in years, and no one would be able to read my handwriting anyway, so keen to avoid the need for a letter to be sent if possible.

***Third representation (response to Cllr Atkins)***

To add - and at the risk of sounding hyperbolic, this is going to be the single biggest effect the labour council will have on me as a resident. If this goes through, safe to say you will have to go a long way to ever get a local election vote out of me for labour. And this generally colours my view to the party more widely.

Not sure how to state my point more clearly, but I think the process and outcome here is outrageous. Whether it is deliberate or unintentional misinformation, or a process which allows a vocal minority of residents in the area (i.e. a subset of 20%) to effectively impose extra costs of £200-£300 a year on the whole area I think is beaurocracy at its worst.

As an approach to dealing with an issue which a minority of the residents have a legitimate concern about, the cost on the wider population is completely disproportionate. I'm not opposed to parking restrictions that make the lives of my neighbors that have issues with parking easier, and I'd be happy to pay a reasonable amount to support this. But £192 for a permit for our small, new car (i.e. not a massive diesel 4x4!) and expensive costs for friends, family and any traders, is ridiculous.

41	<p><b>Nuthurst Avenue</b> <b>E/S - results not representative - not enough responses. Interpretation to support council objectives of increasing tax take. No clarity on what this new local vehicle or road tax is for / will support.</b></p>
----	---

I'd like to register my objection to the introduction of this scheme. There appear to be a number of streets, my own included, that voted against the introduction of this scheme or had a broadly even split of views. The view of parking challenges in some streets should not automatically mean restrictions are introduced in all, especially considering roughly half of all streets stated there wasn't a problem with parking or were evenly split. Furthermore, disregarding weighted averages, the majority of streets were not in favour of introducing controlled parking - this contradicts your view that 56% of the 21% of respondents supported the introduction of the CPZ.

Do you have minimum response requirements in order to make significant changes to the local area? 21% seems embarrassingly low and not representative.

I would also like to object to the introduction of paid parking for residents in the areas you are claiming have a problem with parking. Understandably, if I want to have visitors I would need to pay a small fee to allow them to park for the day. Please inform me, given there is an election coming up, how you are working for my interests when I do not want a CPZ introduced, and do not want to have to pay to park outside my own home. I already pay council tax and road tax that I feel very little benefit from - what does this new council tax hike go towards paying?

My understanding is that you are proposing to limit parking for two hours per day Monday to Friday. A large portion of the people using the surrounding streets near me are employed at the streatham hill bus garage, and so work a range of shifts through the day and night. Introduction of such a limited parking restriction will not prevent the usage of these roads by the majority of current users. You should consider extending the periods of implementation, if it does actually go head.

Finally, if after the forced introduction of this scheme people wish for it to be rescinded can you confirm what the process will be? Would a small majority of a very small number of responses to remove the scheme receive the same weighing and backing from the council?

**Lydhurst Avenue**

I was one of the residents who actually completed the survey and decided that it was not necessary to have a controlled parking zone on this road. I have spoken to a number of my nearest residents who for one reason or another admit they did not complete the survey at the time.

We are extremely alarmed given the low return of 54 for the area, which they do not feel should predicate that they were in favour as we normally do not experience problems parking on this road. I would therefore seriously question how the response rate of 19.2% equates to a 55.6% pro controls if CPZ was introduced in neighbouring roads? This I believe calls for further consultation because residents who did not participate in the original survey did not realise this could possibly be the outcome.

- 1) There is no evidence that we get over-spill from the High Road up here presently.
- 2) We have limited problems when there are road works on Lydhurst Avenue or Valley Road etc, as any reasonable area would under such circumstances and given we have a nearby primary school and at such unusual times also impact the school run.
- 3) Too many councils have found ways of using parking revenues for other projects which do not necessarily benefit road users and in times of financial crisis see this as a revenue generation stream.

42

	<p><b>2<sup>nd</sup> Representation</b>  Further to my email below - to make matters more clear.  item 2)</p> <p>The limited and expected issues we experience from time to time with parking is when there are road works on Leigham Vale, Hillside and others in the locality which impact on Lydhurst Avenue as there is a primary school nearby during the school run periods. This would happen anywhere under such circumstances and are reasonably tolerable at such times.</p>
43	<p><b>Lanercost Road</b>  We recently received a letter from Lambeth following a consultation on our road becoming a cpz. The letter states that at this time the residents have voted not to do this.  I am very concerned however that the letter also states that we will not be consulted again on this matter. This is even more concerning given many streets around us have voted to become a cpz which is likely to significantly increase the amount of commuter drivers parking on our street.</p> <p>I'd therefore like to ask that we are given another opportunity to vote on this once these changes have been made.</p>
44	<p><b>Downton Avenue</b>  I am writing once again to state my objections to any form of CPZ in my area. This scheme &amp; similar ones in the past have been proposed &amp; failed to find any real support.</p> <p>I have lived at my current address in Downton Avenue for nearly 56 years &amp; I have never found any problems with parking near my own house. Even today that is not a problem &amp; at weekends it is definitely not a problem. It seems to me that it is another way in these uncertain times for the council to squeeze the last penny from our pockets.</p> <p>Please consider the extra economic pressures any CPZ regulations would put on cash strapped households. Especially now with the Brexit question on all our minds, not knowing what further economic chaos that may bring.</p> <p>I hope my words have not fallen on deaf ears.</p>
45	<p><b>Lydhurst Avenue</b>  I do not agree to a CPZ in Lydhurst Avenue Streatham Hill. My address is XXydhurst avenue sw2 XXX</p>
46	<p><b>Hitherfield Road</b>  I am writing in response to the consultation on the proposed Streatham Hill CPZ set out in this webpage:  <a href="https://www.lambeth.gov.uk/parking-transport-and-streets/parking/proposed-controlled-parking-zone-streatham-hill-area">https://www.lambeth.gov.uk/parking-transport-and-streets/parking/proposed-controlled-parking-zone-streatham-hill-area</a></p> <p>1. Knock-on effects on nearby streets  I live on Hitherfield Road and am concerned that the introduction of this CPZ will displace parking into Hitherfield Road. If the CPZ is introduced, then I would like the parking situation on neighbouring roads to be monitored following the introduction. If parking difficulties increase then the council should consult on introducing controlled parking in affected roads.</p> <p>2. Streatham and Clapham High School – yellow zig zag lines on Daysbrook Road</p>



	<p>Streatham and Clapham High School has entrances on both Daysbook and Wavertree Roads. These are all protected by yellow zig zag lines except one entrance on Daysbrook Road at the southern edge of the school site. This entrance is used by year 3-6 pupils. It is important for the safety of the pupils that road near this entrance should also have a yellow zig zag marking. This is particularly the case following the introduction of a CPZ as I expect that cars would otherwise be frequently stopping to set down and pick-up in this location. At the moment, this stretch of pavement is usually “protected” by long stay parked cars.</p> <p>3. Double yellow lines Faygate Road between Barcombe and Cricklade Avenue The plan shows double yellow lines on the east side of Faygate Road between Barcombe and Cricklade Avenues. The consultation material does not explain what the policy requirement is for these double yellow lines.</p>
47	<p><b>Barcombe Avenue</b></p> <p>I am making representations against the proposals to introduce CPZ in Streatham Hill area for the following reasons:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The residents of Streatham Hill already voted against the introduction of CPZ in the council initial consultation. The people have spoken.</li> </ul> <p>The reason that the council gave for second consultation was that they had people complaining about parking in the area. This does not make sense because residents already voted against the introduction of CPZ. Council reason for conducting another consultation is undemocratic and purely for the council income generation.</p> <p>Residents don't have problems in parking during the day only at night time which make sense.</p> <p>The council mentioned they only had fifteen percent respond. That does not represent majority. Leave and let's leave please.</p> <p><b>2<sup>nd</sup> Representation</b></p> <p>Residents of Streatham Hill overwhelmingly voted against the introduction of CPZ in December 2018. Why another consultation few months after? The people have spoken.</p> <p>Please stop manipulating figures and given undemocratic excuses in other to introduce the CPZ in the area for council gains.</p> <p><b>3<sup>rd</sup> Representation</b></p> <p>Most people I spoke with around my street and my neighbour's regarding the council CPZ consultations have no knowledge of it.</p>
48	<p><b>Not provided</b></p> <p>Am making a representation against the proposals to introduce CPZ in Streatham hill reference STREATHAM HILL EAST CPZ. The people have spoken in 2017 not to have CPZ in streatham hill. Please we do not need it.</p>
49	<p><b>Barcombe Avenue</b></p> <p>I am totally against paying for residential parking. I am a new mother to twins and stay at home Nd cannot afford such a cost. I hadn't been informed of anything and have had no</p>

	<p>warning. I moved here in September 2018 and am renting. Part of the reason I moved here being a single mum and not working was because it was free parking and now that seems its changing resulting in huge implications for me and have no idea how I am going to afford it. Many thanks and hope you can sympathise and see many other people are also in a similar situation and have the same views.</p>
50	<p><b>Lydhurst Avenue</b> I would like to objected to control parking zone in this street I have no complaint for Lydhurst Avenue.</p> <p>The only agreement I am expressing is for the double yellow lines to be added in suggested areas .</p>
51	<p><b>Amesbury Avenue</b> I received Lambeth Council- proposed controlled parking zone, statutory consultation 01 Nov 2019 to 29 Nov 2019. Your report outcome is completely not reflect the majority of residents and small businesses in your proposed controlled parking areas. In deed all residents and small business objected to your proposal particularly as your proposal cause community economic extinction and render small business entrepreneurs unemployed and possible homeless.</p> <p>The greatest impact would be threaten the live of vulnerable people particularly elderly which most of them suffer with dementia and mental health conditions whose daily lives depending on care and support from our care workers that drive to ensure that they always with these vulnerable people in their own on time. Your proposed parking restrictions seize continuation of these vital services to these vulnerable people as the care workers would be restricted or have no where to park and deliver care and support services to these people who are depended on it to survive daily.</p> <p>We ask the Lambeth Council to consider the impact this proposal would have on the most vulnerable people in the community and urge the Lambeth Council to discontinue this proposal to save the lives of these most vulnerable people in the community. Please find attached our response to this “ill-thought proposal” at the expense of destroying the fabric of the community.</p> <p><i>Letter from Stockwellcare – appended</i></p>
52	<p><b>Hillside Road</b> We object to Hillside Rd, at the Downton end, NOT being included in the proposed CPZ. We believe that the result of Hillside Road NOT being included in this area will mean increasingly congested parking for the street. It is already busy as staff from nearby schools park on the road and also Tulse hill rail passengers park as far up as Hillside due to limited parking on Palace Rd and other roads near the station. It is also used for parking by a number of residents in the Hillside Gardens flats at the end of the road.</p> <p>In addition, the section of road where we live is used as a cut through between the south circular and Streatham High road and has a bus route, meaning it is already a busy road. Those seeking parking spaces will add to the volume of traffic.</p> <p>I ask you to reconsider adding Hillside Rd, or at least the small section outside numbers 10-20, INTO the CPZ if it goes ahead.</p>

53	<p><b>Hillside Road</b></p> <p>I own the property known as XX Hillside Road SW23HN. I would like to see Hillside included in the controlled parking zone such that only residents can park on this street with a residents permit. My fear is that, as Hillside is currently out of the zone, people will park their cars on this street which will leave me and my newborn without a space to park our car.</p>
54	<p><b>Wyatt Park Road</b></p> <p>We are residents in Wyatt Park Road, Streatham Hill SW2.</p> <p>Using the figures stated in the Lambeth Proposed Controlled Parking Zone, Streatham Hill East Area, Statutory Consultation document 1 November 2019-29 November 2019, it is calculated that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There are 2933 households within this area (616 replies representing a response rate of 21%).</li> <li>2. Of those 616 replies 60.4% consider they currently have a parking problem, i.e. 372 households.</li> <li>3. Of those 372 households, 56% support a CPZ, i.e. 345 households.</li> <li>4. This means that 2588 households (88.24%) either do not want the CPZ or did not respond to the second consultation in December 2018.</li> </ol> <p>It seems that Lambeth's view is that any household that did not respond to the December 2018 consultation is in favour of the implementation of the CPZ and therefore it is likely to be brought in, because we are not being given any option in this current consultation to not have a CPZ at all.</p> <p>This is the third attempt by Lambeth to bring in a CPZ on the east side of Streatham Hill. Our responses to those previous consultations were submitted in December 2017 and January 2019. It seems Lambeth will continue consulting until this CPZ is brought in.</p> <p>After the first consultation, in your report of 27 February 2018, you stated that "A decision has been taken to not proceed with the next stage of consultation to introduce parking controls in the area east of Streatham Hill (A23)."</p> <p>On 29 November 2018 Lambeth decided to re-consult about the Streatham Hill East CPZ, on the basis of "petitions and requests for the area to be re-consulted" and "The outcome of the analysis [of those petitions and requests] indicates that if all the properties who signed the petitions had participated in the original consultation this area would have had a majority in favour of introducing parking controls. This indicates a shift in overall opinion which provides a mandate for this re-consultation."</p> <p>As we stated in our response to this November 2018 re-consultation, at no time were we, as long term residents in the Streatham Hill East area, asked to sign a petition about the CPZ nor did we make a request for the CPZ to be re-consulted.</p> <p>It is clear that this is merely a money-making exercise by Lambeth and will be brought in despite only a small percentage of the households in the Streatham Hill East Area, as stated above, actually asking for it.</p>
55	<p><b>Not provided</b></p> <p>I write to you to express my objections to the implementation of controlled parking in my area. I do so on the grounds that I feel the consultation upon which you base your decision (herein referred to as C2) should be void as the year previously the first consultation (herein referred</p>

to as C1) voted against it. It was put to me by one of the councillors that C2 occurred because 3 separate petitions were received. With respect, so what? A million petitions could have been received but if democracy counts for anything, the outcome of C1 should stand. The fact the council have taken the decision to respect C2 would suggest the council has no impartiality in the matter. Also, have the names on these petitions been verified and checked to be living in the areas?

I think the timing of C2 was poor. The deadline was in late Autumn/Early winter as I recall. 21% was a low response to this. I nearly didn't reply as I felt it was an insult to ignore C1. On a personal note, I'm a disabled driver. My understanding is I will not be subject to this charge just now but when I changed from DLA to PIP, there was a lengthy delay and in that period of about 14 months, I lost my disability status. What would happen in the instance should this CPZ come in? Would I be expected to pay and, were my disabled status restored, would I be refunded?

This will no doubt affect businesses on Amesbury avenue. They already struggle. We need to be helping support our local identity and not bow to the highest bidder willing to fill council pockets.

Why are there different prices for different types of cars? If this is about "parking" why is there a discrepancy based on the types or cars? Surely only the dimensions of a vehicle should be taken into account.

Lambeth has implemented yellow lines on the corner of Faygate and Barcombe avenue and also put in bike hangars to, in my mind, frustrate drivers.

I think the wording of C2 was very poor. I recall thinking "Why can I not just tell them I don't want this"?

This will not solve the problems we have with parking. It penalises the victims. It's the equivalent to dealing with a protection racket. It says "pay us this and we won't let Tom Dick and Harry park on your road between these times". It's not going to stop inconsiderate people taking up 1 and 1/2 spaces. It's not going to have the 2 cars at my end of the road that have been sat covered for over a year (2 in the others case). It's not going to have the cars without blue badges parking in an allocated bay every evening I'm not back early enough. Considering the amount of people this will obviously affect, why is it so expensive?

The macro circumstances need to be considered. We have an election coming up, depending on that we are probably going to leave the European Union, the cost of living is predicted to rise and if this were not bad enough, there is a ridiculous initiative extending to the south circular in 2021. For those who make the laws that give them a budget and then provide their shadows with another in the form of expenses, it's easy to pass these things down but people who are already struggling don't have money to dish out like this.

Apologies for the scatter gun way I've written this. I'm not well and I just needed to get it out of the way. I suspect this is littered with grammatical errors too.

The enemy of intelligence is ignorance

56

**Wavertree Road**

We opposed the scheme at the first consultation and after a majority decided against it were

	<p>rather taken aback that barely a year later the same CPZ is proposed again. It seems the council will not stop until yet another money spinner is forced on the people.</p> <p>If one were to look a little closer at the parking situation one could see that the CPZ are part of and aggravating the problem and adding to the rising costs of living, forcing people with lower income to move further away. Which in turn means more commuters, which will add to the traffic, since public transport connections are not all that brilliant, particularly going East to West.</p> <p>The charges for the permit are well over the top and for many simply not affordable. Business pay even more, having to calculate higher overheads into their prices and some price themselves out of business. Streatham High Street proves just that. With shutters coming down faster and faster. With the prognosis on future growth of the economy rather dim the last thing any one needs is yet another year by year increasing charge.</p> <p>A response rate of 21% is very low and can hardly be seen as representative for the neighbourhood.</p> <p>Furthermore we are told that the money raised will go into street improvement. That is laughable. Just walk down up and down the High street and you have to be very alert to not stumble over one of many trip hazards. Pavements and many of the side streets are in a very poor repair. We have not seen any improvement in streets that have been made CPZ. We would like to express again our opposition to the scheme and very much wish that it is shelved once and for all.</p>
57	<p><b>Not provided</b></p> <p>I do NOT want CPZ in this area if it means that we as residents have to pay for the privilege to have a space outside our road to park our own vehicle, as we already pay a lot of council tax to Lambeth. Residents; families, friends and (traders who are doing work for the residents) should not be penalized either.</p> <p>I have lived here for decades and I object to pay any charges for CPZ on STREATHAM HILL EAST CPZ. However, non residents who park their vehicles in this neighbourhood should be encouraged to walk, cycle or take public transport.</p> <p>Non residents should not leave their engines on while just sitting in a car because it is polluting the air. If there is to be a CPZ, then it should be between Mon-Fri during peak hours from 7:30 am to 9:00 am and 3:00 pm to 5:00 pm (particularly during the school run hours). Because there are so many cars in the area, it can get very congested and causes a lot of fumes.</p> <p>There is a bus garage nearby and many of the bus drivers park their cars on our road, they need to be encouraged to take public transport (which is free for them)!</p> <p><b><i>Please refer to my email below, 18 March 2018,</i></b></p> <p>As residents who live on the east side of Streatham Hill, we are in favour of CPZ as long as residents are not charged for parking vehicles on our road because we already have to pay a high council tax bill and taxes to the government.</p> <p>Over the years, our residents have noticed that drivers who do the school run tend to park their car for a long time outside our road. My house is next door to a school and we have noticed an increased amount of traffic, creating increased noise and fumes along this road for</p>

	<p>a number of years between the hours of 8.00am to 8.30am and around 4.00pm. A solution would be for more children to take public transport or encourage children to walk to and from school.</p> <p>Other commuters going to work also tend to park their cars along our road, making it difficult for our residents to find a parking space for their own vehicles and for trades people who need to do work for residents. Also bus drivers tend to park their cars on our roads on weekends as well.</p> <p>What does "At anytime" waiting restrictions in various roads at key locations mean? Especially if we need trades people who have to do work on our houses, for example: plumbers, electricians, builders etc, How would a CPZ affect these tradespeople if residents have to call them out to do a job? I am not in favour of a CPZ if residents have to pay a charge for our tradespeople to park.</p> <p>Our residents, family, friends (and traders who are working for residents) should be allowed to park their vehicles on their own roads and not be charged for parking at all. However, I do object to all other commuters parking for hours on our roads</p>
58	<p><b>Amesbury Avenue</b></p> <p>Please accept this email as my formal objection to the proposed parking scheme: Streatham Hill East CPZ. The following points are my main concerns opposing the scheme.</p> <p>Increased difficulty in finding parking spaces for local residents. The local supermarket and shops at the Hillside end of Amesbury Ave, already create a heavily congested traffic area which includes the double parking of cars and trucks this is noisy and unsafe.</p> <p>This scheme would be an extra financial burden on the local residents who I believe should be entitled to free parking outside their residence in consideration of the council tax we are already paying. The service that we currently receive in return for the tax is quite inadequate. For these reasons I am strongly opposed to this scheme.</p>
59	<p><b>Barcombe Avenue</b></p> <p>I am writing to express my opposition and rejection of the proposed controlled parking zone referred to as Streatham Hill East, Zone "M".</p> <p>My fundamental reason for objection is because this scheme appears to be an additional income generating mechanism for Lambeth Council, and certainly not one designed for the benefit of local residents and business owners in Streatham Hill East. The original consultation undertaken for this proposal led to a resounding rejection of such a scheme by local residents late last year.</p> <p>If the scheme was fundamentally to ensure parking in the local area was for local residents and locally businesses, there should be no charge for residents' permits, but instead the financial cost of the scheme should be the burden of those who violate any parking restrictions. Local business owners and local residents should be able to park for free, as they do now, and should not be charged for any permit to do so. When I purchased my property, one of the key considerations was the ease of me, and my guests and family being able to park with ease and without cost.</p> <p>Considering the cost of the permits vary dependent on vehicle age and emissions, this further</p>

	<p>suggests that the scheme is designed as an additional penalty to owners of older vehicles, and in particular, diesel car owners.</p> <p>Last year residents in the area were consulted and formally opposed the introduction of a controlled parking zone. Evidence collected at the time for my area supported my own observations that on the whole I found more space to be available during the working day than in the evenings, therefore suggesting most vehicles were owned by local residents. To sum up, I do not feel that this scheme is in the best interests of local residents. The scheme will be expensive to administer and in addition penalises drivers of diesel vehicles which, only fifteen years ago, had similar tax breaks to modern electric and hybrid vehicles as diesel was promoted as a cleaner fuel at the time. This will also drive up the costs for local business owners and is likely to reduce custom.</p>
60	<p><b>Amesbury Avenue</b></p> <p>With reference to the proposed CPZ, Lydhurst Avenue SW2 there has never been a parking issue in Lydhurst Avenue. We have several residences old, vulnerable and infirm on Lydhurst Avenue all depending on family visits and care workers throughout the day. Plus it has enabled some teachers of Hitherfield School to park here as most of them seem to have an early start at 7.30 am. And quite frankly I do not wish to have to pay for a parking permit out of my pension when there is not a problem in Parking on my road.</p> <p>Since the arrival of yellow lines, disabled bays, and cycle storage sheds which have greatly reduced the parking on the Leigham Court Estate. In addition to the surrounding CPZ's...This has had a knock-on effect on the ABCD roads. As for Amesbury Avenue, the extra charge for business parking will have a knock-on effect on the small businesses.</p>
61	<p><b>Lydhurst Avenue</b></p> <p>I do not agree to having CPZ in Lydhurst avenue. Number XX.</p>
62	<p><b>Amesbury Avenue</b></p> <p>Hi my name is mr XXXXX live in Amesbury Ave above the shop I've been here 30 odd years and had no problem parking and still have no problem parking so why is Lambeth so keen to put parking restrictions on the abc road they keep talking about support your local shop how if you can't park free to use them the council let the build large blocks of flats where the bowling alley was with no parking so we're did they think them people were going to park of course at the ends of the abc road the bottom on the roads have always been busy but you would of known that before you buy your house down there Lambeth again trying to claw money back for over spending again.</p>
63	<p><b>Anonymous</b></p> <p>Dear Madam</p> <p>I am opposed to the new parking restrictions in Streatham</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The scheme is not needed at the present time</li> <li>2. It will be bad for businesses</li> <li>3. It will have a bad effect on neighbouring roads</li> <li>4. If introduced it should be free for senior citizens and disabled people</li> <li>5. About 80% of residents are against it</li> <li>6. It was rejected about two years ago</li> <li>7. Forms should be sent to all households so they can give their opinion.</li> </ol>