

REPRESENTATIONS IN SUPPORT OF THE PROPOSALS

Doverfield Road (D-SUP-1003)

I support the introduction of a CPZ

However the proposal to have the zone operating from 8.30 to 6.30 is perverse and is not a true reflection of the informal consultation. It is very important that resident's views are reflected and taken account of in this consultation to maintain credibility as we have another consultation regarding traffic flows in the area underway. It looks to be the opposite of what residents have indicated that they want. The majority have asked for either a 4 hour or a 2 hour zone. The Council has simply looked at which of the three options has the most preferences. As the majority have asked for a shorter time zone and many want a zone from 8.30 to 6.30 the correct reflection of resident's views would be a 4 hour zone. It may well be that a similar option in the neighbouring proposed zone should also be a 4 hour restriction rather than a two hour restriction. In my view the Council in its communication has mislead residents and as such if they proceed with a 8.30 to 6.30 zone and a two hour zoen may find their decision challenged either through the formal complaints system which can be taken forward to the Ombudsman or by Judicial Review. It might be presumed that the Council has proposed 8.30 to 6.30 to maximise their income rather than to reflect the views of residents. Can you please tell me what percentage of residents in the proposed zones voted for each of the options?

Officer Response:

Full details of the consultation results and the detailed report explaining the decision can be found on the Lambeth webpage, www.lambeth.gov.uk/bhcpz. The hours of operation for any Lambeth CPZ's is based on the view of the largest majority of respondents. The Council is not a position to manipulate or interpret the figures to suit any preference. The largest majority for Zone D chose 8.30am to 6.30pm.

Doverfield Road (D-SUP-1058)

I just wanted to email you to say thanks for your work on the CPZ consultation in our area, Brixton Hill. It all seems like it's moving in a positive direction, at long last. I have lived at XX Doverfield Rd, SW2 since 2004, and had my campervan parked in the road since then. My partner and I don't use the vehicle much - once every few weeks to go to the garden centre, then we use it for several weeks a year for holidays outside of London. My partner gets the tube to work and I cycle. Despite the low use of our vehicle compared to some vehicle owners in London, we are often reluctant to use the campervan as the parking situation is so horrifically bad that we know we'll struggle to get a space on our return. It's always been bad, ever since we've lived here. Often we'll get back from a weekend away and I will park on the yellow lines at the end of the road as there's no space. My partner will walk up and down the street until there's a space and then call me on the mobile, standing in the space to save it! It's seriously a two-person job! The surrounding streets are no better. As soon as someone leaves a parking space, someone else will go straight into it. I know people use our street as a car park and then get the bus down to the tube station. And since the (perfectly friendly) church and mosque users (who attend the churches and mosque on Brixton Hill) began parking in our streets it's also very bad at weekends too, now. So, although I was very encouraged to see that our zone (Zone D) is proposed Monday to Friday 8.30-6.30, and that would improve things a lot, I still don't think it goes far enough. At the weekends, it's also very difficult to find a space as the church and mosque users use our street as a car park, coming and going constantly all weekend. It's very frustrating. I do wish that people wouldn't be so car dependant, when we have such an excellent public transport system, Speaking to my neighbours, they find the situation equally frustrating. Anyway, I hope that you'll take my feedback into consideration, and I think the proposals sound like they will help a lot. It will be great if they get the go ahead. I think they should apply to the weekend in Zone D, too, but certainly Monday to Friday 8.30-6.30pm will improve the current situation. Thanks very much.

Doverfield Road (D-SUP-1076)

I have been living at number XX Doverfield Rd, SW2 for almost 13 years, parking has always been a problem as many people from outside the area use our road and surrounding streets to park then catch the bus or tube into central London. The road is packed with cars from 7.30am to 7.00pm Monday to Friday so if you are returning home by car during this time you will have no chance of parking near to your house, instead you have to drive around and spend ages looking for a space in distant streets. This is very inconvenient especially if you have heavy shopping/camping equipment etc. to unload. Over the past couple of years things have been made noticeably worse by the large Church, Mosque and new learning/tuition centres that have opened up, now the road is busy during the weekends as well. Our road is often gridlocked with cars full of

people attending various events/classes etc. Incidents of road rage are common as people fight for right of way or argue over parking. I was very encouraged to see that a zone (Zone D) is proposed (Monday to Friday 8.30-6.30) I think that would improve things a lot, I still don't think it goes far enough, as people will still use our road to park in to attend the Church, Mosque and learning/tuition centres at the weekends.

Felsberg Road (D-SUP-1009)

We desperately need this. Residents cannot park - and nor can visitors. Our road is effectively a park and ride for outer London. This is bad for the environment i.e long car journeys and commutes. And it is desperately unfair on us. The stress of parking outside your own home is too much, and service providers (eg plumbers) often simply give up.

Kings Avenue (D-SUP-1059)

We fully support the proposal to bring a permitted controlled parking zone to the Brixton Hill area for the following reasons: 1. "Park and Ride" commuter crowd parking here and going into town on bus/train, as this is now the closest streets to Brixton and Clapham not covered by an existing CPZ. 2. "White Van Park" - non-residents parking their commercial vehicles, it has become a white van car park. Individuals will either leave their van parked on the road, or drive their own car over and swap their car for their van, either way taking up precious parking spaces. 3. "Building Site Parking" - site workers park on the streets and then walk to their work at the building sites. In addition, some Kings Avenue developments are building on their parking spaces so even more cars are looking for spaces on the non CPZ streets. 4. Adjoining streets with CPZ are half empty eg. Lyham Road or Clarence Avenue, but we are excluded from parking there when our streets are full during the day. 5. On a personal level, we are expecting our first child and extremely concerned about continuing to have to park a long way from our front door, especially when trying to cope with a small baby and shopping etc.

Kingswood Road (D-SUP-1002)

I am 100% in favour of the proposals for parking restrictions in this area. Many Thanks for finally listening to us!

Kingswood Road (D-SUP-1004)

Please vote for residents parking for a few hours a day so we do not get motorist using our roads for free and going to work by bus to town

Kingswood Road (D-SUP-1011)

Our address is XX Kingswood Rd, London SW2 4JH. We agree with your proposals as described in the notice. We would also like to add the following: We believe that we need an additional electric charging point for cars on our road and installation of bike hangers. We would also like to see the installation of speed humps to very fast moving traffic coming down Kingswood Road. This would increase the number of electric car usage and also allow more residents to use bikes for travel. We believe that we need to create additional designated spaces for these so that we can cater for additional environmentally friendly modes of transport. There is a huge demand for this and we should not be short sighted at this very important moment. We are unlikely to get another chance to develop environmentally friendly traffic schemes in our area for a very long time. We should also have street signage which encourages drivers to switch off engines. We are finding more and more drivers – in particular those using commercial vehicles – who are leaving their engines on to charge mobile phones or to keep warm. A basic leaflet saying that charging phones with just the car battery is not going to damage the battery or reduce power for the battery to start up engines. I do hope you take these comments into consideration however it goes without saying that we agree with the proposals and they were a long time coming.

Officer Response:

Relating to Electric Vehicle Charging Points in Lambeth. The council is committed to supporting cleaner vehicle technology to reduce the impact of emissions from motor vehicles in the borough. As part of this we are currently exploring a number of options to enable residents and businesses to charge electric vehicles where the option to charge on private land is limited. These are currently as follows:

• Source London

We are currently in contractual negotiations with the operators of the Source London network in order to agree the rollout of charging points on-street in Lambeth. Subject to agreement, this would lead to new charging points being delivered across the borough in 2017.

• Procurement

We are preparing a tender exercise to identify a supplier for charging points in the borough to complement any agreement with Source London. The council has allocated up to £200K to support rollout of fast charge points in 2017/18.

Transport for London have developed a procurement framework and secured funding for Rapid Charging Points - we are currently working with TfL to identify sites for these in Lambeth.

• Lamp column charging

We are working with our lighting contractor to deliver a trial of charging from lamp columns.

While the above discussions are taking place we are logging all requests in our evidence base for reference when agreeing future locations for charging points.

The installation of cycle hangars follows a separate consultation and implementation process. The following link can be used to request one in the road <https://www.lambeth.gov.uk/forms/register-your-interest-in-a-lambeth-bikehangar-form>

At the moment the Council is in the middle of a retendering the contract for installing and maintaining the hangars, so they have a delay in dealing with incoming requests. However, I would recommend that you and your neighbours who are interested in having cycle parking in the neighbourhood complete the request form on the website.

Kingswood Road (D-SUP-1022)

I have lived at XX Kingswood Road SW2 4JE since 1979. In the early days the parking was relatively easy but the last few years it has become so bad. I think I am lucky these days if I manage to park within two roads near my street.

So the new parking restrictions would make my life, especially in older age, so much more pleasant

Kingswood Road (D-SUP-1037)

I fully support the CPZ proposal for Brixton Hill area. Parking for residents has become a nightmare, often we have nowhere to park, and non-residents are using the area to then cycle or get bus into city. Some cars are also parked for weeks, and do not move.

Kingswood Road (D-SUP-1042)

My husband and I are the residents of Kingswood Road and both of us are in full support of the proposed CPZ.

At present, parking presents a serious and sustained problem on both Kingswood Road and the adjoining roads that are not currently controlled by a CPZ. Being within walking distance of a number of Overground and Underground stations (Clapham North, Clapham High Street, Clapham Common and Brixton), the roads are regularly used for parking by commuters who live further away, which causes a major nuisance for residents. In the mornings when I walk to the station, I often see people parking their cars before departing on foot to the station. Parking congestion means that I along with other residents are often forced to park a considerable distance from our homes. Whilst I don't expect to be able to park directly outside my house, having to park 3 or 4 streets away is a point of ongoing frustration, particularly as we have two young children. Parking is generally fine at the weekends but if I use my car during the week then I can spend up to 15-20 minutes trying to find a space which is unacceptable and an issue that I have no doubt would be immediately resolved by the introduction of a CPZ. I further add that nearby roads that already have a CPZ do not seem to suffer the same issues and there is a very visible increase in available parking spaces on these roads. We also would have a preference to just have resident parking between Thorncliff and Thornbury on Kingswood road, rather than metered and resident.

Kingswood Road (D-SUP-1044)

We are in support of restricted parking on, and around Kingswood Road. It has become increasingly harder over the years to find parking in the area, let alone the street we live on. This is in part due to commuter parking but also abandoned vehicle, multiple trade vehicles and the inability to park off road. There is frequent congestion and many angry drivers on these streets with cars 'packed in', often parked on the single yellow lines for loading and unloading with no room for passing vehicles. I have witnessed many 'stand offs' between cars that are, either unable or unwilling to create a right of way. The tightly packed cars also makes visibility harder, particularly for drivers turning onto Kingswood Road from Chale Street and this corner has become a danger spot. I have witnessed 2 accidents in the last 12 months and countless near misses. Kingswood Road has also become a 'rat run' from Brixton Hill to Kings Ave and the long hill encourages speeding, particularly for those that aren't aware of the junction. Parking restrictions may not alleviate these issues but it will help reduce the number of cars on our road and improve visibility.

Kingswood Road (D-SUP-1048)

Just to let you know that we are in full approval of your plans for zone d in Brixton hill.

Kingswood Road (D-SUP-1061)

I am a resident of Kingswood Road and have been for the last 5 years. Having seen the parking situation get worse over the years I am very much in favour of the CPZ in this area. It would appear Kingswood Road and the surrounding area is used by non-residents as a 'car park' during the working week. I have frequently had to park my car on other roads 10-15 minutes walk away from my home, which only pushes the issue elsewhere. I therefore think the introduction of CPZ 'D' is the right solution, and I would be more than happy to pay for a residents' parking permit if it meant I could park near my home.

Kingswood Road (D-SUP-1080)

I live in Kingswood Road SW2 and would like to add my support to the implementation of a CPZ in the road. I have lived in in my property for almost 13 years and parking has steadily become more of an issue. Over the past year or so, the situation has gotten even worse. Some evenings it is impossible to find a parking

space if you arrive home much before 6.30. I look out of the window in the morning and see people park their cars before setting off to work. Some vehicles are even left here whilst the owner goes on holiday. If there is an event at the Richard Atkins school or the hall at the rear, parking becomes even worse. At the weekend parking spaces seem more abundant suggesting that people outside of the area are parking in the street during the week. Connected to this, I think the disabled spaces in the street need reviewing as one is definitely no longer used. This is the one outside number 74/76. Another suggestion to make the road safer is for a one way system to be implemented. People race down the road and it is very dangerous due to the couple of bends. Also making the road one way would avoid the standoffs between drivers that happen regularly when someone is driving up and someone is driving down. Quite often there are tailbacks as people refuse to move and, on occasion, get out of their vehicles to argue. I have also experienced people scrapping along parked cars as they try to fit two vehicles past each other whilst cars are parked either side.

Lyham Road (D-SUP-1012)

I fully support the introduction of these CPZs. As a resident home owner on Lyham Rd it is an appalling situation when you can't find a parking space because people have driven & left their cars on the road as it is cheaper for them to then get the bus into Brixton, or when 1 resident has 5 vehicles that do not move for a year other than to go for an MOT, or when vans are driving so fast up the road you can't see them because of the other large vans parked on the road & blocking your view. It is a dangerous road to live on & try to cross because of the amount of high rise vans parked & you can't see round them to cross until you are inches away from cars & vans speeding past. By introducing the CPZs these issues will go away as fewer cars will be blocking the view of pedestrians. Please introduce these CPZs asap.

Lyham Road (D-SUP-1088)

I am fully in favour of the CPZ restrictions that are being suggested for Lyham Road. I live at XXX Lyham Road and have done since 2009. The road in the last 7 years has become more and more congested and a struggle to find parking. When I first moved here, there was no problems in parking at all. I was able to park my car close to my property and able to keep an eye on it at all times. There was never any wait and or having to park on roads that I don't live on. This has changed drastically in recent times. To the degree that I will not drive my car if at all possible, due to the risk of not having a parking space on my return. I have had to park 4 roads away more than once. I've had to drive around for 20 minutes waiting for a space. The construction vans, the people who take up all the surrounding roads when picking up their children, the muslim centre and the church on New park road, the person on my road that seems to own 5 cars (2 of which are non functional) AND a trailer that have all live on the road and the huge increase in disabled bays, as well as the car club spaces, that take up more and more of the road space. There may be better places to put the car club spaces – like New Park Road on short term bays. My partner moved in 1 year ago and had to sell their car 4 months after moving in because it was too difficult to find parking for two separate cars on this road. I shouldn't have to struggle to fit my small hatchback car that I have had on this road for 7 and a half years because of all of the people that don't live here and can't be bother to pay for parking or commuting as they should. At the weekend, it is easier to park so it is clearly commuters, workmen and the school run. The prospective extension zone D from 8.30am to 6.30pm will be perfect to counter these particular issues. The people of Saxby and Chale are only complaining because most are council tenants. Most of the upper end of Lyham Road are private tenants and owners who having been trying to lobby for this change for years and cannot wait for it to come into place. Hopefully they will have gotten in touch too – but 335, 337, 339 and 341 Lyham Road are all very very keen for the CPZ to come into place. I thoroughly look forward hearing back from you with regards to an implementation date

Lyham Road (D-SUP-1089)

Thank you for sending through the information on the Brixton Hill CPZ proposals. Susannah Coleridge-Smith and myself, both residing a 327 Lyham Road, sw2 5ns, firmly support the proposal of the CPZ introduction. It will hopefully have the desired affect of reducing competition for parking spaces and allow residents to park not those commuting from further afield. Thank you very much for taking residents views into account.

Morrish Road (D-SUP-1013)

I support the controlled parking zone. My address is Brixton Hill and the entrance to my flat is in Morrish Road. There is an issue with safety as drivers use Morrish Road as a rat run when looking for somewhere to park. They come flying down the road at excess speeds and I fear for my safety and that if other residents and my cat - there will be less traffic if there is no reason for people to drive down here.

Morrish Road (D-SUP-1045)

I live at XX Morrish Road and I am so in favour of the Controlled Parking scheme in our area. YES YES YES to controlled parking zone in Brixton Hill. It has been a difficult area to live in with all these huge vans, lorries and commercial vehicles using our road in particular just to park their unsightly vehicles close to the hill. You literally look down Morrish road and the sight is ugly all the time because of the vehicles. There is no room to cross sometimes, vehicles are so parked together. Because of the vicinity of Brixton Hill, commuters

leave their cars there. I mean just leave their cars for days. You can never get close parking if you have shopping or kids or elderly people or have some have heavy item. The whole thing is really out of hand. We live in Brixton Hill, pay a fortune in Council Tax and the parking problem has been allowed to deteriorate over years. I have often heard about the CPZ and we have consultations before but nothing ever happens. At the Resident meeting and local gatherings in our area, the topic always comes up... People are really so frustrated because of this problem, there has to be some control of all these cars especially since the public transport is so good locally. People go out and use Morrish road and Brixton Hill as a free car park whilst we the residents of the area are not considered.

Morrish Road (D-SUP-1073)

I am in favour and fully back the proposed controlled parking zone in the Brixton Hill area and particularly CPZ Zone D. I live on Morrish Road and every day struggle to park my car because the parking spaces are filled by numerous white vans, taxis, seemingly abandoned vehicles and the many cars of visitors to the two restaurants at the end of the road. First thing in the mornings the road is busy with commuters trying to find parking spaces on Morrish and Sulina Road before traveling into central London to work. I know for a fact that most of the parked vehicles are not owned by local residents. Cars are dangerously parked across junctions and on tight bends prevention through traffic and often meaning that the dustbin lorry can't come down the road. As suggested by the council for Zone D - I would back a parking restriction from Monday to Friday 8.30am to 6.30pm. The plan shows a single yellow line around the edge of the white studio building 45 Morrish Road, pedestrians currently have to walk off the pavement into oncoming traffic in the middle of the road to pass here which is even more dangerous when cars are parked against the side of the studio. This should be a double yellow lined to prevent cars from parking in this area at all times.

Officer Response:

Thank you for bringing the single yellow line adjacent to 45 Morrish Road to our attention. This single yellow line will be replaced by a double yellow line at this location to offer protection and clear sightlines at all times. Additionally the Council intends to construct a footway buildout at this location to provide a safe and improved pedestrian footway facility.

Rosebery Road (D-SUP-1007)

As a homeowner at XX Rosebery Road - I support the decision because it can be incredibly difficult to park around there and loads of people who don't live there people use the road free car park.

Rosebery Road (D-SUP-1008)

It gets my support too.

Rosebery Road (D-SUP-1010)

I am a Rosebery Rd homeowner and resident and the representative for the local residents' association. I am wholly in favour of a CPZ. I am in favour of a CPZ preferably for a portion of weekdays only to prevent the two main sources of the problem: weekday commuter parking and long term parking/vehicle dumping by non-residents. In the 9 years I have lived on Rosebery Rd we have consistently faced a chronic lack of parking availability that has also served to make our road dangerous at times. Problems include cars and vans having to park on double yellow lines and around corners, road rage from non-residents as residents are forced to load/unload while stopped briefly in the road, a lack of passing spaces leading to confrontations between drivers.

Officer Response:

The informal consultation results showed the largest majority of respondents' for Zone D support the 8.30am-6.30pm hours of operation, from the options provided. Any change to the hours of operation would require a further separate consultation which would delay the implementation of the zone by 6-12 months. We have not received a significant amount of requests from the area to support a change in hours. Any request for changes can be investigated upon review of the zone.

Rosebery Road (D-SUP-1014)

I am wholly in favour of the proposed CPZ 'D' zone as proposed in the published consultation. As a resident of Rosebery Road for 18+ years I have seen a dramatic increase in parking issues in our road and the surrounding area to the point that car use is becoming very problematic. I need a car as I have an elderly mother who I often have to visit day and night due to her poor health and being unable to park anywhere near my home when returning is a constant issue. There are a few points, however, that don't seem to have been fully explained:

- why we are being offered only Mon-Fri 8.30am-6.30pm (originally there seemed to be a lot of support for a scheme such as CPZ 'L' i.e. 10am-12 noon)?

- how much the residents' permits will cost per annum.

- there seem to be a lot of Disabled bays which are not being used - will these be taken away and Disabled users will just get a residents' permit and use these to park instead?

- the double yellow line road markings at the top corner of Rosebery Road (where the entrance to Rosebery Mews lies) seem to be taking up an excessive amount of space and need to be reviewed and shortened.

Please would it be possible to address the above points?

All of the above said, I feel that any form of CPZ will make a huge difference to parking in this area so you have my full support.

Officer Response:

The informal consultation results showed the largest majority of respondents' for Zone D support the 8.30am-6.30pm hours of operation, from the options provided. Any change to the hours of operation would require a further separate consultation which would delay the implementation of the zone by 6-12 months. We have not received a significant amount of requests from the area to support a change in hours.

Any request for changes can be investigated upon review of the zone.

Full details of parking charges was provided during the informal consultation. The charges are emission based, the full structure can be found on the scheme webpage at, www.lambeth.gov.uk/bhcz.

The introduction and removal of disabled bays are subject to its own consultation processes.

The council is determined to assist people with disabilities and recognises that disabled parking places greatly improve the quality of life for many users. As a result we are keen to ensure that only those parking places that are not being used are removed.

Disabled bays are not registered to a single person or an applicant and therefore can be used by anyone with a blue badge. The bay will remain as long as required by any blue badge holder. We only remove disabled bays when they are unused by any blue badge holder at any time. If, as part of the consultation process, we receive a representation advising us that a bay is in regular use even though this may not be by the person who originally requested the bay then our current policy is not to remove the bay.

The removal of disabled parking places is a sensitive issue and the council only investigate removals upon request as not to cause unintentional distress.

Rosebery Road (D-SUP-1017)

I live at XX Rosebery Road, SW2 4DQ and am writing to express my wholehearted support for the proposals presented for a CPZ in my road.

I have been pressing the council for some years for its introduction. There are several reasons for this:- My household has one car which my partner normally uses to go to and from work. Finding a parking space on return is usually impossible and he has to park on Lyham Road in one of the vacant CPZ spaces overnight. Obviously this means the car has to be moved before the hours of that CPZ go into operation. If we are on holiday or he is ill and can't go to work this causes problems. Once he was taken ill in the night and had left the car on a single yellow on Kingswood Road. When I went to try and move it at 9am I found it had been ticketed and towed. It cost £265 to retrieve it from the Mitcham pound. This was costly and time-consuming and was as a result of being unable to find a spot to park anywhere near home.

Other examples are when you have building work taking place, or a plumber, electrician calling. They have to drive round and round trying to find somewhere to park. Having visitor permits or pay bays will greatly alleviate that problem.

I once returned from dropping a friend at Gatwick airport at 8am one morning and after much driving round and round found a space in Rosebery Road, only to find as I was backing into it that a builder drove forward into it resulting in a very unpleasant altercation.

I could go on....but to sum up a CPZ is long overdue for the sanity of local residents if nothing else.

Rosebery Road (D-SUP-1018)

I live at XX Rosebery road, sw2.

Parking is terrible in the surrounding area during the week.

As your survey shows the immediate area is under huge midweek parking stress.

I completely support your findings and the implementation of a cpz.

Rosebery Road (D-SUP-1019)

I strongly support the CPZ. As a resident of Rosebery Road it is almost impossible to park near my home during the week. People who do not live in the area park their cars here and commute into London. We also suffer from vehicles being left in the street for weeks upon weeks without moving, as well as abandoned cars / vans.

Rosebery Road (D-SUP-1020)

My wife and I are owner/occupiers of X Rosebery Road, and I wish to strongly push for the introduction of this CPZ as soon as possible.

I work at King's College Hospital, my wife works at the RSPCA animal hospital in Putney.

Both our jobs involve antisocial hours of work.

We often return home after 9pm, and it is invariably impossible to find parking on or street.

The situation is not that different during the day - Rosebery Road is the most convenient street for commuters to park their vehicles before boarding public transport into central London. We also get a lot of HMP Brixton staff parking on the street because of limited parking in the prison itself.

We would therefore be very grateful if you would consider our comments.

Rosebery Road (D-SUP-1023)

I am a resident on Rosebery Road, SW2 and I fully support the introduction of a CPZ in this area to protect car parking for residents. I would also support additional car charging points. I think there should be more of these than the single charging point proposed on Kingswood road.

Finally, I often have to return home late in the evening 11pm, midnight or later and it is very difficult to find car parking spaces. When I do this, almost all of the disabled bays in the area are empty. Is it necessary to have so many disabled car parking bays?

Officer Response:

The introduction and removal of disabled bays are subject to its own consultation processes.

The council is determined to assist people with disabilities and recognises that disabled parking places greatly improve the quality of life for many users. As a result we are keen to ensure that only those parking places that are not being used are removed.

Disabled bays are not registered to a single person or an applicant and therefore can be used by anyone with a blue badge. The bay will remain as long as required by any blue badge holder. We only remove disabled bays when they are unused by any blue badge holder at any time. If, as part of the consultation process, we receive a representation advising us that a bay is in regular use even though this may not be by the person who originally requested the bay then our current policy is not to remove the bay.

The removal of disabled parking places is a sensitive issue and the council only investigate removals upon request as not to cause unintentional distress.

Rosebery Road (D-SUP-1028) & (D-SUP-1039)

I am a resident of Rosebery Road and am in full support of the proposed CPZ. At present, parking presents a serious and sustained problem on both Rosebery Road, Thornbury Road and the adjoining roads that are not currently controlled by a CPZ. Being within walking distance of a number of Overground and Underground stations (Clapham North, Clapham High Street, Clapham Common and Brixton), the roads are regularly used for parking by commuters who live further away, which causes a major nuisance for residents. In the mornings when I walk to the station, I often see people parking their cars before departing on foot to the station. Parking congestion means that I along with other residents are often forced to park a considerable distance from our homes. Whilst I don't expect to be able to park directly outside my house, having to park 3 or 4 streets away is a point of ongoing frustration. On many occasions I decide not to drive altogether for fear of not being able to find space to park on my return at all, which is a particular issue in the evenings. I further add that nearby roads that already have a CPZ do not seem to suffer the same issues and there is a visible increase in available parking spaces on these.

Rosebery Road (D-SUP-1030)

I'm writing in support of the proposed cpz in the Brixton hill Area.

I've found it difficult to find parking in the day and particularly in the late evenings since moving to the area in 2012. With 2 young children this had made things a bit difficult as I've had to walk a good distance with 2 grumpy children. I've also found issues with passing places on the road leading to traffic backing up and unpleasantness from other drivers. The cpz would greatly assist with both the above issues.

Rosebery Road (D-SUP-1035)

I am a resident of Rosebery Road and I fully support the proposed plans for a CPZ.

Currently, parking is at an absolute breaking point; we're going through serious problems, on both Rosebery Road and Thornbury Road, and all adjoining roads that are not controlled by a CPZ. The primary reason for this is that the roads are regularly used for parking by commuters who live further away from completely different areas, and it is this which causes major problems for residents. We are perfectly placed for three different tube stations, and so huge numbers of commuters use Rosebery and Thornbury Roads to park their cars, before departing on foot to the stations. This means that current residents are often forced to park considerable distances from our homes; in some instances, 3 or 4 streets away from our homes. All nearby

roads that already have a CPZ in place do not suffer from the same issues, and there is a visible increase in available parking spaces on these controlled streets.

Rosebery Road (D-SUP-1047)

I am a resident at XX Rosebery Road and fully support the proposed CPZ.

At the moment parking is a huge problem for the majority of the residence on both Rosebery Road, Thornbury Road and the surrounding roads that do not currently have controlled parking. Being within walking distance of a number of Overground and Underground stations the roads are regularly used for parking by commuters who live further away, which causes a major nuisance for residents. In the mornings when I walk to the station, I often see people parking their cars before departing on foot to the station. Or worse they park whilst on holiday. I have also seen tradesman such as BT vans parking here for the weekend whilst their owners drive off to their own homes elsewhere. Parking congestion means that I along with other residents are often forced to park a considerable distance from our homes. This is a particular issue with our very young family. Having to park 4 or 5 streets away and sometimes on the main road (which is very dangerous and often cars are damaged) is a point of ongoing frustration. On many occasions I decide not to drive altogether for fear of not being able to find space to park on my return at all, which is a particular issue in the evenings. It is almost impossible for guests to visit and park and even worse for deliveries. I really hope we are put out of our misery and can have the same access and consideration as others in the neighbourhood only a few streets closer to Clapham.

Rosebery Road (D-SUP-1054)

I am writing to express support for the introduction of a CPZ covering the proposed 'D' CPZ area, especially Rosebery Road, Thorbury Road, Thorncliffe Road, Wingford Road and Kingswood Road. It has been extremely difficult for residents to park in this area for a number of years, with a significant jump when the Council introduced CPZs covering the streets nearer to Brixton and Clapham Station. When our own streets are full, we are also prohibited from parking on adjoining streets which are half-empty, since they are covered by existing CPZ - example north part of Lyham Road is in Brixton 'E' zone, same with Mandrell Road or Mauleverer Road. The nearby streets with CPZ are normally less than 50% utilised whereas our streets are bursting at the seams.

Rosebery, Thorbury, and Thorncliffe Roads together with Morrish and Sulina Roads are now the nearest streets for non-residents to park and then catch a bus or walk to the station. I regularly watch non-residents park up, and then catch the bus into town, or walk down Brixton Hill to the station. A relatively new phenomena has been introduced by all the building work that has started on adjoining Kings Avenue over the past 12 months. I now see building site workers with their hard hats coming by car and by van and parking in our streets, and then walking to work on the building sites on Kings Ave. Surely the development companies should be making provision for parking on-site for their own workers, or at least taking steps not to cause nuisance for the local residents.

I suggest that the council considers that 'D' CPZ should also cover weekends, Mon-Sun 8.30am-6.30pm rather than just Mon-Fri. I often have trouble parking when returning on a Sunday evening after a weekend away from London. I see tradesmen leave their work vans in our streets over the weekends and get collected by friends or family by car on Friday evening. These workers are dropped off again on Monday mornings and collect their vans and drive off. I counted 8 "white vans" parked on Rosebery Road alone, Saturday and Sunday. Of these, 7 of the vans left promptly by 8.30am Monday morning. Parking of these commercial vehicles on residential streets not only makes parking for residents difficult but it lessens our enjoyment of the street environment. This is especially true on weekends which are family time and children are more likely to be outside. I further suggestion more consolidation of the Zones. Rather than have lots of small zones, why not combine small zones into bigger zones. For example, rather than introduce a new 'D' zone, I would suggest our area becomes part of the existing Brixton 'E' zone or Clapham 'L' zone. In conclusion, the introduction of a CPZ for our streets will allow residents to park more easily, and also legitimate visitors and tradesmen working for residents will be covered by Visitors Permits. The CPZ cannot come soon enough. My family is strongly in support of this measure.

Rosebery Road (D-SUP-1052)

I am resident at X Rosebery Road and am writing to STRONGLY SUPPORT the introduction of a CPZ please. I have 2 children who I take to school regularly by car. In addition, my work requires me to do regular night shifts as well as late finishing shift work. I can almost never find a parking space after 9am if I return in the morning from a night shift. Similarly, if I return after a late-shift, I have to park several streets away and walk alone in the dark, which, as a lone female, I find very frightening. The sooner a CPZ is introduced the better!

Rosebery Road (D-SUP-1056)

I would like to confirm my support of a Controlled Parking Zone in Rosebery Road, with a restriction of control operational Monday to Friday, 1200 to 1400. My reasons as follows:- Non-residents park their vehicles & leave them all day & night on occasions, preventing residents from parking. - Local construction projects operatives Parkin the road & leave their vehicles all day, again preventing residents parking. - I have also noted people parking their vehicles, putting a suitcase in a taxi then leaving presumably to go on holiday for over a week, leaving their car again preventing residents parking. I do not want the full day restriction I place as that would be impractical for me & others I assume. What we need is a deterrent for the transient non-resident parkers.

Officer Response:

The informal consultation results showed the largest majority of respondents' for Zone D support the 8.30am-6.30pm hours of operation, from the options provided. Any change to the hours of operation would require a further separate consultation which would delay the implementation of the zone by 6-12 months. We have not received a significant amount of requests from the area to support a change in hours.

Any request for changes can be investigated upon review of the zone.

Rosebery Road (D-SUP-1057)

I am writing in full support of the introduction of parking controls in the Brixton Hill area, especially the area between Brixton Hill, Kings Avenue, and Atkins Road/Streatham place, i.e. CPZ 'D'. Parking problems have got worse over the last several years. I am sure non-residents use the area to park in (including my street, Rosebery Road), while they commute into London (I have observed this). We also have cars and vans left here for long periods, including un-taxed vehicles and cars that have been dumped - as I write, there are 2 un-taxed cars in the road, and a van with a flat tyre which has been here for at least 3 months. Every time my wife and I go out in our car, we spend most of the journey back wondering (worrying) if there will be a parking space anywhere near our house - usually there isn't - because my wife cannot walk far, and we frequently have to park on adjoining streets, sometimes 500 yards away. (Yesterday, for example, I had to park on Clarence Avenue; that meant that this morning I had to move the car before 10 a.m., and spend 20 minutes finding another parking space.) We also suffer from builders, maintenance workers and so on parking vans in Rosebery Road, while they work elsewhere. I suspect visitors to Brixton Prison also park in this area - and possibly prison staff also - even though the car park at the prison is not always full. If and when a CPZ is introduced in this area, I hope the opportunity will be taken to reduce the length of double yellow lines to the minimum (some in Rosebery Road especially seem to be un-necessarily long), and that the area set aside for residents will not be divided up into individual marked bays, as this could reduce the space available for parking.

Rosebery Road (D-SUP-1065)

I am writing to support to proposed Brixton Hill CPZ. I reside on Rosebery Road, SW2 which is within the proposed area. The proposed CPZ is a great solution to the parking issues we have been facing. My husband and I have largely stopped using our car for fear of not being able to park when we return. Parking on our street and surrounding streets is consistently affecting our quality of life for the following reasons: Our street seems to be a dumping ground for commercial vehicles that are not in use, especially over the weekend. Our street has an unusually high number of 'white vans' that are parked and left by non-residents and occupy precious spaces that we as residents are desperate to use. Parking on our street seems to be largely used as a park and ride facility for commuters, as our street is in close enough proximity to 3 tube stations (Brixton, Clapham North and Clapham Common). We often see commuters parking in the morning and either walking to the station or taking a bus. Other roads in the area that have controlled parking and in proximity to the tube stations are much less busy and have enough room for residents to park in proximity to their homes. Due to these issues above we usually spend a great deal of time circling the area hoping to secure a parking spot in our area which as they are so limited. We would greatly welcome the CPZ and fully endorse its introduction as proposed by the council in our area (Brixton Hill).

Rosebery Road (D-SUP-1081)

I live on Rosebery Rd SW2 4DD, and I am writing to highlight my reasons for being in favour of a Controlled Parking Zone for the Brixton Hill area, especially Rosebery and Thornbury Rd. We can never park our car near our house, I often have to park a few streets away and with two young children and shopping etc it's dangerous and also very unfair as not many of the people parked on my street even seem to live on my street. Being the nearest road to the tube with free parking I see lots of commuters parking their cars in the morning and picking them up after work, and/or leaving them there all week. People also leave their cars on our streets when they go on holiday, there has been a van directly outside my house with a flat tyre for over 6 weeks now. Cars are being regularly clamped for being parked with no tax/MOT so this proves my point! It also pushes up car crime in the area as thieves watch the cars and vandalise ones they know have been parked there for a while. Due to lots of buildings going up near our streets, namely the one on Helby Rd builders are also Parking on our roads as they are not offered parking on site, and prison wardens from

Brixton prison too. I hope these numerous reasons and the local support for the CPZ will mean it is introduced soon. I feel it is very unfair for residents who pay council tax and road tax and are happy to pay for a permit too.

Rosebery Road (D-SUP-1091)

As a resident of Rosebery Road for eight years I would welcome the introduction of residents parking. It is virtually impossible to find a parking space during the week and I regularly have to park my car many roads away - which is both inconvenient when having to unload bags of shopping and also not a safe option if it is late at night and I am by myself or with my three young children. It also regularly requires me to drive round and round the nearby roads for 30 minutes or more, looking for a space to become vacant. During the week the road is very busy at rush hour as many commuters park their cars in our road and then head to the nearest bus stops to make use of the local transport links. It also makes the road very congested as commuters are driving around looking for a parking space or blocking the road while they wait for someone to leave and for a space to become available. It is also a local hot spot during the week for people to park their business vehicles and vans. A large number of vans are regularly parked in our road overnight with people being dropped off at them in the morning to continue their journey to work and collected at the end of the day having parked here for the night. There is also a lot of commercial building work in the surrounding roads and this attracts a lot of additional vehicles being parked. We also seem to get a high volume of abandoned or untaxed vehicles left in the road for long periods of time. At the weekend it is a dream. You can park your car near to your house, go out, and be able to park again when you come back. I and my family are very much hoping this goes ahead as soon as possible.

Sulina Road (D-SUP-1024)

My wife and I living and residence of XX Sulina Road support this proposal and very much look forward to securing this cpz process so we can ensure we have a better chance parking our car! We are a one car family.

Sulina Road (D-SUP-1025)

1. On Sulina Road alone there have been numerous abandoned and untaxed cars and vans which have caused many problems for us local residents. The knock on effect of such vehicles is to increase vandalism to these and surrounding cars. They obviously reduce the parking available to the legal, tax-paying cars. 2. Cars continually park in such a way as to block the corner of Sulina Road. On at least 4 occasions this year alone the residents have had refuse collection interrupted, delayed or no happened at all as a result of access issues to the whole road. 3. As a small business (Painter & Decorator), and I operate from my home on Sulina Road as a base, I need access to my car to carry the equipment I need for my job. While I don't expect to be able to park directly outside my house, I do need to be within carrying distance in order to run my business. The reservations I have are regards the time constraints. 10am to 4pm is easily sufficient to deter the commuters, and will enable local businesses to have vehicle access from their customers should they need it. This is presumably a plan to solve the parking problem, not a money making venture. In addition, we were promised at least one Car Club bay and I cannot see this mentioned on the list. Looking forward to the CPZ's implementation.

Officer Response:

The informal consultation results showed the largest majority of respondents' for Zone D support the 8.30am-6.30pm hours of operation, from the options provided. Any change to the hours of operation would require a further separate consultation which would delay the implementation of the zone by 6-12 months. We have not received a significant amount of requests from the area to support a change in hours.

Any request for changes can be investigated upon review of the zone.

Following a request for a Car Club in the Sulina/Morrish roads area during the informal Consultation, the Council contacted the Car Club provider who had no interest to provide a vehicle in this location as there are already Car Club vehicles within relatively close proximity.

Sulina Road (D-SUP-1026)

I support desperately cpz. -it is impossible to park in our road -it is impossible to turn corners due to parked cars - it is impossible for anyone to pass no 41 coz of my double parked car - it is dangerous for my kids who i have to heave alone in house whilst I circle the area for 20mins a day - it is bad for pollution that l'm driving half an hour longer every day to find parking spaces - it causes anti-social behaviour in street as we are all stressed trying to get on with our lives -parking wardens make a beeline for our street giving residents tickets whilst non-residents park whilst we are on school runs and trot off to work

Sulina Road (D-SUP-1032)

A CPZ on Sulina Road is necessary and will be most welcome as parking is very hard. However, it will only work if all abandoned vehicles are removed and the garage on Sulina Road and the business on the corner

of Sulina and Morrish Road do not fill the roads with cars that are being repaired and parked lorries, as happens now. Thanks

Sulina Road (D-SUP-1033)

I support the proposals for the CPZ area for Sulina Road. I agree with the proposals that this should be an all day restriction. Cars constantly block access to my property by parking in front of my gates, they park on the corner (despite new yellow lines) which blocks the road so the bin lorry cannot get through. Because of this, there are regular stand-offs in the street, right outside my property because the bin lorry gets stuck. I often also regularly have my bell rung asking if the offending vehicle is mine (it is not). I work from home so see the impacts of the chaotic parking throughout the day. Having a 2 hour restriction will not work as parking is taken-up by business vehicles and non-commuters that come and park to go in to town for shopping. This is clear as you very often see these individuals returning to their cars with shopping bags that are not from local retailers. Additionally the garage at #6 Sulina Road treat the street as a parking lot, several cars on the street at any one time. They even work on them opposite my house, which is further up the street. Having a small window for restriction will not address this problem and will continue to reduce space for genuine residents. This is a residential street and we will still require a permit regardless of the times, therefore having a full day restriction will only affect those who abuse the current free parking and by doing so create significant tension among the neighbours.

Sulina Road (D-SUP-1046)

I am writing regarding the proposed cpz zone D in Sulina Road. Both I and my wife agree that a cpz has become necessary in Sulina Road, but we also agree that it should be in Zone F. An all day except weekend parking cost will be too prohibitive for friends and family to visit or 'drop in', and getting trade deliveries is awkward enough already. Please reconsider the banding of Sulina Road.

Officer Response:

The informal consultation results showed the largest majority of respondents' for Zone D support the 8.30am-6.30pm hours of operation, from the options provided. Any change to the hours of operation would require a further separate consultation which would delay the implementation of the zone by 6-12 months. We have not received a significant amount of requests from the area to support a change in hours. Any request for changes can be investigated upon review of the zone.

Sulina Road (D-SUP-1055)

I support the proposal to implement a CPZ in Zone D on Monday to Friday between 0830-1830.

Sulina Road (D-SUP-1063)

I support the proposals for the CPZ area for Sulina Road. I agree with the proposals that this should be an all day restriction for the following reasons. Having a 2 hour restriction will not work as parking is taken-up by business vehicles and non-commuters that come and park to go in to the centre of town for shopping. This is clear as you very often see these individuals returning to their cars with shopping bags that are not from local retailers. I do not believe that local retailers will be impacted as there is little shopping locally which is not commonly available in most other neighbourhoods, most footfall in these shops is from pedestrians. Restaurants will not be adversely affected as these are evening venues. The garage at #6 Sulina Road treat the street as a parking lot, with several cars (I estimate sometimes up to 6) on the street at any one time. They even work on them in the street. Having a small window for restriction will not address this problem and will continue to reduce space for genuine residents. Refuse and emergency vehicles have had access restricted to the length of Sulina Road, due to parking and double parking, which could prove fatal. Additionally I support the proposed double yellow lines outside my property for the following reasons: Cars constantly block access to my property by parking in front of my gates because parking is so bad. Cars park on the corner of my property which blocks the road so refuse and emergency vehicles cannot get through. Because of this there are regular stand-offs in the street right outside my property when even moderate sized vehicles get stuck. I'm often disturbed by people ringing my doorbell, sometimes early, asking if a poorly parked offending vehicle is mine (it is not). This is a residential street and residents will still require a permit regardless of the timings imposed, therefore having a full day restriction will only affect those who abuse the current free parking and by doing so create significant tension among the neighbours.

Sulina Road (D-SUP-1063)

I have received a leaflet in the post about a proposed controlled parking zone on our road. This letter is to let you know that our household is in favour of the proposal. I would like to put forward a thought for consideration about a dangerous area on our road. At number 45, Morrish Road, there is a white building which sits on the road, no pavement around it and only parked cars to surround it and make the road very narrow.

Pedestrians have to walk in the road to go around it. Cars and vans parked there make for a fairly dangerous spot to circle. I believe the proposals are for a single yellow line around the building. Could it be changed to a double yellow line (so that cars just cannot park there)? That would serve much better for the purpose of keeping pedestrians safe. I have once been run over by a bike there as I was walking around the building pushing a pram. Thankfully no-one was too hurt, but it was not pleasant. I go around it several times a day with kids, and it is a concern.

Officer Response:

We are aware of the pedestrian issue around number 45 Morrish and the Council intends to construct a footway buildout at this location to provide a safe and improved pedestrian footway facility with double yellow lines to keep this section clear for improved sightlines for all road users.

Sulina Road (D-SUP-1070)

I live at XX Sulina Road, and have a car. I am a strong supporter of having a CPZ. It is often impossible to park in my street or neighbouring streets, and so I sometimes have to spend lots of time looking for a place. With small children, and heavy shopping to carry, this is very disruptive. The issues with parking are also threatening neighbourly relations, as there are sometimes arguments between neighbours over parking, e.g. people double parking while taking things to their house etc. My street is in area 'D', which would mean Mon to Fri 8.30-6.30pm. I would prefer a shorter time than the one you have proposed (e.g. 10-12, or 8.30 - 5.30). However, I would much rather have a CPZ with the time you have proposed than no CPZ.

Officer Response:

The informal consultation results showed the largest majority of respondents' for Zone D support the 8.30am-6.30pm hours of operation, from the options provided. Any change to the hours of operation would require a further separate consultation which would delay the implementation of the zone by 6-12 months. We have not received a significant amount of requests from the area to support a change in hours.

Any request for changes can be investigated upon review of the zone.

Sulina Road (D-SUP-1072)

I am resident at XX Sulina Rd and I fully support the proposals for a CPZ. The parking situation continues to worsen with residents often forced to drive repeatedly around looking for spaces. Many cars are left dumped on the road for long periods or spaces are taken by people commuting to work. The roads are so congested now that it is dangerous for children and older people attempting to cross roads. The roads would become safer and cleaner for everyone if we had a CPZ.

Sulina Road (D-SUP-1074)

I am a resident of XX Sulina Road SW2 4EJ. As I didn't receive a copy of the original questionnaire, I would like to take this opportunity to declare my Full Support for your proposal to make our road part of the zone D CPZ (Mon-Fri 8.30am - 6.30pm). The parking situation for residents in Sulina Road and the neighbouring roads has been absolutely terrible at all times of the day ever since I moved here several years ago.

Sulina Road (D-SUP-1075)

I am a resident of XX Sulina Road SW2 4EJ. As I didn't receive a copy of the original questionnaire, I would like to take this opportunity to declare my Full Support for your proposal to make our road part of the zone D CPZ (Mon-Fri 8.30am - 6.30pm). The parking situation, particularly for residents in Sulina Road and the neighbouring roads has been totally disastrous ever since I moved here years ago and I really hope that the parking conditions will sort this situation out.

Sulina Road (D-SUP-1078)

I live in Sulina Rd SW2 and I support a CPZ for our area. The parking situation is next to impossible during weekdays, with cars circling for long periods looking for a space. It seems that many commuters park in our streets since we are just off Brixton Hill and close to a Zone 2 bus stop. Although I do not have a car myself, I find it very difficult when people come to do any work on my house and cannot find anywhere to park. Recently a tree surgeon and a plumber both said they would have to go away and come back on another day - in the end I managed to find space for both of them by waiting in the street and standing in the space as soon as a vehicle left. I would much rather pay for visitors' parking permits. Ideally I would prefer a two hour zone, for example 10-12 or 12-2, but the most important thing is to have a CPZ. One more thing I would like to mention - on the plans for Morrish Rd, the street next to mine, there is a single yellow line alongside the part of the white studio building (45 Morrish Road) where it juts out into the road and pedestrians have to walk into oncoming traffic because there is no footway. It's very important that this is a double yellow line, because otherwise cars will continue to park there at night and we will all continue to risk our lives walking into the road in the dark (indeed it is dangerous any time of day or night). The double yellow line should

connect with the pavement along the rest of the white building. The single yellow line on the other side of the driveway (ie outside 43 Morrish Rd) should also be double yellow for the same reason. Ideally there should be a proper pavement where the building juts out, if that is possible - the double yellow line is essential to provide at least basic protection.

Officer Response:

The informal consultation results showed the largest majority of respondents' for Zone D support the 8.30am-6.30pm hours of operation, from the options provided. Any change to the hours of operation would require a further separate consultation which would delay the implementation of the zone by 6-12 months. We have not received a significant amount of requests from the area to support a change in hours.

Any request for changes can be investigated upon review of the zone.

Thank you for bringing the single yellow line adjacent to 45 Morrish Road to our attention. This single yellow line will be replaced by a double yellow line at this location to offer protection and clear sightlines at all times. Additionally the Council intends to construct a footway buildout at this location to provide a safe and improved pedestrian footway facility.

Sulina Road (D-SUP-1079)

I am a resident on Sulina rd – SW2 4EJ, where the parking consultation is taking place. I'm very much in favour of this happening, parking for residents on the street has become a nightmare with little spaces available for us to use on our own street. My car has been scratched on two different occasions with large vans trying to squeeze down the rd or turn the corner (part of this has now been rectified with the new yellow line on the corner of the rd). Personally I would prefer just a morning restriction on the rd as I think this would allow residents more freedom to park & have visitors without having to use permits and I believe it's usually enough of a deterrent for commuters (which seems to be the main issue). I look forward to hearing the outcome from the consultation.

Officer Response:

The informal consultation results showed the largest majority of respondents' for Zone D support the 8.30am-6.30pm hours of operation, from the options provided. Any change to the hours of operation would require a further separate consultation which would delay the implementation of the zone by 6-12 months. We have not received a significant amount of requests from the area to support a change in hours.

Any request for changes can be investigated upon review of the zone.

Sulina Road (D-SUP-1086)

I live at XX Sulina Road SW2 4EL with my wife and 2 young children. For a number of years there have been issues with parking for local residents and we have certainly been impacted. We would like to support Lambeth Council's proposal to move forward with the proposed CPZ on Sulina Road and the surrounding roads in the proposed time periods. This will facilitate greater access for residents and ideally reduce levels of traffic on a residential street with a number of young children. The proposals also show a single yellow line around the edge of the white studio building, 45 Morrish Road, where pedestrians currently have to walk out into the road in the face of oncoming traffic. In conjunction with my neighbours we would support a double yellow line there so cars cannot park at any time, otherwise pedestrians will still be in danger, especially at night. The double yellow line should connect with the pavement alongside the studio building to create a safe pathway. This is particularly important given we are frequently pushing a pram with one of our children.

Officer Response:

Thank you for bringing the single yellow line adjacent to 45 Morrish Road to our attention. This single yellow line will be replaced by a double yellow line at this location to offer protection and clear sightlines at all times. Additionally the Council intends to construct a footway buildout at this location to provide a safe and improved pedestrian footway facility.

Residents Association, SMWRTA. (D-SUP-1087)

I am writing on behalf of our Residents Association, SMWRTA. The informal consultation results show a majority of residents in Sulina and Morrish Roads support a CPZ, and indeed a CPZ was to have been put in place in our streets by Lambeth Council in spring 2014, but had its funding withdrawn at the last minute. The formal consultation is likely to show a similarly positive response, since our area experiences a great deal of parking stress due to commuter parking during weekdays. Double yellow lines rather than single required in certain locations In the current proposals, there are several places where a single yellow line is shown, but a double yellow line is necessary. *Beside the white studio building at 45 Morrish Road*

In October 2016 SMWRTA wrote to the engineers responsible for planning the proposed new Brixton Hill CPZ, enclosing the original CPZ plans for our streets, which were the result of collaboration between the Residents Association and Lambeth traffic engineers and CPZ officers over a period of several years.

Those plans showed that the Council had intended to place a footway at the side of the white studio building at 45 Morrish Road, where it juts out into the road. Currently there is no pavement here and cars park alongside the building, so pedestrians have to walk out into the street, which is dangerous (especially since it is very difficult to see oncoming traffic). For many years, residents have been asking for a pavement or build-out at this spot, wide enough for buggies or wheelchairs, and protected by bollards. In the current CPZ proposals, a single yellow line is shown at this location. Ideally we would ask for a build-out. At a minimum, the single yellow line should be a double one, otherwise vehicles will continue to park at night, the most dangerous time for pedestrians. The double yellow line should connect with the pavement alongside the rest of the white building. There should also be a double yellow line (instead of a single one) at the other side of the vehicle entrance into the white building, ie outside 43 Morrish Road.

At the corners of Sulina Road / Morrish Road Single yellow lines are also proposed for both corners where Sulina Road meets Morrish Road, and at the right-angled bend in Sulina Road. It is essential that these lines be double yellow, since in our experience people will park across the dropped kerbs where Sulina Rd meets Morrish Rd, and jutting out into the road at the right-angled bend. This makes crossing the road dangerous for pedestrians, and also makes it impossible for Council refuse lorries to get up Sulina Road, so our rubbish has remained uncollected on a number of occasions. *At the corners of Rodmill Lane / Sulina Road*

For the same reasons, double yellow lines need to be placed at both corners where Rodmill Lane meets Sulina Road, since people park right up to those corners, blocking the refuse lorry from collecting commercial rubbish from Rodmill Lane, which then accumulates causing a public health hazard.

We therefore request that changes be made to the proposals, to place double yellow lines:

- At the side of the white studio building, 45 Morrish Road
- Outside 43 Morrish Road
- At both corners where Sulina Road meets Morrish Road
- At the right-angled bend in Sulina Road
- At both corners where Rodmill Lane meets Sulina Road

Officer Response:

Thank you for bringing the single yellow line adjacent to property no's 43 and 45 Morrish Road to our attention. This single yellow lines will be replaced by a double yellow line at this location to offer protection and clear sightlines at all times. Additionally the Council does intend to construct a footway buildout at this location to provide a safe and improved pedestrian footway facility.

It is proposed to protect all the junctions of Sulina Road, Morrish Road and Rodmill Lane with double yellow lines.

Thornbury Road (D-SUP-1001)

Please ensure that the CPZ is implemented in the Thornbury Rd area as there is simply not enough space for residents to park. I have been a resident on Thornbury Rd since 2011 and the situation has deteriorated year on year. I see every morning people from elsewhere in London parking their cars and then getting on public transport to go to work. Please provide adequate parking bays for visitors and don't penalise residents with high park permit charges as the CPZ is a necessity not because of residents having too many cars but because non-residents are using the streets to park their cars during the week as part of their commute. There is enough room to park in the weekends for example.

Thornbury Road (D-SUP-1006)

I fully support the introduction of a CPZ around Thornbury Road. Your email was timely as I have just arrived home having spent 25 minutes circling the neighbourhood trying to find a parking space. This is now normal. Last Thursday I missed an appointment as it took 40 minutes for a space to become available. As well as commuter traffic we are also seeing many commercial vehicles now taking advantage of the free parking facilities in the area. I need to make two short, eight-minute journeys by car in the morning, this is often turned into 40-50 minutes of driving in trying to find a space when I return, leading to increased pollution in the area. Each morning when I return in my car there are several vehicles circling the narrow streets looking for spaces to park, these are mostly commuters as I observe the cars are left for the working day, This often leads to road rage incidents as cars repeatedly meet in the middle of the narrow streets with no way to pass each other. Our narrow streets are therefore heavily congested with traffic in the mornings. The inability to park close to our home has added stress to emergency situations e.g. when my elderly dog had a stroke I had to carry him through the streets while he was still having the stroke to reach my car which was several blocks away. When doing a weekly shop we find that we are having to carry heavy bags for long distances, or else

park temporarily on double yellow lines to unload close to home - as these are on corners this is not entirely safe for us or the other traffic. Also, at the moment many workmen are parking vans on double yellow lines in order to go about their work in neighbourhood homes, this is also dangerous as it obstructs the view of the road ahead when turning into the road. Prison staff and visitors often use our road rather than the prison car park, therefore we are impacted at all hours including evenings when nightshift staff park on our road - hopefully the long 8:30am-6:30am restriction will alleviate this problem. We also observe people who live in the CPZ zone on Lyham Road park in our road rather than pay for parking permits on their own road, therefore restrictions will hopefully end this practice. Many residents feel restricted in their movements, unable to use their cars at specific times (e.g. between 8:30-10:30 and evenings) as they know it will be extremely difficult to return. If the option to freely park in our streets is removed, I would hope that more commuters would choose to take their entire journey to work by public transport rather than driving in for a large part of it. Thus removing some pollution and congestion. Frankly, the sooner a CPZ is introduced the better. Having our neighbourhood used as a free 'park and ride' zone is creating stress and is detrimental to our ability to go about our daily tasks.

Officer Response:

The informal consultation results showed the largest majority of respondents' for Zone D support the 8.30am-6.30pm hours of operation, from the options provided. The zone will not be operating from 8.30am to 6.30am. Any change to the hours of operation would require a further separate consultation which would delay the implementation of the zone by 6-12 months. We have not received a significant amount of requests from the area to support a change in hours.

Any request for changes can be investigated upon review of the zone.

Thornbury Road (D-SUP-1015)

Please note I thoroughly *do* support these proposal, assuming you find in their favour when can you introduce the CPZ?

Thornbury Road (D-SUP-1016)

Thank you for your e-mail advising the consultation period for Brixton Hill CPZ introduction.

I am fully supportive of the introduction of CPZ and have been campaigning for a number of years for its introduction. Since moving into the area 4 years ago the parking has become considerably worse leaving residents unable to park their own cars due to abandon vehicles, people leaving their own vehicles whilst going on vacation, parking their car here during the day for prolonged periods of time. It has also become a trend for white van / tradesman to leave the vehicles on Rosebery and Thornbury Roads resultant of CPZ being in place in surrounding roads which means tradesman are encouraged to leave excess vans in our roads overnight whilst they are working in the area. I have also experienced damage to my own vehicle due to people trying to squeeze their car into small spaces because the parking on the road is severely overcrowded this has been further compounded by recent painting of double yellow lines on the Rosebery / Thornbury roads in several places reducing further the available parking spaces. I am extremely supportive and pleased at last that the council have finally agreed to listen and act on the issues affecting the residents for whom this affects on a daily basis. I look forward to receiving further details re the introduction dates and thank the council for listening and taking action.

Thornbury Road (D-SUP-1021)

Thank you for your e-mail advising the consultation period for Brixton Hill CPZ introduction.

I am fully supportive of the introduction of CPZ and have been campaigning for a number of years for its introduction. I moved to the area few years ago. We have been experiencing lots of difficulties to park which have worsen year after year as many people drop cars and vans on our roads for days and months . Also people park here and go to work. Cleaning our streets is impossible as these are always packed up with cars. The streets are totally overcrowded. I am extremely supportive and pleased at last that the council have finally agreed to listen and act on the issues affecting the residents for whom this affects on a daily basis. I look forward to receiving further details re the introduction dates and many thanks to the council for listening and taking action.

Thornbury Road (D-SUP-1027)

With reference the above we are 100% in favour of the proposed changes to parking in the area. Currently many people including staff at the prison park in our street and its now got to the stage we are reluctant to use our car, even though we need it due to long term illness, as when we go out we can't find any spaces when we come back. Often we are forced to circle the block many times or park in neighbouring streets due to lack of spaces. In the daytime this is particularly annoying as we watch many of the people who park, then go to Kings Ave and get on a bus to continue their journey!

Thornbury Road (D-SUP-1029)

I am fully in favour of controlled parking in Thornbury Road. Having lived here for more than 10 years I am in a position to say with certainty that it has become extremely difficult to park due to the number of people using our road as a close link to commuter central London transport. Frequently I see people parking and then getting on a bus towards central London. The road is surrounded by other roads with CPZ that are almost empty, so everyone parks in one of the few roads without controlled parking leaving residents without parking outside their own homes. I am worried that the situation will become worse with the building works nearby and the future increase in population moving into flats in Kings Avenue. Please help us,

Thornbury Road (D-SUP-1031)

I am 100% in favour of a CPZ in this area. I live in Thornbury Road and have found the past 10 years to be a desperate time for residents trying to park, not just near their house, but in their own street. I have witnessed a van left outside our house for 7 months and because it was taxed we could watch the mould grow on the dashboard. When the owner finally came to pick it up I discovered he lived nowhere near (Norwood) but heard that this was a good place to leave a van long-term. This is just one of many stories we and our neighbours have. Please push this through with all haste.

Thornbury Road (D-SUP-1034)

I wish to support the imposition of a CPZ to cover Thornbury Road, although I am unhappy with the current proposal to make Thornbury Road almost all shared use bays rather than residents only bays. Of the three parallel roads – Rosebury, Thornbury and Thorncliffe – Thornbury seems to be the most used thoroughfare but will be the one with the most parking on it with this plan. I consider this to be unsafe and illogical and would have thought that making this road residents only would be more sensible. It would help with the flow of traffic if there were more spaces available since vehicles would be able to pass more easily. I am not sure why we need shared use bays at all since we have no businesses down Thornbury Road, nor any in any of the surrounding roads. There are no attractions nearby that bring visitors requiring metered parking. All this will do is force all the people who want to park and who are not residents into a small number of roads, resulting in the same problem continuing for residents of the shared use roads. That seems completely unfair and unnecessary. In summary – I fully support the CPZ under any terms, but would like Thornbury Road changed to residents only use.

Officer Response:

The shared use parking proposed for Thornbury Road would allow parking by residents with a valid parking permit, their visitors with a valid visitor's voucher, businesses with a valid permit and Pay by Phone users. It is not currently possible to provide shared use parking in all the bays within CPZ's. Shared use bays should be viewed as an addition for residents and in particular their visitors. It provides residents and alternative to providing visitor with visitor's parking vouchers. When residents have run out of visitors vouchers the Pay by Phone facility provide an alternative method of paying for parking for their visitors. If there were no shared use parking in the vicinity and residents ran out of visitors vouchers they would have no alternative for their visitors.

These bays should not be abused by commuters who seek out free parking. The bays will have a maximum stay of 4 hours to stop all day parking by Pay by Phone users.

Thornbury Road (D-SUP-1036)

I am a resident of Thornbury Road and fully support the proposed CPZ. Currently, parking is a serious and sustained problem on both Rosebery Road, Thornbury Road and the adjoining roads that are not currently controlled by a CPZ. Being within walking distance of a number of Overground and Underground stations (Clapham North, Clapham High Street, Clapham Common and Brixton), the roads are regularly used for parking by commuters who live further away, which causes a major nuisance for residents. If I move my car during the day, I will not find a parking space and this creates unnecessary stress and the same thing happens in the evening. If I park on the CPZ on Lyham Rd in the evening I have to get up by 6am and drive around to find a parking space, or wait until I do, irrespective of what the season is, so at times this involves walking to my car in the dark, even if it is parked streets away. Due to the parking congestion residents are often forced to park a considerable distance away and this leads to frustration and has a knock on effect when one realises one is inconveniencing another neighbour. I often decide not to drive altogether for fear of not being able to find space to park on my return at all, which is a particular issue in the evenings, from a safety perspective. The CPZ creates space on Lyham Road and promotes available localised parking for residents but we cannot take this up during the day because we do not have residents parking. The CPZ will also promote safety; parents with young children will not have to squeeze in between cars to cross the road, and

will also not have to park on the disabled bays (risking a ticket) to unload shopping, children before having to set off to find a parking space.

Thornbury Road (D-SUP-1040)

I am writing in favour of a C.P.Z in my surrounding area.

The simple reason for this is that as a responsible one(small) car household we can frequently not find a space to park. Tours of 20 minutes are not that uncommon. This causes huge stress and wasted time for us, also an air of aggression and annoyance can occur as everyone is in the same boat.

Thornbury Road (D-SUP-1041)

I am fully in favour of the CPZ proposal for the Brixton Hill area (zone D). The parking situation has deteriorated considerably over the last few years and I regularly find one or two cars hovering, waiting for the parking space I vacate in the morning. I have actually encountered people getting quite worked up about who has the 'right' to the space I vacated. You can see that people are parking in Thornbury and surrounding roads and then walking through the prison to the buses on Brixton Hill (or Kings Avenue) to continue their journey by public transport (some people have double checked with me that there are no restrictions). Non-residents often leave their cars for days at a time, which impacts evening parking too.

This means it is really difficult to find a space to park in. I am rarely able to park anywhere near my house, and sometime have to drive around, and around, hoping somebody leaves. When I have to park quite a distance from home it feels less safe if late at night. While wholeheartedly in favour, I have one suggestion, which is to have just one side of Thornbury Road as a shared use bay and the rest as residential only. While there is need for a small amount of business resident parking, I don't think there is a need for much non-resident parking (there are no shops, or cafés or restaurants). One side of the road would suffice. Thank you for consulting on this and I hope the proposals are signed off.

Officer Response:

The shared use parking proposed for Thornbury Road would allow parking by residents with a valid parking permit, their visitors with a valid visitor's voucher, businesses with a valid permit and Pay by Phone users. It is not currently possible to provide shared use parking in all the bays within CPZ's. Shared use bays should be viewed as an addition for residents and in particular their visitors. It provides residents and alternative to providing visitor with visitor's parking vouchers. When residents have run out of visitors vouchers the Pay by Phone facility provide an alternative method of paying for parking for their visitors. If there were no shared use parking in the vicinity and residents ran out of visitors vouchers they would have no alternative for their visitors.

These bays should not be abused by commuters who seek out free parking. The bays will have a maximum stay of 4 hours to stop all day parking by Pay by Phone users.

Thornbury Road (D-SUP-1043)

We are 100% FOR the proposed CPZ in the Thornbury Road area. Please note this as significant interest in the scheme.

Thornbury Road (D-SUP-1049)

I am delighted to see the CPZ Proposal. I spent all week this week, like I spent all week last week and the week before that, driving around for more than half an hour before being able to park during the day. Last year I worked at the Young Vic Theatre performing a show for 7 weeks, 6 nights a week. I was able to park near my house 5 times over that period. Faced with a long and potentially dangerous walk from either Clarence Avenue or Upper Tulse Hill Road (where you can buy sex or drugs), I'd occasionally park in the unused disabled bay (the gentleman to whom it had been allocated has died sometime ago) or double yellow line, in sheer desperation. On each of the 6 occasions I was forced into this situation, I paid the penalty. Each time I chose my safety, it cost me £60, without fail. We desperately need controlled parking

Thornbury Road (D-SUP-1053)

I am a resident of Thornbury Road and am in full support of the proposed CPZ; the current parking situation is a frustrating and constant problem for Thornbury Road, and adjoining roads also not controlled by a CPZ. One issue an absent CPZ creates, is residents & local businesses within surrounding CPZ's have our roads to use as an alternative to getting a permit, limiting our available spaces. Similarly, due to our location being within walking distance of a number of transport links and on the cusp of the other CPZ's, I often see commuters parking their cars before continuing their journey, maintaining the problem with our parking. Combined, we are left with very limited to no spaces for residents throughout the day (not just working hours). As a result, we are often forced to park a considerable distance from our homes, sometimes 3 – 4 streets away; normally after driving around the block numerous times in the hope a space frees up. This is

not ideal when late at night or in a hurry, or combined with grocery shopping, pushchairs/children, large purchases etc. Thank you for taking the time to read this email and look forward to the proposal outcome.

Thornbury Road (D-SUP-1054)

I fully support the introduction of a CPZ on and around Thornbury Road. Parking has been an issue for residents now for many years. It's pretty impossible now to expect to be able to find a spot early morning and throughout the day as a huge number of commuters now leave their cars on our road and continue their journeys to work on public transport. Myself and my neighbours will often have to circle the surrounding streets for anything up to 40 minutes before a spot comes free and many times we're forced to carry heavy shopping, small children etc to our own homes from many streets away. The vast majority of us have been telling you for years that this is an issue and we would be more than willing to pay the CPZ fee as it really has made some of our lives difficult. To be frank the amount of time we've waiting for this to be properly considered and implemented is totally unacceptable.

Thornbury Road (D-SUP-1060)

I am writing to confirm that i am in full support for the proposed CPZ in the Brixton Hill area. I have been a resident on Thornbury Road for 4 years and have noticed that the parking has got considerably worst and congested. Quite often i decide not to drive (when i actually need to) in case i cannot find a space on my return. I have also on occasion had to park on the end of the road opposite my house on double yellow lines as there has been no where to park and then have to be constantly looking for a space. Not having permits around the area has also given thought for us moving to another area where we can park. I'm not suggesting that we should be able to park directly outside our own houses/flats but would be nice to be on the same street. Have a young child this also poses problems as if you cannot park on the same road or even find a space it's very difficult getting to and from the car with child and stuff.

Other reasons *for* the proposed CPZ:

1. "Park and Ride" crowd parking here and going into town on bus/train, since this is now nearest streets to Brixton and Clapham not covered by an existing CPZ.
2. "White Van Park" - non-residents parking their commercial vehicles, often over the weekend (and either driving away in their car or being picked up on Fri, returning Mon).
3. "Building Site Parking" - with all the development work on Kings Ave, I see site workers with their hard hats, parking on our streets and then walking to work at the building sites. Surely they should provide on-site parking or steps to make sure no nuisance to nearby residents. This is nuisance and the thought that this will be going on for some time will be very frustrating.
4. Adjoining streets are half empty eg.Brixton E CPZ but we are excluded from parking there when our streets are full.

Further to the above I nearby roads that already have a CPZ do not seem to suffer the same issues and there is a visible increase in available parking spaces on these. Hopefully something will be done in the near future.

Thornbury Road (D-SUP-1062)

Thank you for all the information you sent through regarding Zone D. Whilst I do not expect to park outside my house I would like to park closer. One Sunday I came home at 9.00 pm (not late). The only place I could find available was outside Glenbrook School (I live in Thornbury Road). I had to walk on my own (there was no-one about at this time), in the dark and in the rain. There was no parking in the surrounding streets or on the Kings Avenue. Since then, of an evening, I have taken a mini cab. The only time I can shop is late afternoon on a Friday or all day Saturday which is when I can get a parking space somewhere in the area and carry my shopping home. The vans parked in our area are a real problem. Last week I had a van parked outside my house for days and I was waiting to have scaffolding delivered. Luckily I managed to catch the driver and explain that I needed the space. His response was "I was going to move my car into the space when I had moved the van out). This person does not live in the area. He then moved his car into my parking space so that I could put my car outside the house so that I could move it when the scaffolders arrived. Following this he continued to swop car/van further down the street. This is one incident. We have many of these regarding vans. My car has been damaged so many times with people trying to get into small spaces and large vehicles trying to squeeze past cars. Last week it was the wing mirror. I support the Mon - Fri CPZ 100%. However, the one point I am on clear on is your suggestion for 8.30 - 6.30 when 45% supported a 2 hr option. Could you please explain the reasoning behind this. Many thanks for all the support you and your colleagues have shown in this problem.

Officer Response:

The informal consultation results for Zone D was isolated to reflect the collective views of residents in this area. This showed the largest majority of respondents' support the 8.30am-6.30pm hours of operation, from the options provided. Any change to the hours of operation would require a further separate consultation

which would delay the implementation of the zone by 6-12 months. We have not received a significant amount of requests from the area to support a change in hours.

Any request for changes can be investigated upon review of the zone.

Thornbury Road (D-SUP-1066)

I am a retired resident of Thornbury Road and have been diagnosed with Parkinson's Disease so am a bit wobbly! I support the proposed CPZ because parking is a constant subject of complaint in the street. At present, parking presents a serious problem on Thornbury Road and the adjoining roads that are not currently controlled by a CPZ. Being within walking distance of a number of Overground and Underground stations, the roads seem to be used for parking by commuters who live further away, which causes a major nuisance for residents. In the mornings, I see people parking their cars and vans. After 8am it becomes difficult to get a space near where I live. Parking congestion means that I along with other residents have to park further away than is convenient for us and sometimes it proves impossible to find a space within a reasonable distance. Because of this I am discouraged from using my car and struggle with heavy shopping and feel unwilling to use the car for taking items to the tip or charity shops. Nearby roads that already have a CPZ do not seem to suffer the same issues and so I am encouraged to think that a CPZ would ameliorate the situation.

Thornbury Road (D-SUP-1067)

I am writing in support of the proposal to implement a CPZ in my area. I live on Thornbury Road. I have owned a property here for five years and in that time have frequently struggled to park my car on my road or the surrounding roads. I often see commuters parking here to get access to the tube station, and there are a large number of commercial vans left here, sometimes with owners driving up in another vehicle and loading and unloading goods, leaving the van parked on the road as a sort of storage unit. These vans obviously don't belong to residents! I think that the only solution is the CPZ you propose.

Thornbury Road (D-SUP-1069)

I fully support the proposed Zone D CPZ to operate between 8.30am until 6.30pm from Monday to Friday for Thornbury Road. For a number of years i have witnessed the following. Non residents parking to avoid paying the congestion charge and continuing there journey by public transport into the city of London. Parking by residents from local housing estates for days, weeks & sometimes months on end to avoid paying their own CPZ charge, especially those with 2 vehicles, where they leave the second vehicle parked for ages.

Thornbury Road (D-SUP-1071)

I am a resident of Thornbury Road and support the proposed CPZ. I had supported the two-hour restriction, but reconsidering the problems with parking at night, I now reluctantly support Mon-Fri 8.30am-6.30pm. At present, parking presents a serious and sustained problem on Rosebery Road, Thornbury Road and adjoining roads that are not currently controlled by a CPZ. Being within walking distance of a number of Overground and Underground stations (Clapham North, Clapham High Street, Clapham Common and Brixton), the roads are regularly used for 'park and ride' by commuters who live further away, which causes a major nuisance for residents. In the mornings when I walk to the station, I often see people parking their cars before departing on foot or bus to the station. We experience non-residents parking their commercial vehicles, often overnight and over the weekend (and either driving away in their car or being picked up on Fri, returning Mon). The amount of building and development work on and around Clapham Park means that site workers with their hard hats park on our streets and then walk to work at the building sites, causing additional nuisance. Adequate on-site parking or steps to make sure no nuisance to nearby residents should be agreed before planning proposals are agreed by the local authority. Parking congestion means that I and other residents are often forced to park a considerable distance from our homes, especially at night. Whilst I don't expect to be able to park directly outside my house, having to park 3 or 4 streets (sometimes even further) away is a point of ongoing frustration, and causes difficulty if carrying a lot of shopping or transporting other heavy loads. Sometimes, I decide not to drive altogether for fear of not being able to find space to park on my return at all. This can be a particular issue in the evenings, when using public transport can be less appealing than during the day. Nearby roads that already have a CPZ do not seem to suffer the same issues. There are often many spaces on these streets, but we cannot use them even when we cannot park on our street.

Thornbury Road (D-SUP-1077)

Herewith I wanted to write to you as a resident of Thornbury Road why I am in favour for the proposal of the Controlled Parking Zone for Brixton Hill !! Having a CCTV camera installed outside my house I seen.

1. Commuters parking their car on our road in order to take the bus to the tube station or to work. Also some have a bicycle in the boot and swap over in order to cycle to work.
2. Lots of white van parking on our road who are non-residents and leave it parked for days and/or weekends. They usually swap over to their private car in order to get home.
3. Cars being dumped if the tax or MOT has not been paid for weeks/months.

4. Cars being parked by non-residents for a weeks/ month at a time - especially during school holiday times
5. Builders/Site workers who work on the development on Kings Avenue & Thorncliffe road park their car on our road.
6. Prison officers who work for Brixton Prison park on our Road.
7. Teachers & Staff working Glenbrook School, Kings Avenue School or Elm Park Nursery use our Road for parking. Non resident parents of those whose children attend those schools park on our roads and do their school run.
8. Residents who live in a CPZ zone (e.g. Brixton 'E' CPZ) or CPZ Zone closer to Acre Lane - they park on our road possibly to avoid paying for a parking permit

Thornbury Road (D-SUP-1083)

My husband and I (and two young sons) are residents of Thornbury Road and am in full support of the proposed CPZ. One question we do have: why is Thornbury Road the only street out of Rosebery, Thornbury, Kingswood and Wingford to be showing mixed parking (a mixture of resident-only and metered bays) on the proposed plans; surely the metered bays should be spread out across a number of streets? Our concern is that there will be fewer parking spaces available for Thornbury Road residents on Thornbury Road. At present, parking presents a serious and sustained problem on Thornbury Road, Rosebery Road, Kingswood Road and the adjoining streets that are not currently controlled by a CPZ. Being relatively close (and on bus routes) to a number of Overground and Underground stations (Clapham North, Clapham High Street, Clapham Common and Brixton), the roads are regularly used for parking by commuters who live further away, which causes a major nuisance for residents. In the mornings we frequently see people parking their cars and then boarding buses into Clapham - the route we both take on our way to work. I have on a number of occasions questioned these commuters who explain that the streets are a convenient place to park their car, free of charge for the day. We also believe that employees of, and visitors to Brixton Prison park within the surrounding streets even though there are parking facilities on the prison grounds. Parking congestion throughout the day and even into the evening, means that we along with other residents are forced to park a considerable distance from our homes and a couple of times I have had to drive around for 20+ minutes before finding a space or park as far away as New Park Road. Since we moved to the street seven years ago (with a two-year-old and new-born) this has been an ongoing source of frustration and irritation. I frequently have to park the car in the middle of Thornbury Road with the hazard lights on so I can unload heavy shopping or carry my sleeping children into the house; and on more than one occasion have been on the receiving end of abuse from impatient (understandably) drivers - not an ideal situation I'm sure you'll agree. We sometimes decide not to drive altogether for fear of not being able to find space to park on our return at all. Nearby roads that already have a CPZ do not seem to suffer the same issues and there is a visible increase in available parking spaces on these.

Officer Response:

The shared use parking proposed for Thornbury Road would allow parking by residents with a valid parking permit, their visitors with a valid visitor's voucher, businesses with a valid permit and Pay By Phone users. It is not currently possible to provide shared use parking in all the bays within CPZ's. Shared use bays should be viewed as an addition for residents and in particular their visitors. It provides residents and alternative to providing visitor parking with visitor's vouchers. When residents have run out of visitors vouchers the Pay by Phone facility provide an alternative method of paying for parking for their visitors. If there were no shared use parking in the vicinity and residents ran out of visitors vouchers they would have no alternative for their visitors. These bays should not be abused by commuters who seek out free parking.

Thornbury Road (D-SUP-1085)

Good morning, WE FULLLY SUPPORT THE PROPOSALS FOR THE CPZ IN OUR AREA. In particular for zone D to be Monday - Friday, 8.30am to 6.30pm. Our streets have become a park-and-ride zone for commuters driving into zone 2 from further south. It's a nightmare for Lambeth residents. We have lived here for 27 years and it's reached the worst point ever.

Thornbury Road (D-SUP-1087)

We support the proposal for the Brixton Hill CPZ.
We are unable to park near our home on Thornbury Road during the week, with a newborn and a toddler this makes life pretty challenging. We would very much like to no longer have to go round and round for up to 30 minutes at a time trying to find a parking spot.

Thornbury Road (D-SUP-1090)

I support the CPZ for Thornbury Road and surrounding area. My young family needs to be able to park a car near our house. I've lost count of the amount of hours I've lost to driving around looking for a space. Also it will encourage people to park respectfully as now it is a free for all with builders reserving space with bins,

additional cars and their vans overnight and weekends. Also lots of commuters use the space and get on the bus to Clapham and Brixton, It will also make it easier for visitors to be allocated parking by residents using visitor permits.

Thornclyffe Road (D-SUP-1005)

Many thanks for your email. I fully support the introduction of residents parking. I have lived in Thornclyffe Road for 15 years and have struggled to park near my house most days. This has meant carrying shopping and 3 small children some distance to reach my own property. When returning late at night I often have to park some streets away and face the unsafe walk alone back to my property.

Thornclyffe Road (D-SUP-1082)

I would like to support the proposal for a controlled parking zone for Thornclyffe Road, Thornbury Road, Rosebery Road and surrounding streets. I would like to echo the points raised by my neighbour regarding the issues with parking and who is parking in our roads listed below. I have 3 children and am often forced to park several roads away after driving round for 10-20 minutes. 1. Commuters parking their car on our road in order to take the bus to the tube station or to work. Also some have a bicycle in the boot and swap over in order to cycle to work. 2. Lots of white van parking on our road who are non-residents and leave it parked for days and/or weekends. They usually swap over to their private car in order to get home. 3. Cars being dumped if the tax or MOT has not been paid for weeks/months. 4. Cars being parked by non-residents for a weeks/ month at a time - especially during school holiday times 5. Builders/Site workers who work on the development on Kings Avenue & Thornclyffe road park their car on our road. 6. Prison officers who work for Brixton Prison park on our Road. 7. Teachers & Staff working Glenbrook School, Kings Avenue School or Elm Park Nursery use our Road for parking. Non resident parents of those whose children attend those schools park on our roads and do their school run. 8. Residents who live in a CPZ zone (eg. Brixton 'E' CPZ) or CPZ Zone closer to Acre Lane - they park on our road possibly to avoid paying for a parking permit. In my opinion the proposed time of 8am-6pm is excessive, 10-1pm or 10-12 would be sufficient. However, if the option is all day or no zone I would support all day.

Officer Response:

The informal consultation results showed the largest majority of respondents' for Zone D support the 8.30am-6.30pm hours of operation, from the options provided. Any change to the hours of operation would require a further separate consultation which would delay the implementation of the zone by 6-12 months. We have not received a significant amount of requests from the area to support a change in hours. Any request for changes can be investigated upon review of the zone.

Thornclyffe Road (D-SUP-1084)

I am a resident of Thornclyffe Road and am supportive of the introduction of a new CPZ for the area. Parking has been an issue in the area for the eight years we have lived there and, if anything, has gotten worse in the last couple of years, no doubt partly due to the large number of builders involved in the construction of new homes. These homes are due to be completed soon as this will add further pressure to local parking. Much of the issue seems to be with commuters during the week who either then use local buses, or who carry bikes in their cars and then cycle to their destination. This is obviously exacerbated by the fact that any areas closer to tube stations etc. are already within CPZs, even if only for part of the day. The one aspect that I would ask you to reconsider is the hours of operation. The proposed CPZ on the other side of Brixton Hill will operate between 12 and 2, the closest part of Clapham 'L' is from 10 to 15:30 and local parts of Brixton Hill East 'Q' are 10 to 12. Given the main issue appears to be commuter parking then I believe something like 12 to 2 would be both sufficient and much more helpful for local residents when friends or family are helping with the school run etc.

Officer Response:

The informal consultation results showed the largest majority of respondents' for Zone D support the 8.30am-6.30pm hours of operation, from the options provided. The largest majority of respondents' for Zone F supported 2 hours of operation. The operational hours are always chosen by residents, not the Council. Any change to the hours of operation would require a further separate consultation which would delay the implementation of the zone by 6-12 months. We have not received a significant amount of requests from the area to support a change in hours. Any request for changes can be investigated upon review of the zone.

Wingford Road (D-SUP-1050)

I have just received the latest leaflet regarding the CPZ consultation above. I am the resident homeowner at XX Wingford Road. I have only occasional issues with parking in the streets surrounding my house with the worst times being evenings/at night which would seem to suggest the biggest issue is that there are too many

vehicles owned by the residents in the streets. I am not sure what benefit a CPZ would actually bring to solving the issue of finding spaces at that time of day. It would certainly not solve that problem. And would simply cost us money to park. As a revenue raising opportunity however I can see the benefit to the council. And in these times of squeezed budgets I am not at all surprised it has come to this (nor can I complain too much). I do take issue with the 8.30am -6.30pm zone however. If the aim is to prevent people parking here during the day when they live/work elsewhere then the 12-2pm restrictions would serve that purpose. Any resident is going to buy a permit anyway (or perhaps move their car away but I find that unlikely) and given the parking problems are caused by the number of vehicles registered to the houses then whether the restrictions are 8.30-6.30 or 12-2 will make difference to ability to park. Anyone trying to game the system would not be able to park anywhere else in the vicinity as those restrictions would all be the same. I therefore support the imposition of a CPZ but would prefer it to be 12-2pm. This would be hugely beneficial as it would mean transient workman or other visitors (cleaners/hedge trimmers/family/babysitters etc) could make use of a space for short periods of time but if they are there for a day could make use of a temporary permit. Residents whose cars are already parked have the use of the space for the day anyway and my expectation is that this would not make a huge difference to the inconvenience or otherwise of finding a space. But it would mean that the convenience of being able to have visitors to stop by is not completely removed.

Officer Response:

The informal consultation results showed the largest majority of respondents' for Zone D support the 8.30am-6.30pm hours of operation, from the options provided. The largest majority of respondents' for Zone F supported 2 hours of operation. The operational hours are always chosen by residents, not the Council. Any change to the hours of operation would require a further separate consultation which would delay the implementation of the zone by 6-12 months. We have not received a significant amount of requests from the area to support a change in hours.

Any request for changes can be investigated upon review of the zone.

Wingford Road (D-SUP-1064)

I'm a resident in the proposed Zone D. I'd like to say that I fully support the proposal to include my road in the extension. Parking on my street is a nightmare. I understand you propose Monday to Friday 8.30-6.30 I would more than happy if you went longer but feel this is the MINIMUM that should be put in on this road as cars are dumped here for days or even weeks on end, taking up precious space that should be available for residents parking. I support the cpz extension.

REPRESENTATIONS IN OPPOSITION OF THE PROPOSALS

Brixton Hill (D-OBJ-2004)

I oppose the proposed controlled parking zone. Unless there is statistical proof that people who do not live or work in the area are parking their cars and using public transport to access Central London, I will assume this is simply a proposal to monetise an existing free facility – street parking for local residents. I live in the local area and am a car owner and have never found it in the slightest bit difficult to access parking. Introducing residents permits will simply extend the area in which the council can make a profit and will make it less financially viable for people who need a car for work to be able to maintain their ownership.

Officer Response:

These CPZ proposals came about through continued request and campaigning by residents to the Council and through their local Ward Councillors. The Council have commissioned survey to assess the parking pressure in the area, which can be found on the council webpage, www.lambeth.gov.uk/bhczp.

Dumbarton Road (D-OBJ-2007)

I am against the introduction of extensive controlled parking zones, especially as I am in the area where there is a proposal for all day controlled parking. I work from home and I work with clients who need to be able to park locally. I would support the shorter 12 to noon pink zone for my area as I understand it would stop people parking in the area all day but otherwise I think the proposal is draconian. I am far more concerned about the terrible condition of the pavements in Dumbarton Road and the road being used as a rat run which leads to daily arguments outside my flat. Are either of these issues being addressed?

Officer Response:

The informal consultation results showed the largest majority of respondents' for Zone D support the 8.30am-6.30pm hours of operation, from the options provided. The largest majority of respondents' for Zone F supported 2 hours of operation. The operational hours are always chosen by residents, not the Council. Any change to the hours of operation would require a further separate consultation which would delay the

implementation of the zone by 6-12 months. We have not received a significant amount of requests from the area to support a change in hours. Any request for changes can be investigated upon review of the zone. Highway maintenance and 'Rat-Running' are dealt with by the Council Highways department and are not the subject of this Parking Statutory Consultation.

Dumbarton Road (D-OBJ-2011)

I write with reference to the consultation around the proposed Brixton Hill CPZ conducted recently, and have the following feedback, taking into account the fact that I live on the corner of both Dumbarton and Lyham Roads:

- I do not consider a 7.6% (580 respondents) a sufficient response rate to proceed with a CPZ, and would like insight into why you feel this is acceptable
 - you cite a 45% majority of respondents preferring a two-hour parking control (with no stand-out response from either Dumbarton or Lyham Road respondents), yet have proposed a 8.30am-6.30pm CPZ for those roads - I would like to understand your justification for that. For the record, I reject this latter proposal.
- Furthermore, I would be grateful for an insight into how you came to the residents' permit pricing structure.

Officer Response:

Whilst it is disappointing to have such a low response, the council is still obliged to assist those who did take the time to participate in the consultation process. With the majority of respondents wanting controls. We can only provide the necessary information required to make an informed decision, the Council cannot force residents/businesses to participate.

We ran an extensive and comprehensive engagement exercise. Newsletters were delivered to residents during the informal consultation explaining the proposals, describing the reasons for the consultation, how a CPZ works and how to participate in the consultation. A Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ's) document was also provided to answer common CPZ related questions and Lambeth's Permit Pricing Structure information showing the cost of the various parking permits at the time of the consultation. A webpage was also created which contained all the relevant information with detailed plans of the Council's proposals. On these webpages were links to a survey where households could complete and submit their views including comments. For those properties who were unable to access the information on the website, or complete the online survey, a telephone request line was created where respondents could request maps and hardcopy questionnaires. The details of this telephone request line was in the Newsletter sent out to all properties. A3 posters were erected on lamp columns in and around the Housing Estates to raise awareness of the consultation. The poster contained a short link to the council website for detailed information and the telephone request line number. A public exhibition was also held allowing residents and businesses to discuss the proposed measures with officers.

The informal consultation results for Zone D was isolated to reflect the collective views of residents in this area. This showed the largest majority of respondents from your area support the 8.30am-6.30pm hours of operation, from the options provided. Any change to the hours of operation would require a further separate consultation which would delay the implementation of the zone by 6-12 months. We have not received a significant amount of requests from the area to support a change in hours. Any request for changes can be investigated upon review of the zone.

As part of the Council commitment to act against air pollution, and to combat the harm that it does to our health and the environment, we introduced a pricing structure for our resident parking permit scheme based on the level of emissions produced by a vehicle. This means that owners of vehicles that produce more pollution will pay more for resident parking permits than owners who choose to drive a vehicle that emits less pollution.

Dumbarton Road (D-OBJ-2012)

I live in Dumbarton court the estate by Dumbarton road and do not agree with putting Controlled parking all the adjoining roads Dumbarton Court, New Park road, and. At the moment, I have no problems with parking it's all first come first serve along the roads. IF it changes to controlled Parking there's no guarantee there is adequate parking for the residents who live in the houses on Dumbarton road, plus the tenants who live in the big estate which is directly on Dumbarton Road. In the estate, there is only a certain amount of allocate estate parking spaces and is not enough for everyone to use, so it I feel that it would be unfair to put restrictions in place, it would just make it harder for all of us to park our car near to where you live. Plus, there's no guarantee if you had a permit you will get a space on the road with so many cars around the Brixton hill area, I've seen cars on the main road who have estate permits so I don't think this will make a great difference to the space available. I do not feel that Brixton hill is a great issue for parking and we are not that close to the Brixton shopping area that already has a massive parking restriction, I think it's so unfair on car

users to be penalised for having a car we already pay enough car insurance, road tax and yet we still have to pay once again for parking permits to park where you live.

Officer Response:

The proposed CPZ will prioritise parking for local residents within the scheme and remove all non-essential parking from the area e.g. commuters, residents from adjacent CPZs who do not want to pay for parking. All other vehicles without a permit would be unable to park in these roads except for those who need to stop for loading/unloading purposes. With commuter vehicles removed from any included road, the Council is confident that there would be enough parking spaces for the use of residents within this scheme. A CPZ does not guarantee residents parking spaces in front of their houses but by removing non-resident parking it will make parking easier within 100 metres of their homes and will help remove traffic congestion and pollution caused by those motorists who currently travel from road to road looking for a parking space.

Kingswood Road (D-OBJ-2001)

I object because the area is ok with free parking no need for cpz.

Kingswood Road (D-OBJ-2006)

I have received your letter regarding the new proposed parking in the sw2 area you state that you have received 579 questionnaires Firstly I'm a dustcart driver for lambeth and on kings wood road sw2 I know there is over 80 properties and judging my the map there must be 1000s and 1000s of homes and houses and i know full well that all these residents and my neighbours do not want this new controlled parking zone and you state that 67% consider it and 28% do not want it leaving 5% Secondly I know there are over 33,000 houses in lambeth alone and you have only received only 579. So can you please state to me as myself and all my neighbours and I know people who live in the lambeth area do not want this to happen As where and how you have got this numbers and figures As I work for lambeth council each has 6 areas which all have 5500 homes and houses and they all cars and I can tell you know these people do want to pay for it Please get back to me with your numbers and figures.

Officer Response:

In the Informal Consultation carried out during September/October 2016 we consulted 7660 properties, of those we received 579 responses representing a response rate of 7.6%. Of those 579 who did respond, 338 were in favour of parking controls, representing 58.4%.

For further details regarding the process, results and decisions taken please visit the following link, www.lambeth.gov.uk/bhczp.

Kingswood Road (D-OBJ-2008)

I am writing to say that I am strongly AGAINST introducing a controlled parking zone in my neighbourhood/Brixton Hill. I have been living at XX Kingswood Rd since May 2013 and feel that there are not currently parking problems on my street, and that any issues people may have with parking certainly are not bad enough to bring in a controlled parking zone. Introducing a CPZ would make me feel as if I were being penalised for no reason as I greatly value the privilege that I and my visitors have to park freely on my street. After all, where does the money generated from the CPZ (my hard earned money that I would have to pay to park on my own street!) even go to? Please let me know if there are further meetings or discussions regarding this CPZ as I would be happy to participate and argue my case.

Officer Response:

The introduction of a Controlled Parking Scheme involves various set up costs for implementation e.g. road markings, signs, and pay and display machines, advertising the TMOs along with the cost of enforcing and maintaining the zone. Guidance for Controlled parking schemes recommends that they should be at least self-funding. Charging residents, visitors and businesses to park in return for a permit can fund this cost. As per the legislation any "surplus" revenue generated must be used in accordance with section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

Lyham Road (D-OBJ-2002)

I am opposed to any scheme to introduce parking charges to Lyham Road. Reasons for this are as follows:

1. I live at No.XXX. We have an underground garage on this little estate. We already are severely inconvenienced by cars parking along the driveway to our garage making access very difficult - the introduction of parking charges will only make this worse, as people will use our driveway for free parking. The church next door has similar problems.
2. The worst problems here are experienced at night, as a lot of people come to the 'Chicken shop' on the corner of Lyham Road/New Park Road - the road (and access to our garage) is often blocked by people parking while they "Just run to the chicken shop" - I have had to track people down in the shop several times - also sometimes in the grocery stores - to move their cars so I can go home. This problem has been made

much worse by the introduction of the traffic calming measures, narrowing the access to Lyham Road. The proposals will not address this problem, unless you also introduce - and police - an evening ban too.

3. The main reason for the parking pressure in Lyham Road (and surrounding roads) is the local taxi company, who frequently have several vehicles parked in the road. This could be improved by introducing a short-term parking scheme - possibly something like '1 hour maximum and no return for 3 hours.' Introduction of parking charges will also mean that I am forced to buy into the scheme while I run around tracking people down.

4. The parking charge will seriously affect my work in Lyham Road.

5. This will have to be policed - presumably funded by the payment charges? - or is it also a money-making scheme?

May I add to my submission that the proposed parking charges will not stop the problem of taxis parking in Lyham Road - they will just purchase a permit and we will be back with the same problem.

Officer Response:

As part of the CPZ double yellow lines are proposed across your shared drive to protect your access and keep your driveway clear at all times. The Council has no authority to enforce obstructive parking on private property.

Residents would only need to purchase a parking permit if they intend to park their vehicle on the public highway during the hours of operation.

All of Lambeth's CPZ's are regularly enforced to ensure the restriction are being adhered to.

Taxi's would not be eligible to purchase permits for the CPZ.

Morrish Road (D-OBJ--2013)

I write with regard to Morrish Rd, falling in your Zone D. I object to the placing of a single yellow line running along the 'jutting out' part of 45 Morrish Rd, a large white building. I would strongly encourage the use of a double yellow line which is painted a pedestrian's width away from the outside of the building. The reasons for this are that the footpath disappears either side of this building, as a consequence pedestrians have to step out into the path of oncoming traffic and risk their lives whilst trying to pass on the northern side of Morrish Rd. The use of a double yellow line would permanently create a pathway so that ALL pedestrians could navigate safely around 45 Morrish Rd. Secondly I object to a proposed 08.30-18.30 Zone D. I support a 12noon to 2pm Zone D.

Officer Response:

Thank you for bringing the single yellow line adjacent to 45 Morrish Road to our attention. This single yellow line will be replaced by a double yellow line at this location to offer protection and clear sightlines at all times. Additionally the Council intends to construct a footway buildout at this location to provide a safe and improved pedestrian footway facility.

The informal consultation results showed the largest majority of respondents' for Zone D support the 8.30am-6.30pm hours of operation, from the options provided. Any change to the hours of operation would require a further separate consultation which would delay the implementation of the zone by 6-12 months. We have not received a significant amount of requests from the area to support a change in hours.

Any request for changes can be investigated upon review of the zone.

Sulina Road (D-OBJ-2009)

Not sure if this is the correct link. have to say I'm completely against controlled parking. i work shifts and have to drive around for a space at 2am,4 or 5am.i did invite 2 gents into our house and showed photos of the street at various times to Back this up. i don't know many commuters at that time. i don't think it will make any difference.in all my years in Sulina rd I've only had to walk 2 minutes .people living in zone 2 can't expect the convenience of suburban/country living. dont move here. As I mentioned previously why weren't posters on lampposts instead of a letter which not many people even opened. it looked the same as 100's of time wasting sales or estate agent mail.id say that's why not many people voted.

Thornbury Road (D-OBJ-2005)

I would like to put forward an anonymous objection to the proposed CPZ plan around Thornbury Road for the following reasons:

- I am not a car owner myself (for medical reasons) but my partner drives a scooter and never has a problem parking. It would cost a considerable amount for him to park and given the living costs and high council tax costs it wouldn't be feasible to budget for this in addition to our existing outgoings

- When I have work done on my flat I will have to add parking costs for builders or my Father into the overall budget so it makes house maintenance even more expensive

- Neighbours' prime concerns are not being able to park outside their front doors but given that households have multiple cars and motorbikes per house out of choice I am not sure permit parking will resolve this.
- I don't feel my visitors from out of London should have to pay to park and visit me for the sake of those who choose to own cars in London in an area that has extremely good transport links

Officer Response:

The introduction of a Controlled Parking Scheme involves various set up costs for implementation e.g. road markings, signs, and pay and display machines, advertising the TMOs along with the cost of enforcing and maintaining the zone.

Guidance for Controlled parking schemes recommends that they should be at least self-funding. Charging residents, visitors and businesses to park in return for a permit can fund this cost. As per the legislation any "surplus" revenue generated must be used in accordance with section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

Please note that local authorities are afforded discretion to set charges to reflect its parking policies.

Tilson Gardens (D-OBJ-2003)

I've just received the results of your consultation through my door, predictably ruining what was otherwise a lovely sunny afternoon in Brixton. I would like to, again, air my many grievances with your parking wheeze. Perhaps I'll do a list so that the other councillors can manage to read it this time.

1. A response rate of 7.6% is enough to pursue this scheme? Is there some kind of precedent or national guidance for this? It seems an impossibly small turnout to implement what amounts to a significant source of revenue that you may otherwise have had to significantly hike council tax to acquire (by my reckoning it should bring in £1m+ each year so ~1% of your council tax requirement? How much was it for a referendum again?). Furthermore, only 58% of respondents were in favour! So only ~4-5% of people in the area support it! It's hard to imagine that if people were very worried about the parking situation then they wouldn't have responded, no?

2. Your own report states that 45% were in favour of 2h restrictions. Could you therefore please explain why Zone D proposal is 8.30-6.30? And was 8.30-5.30pm not an option? I have never once experienced a problem parking close to my flat between the hours of 5.30 and 6.30 in this area. Perhaps you would be willing to compromise on this small point?

3. I would like to again state my strong objection to the manner in which you are proposing to charge for the parking. In what way does charging by the vehicle's emissions help the parking situation? As I said last time, the guy on Kingswood Road with a £70,000 Tesla that takes up twice the space of my car will get a free permit whereas I will be charged, I seem to remember, £160 for mine. I have no problem with incentivising less polluting cars but it is unfair to charge people twice - on both road tax and their parking permit - to this end.

4. As you have previously stated that you see it as acceptable to overturn the results of the previous consultation from 6 years ago, will you be consulting again at some point after the CPZ has been implemented to allow people the option to remove the controlled parking zone? Or is this, as I strongly suspect, a one way ticket?

Thank you very much in advance for your deliberations.

Officer Response:

The Council can only make the appropriate recommendation and decision based on the results of the consultation as returned by residents / businesses in the area. Whilst it is disappointing to have such a low response the council is still obliged to assist those who did take the time to participate in the consultation process. We can only provide the necessary information required to make an informed decision, the Council cannot force anyone to participate.

The newsletter delivered to residents in the informal consultation explained the proposals, describing the reasons for the consultation, how a CPZ works and how to participate in the consultation. A Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ's) document was also provided to answer common CPZ related questions and Lambeth's Permit Pricing Structure information showing the cost of the various parking permits at the time of the consultation. A webpage was also created which contained all the relevant information with detailed plans of the Council's proposals. On these webpages are links to a survey where households could complete and submit their views including comments. For those properties who were unable to access the information on the website, or complete the online survey, a telephone request line was created where respondents could request maps and hardcopy questionnaires. The details of this telephone request line was in the Newsletter sent out to all properties. A3 posters were erected on lamp columns in and around the Housing Estates to raise awareness of the consultation. The poster contained a short link to the council website for detailed

information and the telephone request line number. A public exhibition was also held allowing residents and businesses to discuss the proposed measures with officers.

The informal consultation results for Zone D was isolated to reflect the collective views of residents in this area. This showed the largest majority of respondents' support the 8.30am-6.30pm hours of operation, from the options provided. Any change to the hours of operation would require a further separate consultation which would delay the implementation of the zone by 6-12 months. We have not received a significant amount of requests from the area to support a change in hours. Any request for changes can be investigated upon review of the zone.

As part of our commitment to act against air pollution, and to combat the harm that it does to our health and the environment, we introduced a pricing structure for our resident parking permit scheme based on the level of emissions produced by a vehicle. This means that owners of vehicles that produce more pollution will pay more for resident parking permits than owners who choose to drive a vehicle that emits less pollution.

Once the zone is introduced it will immediately be added to the Council's CPZ review programme, which is already underway. During the review residents would be given the options to remove the CPZ, change the days/hours of operation and suggest amendments to the zone.

Tilson Gardens (D-OBJ-2010)

In response to proposed controlled parking zone leaflet dated 22 March 2017 -12April2017. As clearly stated in the leaflet majority of resident in Tilson Gardens where I live and some other streets don't want this control parking forced on us. For the following reasons:- 1. All the estates on those streets mentioned in the leaflet has car parking spaces which are paid for by residents but not enough for everyone living within the estate, hence we park on the streets, as parking in the provided parking spaces are first come first serve.

2. We are aware that when the control parking is in place residents would have to pay, these would mean paying twice, one to the estate management parking agent and secondly to the council for parking permit. Please this would be too much for us as majority of us are on very low income and these would seriously affect us considering that our council tax has recently been raised.

3. We are understandably aware that the enforcement of control parking in neighbouring areas may cause parking displacement on our street but we would have an edge over any other intending to use our streets as we would have been there overnight.

4. Majority of car owners on the streets mentioned in the leaflet who are not in support of control parking on their street, do so because we do not drive to work daily reducing pollution and congestion. If this Lambeth is in support of reducing pollution please don't force us to abandon public transport.

Finally I believe that residents of the streets mentioned are still opposed to the proposed controlled parking zone on our streets especially Tilson Gardens based on my survey of some other residents in the area majority of whom are car owners.

Please consider what our plight would be financially if this proposal goes on economically we are being squeezed as it is.

Representation - Comments of the proposals

Dumbarton Road (D-COM-3002)

I am a resident – living at X Dumbarton Road SW2 5LT and I writing with regard to the proposals to introduce a CPZ in Zone 'D'. I submitted a response to the initial consultation, making it clear that whilst I support the introduction of the zone, it would not address the serious safety and traffic management issues in Dumbarton Road. I do not believe that my concerns have been taken into account as I can see no difference in these proposals to the original ones. I believe that the introduction of controlled parking is the best way to alleviate the serious traffic problems on this street, where vehicles are unable to safely pass each other, leading to jams, noise pollution, emissions pollution and frequent aggressive motoring and verbal clashes, which I fear may one day turn into actual physical violence, and not to alter the proposals in this light is an opportunity missed, which will then need to be rectified – at greater cost and inconvenience to the Council and long-suffering residents. Reducing the spaces available by only one or two bays would give vehicles room to manoeuvre and would also calm the traffic as they would also need to slow down and steer into the free space. I am surprised that your consultants did not observe or mention the traffic flow difficulties in their report, and also that in reviewing the traffic calming alterations on New Park Road you are unaware of the knock-on effect of vehicles now using Dumbarton Road as an alternative. If the consultation on the introduction of the CPZ in this form is not the right way to raise these safety and traffic management issues, could you let me know what is? I have already raised this issue with the Brixton Hill councillors.

Officer Response:

The parking design on proposals for Dumbarton Road did not change as Dumbarton Road has sufficient naturally occurring passing gaps adjacent to all its junctions. This consultation only relates to parking. Road safety and traffic management should be directed to the Councils Highways Department.

Lyham Road (D-COM-3001)

I honestly don't think a CPZ will help matters. The most difficult time to park is Sunday evening - indicating that commuters aren't the problem. Stopping the use of these rat runs is my priority.

Lyham Road (D-COM-3003)

I am writing with concern about the proposed CPZ's about to come into enforcement on my road: LYHAM ROAD SW2. I am for having controlled parking zones as parking has been a problem for a while where I live and has got worse over the last five years. However, I, like the other 45% was in support of a two hour operation, and for some reason my road has been elected to be 8.30am - 6.30pm. I feel this is highly unnecessary and will no longer be for the benefit of residents but for the benefit of parking enforcement officers who no doubt will be able to place fines on more cars. We needed the enforcement to stop people parking and commuting from here. I believe that this is possible with a two hour control - preferably 10am-noon. I often have visitors, and a lot of them have children and so arrive earlier than 6.30pm. This system seems to be working against residents and not with them and more towards making money for the council.

I'm not sure why this zone has been marked with these hours as 45% (the majority) of people wanted two hour operation and a lots of roads within my zone did not even want CPZ's - what is the point of a public consultation if our voices are not heard? With the facts in mind, it seems wrong to put the heaviest/longest parking zone in an area which was majority against the scheme... why not match surrounding roads and make it two hour operation?

Officer Response:

The informal consultation results for Zone D was isolated to reflect the collective views of residents in this area. This showed the largest majority of respondents from your area support the 8.30am-6.30pm hours of operation, from the options provided. Any change to the hours of operation would require a further separate consultation which would delay the implementation of the zone by 6-12 months. We have not received a significant amount of requests from the area to support a change in hours. Any request for changes can be investigated upon review of the zone.

Sulina Road (D-COM-3004)

If there is to be a CPZ in the Brixton Hill area, please make it a 2 hr limit, ideally 12.00 till 14.00 is preferred by myself and our household, and not an all day zone which simply extracts even more money from residents penalising us and our visitors further.

Officer Response:

The informal consultation results for Zone D was isolated to reflect the collective views of residents in this area. This showed the largest majority of respondents from your area support the 8.30am-6.30pm hours of operation, from the options provided. Any change to the hours of operation would require a further separate consultation which would delay the implementation of the zone by 6-12 months. We have not received a significant amount of requests from the area to support a change in hours. Any request for changes can be investigated upon review of the zone.

Wingford Road (D-COM-3005)

I'm aware I've missed the deadline regarding making representations for the controlled parking zone proposals, but I was away at the time and so I thought I would get in touch on the off chance you had extended the deadline. While I accept the majority of respondents have voted for a controlled parking zone (myself included), I am concerned my parking zone (CPZ D) is the only one to have parking restrictions for longer than two hours each day. I believe a two hour parking restriction would be sufficient to stop commuters parking here all day, and I fear that having an all day restriction could place a great financial burden on all residents in the zone and not just the car owners. It will mean we will have to pay to receive any visitors (friends, family or tradesmen) who wish to visit during the week, whereas if there was only a two hour parking restriction visitors could plan their visits around that restriction. From a quick analysis of the responses it also appears the majority of respondents from the streets in CPZ D voted for either a two or four hour parking restriction, when the results are combined, therefore the majority of people would not want an all day restriction. I'm also concerned this parking restriction could make large scale home improvements unaffordable for many when the additional cost of parking is factored in. For the above reasons I'm strongly in favour of the restriction being limited to a two hour window in the day in CPZ D, consistent with all the other surrounding zones.

Officer Response:

The informal consultation results for Zone D was isolated to reflect the collective views of residents in this area. This showed the largest majority of respondents from your area support the 8.30am-6.30pm hours of operation, from the options provided. Any change to the hours of operation would require a further separate consultation which would delay the implementation of the zone by 6-12 months. We have not received a

significant amount of requests from the area to support a change in hours. Any request for changes can be investigated upon review of the zone.

Zone D - Brixton Hill (D-COM-3006) Streatham Action Transport

1. Our key concern with regard to this recommendation is the proposed hours of operation for this particular D CPZ scheme between Brixton Hill and King's Avenue - hours of 08:30 to 18:30hrs Monday through Friday. There are 4 other CPZ zones in operation between Clapham Common and Tulse Hill, all of which schemes are restricted to no more than 2-hour periods, either during the mid-morning (10:00 - 12:00hrs) or lunchtime period (12:00 - 14:00hrs), during Monday through Friday. We should like to know as to what leads Lambeth Council now to wish to introduce this proposed 10-hour period here for the new Zone D, when the existing Brixton Hill Q CPZ scheme is operational between 10:00 and 12:00hrs only. Is there any evidence emerging that a two-hour operational period in the late morning or early afternoon is deemed to be an insufficient length of time to deter commuters from parking in or around this particular zone?
2. The proposed extended period of operation leads us also to ask as to whether or not consideration has been given as to the likely displacement impact that this proposal - for such an extended 10-hour period of operation daily, Monday through Friday - will have on neighbouring streets, eg in the Streatham Hill area.

Officers Response

Full details of the consultation results and the detailed report explaining the decision can be found on the Lambeth webpage, www.lambeth.gov.uk/bhczp. The hours of operation for Lambeth CPZ's is based on the largest majority of respondents view.

The informal consultation results for Zone D was isolated to reflect the collective views of residents in this area. This showed the largest majority of respondents' support the 8.30am-6.30pm hours of operation, from the options provided. Any change to the hours of operation would require a further separate consultation which would delay the implementation of the zone by 6-12 months. We have not received a significant amount of requests from the area to support a change in hours. Any request for changes can be investigated upon review of the zone.

Whilst we are aware of the possible displacement and will consult those affected if requested, the Council is obliged to consult and assist those who are experiencing parking difficulties.

PETITIONS RECEIVED

Archbishops Place cul-de-sac turning circle (PT-17 BH-001)

We, the residents of Archbishops Place, object to the proposals of having a turning circle at the end of the cul de-sac, as part of the proposed CPZ 'F' changes. It is an unnecessary limitation to the number of parking places. It is also an unnecessary cost to the council and tax payer regarding installation of street furniture and a new disabled parking place.

Officers Response:

Prior to the Council assessing parking conditions on Archbishop's Place, residents were completing the unsafe manoeuvre of reversing the length of up to 120 metres at their own discretion. Now that the Council has assessed conditions on Archbishops Place, we have a duty of care and are obligated to address the unsafe reversing practices by introducing double yellow lines to provide a turning facility. We cannot design for road users to carry out unsafe manoeuvres.

We appreciate the parking needs of residents; however, the Councils' requirements for safety override the need for parking.

The Road Vehicles (Construction and Use) Regulations 1986 states that *'A person shall not drive, or cause or permit to be driven, a motor vehicle backwards on a road further than may be requisite for the safety or reasonable convenience of the occupants of the vehicle or other traffic, unless it is a road roller or is engaged in the construction, maintenance or repair of the road.'*

You MUST NOT reverse your vehicle further than necessary. [Law CUR reg 106]

Archbishops Place cul-de-sac turning circle (PT-17 BH-001)

If the proposed CPZ F is introduced, we ask that it should operate Monday – Friday 10am – noon rather than noon – 2pm as in the consultation document. This would suit us much better in relation to lunchtime visitors to our homes and it seems to us it would be just as effective in reducing pressure on parking spaces. The existing adjacent CPZ Q is already 10am – noon (ie Elm Park and northwards). Surely CPZ F should be the same as that one. CPZ H is noon to 2pm (around Tulse Hill station) but that is much less relevant to CPZ F.

Officers Response:

During the Informal Consultation we offered a 2 hour option and not a specific 2 hour slot to give us the ability to assess the outcome of the results and choose the appropriate 2 hour slot for each specific area. The 12noon-2pm slot was chosen for this area because the existing adjacent zone operates at 10am to 12 noon. It is difficult for Civil Enforcement Officers to get around a 2 hour zone, therefore we stagger the hours so enforcement can get around both (existing Zone Q and proposed Zone F) zones over a 4 hour period instead of having to enforce both zones over a single 2 hour period.

Any change to the hours of operation would require a further separate consultation which would delay the implementation of the zone by 6-12 months. We have not received a significant amount of requests from the area to support a change in hours.

Any request for changes can be investigated upon review of the zone.

REPRESENTATIONS IN SUPPORT OF THE PROPOSALS

Archbishops Place (F-SUP-1019)

I live at XX Archbishop's Place. I am writing to you to lodge my concern about the proposed turning circle at the cul-de-sac end of Archbishop's Place. In my opinion, this is unnecessary and will reduce the number of parking spaces available. Residents have managed without this facility up till now, either by backing down the street and/or turning their cars using power steering. The size of parking bays will also reduce parking spaces. I support the need to have a CPZ due to severe parking problems because of commuter parking; however, residents' parking problems will continue if parking spaces are going to be substantially reduced by its implementation. I would be very unhappy about this, especially as residents will be paying to park so will expect to have sufficient parking spaces; otherwise, we will be no better off than we currently are and may even be worse off. Can you tell me how many parking bays will the CPZ provide for Archbishop's Place, Meredene Street and Somers Road?

Officers Response:

Prior to the Council assessing parking conditions on Archbishop's Place, residents were completing the unsafe manoeuvre of reversing the length of up to 120 metres at their own discretion. Now that the Council has assessed conditions on Archbishops Place, we have a duty of care and are obligated to address the unsafe reversing practices by introducing double yellow lines to provide a turning facility. We cannot design for road users to carry out unsafe manoeuvres.

We appreciate the parking needs of residents; however, the Councils' requirements for safety override the need for parking.

The Road Vehicles (Construction and Use) Regulations 1986 states that *'A person shall not drive, or cause or permit to be driven, a motor vehicle backwards on a road further than may be requisite for the safety or reasonable convenience of the occupants of the vehicle or other traffic, unless it is a road roller or is engaged in the construction, maintenance or repair of the road.'*

You MUST NOT reverse your vehicle further than necessary. [Law CUR reg 106]

Archbishops Place (F-SUP-1021)

I live at 21 Archbishops Place. I support the introduction of a CPZ because commuters parking in the street do cause parking problems for residents. However, I am strongly opposed to the introduction of a turning facility at the end of Archbishops Place because this will seriously reduce the number of parking spaces available. The residents would then have no more spaces than we do now competing with commuters. I think if you asked the residents whether they would prefer a turning facility or additional parking spaces, they would say additional parking spaces. I really don't think anyone would bother driving down to the end of the road in order to do a three point turn when it is easier simply to reverse out of the road. The plan also shows relocation of a disabled parking bay. I understood that this bay was for a disabled child at number 45 who is no longer alive. So it may no longer be needed, unless another resident now requires a disabled parking bay. All in all I think you need to separate out the idea of introducing a CPZ to help residents with the idea of preventing parking at the end of our road which will cause a problem for residents.

Officers Response:

Prior to the Council assessing parking conditions on Archbishop's Place, residents were completing the unsafe manoeuvre of reversing the length of up to 120 metres at their own discretion. Now that the Council has assessed conditions on Archbishops Place, we have a duty of care and are obligated to address the unsafe reversing practices by introducing double yellow lines to provide a turning facility. We cannot design for road users to carry out unsafe manoeuvres.

We appreciate the parking needs of residents; however, the Councils' requirements for safety override the need for parking.

The Road Vehicles (Construction and Use) Regulations 1986 states that *'A person shall not drive, or cause or permit to be driven, a motor vehicle backwards on a road further than may be requisite for the safety or reasonable convenience of the occupants of the vehicle or other traffic, unless it is a road roller or is engaged in the construction, maintenance or repair of the road.'*

You MUST NOT reverse your vehicle further than necessary. [Law CUR reg 106]

There was another disabled that was recently removed adjacent to no 45 Archbishop's Place, but the Disabled bay that is being relocated is still in use.

Archbishops Place (F-SUP-1022)

I am pleased and support the plan to introduce a controlled parking scheme to the road I live on – Archbishops Place, SW22AJ. However, I would like to lodge my strong disagreement with one aspect of the proposed plan, that is to reallocate the disabled parking bay in order to create a turning bay at the end of the road.

The turning bay is not necessary and will result in the loss of 6 parking spaces. The street is more than wide enough, even when cars are parked on both sides of the street, to do a 3-point turn. The loss of 6 parking spaces will add a pressure on the parking spaces available. During the 10 years that I have lived here I have seen the street accessed by large articulated lorries, ambulances, and the fire-brigade all of whom have managed to access the street without a turning bay. My household has one car, but unfortunately many of the residents in the street have more than one, indeed my neighbour has four cars (between two people), making it a priority that all spaces are made available for parking. I very much hope that you can revise the plan following consultation.

Officers Response:

Prior to the Council assessing parking conditions on Archbishop's Place, residents were completing the unsafe manoeuvre of reversing the length of up to 120 metres at their own discretion. Now that the Council has assessed conditions on Archbishops Place, we have a duty of care and are obligated to address the

unsafe reversing practices by introducing double yellow lines to provide a turning facility. We cannot design for road users to carry out unsafe manoeuvres.

We appreciate the parking needs of residents; however, the Councils' requirements for safety override the need for parking.

The Road Vehicles (Construction and Use) Regulations 1986 states that *'A person shall not drive, or cause or permit to be driven, a motor vehicle backwards on a road further than may be requisite for the safety or reasonable convenience of the occupants of the vehicle or other traffic, unless it is a road roller or is engaged in the construction, maintenance or repair of the road.'*

You MUST NOT reverse your vehicle further than necessary. [Law CUR reg 106]

Bannister Close (F-SUP-1014)

My name is Xxxx Xxxx. I live in Flat XX Xxxxxxx House, Bannister Close, SW2 2PB, and I write regarding the Control Parking Zone in my area. Just to let you know that I am in favour of the proposed CPZ. In our close we've had cars and a motorbike parked there for many months (abandoned) and workers from "Pinacle" company keep parking their cars everyday making it harder each time to park. I know you don't want to here my complaints, but just to let you know why I'm in complete favour of the parking restriction proposal.

Brading Road (F-SUP-1004)

Resident of Brading Road, Brixton Hill. I am writing this email to show my approval of the introduction of a CPZ on my street and the surrounding area. This is due to the fact that people abuse the free parking in the area meaning that residents on my street and surrounding streets cannot find parking during the day. I have lived on the street since 2006 and for a few years now this has been an issue. People tend to park their vehicles on my street early in the morning to catch the bus into Brixton and continue their journey on the Tube. This means that there is reduced parking until about 5.30:6.30pm in the area. The introduction of a CPZ will help alleviate this problem.

Claverdale Road (F-SUP-1017)

This email is to support the new proposed controlled parking zone F. As a resident of Claverdale Road, I fully support the proposal which will address the current parking problems.

Claverdale Road (F-SUP-1020)

I fully support the new proposals but feel we should do what we can to help people who face high travel costs and currently park in this area before commuting in to central London. I have been monitoring the number of cars parking in Josephine Avenue over many years and the most I have ever seen during the day is 5. This road was one of the first parking zones despite all residents having parking in the "internal road" in front of their houses. It seems to me that this parking zone is totally unnecessary - it would be of interest to find out how many residents even have a parking permit. This road could easily be used for a parking scheme for people wanting to commute or even just for normal parking, it is clearly not needed for the residents and has put more unnecessary pressure on other streets. I would be grateful if this could be discussed. As residents we may not like having people coming to park in our streets but we do not have the right to just keep them away, particularly if we have somewhere to park anyway. Thank you for taking your time to consider this.

Cotherstone Road (F-SUP-1006)

Thanks for getting back to me regarding the zoning on cotherstone road. I very much hope it happens- it's almost impossible to find parking on this street during the day due to people using it as a car park. Although I have to say, there are two schools on the (very small) street and a lot of those cars I fear are the teachers. So I hope there are some restrictions as to how many people each school are allowed to have permits. At least it may get rid of the re-occurring person living in his van on the street! Never good - for them or the heath of the street.

Cotherstone Road (F-SUP-1010)

I am writing as a resident of Cotherstone Road, SW2 3NE. I am very much in favour of regulated parking in this area. As a resident of a small street made up of a large amount of flats it is hard enough to fit in all the residents cars let alone everyone else who decides to use it as a car park - (It happens to be the start of a lot of bus routes with easy access into the city centre) It is annoying to have to second guess yourself as to if you really need to use your car as you may not be able to find a parking space if you return during the day! Nine times out of ten it is impossible to find a parking space on the street during working hours. I have received a parking ticket for having to park in the wrong place and sometimes am forced to park in the one hour bays and have to remember to move the car around! Either that, or park the other side of Holmewood Gardens. The problem is exacerbated by there being two schools at the end of the street. During school hours a number of employees of the school park in the street, further limiting the number of spaces for the residents. Then of course there is school pick up and drop off times !!! Pandemonium! Anyone would think children incapable of walking more than 2 feet from car to school. Parents seem to ignore every posted sign imaginable - including parking in the middle of the road, on double yellow lines and outside the school gates were it expressly says "no parking". I wish sometime the council would send parking enforcement here at

those times to move people on.... With other drivers getting frustrated and whizzing through at top speed as a result it makes it very dangerous. We also have a problem of long term parking issues. One man has been living in his van for some time. It moved for a while, but is now back. This is at the end of Cotherstone Road - actually in Holmewood Gardens - so if these residents do not partake in the scheme then I guess this van would not have to move. A little disconcerting. I look forward to the introduction of the controlled zone - I only wish it was going to be all day.

Holmewood Gardens (F-SUP-1002)

I live at XX, Holmewood Gardens, SW2 3RS. My name is Xxxx Xxxxxxx. May I start by saying that the consultation maps are hard to access and I could not find the key to the colour coding. However, I am assuming that there will be a 10am to 2:00pm CPZ in Holmewood Gardens which is a great idea and is long overdue. Parking here is getting more and more difficult despite the extra spaces available due to the central park area. Could I suggest just one small alteration and make the restricted time from 10am to 12 noon. 4 hours seems unnecessary.

Officers Response:

During the Informal Consultation we offered a 2 hour option and not a specific 2 hour slot to give us the ability to assess the outcome of the results and choose the appropriate 2 hour slot for each specific area. The 12noon-2pm slot was chosen for this area because the existing adjacent zone operates at 10am to 12 noon. It is difficult for Civil Enforcement Officers to get around a 2 hour zone, therefore we stagger the hours so enforcement can get around both (existing Zone Q and proposed Zone F) zones over a 4 hour period instead of having to enforce both zones over a single 2 hour period.

Any change to the hours of operation would require a further separate consultation which would delay the implementation of the zone by 6-12 months. We have not received a significant amount of requests from the area to support a change in hours.

Any request for changes can be investigated upon review of the zone.

Holmewood Gardens (F-SUP-1008)

I am writing to confirm that I am very much in favour of a cpz in our area. We live in Holmewood Gardens and often find it difficult and sometimes impossible to park when we return home during the day on weekdays. I would, however, rather have our zone operating between 10am and 12 noon, as we can then have visitors any time after 12, and there is little chance of commuters parking for the day after 12. This small change would make a big difference to our lives and the lives of our neighbours who are at home during the day. Thank you for organising this.

Officers Response:

During the Informal Consultation we offered a 2 hour option and not a specific 2 hour slot to give us the ability to assess the outcome of the results and choose the appropriate 2 hour slot for each specific area. The 12noon-2pm slot was chosen for this area because the existing adjacent zone operates at 10am to 12 noon. It is difficult for Civil Enforcement Officers to get around a 2 hour zone, therefore we stagger the hours so enforcement can get around both (existing Zone Q and proposed Zone F) zones over a 4 hour period instead of having to enforce both zones over a single 2 hour period.

Any change to the hours of operation would require a further separate consultation which would delay the implementation of the zone by 6-12 months. We have not received a significant amount of requests from the area to support a change in hours.

Any request for changes can be investigated upon review of the zone.

Holmewood Gardens (F-SUP-1009)

I live in Holmewood Gardens and parking is usually very difficult and sometimes impossible in the day on weekdays. In the original consultation I suggested that I would prefer it if our zone were to operate between 10am and 12 noon, as we can then have visitors any time after 12, and there is little chance of commuters parking for the day after 12. This small change would make a big difference to our lives and the lives of our neighbours who are at home during the day. Just to underline my view on having a cpz in Holmewood Gardens; I think it is absolutely *essential*. I would say that I feel that the Council should warn those who are against it *in the strongest possible terms* that parking will be an absolute nightmare in any areas or streets that are 'surrounded' by cpzs.

Officers Response:

During the Informal Consultation we offered a 2 hour option and not a specific 2 hour slot to give us the ability to assess the outcome of the results and choose the appropriate 2 hour slot for each specific area. The 12noon-2pm slot was chosen for this area because the existing adjacent zone operates at 10am to 12 noon. It is difficult for Civil Enforcement Officers to get around a 2 hour zone, therefore we stagger the hours so enforcement can get around both (existing Zone Q and proposed Zone F) zones over a 4 hour period instead of having to enforce both zones over a single 2 hour period.

Any change to the hours of operation would require a further separate consultation which would delay the implementation of the zone by 6-12 months. We have not received a significant amount of requests from the area to support a change in hours.

Any request for changes can be investigated upon review of the zone.

Holmewood Gardens (F-SUP-1012)

As a very long term resident of Holmewood Gardens (number XX) I fully support the introduction of controlled parking for the area. It is becoming increasingly difficult to park during the day when non residents leave cars for extended periods with some vehicles being left for days. This makes it very stressful if you need to make a car journey during the day when working from home as it can become impossible to find a space on returning. The suggested period from 12-2pm would seem appropriate to stop all day parking without preventing short term school drop offs or parents with children visiting the park although the 10-12 option would also have been useful. I am surprised that the majority of people from Holmewood Gardens did not support this as it has been talked about as a problem for some time. (Additional Comments) I have already sent a mail in support of the CPZ in Holmewood Gardens . I had thought there was only one option i.e. From 12-2pm however I would like to add my support for a 10-12 slot as this would better deter all day parking without inconveniencing school drop offs and usage of the children's playground .

Officers Response:

During the Informal Consultation we offered a 2 hour option and not a specific 2 hour slot to give us the ability to assess the outcome of the results and choose the appropriate 2 hour slot for each specific area. The 12noon-2pm slot was chosen for this area because the existing adjacent zone operates at 10am to 12 noon. It is difficult for Civil Enforcement Officers to get around a 2 hour zone, therefore we stagger the hours so enforcement can get around both (existing Zone Q and proposed Zone F) zones over a 4 hour period instead of having to enforce both zones over a single 2 hour period.

Any change to the hours of operation would require a further separate consultation which would delay the implementation of the zone by 6-12 months. We have not received a significant amount of requests from the area to support a change in hours.

Any request for changes can be investigated upon review of the zone.

Holmewood Gardens (F-SUP-1013)

I would like to strongly support the introduction of a 2- or 4-hour CPZ on both sides (park-side, and in front of houses) of Holmewood Gardens. The area is heavily used by people from outside of the local area who park up early in the morning and then take the tube from Brixton; many of these commuters litter and are confrontational/rude to local residents and that is having a detrimental effect on our community. There has also been a high level of speeding traffic, mainly from commuters, which poses serious safety concerns as the area is bordered by 5 local schools, several nurseries, and the park inside the gardens is also well-used by small children from the wider area. And finally, there has been growing pressure for local residents to find suitable parking, which has become unacceptably challenging in recent years. Failure to introduce the CPZ would further exacerbate these problems, so I would very much like to see the zone established, in the entire Holmewood Gardens area.

Holmewood Gardens (F-SUP-1023)

We are vehicle owning residents of Holmewood Gardens and, as such, we are responding to the Statutory Consultation. We currently experience parking difficulties over the whole day. The prospect of displaced parking from other adjacent new CPZ areas would be untenable. We, therefore, support the introduction of 'CPZ area F'.

Holmewood Gardens (F-SUP-1003)

I am in favour of the proposed CPZ on upper tulse hill (Brixton Hill Zone).

Mainly because commuters use the free roads to park their cars all day and travel into central London.

This then means that when I move my car in the morning to do the school run or errands, when I return I cannot park outside/near my home. The problem is getting worse and unbearable. Often the parking is bad and unthoughtful of local residents. I would like to see the CPZ in place on upper tulse hill and throughout Roupell park estate.

Holmewood Gardens (F-SUP-1025)

We live at XX Holmewood Gardens, SW2 3NB. We submitted our views through the informal consultation where we voted in favour of a CPZ in Holmewood Gardens if it looks as though adjoining roads have opted for a CPZ. From your documents it does look as though most, if not all, adjoining roads are opting to implement one, so on that basis we do support a CPZ in Holmewood Gardens.

10-Noon restriction preferred

We would like to echo the preference for a 10-noon restriction as opposed to the noon-2pm restriction. We agree with the reasons outlined by our neighbours (see below) as to why. I also have a couple of more detailed questions regarding the actual implementation of the CPZ if it does go ahead.

Homezone rumble strip cobbles / bollarded sections in Holmewood Gardens – further consultation required

Linked to the implementation of the Holmewood Area Homezone in 2004/5, rumble strips, bordered by bollards set 1 metre in from the pavement line, were created at 2 points in Holmewood Gardens. One of these sections is to the front of our house. These areas were created at junctions and were meant to prevent any cars parking at these sections for safety reasons (pedestrians crossing). No road markings were put down. Residents 'knew' not to park here as they had been part of the homezone planning process/consultation. The paved area outside our house has succeeded in this aim in that no cars have ever parked here, despite the increasing parking pressure. The same, however, cannot be said of the other section. If the CPZ goes ahead perhaps some thought will need to go in to how these two sections are treated and further consultation with local residents may be required to reach broad agreement on the arrangements here. Our crossover - Our back garden leads on to Maplestead Road and in 2011 we asked Lambeth to create a vehicular crossover from our garden/hardstanding onto Maplestead Road which they did. If Maplestead Road choose to implement a CPZ, how is our crossover treated?

Officers Response:

All crossovers within any Lambeth CPZ is protected by means of a single yellow line which generally operate at the same hours as the zone in which it is located. In this case, Zone F is proposed to operate Mon to Fri from 12 noon to 2pm. During the hours of operation no-one is allowed to park on the yellow line, including the owner of the property/crossover.

Holmewood Road (F-SUP-1001)

I am supporting the controlled parking which has been proposed for our part of the hill 12-2pm. I would like an assurance that it will be policed, at the moment we have 2 disabled spaces (in Holmewood Road) which I am also in favour of, but all sorts of people park there, most with no disabled badge being displayed. Do we have an assurance that if the controlled parking goes ahead that the area will be checked by wardens? I assume that is why we pay for having a controlled zone?

Officers Response:

Our aim is to provide a level of enforcement which ensures that residents permit holders are able to park near their homes, while also looking to reduce congestion across the borough in line with our ambitions to improve air quality. Our contractors monitor information retrieved on a daily basis from our on-street operations and other sources to ensure that we're deploying proportionate numbers of staff to manage the demand, compliance and congestion levels for parking across the borough.

Holmewood Road (F-SUP-1005)

I can confirm that myself and my partner support the proposal for parking restrictions in this area. We are concerned with commuters parking and so we would be happy to have a parking restriction for a very short period during the day (e.g. a two hour parking restriction at midday).

Holmewood Road (F-SUP-1007)

I am for the controlled parking zone CPZ F I think the period of 12.00pm-14.00pm is perfect it will stop, all drivers that come and park all day and go to work.

Maplestead Road (F-SUP-1018)

Further to the consultation being conducted in reference to parking on Maplestead Road, and as a Joint Freeholder and Flat owner of X Maplestead Road, we would like to confirm our vote in support of Controlled Parking on Maplestead Road. It is often times very difficult for residents to park on the street.

Merredene Street (F-SUP-1016)

I am a resident of Merredene Street SW2. I would like to express my strong support for the council's proposed CPZ extension. Parking Monday to Friday on the street is a nightmare. As the first road up Brixton Hill without any parking restrictions, it's clear that many non-residents park on it and continue their journeys into town on public transport. I encountered one guy who lived outside London and confessed he always left his car on the street Monday to Friday while he was staying in town. The lack of restrictions means we also have an ongoing problem with abandoned vehicles. I am convinced that the survey results in the consultation do not accurately represent the views of residents who actually drive. There are quite a few houses where people, laudably of course, only cycle or use public transport and so are completely unaware of the parking problems for residents. We have small children and any time we need to drive to the GP or supermarket during the day we return to find it impossible to park anywhere near our own house. As you make clear in the consultation leaflet, this is a problem that will only get worse when there is a displacement from other areas. A number of residents have expressed concerns about the loss of spaces resulting from the proposed turning area at the bottom of Archbishops Place and the double yellow areas around the corners of Merredene Street, Somers Road and Archbishop's Place, and have therefore taken against the entire - in my view, very sensible - CPZ extension. Could these be minimised? Is a turning area necessary at all given there isn't one at the moment? Thank you for your efforts on this.

Officers Response:

Prior to the Council assessing parking conditions on Archbishop's Place, residents were completing the unsafe manoeuvre of reversing the length of up to 120 metres at their own discretion. Now that the Council has assessed conditions on Archbishops Place, we have a duty of care and are obliged to address the unsafe reversing practices by introducing double yellow lines to provide a turning facility. We cannot design for road users to carry out unsafe manoeuvres.

We appreciate the parking needs of residents; however, the Councils' requirements for safety override the need for parking.

The Road Vehicles (Construction and Use) Regulations 1986 states that *'A person shall not drive, or cause or permit to be driven, a motor vehicle backwards on a road further than may be requisite for the safety or reasonable convenience of the occupants of the vehicle or other traffic, unless it is a road roller or is engaged in the construction, maintenance or repair of the road.'*

You MUST NOT reverse your vehicle further than necessary. [Law CUR reg 106]

The double yellow lines proposed for the junctions in this area already fall below the Highway Code recommendation of 10 metres.

Merredene Street (F-SUP-1024)

I live at XX Merredene street. I am writing to you to support the need to have a CPZ due to severe parking problems. However, I have doubts about the proposed turning circle at the cul-de-sac end of Archbishop's Place.

Officers Response:

Prior to the Council assessing parking conditions on Archbishop's Place, residents were completing the unsafe manoeuvre of reversing the length of up to 120 metres at their own discretion. Now that the Council has assessed conditions on Archbishops Place, we have a duty of care and are obligated to address the unsafe reversing practices by introducing double yellow lines to provide a turning facility. We cannot design for road users to carry out unsafe manoeuvres.

We appreciate the parking needs of residents; however, the Councils' requirements for safety override the need for parking.

The Road Vehicles (Construction and Use) Regulations 1986 states that *'A person shall not drive, or cause or permit to be driven, a motor vehicle backwards on a road further than may be requisite for the safety or reasonable convenience of the occupants of the vehicle or other traffic, unless it is a road roller or is engaged in the construction, maintenance or repair of the road.'*

You MUST NOT reverse your vehicle further than necessary. [Law CUR reg 106]

REPRESENTATIONS IN OPPOSITION OF THE PROPOSALS

Archbishops Place (F-OBJ-2002)

I am writing to object to the plans to include Archbishops Place in the new Brixton Hill F CPZ. Particularly, I would like to object to the double yellow lines at the end of Archbishops Place to create a turning circle. I have set out my reasons below. - The proposed timing of the restriction (from 12pm - 2pm) will force any residents who do not drive to work to buy at least one permit. At the very minimum this is over £100 annually which is a significant extra cost. When I bought my house on the street, one of the attractions was that the parking on the entire street was free. I believe this measure will have an impact on house prices in the street. - The comprehensive report shows that the street was not full on a Wednesday, when you might expect commuter parking. At its busiest, there were still 3 spaces left. On Saturday, when you would not expect commuter parking, and you would expect the street to have residents parking and their visitors, there were only 3 less cars on the street - 6 spaces left. Introducing a CPZ with all the consequential costs to the Council of painting yellow lines, putting up signs and policing the CPZ seems an over-reaction to the presence of 3 additional cars. - The results of the survey have shown that only 15 people on the street answered the questionnaire. Of these, just over half said there was a problem with parking - 8 people, with 7 saying there was no problem. One would expect that people who feel aggrieved by parking would be more likely to respond to the survey; indeed, this is a well-known problem with the methodology. For that reason it is striking that only one more person expressed concerns. I note also the survey asked for suggestions on what type of restrictions would assist these answers have not been published. - Anecdotally, I have never had a problem with being able to park on the street, whether during the week or at the weekend. - My house is right at the end of Archbishops Place and so the proposed turning circle would leave me unable to park near my house. Given the nature of the cul-de-sac, as I am sure you have observed, with a number of houses accessible down a small passage-way at the end of the street, there are a larger than normal number of houses who wish to park as close as possible to the end of the street. Creating a turning circle will mean we are all unable to do so and will put extra pressure on the rest of the street. If one assumes that all the cars parked on the

street on a Saturday belong to residents / their guests (understanding that is unlikely to be the case, but the vast majority will belong to residents and their guests), this means that even with the CPZ there will only be 6 spaces left in the street. Introducing the turning circle will create more parking stress as it will decrease the number of spaces available. - I note that the reason residents must pay to park where there is a CPZ is to meet the costs of "installation, maintenance, enforcement and review of the zone". It seems to me that the most cost-efficient way would be not to impose the CPZ - then there will be no costs for installation, maintenance enforcement and review, and residents will not need to pay. This seems to me to be a money-spinning exercise by the Council. If the CPZ is put in place I will request to see the full results of the survey, and details of all representations received by Lambeth Council in relation to Archbishops Place. This is a small cul-de-sac with a friendly, family feel - a number of people have lived on the street for well over a decade - it should not be lumped in with the Council's decisions on other streets.

Officers Response:

Prior to the Council assessing parking conditions on Archbishop's Place, residents were completing the unsafe manoeuvre of reversing the length of up to 120 metres at their own discretion. Now that the Council has assessed conditions on Archbishops Place, we have a duty of care and are obligated to address the unsafe reversing practices by introducing double yellow lines to provide a turning facility. We cannot design for road users to carry out unsafe manoeuvres.

We appreciate the parking needs of residents; however, the Councils' requirements for safety override the need for parking.

The Road Vehicles (Construction and Use) Regulations 1986 states that '*A person shall not drive, or cause or permit to be driven, a motor vehicle backwards on a road further than may be requisite for the safety or reasonable convenience of the occupants of the vehicle or other traffic, unless it is a road roller or is engaged in the construction, maintenance or repair of the road.*'

You MUST NOT reverse your vehicle further than necessary. [Law CUR reg 106]

Archbishops Place (F-OBJ-2005)

I live on Archbishop's place off Brixton Hill (SW2 2AH) and our google group has circulated the proposal for a parking zone on our street- I think it's 'zone F' (12-2pm daily) I have a car, and have never found it too difficult to park on the street mostly because people who live on the street tend to use public transport or cycle to work and therefore don't move their cars during the day, but usually at night. I know that everyone who belongs to our street google group is very keen to keep our street free of controlled parking pays that will be costly for a lot of us, particularly those who are pensioners and don't have much money for an expensive annual permit. These are very small houses and a lot of people are on the lower income scale and have lived here for a long time. It's also very convenient for friends and relatives who are visiting, as well as service vehicles, etc to have free parking. I know that a CPZ would alleviate some of the people who use our road for parking while at work in Brixton, but I honestly think on balance that free parking is more important to us than paying for it since most of us can usually find parking as we don't move our cars during the day.

Archbishops Place (F-OBJ-2008)

As an Archbishops Place resident, I also am in strong objection of a turning circle at the end of my road Archbishops Place. I feel it is totally unnecessary and will remove several valuable parking spaces. There is also a disabled bay down there and will interfere with this. Please lodge my objection.

Officers Response:

Prior to the Council assessing parking conditions on Archbishop's Place, residents were completing the unsafe manoeuvre of reversing the length of up to 120 metres at their own discretion. Now that the Council has assessed conditions on Archbishops Place, we have a duty of care and are obligated to address the unsafe reversing practices by introducing double yellow lines to provide a turning facility. We cannot design for road users to carry out unsafe manoeuvres.

We appreciate the parking needs of residents; however, the Councils' requirements for safety override the need for parking.

The Road Vehicles (Construction and Use) Regulations 1986 states that '*A person shall not drive, or cause or permit to be driven, a motor vehicle backwards on a road further than may be requisite for the safety or reasonable convenience of the occupants of the vehicle or other traffic, unless it is a road roller or is engaged in the construction, maintenance or repair of the road.*'

You MUST NOT reverse your vehicle further than necessary. [Law CUR reg 106]

Archbishops Place (F-OBJ-2011)

I live at XX Archbishops Place, SW2 2AH and am contacting you regarding the upcoming decision on implementing a CPZ on my road and others nearby. While I disagree with the introduction of a CPZ I understand I maybe in the minority among my neighbours. Where however, we all seem to agree are the ways in which a possible new CPZ could hinder:

A) a turning circle would seem to decrease the number of valuable parking slots and make for a dangerous place for children, where now they regularly play outside.

B) Similarly the introduction of yellow lines with further cut down the number of parking spaces for residents - something I believe the council are trying to improve?

C) The parking sizes appear to be overly large, yet again diminishing space, are they a standard size or can these be reduced?

As I've mentioned I'm against a CPZ at all, as someone without a permanent car if this goes ahead then I will have to pay for extremely expensive visitor permits to park outside my own home, and indeed even be limited to the amount of these permits I am allowed per year however, if it must go forward it seems the most agreeable to all that live here to reduce the hours to a minimum in order to, as you say, reduce: ----"People who commute into the area to continue their journey to work using the good transport links in Lambeth.---- Residents and staff from local businesses in nearby streets where there are parking controls are parking here instead to avoid paying for parking." While making sure that the greatest number of parking spaces remain, as above.

Officers Response:

Prior to the Council assessing parking conditions on Archbishop's Place, residents were completing the unsafe manoeuvre of reversing the length of up to 120 metres at their own discretion. Now that the Council has assessed conditions on Archbishops Place, we have a duty of care and are obligated to address the unsafe reversing practices by introducing double yellow lines to provide a turning facility. We cannot design for road users to carry out unsafe manoeuvres.

We appreciate the parking needs of residents; however, the Councils' requirements for safety override the need for parking.

The Road Vehicles (Construction and Use) Regulations 1986 states that *'A person shall not drive, or cause or permit to be driven, a motor vehicle backwards on a road further than may be requisite for the safety or reasonable convenience of the occupants of the vehicle or other traffic, unless it is a road roller or is engaged in the construction, maintenance or repair of the road.'*

You MUST NOT reverse your vehicle further than necessary. [Law CUR reg 106]

The double yellow lines proposed for the junctions in this area already fall below the Highway Code recommendation of 10 metres.

The parking bays will not be segregated into individual bays so residents would be able to park within the marked bays as they currently do.

Archbishops Place (F-OBJ-2015)

I live at no XX Archbishops Place SW2 2AJ. I am completely opposed to this happening on our road. I cannot afford to pay £200+ per year to park on my own road. My little car is only worth around £200 and I need to get my son to school. I cannot afford for parking vouchers for my family to visit me. I think the creation of a turning circle at the bottom of Archbishops also looks to severely reduce parking space, there is no need for this. The cost of 'visitor' vouchers is exorbitant and I understand that there will be an annual limit to numbers? I can't see any sign on documentation of whether the CPZ also plan to include metered parking. Please can you confirm that all planned spaces will be for the use of residents/visitors and there'll be no areas where parking is only via meter?

Officers Response:

Prior to the Council assessing parking conditions on Archbishop's Place, residents were completing the unsafe manoeuvre of reversing the length of up to 120 metres at their own discretion. Now that the Council has assessed conditions on Archbishops Place, we have a duty of care and are obligated to address the unsafe reversing practices by introducing double yellow lines to provide a turning facility. We cannot design for road users to carry out unsafe manoeuvres.

We appreciate the parking needs of residents; however, the Councils' requirements for safety override the need for parking.

The Road Vehicles (Construction and Use) Regulations 1986 states that *'A person shall not drive, or cause or permit to be driven, a motor vehicle backwards on a road further than may be requisite for the safety or reasonable convenience of the occupants of the vehicle or other traffic, unless it is a road roller or is engaged in the construction, maintenance or repair of the road.'*

You MUST NOT reverse your vehicle further than necessary. [Law CUR reg 106]

Lambeths current parking policy has a limit of 50 visitors vouchers per household per year.

Residents displaying a valid permit or their visitors displaying a valid voucher would be able to park in any of the permit holder only or shared use bays within the zone during the hours of operation. There are no pay by phone (meter) only bays proposed in your zone.

Archbishops Place (F-OBJ-2017)

I am writing to you regarding the proposed introduction of a CPZ to Archbishops Place and surrounding roads.

1. I've been living in Somers Road since 2009 and I own a car. So far I have not experienced any major problems in finding a parking space (even though commuters parking in our area), so I oppose the introduction of a CPZ. Instead I rather would like to question whether the council is actually trying to disguise their intention to find additional income streams as an intention to provide residents' parking. The reason why I question the borough's real intentions are the exorbitant high fees that they propose to charge for residents' and visitors' permits without providing any obvious adequate benefit. In my opinion residents should only be charged a fee that covers the cost for the borough to implement and maintain such a residents' parking scheme. I lived in several other countries like Germany and Spain where the fees for residents' parking permits are very clearly charged as a fee for administering the residents' parking schemes rather than a source of income. As example of the amount of fees payable in other cities I would like to cite cities like Munich, Frankfurt am Main, Hamburg and Madrid where residents' parking fees range between EUR 22.40 and EUR 30 p.a. To me the fees of GBP 175 - 260 p.a. proposed by the Borough of Lambeth seem to be out of proportion (also taking into consideration that the borough will most likely start to send enforcement officers around in such areas in order to generate even more income), given that other big and expensive cities seem to be able to manage to charge just an administration fee. In addition I understand that the Acre Lance CPZ increased its costs by 100% in the first 9-12 months of operation, so I'm really concerned that this will happen with the proposed CPZ as well. While I understand that the borough might be strapped for cash I think that it should try to further reduce its cost rather than using its residents as a cash cow.
2. Another significant issue with the proposal of the new CPZ is that the residents' parking space will be actually substantially reduced by its implementation. The reduction in parking space results especially from - the proposed turning circle at the cul-de-sac end of Archbishop's Place, - the increased length of the parking bays and - the additional extensions of yellow single lines on and near corners of Merredene and Somers Road. As far as I'm aware there are currently about 100 spaces in Archbishops Place, Somers Road and Merredene Road. After the introduction of the CPZ there would only be 77. If residents have to pay for parking then they would expect to have sufficient parking space, but with the introduction of the CPZ we will be even worse off, as we would have to compete with less parking spaces than there are currently (even if you take into consideration that there are some commuters parking in this area during the week).
3. The proposed turning circle at the cul-de-sac end of Archbishop's Place is unnecessary and will reduce the number of parking spaces available significantly. Drivers have managed without this for several years, so there is no requirement for it.
4. The parking problems will worsen rather than improve if the length of parking bays are marked out, as this will significantly reduce parking spaces further, whereby small cars (many on the street are Minis, Golfs, Polos and similar smaller cars) will take up the same space, rather than allowing drivers to park efficiently, thus maximising parking.
5. The addition of new extended yellow lines on and near the corners of Merredene and Somers Road will unnecessarily reduce parking available and isn't necessary, especially on a quiet cul-de-sac. I would also request that you remove the double yellow lines from a single space at the stopped-up road outside number 27 Somers Road, which would allow one more space to be available or could be used for cycle parking.
6. I can't see whether the proposed CPZ includes any metered parking and I would be grateful if you could confirm that all planned spaces will be for the use of residents/visitors and that there will be no areas where parking is only via a meter.
7. I would like to take this opportunity, to point out that the parking spaces in Somers Road are never used by any of the residents, because car windows are constantly smashed in (i.e. several times a month) as a result of being somewhat secluded and having reduced street lighting (especially in summer when all the leaves from the trees cover the already dim street lighting). I would welcome if the borough could finally introduce adequate security measures (which would also increase the security of pedestrians walking there at night).
8. In addition I would welcome to install better street signage for Somers Road at the end of Somers Road / Somers Place and at the corner of Merredene Street and Somers Road, as there is a significant number of drivers coming from Somers Place or from Merredene Street who don't notice that Somers Road is a one-way street and that they are that they are driving down Somers Road in the opposite direction. The fact that this happens to a significant number of drivers (1-3 a month) is a clear indication that the street signage is not clear enough (at the corner Merredene Street / Somers Road for example there is not even a street sign, but it's only written on the asphalt to turn only left) and proposes a significant risk for cars turning into Somers Road from Brixton Hill who don't expect drivers coming in the opposite direction.

Officers Response:

This CPZ proposal was initiated by residents through requests and campaigning the Council and their Ward Councillors for many years to be consulted on parking controls to alleviate the parking pressure they experience.

Please note that local authorities are afforded discretion to set charges to reflect its parking policies.

As part of our commitment to act against air pollution, and to combat the harm that it does to our health and the environment, we introduced a pricing structure for our resident parking permit scheme based on the level

of emissions produced by a vehicle. This means that owners of vehicles that produce more pollution will pay more for resident parking permits than owners who choose to drive a vehicle that emits less pollution.

The parking bays will not be segregated into individual bays so residents would be able to park within the marked bays as they currently do.

The double yellow lines proposed for the junctions in this area already fall below the Highway Code recommendation of 10 metres.

Prior to the Council assessing parking conditions on Archbishop's Place, residents were completing the unsafe manoeuvre of reversing the length of up to 120 metres at their own discretion. Now that the Council has assessed conditions on Archbishops Place, we have a duty of care and are obligated to address the unsafe reversing practices by introducing double yellow lines to provide a turning facility. We cannot design for road users to carry out unsafe manoeuvres.

We appreciate the parking needs of residents; however, the Councils' requirements for safety override the need for parking.

The Road Vehicles (Construction and Use) Regulations 1986 states that *'A person shall not drive, or cause or permit to be driven, a motor vehicle backwards on a road further than may be requisite for the safety or reasonable convenience of the occupants of the vehicle or other traffic, unless it is a road roller or is engaged in the construction, maintenance or repair of the road.'*

You MUST NOT reverse your vehicle further than necessary. [Law CUR reg 106]

The total number of unrestricted spaces quoted in the independent parking survey shows a total of 102 spaces for Archbishop's Place, Merredene Street and Somers Road. However this did include 9 spaces on the unrestricted areas of Somers Road. Somers is not wide enough to accommodate any parking. Taking the existing available parking spaces to 93. Using an average of 5 metres per space to calculate the proposed parking capacity, there will be a total 88 parking spaces available on these roads. Resulting in a net loss of five parking spaces as a result of the CPZ. This is to keep the junctions clear to improve sightlines for all road users and creating the turning facility of Archbishops Place.

Residents displaying a valid permit or their visitors displaying a valid voucher would be able to park in any of the permit holder only or shared use bays within the zone during the hours of operation. There are no pay by phone (meter) only bays proposed in your zone.

We have passed on the request for One Way signage on Somers Road to our Highways Department for investigation.

Archbishops Place (F-OBJ-2019)

We have no problem parking in Archbishops place, so I don't want a CPZ. I feel that some people in Archbishops place want the cpz because they think they have the right to park directly outside their house regardless, but having a cpz cannot guarantee this .on the other hand myself and other neighbours do not have a problem being unable to park outside our house, or walking any amount of metres from an available space.

Officers Response:

The proposed CPZ will prioritise parking for local residents and their visitors within the scheme and remove all non-essential parking from the area e.g. commuters, residents from adjacent CPZs who do not want to pay for parking. All other vehicles without a permit would be unable to park in these roads except for those who need to stop for loading/unloading purposes. With commuter vehicles removed from any included road, the Council is confident that there would be enough parking spaces for the use of residents within this scheme. A CPZ does not guarantee residents parking spaces in front of their houses but by removing non-resident parking it will make parking easier within 100 metres of their homes and will help remove traffic congestion and pollution caused by those motorists who currently travel from road to road looking for a parking space.

Archbishops Place (F-OBJ-2030)

I am a resident of Archbishops Place (SW2 2AH – Proposed CPZ F). I have the following objections and queries relating to the proposal that I would like to submit:

- Turning Area proposed for bottom of Archbishops Place cul-de-sac – this is unnecessary, unwanted and will deprive residents of many parking places.
- Yellow lines around corners – this is unnecessary and will deprive residents of several parking places. The existing drop-kerbs are proven to be sufficient for keeping the corners clear for larger vehicles to turn and for general visibility.
- The plans describe the proposed CPZ parking areas as 'bays'. If these are individual marked bays then I would object to this (other than individually marked disabled bays)– bays marked to accommodate large vehicles would waste a lot of parking space overall. Residents are proven to be able to use the available space sensibly without individual marked bays.

- I think it's a moot point whether the level of current/proposed fee for a resident's permit is a reasonable amount to cover the administration of a well-run scheme. However, I certainly object to the proposed fees and availability of the 'visitors' permits.
- A clear majority of residents of this street have historically opposed a CPZ, but many now grudgingly accept that Lambeth have effectively forced it upon us. What is our protection from arbitrary or unwelcome imposition by Lambeth of fee increases and extensions to the controlled hours and/or days?

Officers Response:

Prior to the Council assessing parking conditions on Archbishop's Place, residents were completing the unsafe manoeuvre of reversing the length of up to 120 metres at their own discretion. Now that the Council has assessed conditions on Archbishops Place, we have a duty of care and are obligated to address the unsafe reversing practices by introducing double yellow lines to provide a turning facility. We cannot design for road users to carry out unsafe manoeuvres.

We appreciate the parking needs of residents; however, the Councils' requirements for safety override the need for parking.

The Road Vehicles (Construction and Use) Regulations 1986 states that *'A person shall not drive, or cause or permit to be driven, a motor vehicle backwards on a road further than may be requisite for the safety or reasonable convenience of the occupants of the vehicle or other traffic, unless it is a road roller or is engaged in the construction, maintenance or repair of the road.'*

You MUST NOT reverse your vehicle further than necessary. [Law CUR reg 106]

The total number of unrestricted spaces quoted in the independent parking survey shows a total of 102 spaces for Archbishop's Place, Merredene Street and Somers Road. However this did include 9 spaces on the unrestricted areas of Somers Road. Somers Road is not wide enough to accommodate any parking. Taking the existing available parking spaces to 93. Using an average of 5 metres per space to calculate the proposed parking capacity, there will be a total 88 parking spaces available on these roads. Resulting in a net loss of five parking spaces as a result of the CPZ. This is to keep the junctions clear to improve sightlines for all road users and creating the turning facility of Archbishops Place.

The double yellow lines proposed for the junctions in this area already fall below the Highway Code recommendation of 10 metres.

The parking bays will not be segregated into individual bays so residents would be able to park within the marked bays as they currently do.

Please note that local authorities are afforded discretion to set charges to reflect its parking policies.

As part of our commitment to act against air pollution, and to combat the harm that it does to our health and the environment, we introduced a pricing structure for our resident parking permit scheme based on the level of emissions produced by a vehicle. This means that owners of vehicles that produce more pollution will pay more for resident parking permits than owners who choose to drive a vehicle that emits less pollution.

Athlone Road (F-OBJ-2029)

I object to the introduction of the new CPZ for the following reasons: Primarily the council has not proved that a CPZ is required. The informal consultation had a response rate of 7.6% which is not a mandate for change. The response rate is so low that it cannot be seriously used as a basis for the introduction of the CPZ. The consultation required the local residents to have internet access to complete the survey – in the previous consultation this was done by letter. You cannot assume everyone has internet access. Apart from this informal consultation what other evidence does the council have that a CPZ is required? The council states that they have 'recently received many letters, emails from local residents' complaining about the parking situation. How many complaints have they received? Is the council driven by the complaints of a small minority of people backed up by an inadequate consultation? A lot of the people who complain seem to think they have a right to have their car parked in front of their house. These complainers are also not worried about the financial implications which will impact poorer households. Additionally the (frankly bizarre) CO2 pricing of the permits will again impact the poorer households who own older more polluting vehicles. (A parked car produces no CO2). Southwark Council charge £125 per car regardless of CO2. When was the last parking survey done? From my day to day experience of parking in Athlone Road, demand for parking has dropped in the last 3 months. I am always able to find a space on the road during the working day. On Upper Tulse Hill there are always available parking spaces. Cooperative Council Lambeth states it is a cooperative council....(1) Being a Cooperative Council is about bringing local people, staff and councillors together to improve people's lives in Lambeth. It therefore requires the Council to work collaboratively with local people to tackle the things that affect them and their communities, thereby improving local services and helping to build a stronger community. I would argue that the council is failing in its duties in this regard, they have failed to consult the majority of residents and so have no mandate for change. Surely there must be an approval of 50% of residents to provide any legitimacy to the consultation? I would suggest that the council conducts a door to door survey (telling the residents what the permits will cost them each year) to obtain a proper survey of the residents views. (When I asked 4 neighbours at random about the survey none could recall receiving the letter. The letter did look like unsolicited mail and so may have been discarded by some, which may

explain the poor return rate. What was the return rate percentage in the last consultation done several years ago? I believe it was much higher. Although the council then went on to ignore the majority vote against the CPZ on Claverdale Rd because of a personal intervention by a local councillor.) Is Lambeth (and its councillors) Really Listening To All The Residents? I and many others do not have a problem parking and have not complained to the council – the silent majority. Yet you want to start charging my hundreds of pounds a year for a problem which does not exist for the majority. Is this helping the local residents? Or is it a means of raising revenue for a cash strapped council via another backdoor taxation?

Officers Response:

This CPZ proposal was initiated by residents through requests and campaigning the Council and their Ward Councillors for many years to be consulted on parking controls to alleviate the parking pressure they experience.

The Council can only make the appropriate recommendation and decision based on the results of the consultation as returned by residents / businesses in the area. Whilst it is disappointing to have such a low response the council is still obliged to assist those who did take the time to participate in the consultation process. We can only provide the necessary information required to make an informed decision, the Council cannot force residents to participate.

The newsletter delivered to residents in the informal consultation explained the proposals, describing the reasons for the consultation, how a CPZ works and how to participate in the consultation. A Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ's) document was also provided to answer common CPZ related questions and Lambeth's Permit Pricing Structure information showing the cost of the various parking permits at the time of the consultation. A webpage was also created which contained all the relevant information with detailed plans of the Council's proposals. On these webpages are links to a survey where households could complete and submit their views including comments. For those properties who were unable to access the information on the website, or complete the online survey, a telephone request line was created where respondents could request maps and hardcopy questionnaires. The details of this telephone request line was in the Newsletter sent out to all properties. A3 posters were erected on lamp columns in and around the Housing Estates to raise awareness of the consultation. The poster contained a short link to the council website for detailed information and the telephone request line number. A public exhibition was also held allowing residents and businesses to discuss the proposed measures with officers.

The Council also commissioned independent parking stress survey's in this area. The full report can be viewed on the council webpage at, www.lambeth.gov.uk/bhczp.

Brixton Hill (F-OBJ-2018)

I live at XX Brixton Hill, and have just recently been advised of the parking restrictions you are planning for Holmewood Rd. I haven't received any notification regarding these plans, which will affect me as a car owner? How will I be able to apply for a permit should these restrictions be implemented? I am against the parking restrictions, however, I'm also aware of the parking difficulties we encounter from outside people using the area on a daily basis. Should the restrictions go ahead, I'd like to opt for a 10am - 12am restriction as many builder/ delivery people come in the afternoons.

Officers Response:

During the Informal Consultation we offered a 2 hour option and not a specific 2 hour slot to give us the ability to assess to outcome of the results and choose the appropriate 2 hour slot for each specific area. The 12noon-2pm slot was chosen for this area because the existing adjacent zone operates at 10am to 12 noon. It is difficult for Civil Enforcement Officers to get around a 2 hour zone, therefore we stagger the hours so enforcement can get around both (existing Zone Q and proposed Zone F) zones over a 4 hour period instead of having to enforce both zones over a single 2 hour period.

Any change to the hours of operation would require a further separate consultation which would delay the implementation of the zone by 6-12 months. We have not received a significant amount of requests from the area to support a change in hours.

Any request for changes can be investigated upon review of the zone.

Cothelstone Road (F-OBJ-2001)

This proposed introduction of parking zone F does not have a work able mandate. You have a tiny response rate of 7.6% on questionnaires sent out and the majority of respondents in 2 large roads in this area votes again this proposal. Introducing this control makes no sense.

I also object to the proposed times of control from 12-2. The biggest problem, cars jamming the roads dropping off and picking up kids from the 4 schools in this area, will not be addressed by this control timing. This will penalise residents from having deliveries during that time and adding expense when needing repair men (roofers, plumbers, electricians etc.) attending. This makes no sense to residents.

Officers Response:

The Council can only make the appropriate recommendation and decision based on the results of the consultation as returned by residents / businesses in the area. Whilst it is disappointing to have such a low response the council is still obliged to assist those who did take the time to participate in the consultation process. We can only provide the necessary information required to make an informed decision, the Council cannot force residents to participate.

Leaving individual roads uncontrolled and surrounded by parking controls would leave them open to displacement from those in the surrounding CPZ looking to avoid the charges.

CPZ will create more space by removing commuters, which would free up space for deliveries and traders working for local residents.

The Informal Consultation results showed the largest majority of respondents' for Zone F support 2 hours of operation, from the options provided. During the Informal Consultation we offered a 2 hour option and not a specific 2 hour slot to give us the ability to assess to outcome of the results and choose the appropriate 2 hour slot for each specific area. The 12noon-2pm slot was chosen for this area because the existing adjacent zone operates at 10am to 12 noon. It is difficult for Civil Enforcement Officers to get around a 2 hour zone, therefore we stagger the hours so enforcement can get around both (existing Zone Q and proposed Zone F) zones over a 4 hour period instead of having to enforce both zones over a single 2 hour period.

Any change to the hours of operation would require a further separate consultation which would delay the implementation of the zone by 6-12 months. We have not received a significant amount of requests from the area to support a change in hours.

Any request for changes can be investigated upon review of the zone.

Leckhampton Place (F-Obj-2021)

As a resident of Leckhampton Place, I strongly oppose the proposed Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) for the Brixton Hill Area, which I feel is merely another revenue generated proposal by the council, rather than a proposal to minimise the inconvenience some residents and businesses may be experiencing with parking in the area. Had this proposal truly been about protecting the parking needs of residents, their visitors and local businesses, there would not be an annual permit cost index ranging from £117 - £1900 for residential to other parking permits of petrol/diesel car owners. Instead, there would either be no cost or a nominal charge e.g. £20 per annum for those affected by the proposal. Furthermore, implementation of the CPZ in this area may simply cause what issue some residents or businesses may currently be facing, to be relocated to neighbouring areas and private roads, hence an unwanted and unnecessary problem for many.

Therefore, to reiterate based on my views above, I strongly oppose the proposal for a CPZ in the Brixton Hill Area and request reconsideration of the proposal.

Officers Response:

This CPZ proposal was not initiated by the Council, it was initiated by residents through requests and campaigning the Council and their Ward Councillors for many years to be consulted on parking controls to alleviate the parking pressure they experience.

As part of our commitment to act against air pollution, and to combat the harm that it does to our health and the environment, we introduced a pricing structure for our resident parking permit scheme based on the level of emissions produced by a vehicle. This means that owners of vehicles that produce more pollution will pay more for resident parking permits than owners who choose to drive a vehicle that emits less pollution.

Displacement is an unfortunate by-product of introducing CPZ, which we are aware of and do highlight to residents, but the council is still obliged to assist those who are experience parking difficulty.

Maplestead Road (F-Obj-2004)

I emphatically oppose the proposed cpz in my street/area (Maplestead rd) i don't deem the controlled parking zone necessary as i don't find it difficult to find a parking spot when needed, and visitors to friends and family shouldn't have to pay for the pleasure. Not to mention the school run parents need a quick pick up spot for their kids. It's clearly just another tax and money maker for the haves.

Officers Response:

Whilst we appreciate that Maplestead Road might not currently have much parking difficulty, we do feel that the displacement from the proposed surrounding CPZ would cause it parking difficulty. We did consider Maplestead Road residents' continued opposition to parking controls to be excluded from the proposed CPZ. However, should this road be excluded it would be the only uncontrolled road for some distance and would be completely surrounded by parking controls, leaving it vulnerable to displacement from commuters and nearby residents avoiding charges in the new CPZ. Due to this displacement, if residents are unable to find a parking space they either need to pay to park (which has a 1 hour max stay) in the surrounding 12noon to 2pm CPZ roads or effectively the closest free parking available to these residents will be south of the south circular, which is approximately 0.5 kilometres away.

In the event that residents request the Council to re-consult the area due to the inevitable parking displacement, it is unlikely that the Council would be able to revisit the area again in the short – medium term as funding and resources will need to be identified and allocated. This potentially would leave residents with parking difficulties for some time.

Therefore, it is considered that it is in Maplestead Road resident's best interest that they are included within the proposed zone.

Maplestead Road (F-Obj-2006)

I totally oppose the proposed CPZ in my street / area (Maplestead road sw2 3lx). Currently I'm not I emphasizes I'm not experiencing any difficulty to find parking spot in my road. Also introducing CPZ makes the matter difficult for parents who need a quick parking spot to pick up their children as well as making difficulty for family and friends who are visiting. And the CPZ proposal is nothing but making us as residents, out of pocket in this difficult financial uncertainty.

Officers Response:

Whilst we appreciate that Maplestead Road might not currently have much parking difficulty, we do feel that the displacement from the proposed surrounding CPZ would cause it parking difficulty. We did consider Maplestead Road residents' continued opposition to parking controls to be excluded from the proposed CPZ. However, should this road be excluded it would be the only uncontrolled road for some distance and would be completely surrounded by parking controls, leaving it vulnerable to displacement from commuters and nearby residents avoiding charges in the new CPZ. Due to this displacement, if residents are unable to find a parking space they either need to pay to park (which has a 1 hour max stay) in the surrounding 12noon to 2pm CPZ roads or effectively the closest free parking available to these residents will be south of the south circular, which is approximately 0.5 kilometres away.

In the event that residents request the Council to re-consult the area due to the inevitable parking displacement, it is unlikely that the Council would be able to revisit the area again in the short – medium term as funding and resources will need to be identified and allocated. This potentially would leave residents with parking difficulties for some time.

Therefore, it is considered that it is in Maplestead Road resident's best interest that they are included within the proposed zone.

Maplestead Road (F-Obj-2007)

I live in First and Second Floor Flat X Maplestead Road. I am AGAINST introduction of CPZ. Please note that your anonymous letter arrived on 1 April , halfway through your supposed Statutory Consultation which suppose to happen between 22 March 2017 and 12 April 2017. You claim to have a proper consultation, how would you know that any Joe Bloggs answering you by e-mail is actually a resident???? How old residents with no access to e-mail will reply???? YOUR Expensively commissioned brochure does not give 2 very Crucial Information:

- 1) You will reduce available parking spaces by at least half when you introduce CPZ.
- 2) You will charge a quarter of council tax a year again.

And once you start charging, suddenly your current data protection issues will go away and you will send letters by the name to residents ! You claim that your informal online survey style consultation responded by 576 which is 7.6 % of the total residents. This is a very low percentage for any democratic process ! And you say that my road and neighbouring road residents rejected it, but you still say that you know better and you will introduce it!!!!!! This is not democracy at all, it is dictatorial. This consultation is deliberately badly organised, FALSE, UNDEMOCRATIC and CAN EASILY BE RIGGED ! Please scrap it and organise a proper Statutory Consultation!

Officers Response:

We were made aware very early on of the issues with the delivery of the Statutory Consultation newsletters and to accommodate for this we extended the consultation by 1 week. This extension was reflected on the website and late submissions to the consultation were being accepted. Lambeth's CPZ Statutory Consultations are open to anyone to participate, not only local residents.

All road users were given two options to submit their representations, by email or post.

Whilst there is generally a reduction of available parking spaces when introducing parking controls, the council makes every effort to keep the reduction to a minimum by only restricting parking where it would be unsafe, cause obstruction or impede the flow of traffic.

The permit pricing structure was given to all residents during the informal consultation and is still available on the following webpage, www.lambeth.gov.uk/bhcppz

The on street notices and advert in the Lambeth Weekender are the minimum statutory requirements to which the Council must adhere to. We additionally send out newsletters to all properties in the affected area and supply an email and postal address where they can make their representations.

Maplestead Road (F-Obj-2012)

I am the resident of XX Maplestead Road, SW23LY and I am writing in response to the statutory consultation of the Brixton Hill CPZ. I would like to once again oppose this plan of trying to introduce CPZ in our area. The majority of respondents to the last consultation was very much opposed to this plan. We feel that the traffic and pressure on parking spaces are fine.

Officers Response:

Whilst we appreciate that Maplestead Road might not currently have much parking difficulty, we do feel that the displacement from the proposed surrounding CPZ would cause it parking difficulty. We did consider Maplestead Road residents' continued opposition to parking controls to be excluded from the proposed CPZ. However, should this road be excluded it would be the only uncontrolled road for some distance and would be completely surrounded by parking controls, leaving it vulnerable to displacement from commuters and nearby residents avoiding charges in the new CPZ. Due to this displacement, if residents are unable to find a parking space they either need to pay to park (which has a 1 hour max stay) in the surrounding 12noon to 2pm CPZ roads or effectively the closest free parking available to these residents will be south of the south circular, which is approximately 0.5 kilometres away.

In the event that residents request the Council to re-consult the area due to the inevitable parking displacement, it is unlikely that the Council would be able to revisit the area again in the short – medium term as funding and resources will need to be identified and allocated. This potentially would leave residents with parking difficulties for some time.

Therefore, it is considered that it is in Maplestead Road resident's best interest that they are included within the proposed zone.

Maplestead Road (F-Obj-2016)

As a resident of Maplestead road sw2 - I am AGAINST the proposed traffic management order. I do not want CPZ on my road, nor do I feel it is fair to force us either.

Officers Response:

Whilst we appreciate that Maplestead Road might not currently have much parking difficulty, we do feel that the displacement from the proposed surrounding CPZ would cause it parking difficulty. We did consider Maplestead Road residents' continued opposition to parking controls to be excluded from the proposed CPZ. However, should this road be excluded it would be the only uncontrolled road for some distance and would be completely surrounded by parking controls, leaving it vulnerable to displacement from commuters and nearby residents avoiding charges in the new CPZ. Due to this displacement, if residents are unable to find a parking space they either need to pay to park (which has a 1 hour max stay) in the surrounding 12noon to 2pm CPZ roads or effectively the closest free parking available to these residents will be south of the south circular, which is approximately 0.5 kilometres away.

In the event that residents request the Council to re-consult the area due to the inevitable parking displacement, it is unlikely that the Council would be able to revisit the area again in the short – medium term as funding and resources will need to be identified and allocated. This potentially would leave residents with parking difficulties for some time.

Therefore, it is considered that it is in Maplestead Road resident's best interest that they are included within the proposed zone.

Maplestead Road (F-Obj-2028)

I remain opposed to the introduction of further controlled parking zones in the Brixton Hill area. In relation to Maplestead Road, where I live, I don't believe a CPZ is at all necessary. Parking is available for most of the time, either on the street or in a nearby road. I accept that during commuter times in the morning, if you move your car you are unlikely to find the same space available when you return but this is not an issue for many people on the street who do not move their cars very often during the daytime on weekdays. Once the afternoon school run is over parking is no problem, and in the evenings and weekends there are always spaces available. Imposing a CPZ seems to be only to deal with the overspill effect of introducing it in other roads. It is unfair for some residents to have to pay for a parking permit when they themselves have no problem with parking. From my observations, this is the situation for the majority of Maplestead Road residents.

Officers Response:

Whilst we appreciate that Maplestead Road might not currently have much parking difficulty, we do feel that the displacement from the proposed surrounding CPZ would cause it parking difficulty. We did consider Maplestead Road residents' continued opposition to parking controls to be excluded from the proposed CPZ. However, should this road be excluded it would be the only uncontrolled road for some distance and would be completely surrounded by parking controls, leaving it vulnerable to displacement from commuters and nearby residents avoiding charges in the new CPZ. Due to this displacement, if residents are unable to find

a parking space they either need to pay to park (which has a 1 hour max stay) in the surrounding 12noon to 2pm CPZ roads or effectively the closest free parking available to these residents will be south of the south circular, which is approximately 0.5 kilometres away.

In the event that residents request the Council to re-consult the area due to the inevitable parking displacement, it is unlikely that the Council would be able to revisit the area again in the short – medium term as funding and resources will need to be identified and allocated. This potentially would leave residents with parking difficulties for some time.

Therefore, it is considered that it is in Maplestead Road resident's best interest that they are included within the proposed zone.

Maplestead Road (F-Obj-2031)

I have lived on Maplestead Road for nearly 20 years. I think a CPZ would be an unnecessary imposition because we have no significant problem parking here. I would add that the road is wide enough to allow cars to comfortably pass each other even during peak parking times. All the neighbours I speak to share similar views. If Lambeth imposes parking restrictions nearby, inevitably this has an impact on parking here. Surely a valid option in the consultation should be the removal of restrictions from nearby areas? Couldn't Lambeth at least try it in order to assess the impact on this area? If there is a process (and resources) for the creation of CPZs, there must be a process for their removal. Let's try it.

Officers Response:

Whilst we appreciate that Maplestead Road might not currently have much parking difficulty, we do feel that the displacement from the proposed surrounding CPZ would cause it parking difficulty. We did consider Maplestead Road residents' continued opposition to parking controls to be excluded from the proposed CPZ. However, should this road be excluded it would be the only uncontrolled road for some distance and would be completely surrounded by parking controls, leaving it vulnerable to displacement from commuters and nearby residents avoiding charges in the new CPZ. Due to this displacement, if residents are unable to find a parking space they either need to pay to park (which has a 1 hour max stay) in the surrounding 12noon to 2pm CPZ roads or effectively the closest free parking available to these residents will be south of the south circular, which is approximately 0.5 kilometres away.

In the event that residents request the Council to re-consult the area due to the inevitable parking displacement, it is unlikely that the Council would be able to revisit the area again in the short – medium term as funding and resources will need to be identified and allocated. This potentially would leave residents with parking difficulties for some time.

Therefore, it is considered that it is in Maplestead Road resident's best interest that they are included within the proposed zone.

Merredene Street (F-Obj-2024)

Further to the consultation on introducing CPZ to Merredene Street, Archbishops Place, Somers Road and surrounding area, I am writing to you to lodge my opposition to the proposed scheme. I feel that this is a money making exercise for the council with no real benefit for the residents. There are a number of concerns which will negatively impact Merredene Street: 1. The proposed turning circle at the cul-de-sac end of Archbishop's Place. This is unnecessary and will reduce the number of parking spaces available significantly and potentially endanger children playing at this end of the street. 2. The addition of new extended yellow lines on and near the corners of Merredene and Somers Road will reduce parking further. 3. The cost of 'visitor' permits penalises those who do not own cars 4. I am concerned about potential metered parking that would impact the number of spaces available on the street. 5. Cycle parking would be beneficial for those residents with smaller garden spaces - perhaps it could go at the stopped-up end of Somers Road? 6. Total number of spaces: Of the 102 spaces currently across Archbishops Place, Merredene Street and Somers Road you say are included in our CPZ allocation, does that include the 6-8 spaces on Somers Road? This road is notorious for having car windows smashed (as there was again last week) and residents avoid parking on this road because of this. Also, please bear in mind that there will likely be more cars in the neighbourhood with the 4 x 4-bedroom houses currently on the market on Somers Place. More residents competing for fewer spaces would likely mean residents end up being fined.

Officers Response:

Prior to the Council assessing parking conditions on Archbishop's Place, residents were completing the unsafe manoeuvre of reversing the length of up to 120 metres at their own discretion. Now that the Council has assessed conditions on Archbishops Place, we have a duty of care and are obligated to address the unsafe reversing practices by introducing double yellow lines to provide a turning facility. We cannot design for road users to carry out unsafe manoeuvres.

We appreciate the parking needs of residents; however, the Councils' requirements for safety override the need for parking.

The Road Vehicles (Construction and Use) Regulations 1986 states that 'A person shall not drive, or cause or permit to be driven, a motor vehicle backwards on a road further than may be requisite for the safety or reasonable convenience of the occupants of the vehicle or other traffic, unless it is a road roller or is engaged in the construction, maintenance or repair of the road.'

You **MUST NOT** reverse your vehicle further than necessary. [Law CUR reg 106]

The double yellow lines proposed for the junctions in this area already fall below the Highway Code recommendation of 10 metres.

Residents displaying a valid permit or their visitors displaying a valid voucher would be able to park in any of the permit holder only or shared use bays within the zone during the hours of operation. There are no pay by phone (meter) only bays proposed in your zone.

The total number of unrestricted spaces quoted in the independent parking survey shows a total of 102 spaces for Archbishop's Place, Merredene Street and Somers Road. However this did include 9 spaces on the unrestricted areas of Somers Road. Somers Road is not wide enough to accommodate any parking. Taking the existing available parking spaces to 93. Using an average of 5 metres per space to calculate the proposed parking capacity, there will be a total 88 parking spaces available on these roads. Resulting in a net loss of five parking spaces as a result of the CPZ. This is to keep the junctions clear to improve sightlines for all road users and creating the turning facility of Archbishops Place.

The parking bays will not be segregated into individual bays so residents would be able to park within the marked bays as they currently do.

Your request for a cycle parking hangar in the area has been forwarded onto the relevant department for investigation.

Merredene Street (F-OBJ-2026)

This letter is regarding the CPZ consultation on Merredene St, Archbishop's place and Somers Rd. In general I am in opposition to the extension of the CPZ. It will change the character of the street with no net benefit to residents. They will trade high parking fee for less spaces and flexibility for visitors. There are commuters parking around 8am and leaving around 6pm. Yet, most residents use public transport, and so not move their car. So, this pattern has less impact generally on residents. The proposed plans will mean competing with neighbours rather than occasional commuters. The patterns of neighbours will be more correlated and competition higher. With reduced spaces, as per the proposal, this will be worse than the current state. Further questions on Merredene St, Archbishop & Somer Rd: 1. The cost of 'visitor' permits penalises those who do not own cars. This seems very inflexible and expensive. Could this be reduced and made more flexible as a concession? 2. I am concerned about potential metered parking. Can you confirm if the council have any plans to introduce metered parking? 3. If we are to have parking altered, then I would like to see some provision for cycling hangers. Is there any plans for the addition of cycle hangers? 4. What is being proposed to improve the security of the parking at the entrance of Somers Rd? This has many break-ins and is currently unsuitable for residents parking as it is.

Officers Response:

The proposed CPZ will prioritise parking for local residents and their visitors within the scheme and remove all non-essential parking from the area e.g. commuters, residents from adjacent CPZs who do not want to pay for parking. All other vehicles without a permit would be unable to park in these roads except for those who need to stop for loading/unloading purposes. With commuter vehicles removed from any included road, the Council is confident that there would be enough parking spaces for the use of residents within this scheme. A CPZ does not guarantee residents parking spaces in front of their houses but by removing non-resident parking it will make parking easier within 100 metres of their homes and will help remove traffic congestion and pollution caused by those motorists who currently travel from road to road looking for a parking space.

Residents displaying a valid permit or their visitors displaying a valid voucher would be able to park in any of the permit holder only or shared use bays within the zone during the hours of operation. There are no pay by phone (meter) only bays proposed in your zone.

Your request for a cycle parking hangar in the area has been forwarded onto the relevant department for investigation.

Rickards Close (F-OBJ-2003)

I write to you in non agreement of the controlled parking zone proposed for Rickards Close SW2. This is not required as we have no issues with parking and no issues with others leaving their cars in our close and going off to work. I have lived for many years in this close and the parking has not been a problem. I would again like to state that I do not agree that a CPZ F is required for Rickards Close.

Officers Response:

The Council is not proposing to introduce any restrictions on any of the private/housing estate roads in the area, such as Rickards Close. However, residents who reside in these roads will have the opportunity to purchase parking permits to park on the public highway roads within zone F if they choose to.

Rickards Close (F-Obj-2009)

I live at X Rickard Close. I don't agree that we should have a controlled parking zone on either Rickards Close SW2 2RU or Upper Tulse Hill.

Officers Response:

The Council is not proposing to introduce any restrictions on any of the private/housing estate roads in the area, such as Rickards Close. However, residents who reside in these roads will have the opportunity to purchase parking permits to park on the public highway roads within zone F if they choose to.

Rickards Close (F-Obj-2010)

Because my father & me are disabled we need the car all the time as my dad don't have a disabled parking bay.

Officers Response:

The Council is not proposing to introduce any restrictions on any of the private/housing estate roads in the area, such as Rickards Close. However, residents who reside in these roads will have the opportunity to purchase parking permits to park on the public highway roads within zone F if they choose to.

Disable Blue Badge holders are able to park for free within CPZ's in Lambeth when displaying their badge.

Rickards Close (F-Obj-2010)

I am not agree with the proposal of Controlled Zone Parking at Rickards Close.

Officers Response:

The Council is not proposing to introduce any restrictions on any of the private/housing estate roads in the area, such as Rickards Close. However, residents who reside in these roads will have the opportunity to purchase parking permits to park on the public highway roads within zone F if they choose to.

Rickards Close (F-Obj-2013)

I'm a resident of Rickards Close, and I'm aware that the council plans to implement a controlled parking zone. I would like to say this is not something that is wanted or required by the residents/ car owners.

Officers Response:

The Council is not proposing to introduce any restrictions on any of the private/housing estate roads in the area, such as Rickards Close. However, residents who reside in these roads will have the opportunity to purchase parking permits to park on the public highway roads within zone F if they choose to.

Rickards Close (F-Obj-2014)

I do not require for a controlled parking zone to be installed at Rickard's close.

Officers Response:

The Council is not proposing to introduce any restrictions on any of the private/housing estate roads in the area, such as Rickards Close. However, residents who reside in these roads will have the opportunity to purchase parking permits to park on the public highway roads within zone F if they choose to.

Rickards Close (F-Obj-2022)

I am and have been a current resident of XX Rickard Close with my Mum for over 13 years. In light of this news regarding a controlled parking zone in Rickard Close, me and my mum would like to inform you that we are against the idea. We register that we do NOT require or agree with paying parking charges after holding tenancy at this address for over a decade. Please take this into consideration, thank you.

Officers Response:

The Council is not proposing to introduce any restrictions on any of the private/housing estate roads in the area, such as Rickards Close. However, residents who reside in these roads will have the opportunity to purchase parking permits to park on the public highway roads within zone F if they choose to.

Rickards Close (F-Obj-2023)

Please we do not agree with the control parking in Richard close. Thank you

Officers Response:

The Council is not proposing to introduce any restrictions on any of the private/housing estate roads in the area, such as Rickards Close. However, residents who reside in these roads will have the opportunity to purchase parking permits to park on the public highway roads within zone F if they choose to.

Rickards Close (F-Obj-2025)

In regards to Lambeth proposing to install a Controlled Parking Zone in Rickards Close between 12-2pm, as a resident living in Rickards Close, on behalf of my children and I we disagree/object to this proposal. Living in Rickards Close for over 20years with my family parking has truly not been an issue here. Similarly, the residents of Rickards Close, are a small community of elders and mature adults [one is registered blind] that does not in my opinion require this parking zone proposal.

Officers Response:

The Council is not proposing to introduce any restrictions on any of the private/housing estate roads in the area, such as Rickards Close. However, residents who reside in these roads will have the opportunity to purchase parking permits to park on the public highway roads within zone F if they choose to.

Roupell Road (F-Obj-2020)

Herewith, I confirm that I am against it.

Roupell Road (F-Obj-2027)

I have received your consultation letter on the above. I am a resident of Roupell Road being considered for CPZ f Mon - Fri 12.00 - 14.00. And strongly object to this scheme being extended to include Roupell Road. I am appalled that you should be considering this scheme, again despite there being no local support for it. A similar scheme has been consulted on twice in the last several years and deemed unnecessary by residents so not undertaken, the parking situation remains unchanged, I know the councils finances are more stretched but it is unfair to charge residents for parking. Still you persist despite this consultation having an incredibly low response of 7.6%. As only 58% supported a CPZ that leaves approx 4% of residents only supporting a CPZ. Had there been genuine parking problems you would anticipate a higher % response, people are rarely so apathetic if inconvenienced personally. In Roupell Road, where I have lived for 12 years I have NEVER had a parking issue. I am a blue badge holder and even without a designated disabled space I never have to park more than a few steps away from my door. I can barely walk so it cannot be a problem. I am in receipt of enhanced mobility PIP. As a resident of a Road opposed to the Zone I do not imagine parking displacement will become an issue, we are too far away from convenient commuter links (3/4 mile) non-resident car owners will not park and walk that far! We are not close enough to a school to be convenient for drop off and anyway the 12.00 -14.00 CPZ suggestion would not prevent that. It's a well known fact that in answering multiple option questions people plump for a middle choice not a one at either end, in no way would a 12.00 -2.00 CPZ be sensible. If anything it's weekends and late at night when spaces are most filled up, with residents not commuters!! I would like to attend any hearing when this scheme is to be decided.

Officers Response:

This CPZ proposal was not initiated by the Council, it was initiated by residents through requests and campaigning the Council and their Ward Councillors for many years to be consulted on parking controls to alleviate the parking pressure they experience.

The Council can only make the appropriate recommendation and decision based on the results of the consultation as returned by residents / businesses in the area. Whilst it is disappointing to have such a low response the council is still obliged to assist those who did take the time to participate in the consultation process. We can only provide the necessary information required to make an informed decision, the Council cannot force residents to participate.

The hours of operation was chosen by the largest majority during the Informal Consultation. The Council is not a position to manipulate or interpret the figures to suit any preference.

A decision on how to proceed will be taken by the Council under delegated authority which does not require any hearings.

Representations - Comments of the proposals

SUSTRANS

LB Lambeth Brixton Hill Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) consultation

QW Proposals & the proposed Brixton Hill CPZ

As part of The Mayor of London's Quietways programme to get more people cycling and walking, a new route is being proposed between Peckham Rye and Streatham High Road in partnership with LB Lambeth, LB Southwark, TfL and Sustrans.

The proposed route alignment can be found here.

LB Lambeth's CPZ proposal for Brixton Hill offers an excellent opportunity to improve conditions for cyclists and pedestrians as well as addressing local resident's issues over commuter parking. The Tulse Hill section of the proposed QW (see sky blue line in Figure 1) runs through CPZ sections 'F' & 'H' Sustrans welcomes LB Lambeth's CPZ proposals and offers the following recommendations for the CPZ proposals to compliment the proposed QW.

On site observations suggests that motorised vehicles often accelerate on the approach to the junction to avoid the existing long red signal phase. This creates a dangerous pinch point for cyclists when transitioning from primary position into the existing advisory filter lane. Sustrans recommends that the circled parking bays are removed from the proposals to mitigate against this conflict and allow cyclists a safe approach to the junction.

For cyclists turning on/off High Trees sightlines are restricted by car parking on the shop side of Upper Tulse Hill. Sustrans recommends shortening back the shared use parking bays adjacent to the shops.

Officers Response:

The Quietway proposals are subject to its own Statutory Consultation, which carries a risk of the scheme proposals changing or at worst being abandoned. The CPZ proposals are a separate entity which is not advisable to be amended to accommodate a cycling scheme at this stage which is subject to its own Statutory Consultation process.

Sustrans proposals for reduction and removal of parking should be dealt with through its own Statutory Consultation process.

Archbishops Place (F-COM-3002)

In general, although opposed to any changes, if there are adjacent parking controls then there must be on archbishops place too. The proposal for turning space is unnecessary and wastes parking space. Cars can reverse which is what has been done for years. Somers road, with the industrial units has single yellow lines with long restrictions. This should be made into resident bays. The only reason for this is the very occasional articulated lorry to one of the businesses. There are now six new houses there so surely residents should be given some priority. If they remain they should be reduced so that additional spaces can be created. Approximately twenty spaces are currently wasted. I agree with the proposed two hour restriction. There might be a reason but why are there adjacent zones where one is 10-12 and the other 12-2?

Officers Response:

Prior to the Council assessing parking conditions on Archbishop's Place, residents were completing the unsafe manoeuvre of reversing the length of up to 120 metres at their own discretion. Now that the Council has assessed conditions on Archbishops Place, we have a duty of care and are obligated to address the unsafe reversing practices by introducing double yellow lines to provide a turning facility. We cannot design for road users to carry out unsafe manoeuvres.

We appreciate the parking needs of residents; however, the Councils' requirements for safety override the need for parking.

The Road Vehicles (Construction and Use) Regulations 1986 states that '*A person shall not drive, or cause or permit to be driven, a motor vehicle backwards on a road further than may be requisite for the safety or reasonable convenience of the occupants of the vehicle or other traffic, unless it is a road roller or is engaged in the construction, maintenance or repair of the road.*'

You MUST NOT reverse your vehicle further than necessary. [Law CUR reg 106]

During the Informal Consultation we offered a 2 hour option and not a specific 2 hour slot to give us the ability to assess to outcome of the results and choose the appropriate 2 hour slot for each specific area. The 12noon-2pm slot was chosen for this area because the existing adjacent zone operates at 10am to 12 noon. It is difficult for Civil Enforcement Officers to get around a 2 hour zone, therefore we stagger the hours so enforcement can get around both (existing Zone Q and proposed Zone F) zones over a 4 hour period instead of having to enforce both zones over a single 2 hour period.

Any change to the hours of operation would require a further separate consultation which would delay the implementation of the zone by 6-12 months. We have not received a significant amount of requests from the area to support a change in hours.

Any request for changes can be investigated upon review of the zone.

Archbishops Place (F-COM-3007) & (F-COM-3013)

Further to the consultation on introducing CPZ to Archbishops Place and surrounding roads, I am writing to you to lodge my concern about a number of the elements included within it.

1. The most significant issue is the proposed turning circle at the cul-de-sac end of Archbishop's Place. This is unnecessary and will reduce the number of parking spaces available significantly. Drivers have managed without this facility for about 100 years (and without power steering) so there is no requirement for it. I'm especially concerned that this addition will threaten the quiet nature of the street as drivers will tend to speed up as they near the end of the road and this will endanger children playing and the peaceful nature of the street.

2. The parking problems will worsen rather than improve if the length of parking bays are marked out, as this will significantly reduce parking spaces further, whereby small cars (many on the street are minis, golfs, polos and similar smaller cars) will take up the same space, rather than allowing drivers to park efficiently, thus

maximising parking. As residents will be paying to park they will expect to have sufficient parking spaces, otherwise we will be no better off than we currently are, and may even be worse off.

3. The addition of new extended yellow lines on and near the corners of Merredene and Somers Road will unnecessarily reduce parking available and isn't necessary, especially on a quiet cul-de-sac. I would also request that you remove the double yellow lines from a single space at the stopped-up road outside number 27 Somers Road, which would allow one more to be available.

4. If parking bay lengths are not demarkated, the proposed double yellow lines on the corners shortened and the disabled bay outside the old King of Sardinia PH is moved to one end of the parking bay, this would potentially allow two small cars to park in front/behind it, thus adding one more space and making it easier for the disabled driver to park.

5. The cost of 'visitor' permits is exorbitant and I understand that there will be an annual limit to numbers. The name 'visitor' is a misnomer as those of us without our own cars would be forced to pay dearly for occasional parking, such as when neighbours hire cars for short term use. Furthermore, we all need to have parking available for guests, workmen, childcare etc, the need for which would vary by household and year to year. I also understand that Guest/Visitor permits are not renewable i.e. once you have used your permits, you cannot be reissued with more the same year. This was presented as anecdotal evidence from residents in another newly established CPZ in Lambeth at one of the previous meetings. There needs to be more flexibility for the number of vouchers that can be purchased per household.

6. I can't see whether the proposed CPZ includes any metered parking. I would be grateful if you could confirm that all planned spaces will be for the use of residents/visitors and there'll be no areas where parking is only via a meter?

7. Cycle parking: While I understand the desire for a cycle storage area, at least cycling residents have a choice of where they can put their bike, even if it means a bike store in the garden, in the house, or taking out to the back garden - car owners have no such choice. I believe bike sheds accommodate only 6 bikes but take up a full car space, if not slightly more, thus reducing the parking further. (Or perhaps it could go at the stopped-up end of Somers Road?)

8. Total number of spaces: Of the 102 spaces currently across Archbishops Place, Meredene Street and Somers Road you say are included in our CPZ allocation, does that include the 6-8 spaces on Somers Road? This road is notorious for having car windows smashed (as there was again last week) and residents avoid parking on this road because of this. Also, please bear in mind that there will likely be more cars in the neighbourhood with the 4 x 4-bedroom houses currently on the market on Somers Place. More residents competing for fewer spaces would likely mean residents end up being fined.

9. The costs of permits per year: I understand that the Acre Lance CPZ increased its costs by 100% in the first 9-12 months of operation and Leander Road had agreed the amount of time, days of the week and cost of the permits with Lambeth Council when they agreed to CPZ, yet when it was introduced it was for longer hours, on more days, and at a significantly higher cost than agreed, and went up significantly every year. What reassurances can you give us that if we agree to 12-2pm, Monday to Friday for the costs listed, that a) you will implement what we agree b) that prices will only go up by inflation (or close to inflation) each year. While we understand the council is under pressure to cut its costs, using its residents as a cash cow would not go down well.

10. I would like to take this opportunity, again, to point out that one of the cul-de-sac signs has faded so much it is illegible and request that you replace it.

11. It took over a year to have a disabled bay removed this year, and about 3 years to have the one removed from outside #19 and various neighbours have written to Lambeth about a car that has been dumped here for 6 months - yet it's still here (now with a yellow boot on). If Lambeth were more efficient in dealing with these sorts of issues, it would soften the blow of having to pay to park on our own street.

In conclusion, although many of us have been opposed to the introduction of CPZ, if it will be brought in on neighbouring streets we may well feel we are left with no choice but to accept it as we often have parking issues already, mostly due to commuter parking (often by Council workers but, if you maximise the number of spaces available, run the scheme for 2 hours Mon-Fri and keep the costs to a minimum, it will make this bitter pill a little easier to swallow.

Officers Response:

Prior to the Council assessing parking conditions on Archbishop's Place, residents were completing the unsafe manoeuvre of reversing the length of up to 120 metres at their own discretion. Now that the Council has assessed conditions on Archbishops Place, we have a duty of care and are obligated to address the unsafe reversing practices by introducing double yellow lines to provide a turning facility. We cannot design for road users to carry out unsafe manoeuvres.

We appreciate the parking needs of residents; however, the Councils' requirements for safety override the need for parking.

The Road Vehicles (Construction and Use) Regulations 1986 states that *'A person shall not drive, or cause or permit to be driven, a motor vehicle backwards on a road further than may be requisite for the safety or reasonable convenience of the occupants of the vehicle or other traffic, unless it is a road roller or is engaged in the construction, maintenance or repair of the road.'*

You MUST NOT reverse your vehicle further than necessary. [Law CUR reg 106]

The total number of unrestricted spaces quoted in the independent parking survey shows a total of 102 spaces for Archbishop's Place, Merredene Street and Somers Road. However this did include 9 spaces on the unrestricted areas of Somers Road. Somers is not wide enough to accommodate any parking. Taking the existing available parking spaces to 93. Using an average of 5 metres per space to calculate the proposed parking capacity, there will be a total 88 parking spaces available on these roads. Resulting in a net loss of five parking spaces as a result of the CPZ. The parking bays will not be segregated into individual bays so residents would be able to park within the marked bays as they currently do.

The double yellow lines proposed for the junctions in this area already fall below the Highway Code recommendation of 10 metres.

We have reviewed the parking configuration adjacent to the King of Sardinia PH and the next gain would be an additional 3.5 metres, which is not sufficient to accommodate an additional parking space. The double yellow lines at these junctions cannot reduce.

Many areas within Lambeth have a high demand for parking spaces which is why we currently restrict residents to purchasing a maximum of 50 visitor vouchers for each household within a 12 month period.

Although extra permits may be issued in exceptional circumstances it's important that we limit the number of vouchers issued to keep the balance between the number of residents and parking demand as fair as possible. It's a careful balance and if we issued vouchers based on resident's preferences this could upset this balance leading to insufficient spaces in some zones to meet demand.

In addition because of the demand for parking space and the fact that vouchers can be used in any vehicle, regrettably, some resident would choose to sell their vouchers for a profit.

Whilst visitor voucher cost more than annual residents permits (partly due to the additional administration costs involved) they still offer much better value for visitors wishing to park all day compared to purchasing pay and display tickets. Workmen etc should be purchasing Traders Permits which have no cap.

There are no pay by phone (meter) only bays proposed in your zone. Residents displaying a valid permit or their visitors displaying a valid voucher would be able to park in any of the permit holder only or shared use bays within the zone during the hours of operation.

The Cycle Hangars used in Lambeth are 2.55 metres in length, which is approximately half the length of a vehicular parking space, and it accommodates six bicycles.

The total number of unrestricted spaces quoted in the independent parking survey shows a total of 102 spaces for Archbishop's Place, Merredene Street and Somers Road. However this did include 9 spaces on the unrestricted areas of Somers Road. Somers is not wide enough to accommodate any parking. Taking the existing available parking spaces to 93. Using an average of 5 metres per space to calculate the proposed parking capacity, there will be a total 88 parking spaces available on these roads. Resulting in a net loss of five parking spaces as a result of the CPZ. This is to keep the junctions clear to improve sightlines for all road users and creating the turning facility of Archbishops Place.

The Council has a set permit pricing structure and is the same for all CPZ's.

The introduction and removal of disabled bays are subject to its own consultation processes.

The council is determined to assist people with disabilities and recognises that disabled parking places greatly improve the quality of life for many users. As a result we are keen to ensure that only those parking places that are not being used are removed.

Disabled bays are not registered to a single person or an applicant and therefore can be used by anyone with a blue badge. The bay will remain as long as required by any blue badge holder. We only remove disabled bays when they are unused by any blue badge holder at any time. If, as part of the consultation process, we receive a representation advising us that a bay is in regular use even though this may not be by the person who originally requested the bay then our current policy is not to remove the bay.

The removal of disabled parking places is a sensitive issue and the council only investigate removals upon request as not to cause unintentional distress.

The Council has no powers to remove abandoned vehicles which have valid road tax from the public unless they are in contravention of the highway code. The introduction of a CPZ would authorise the Council to remove abandoned vehicle with or without a valid road tax on the grounds that they do not have a valid parking permit.

The hours of operation proposed for Zone F is Monday to Friday from 12noon to 2pm.

Archbishops Place (F-COM-3008)

I and my wife and 2 young sons live at 17 Somers Road. We do not have a car – we have a lot of bicycles (and nowhere to keep them). But we do use hire cars (usually car-club ones) and we do occasionally have need to park them. We are concerned, along with many of our neighbours, that the proposals seek to limit the parking spaces available to residents by adding spurious extra yellow lines – particularly at the bottom end of Archbishops Close to create a ‘turning circle’ – there has been no difficulty for residents manoeuvring in the past, so we can only presume that is to encourage other persons in the parking zone to speed down this quiet cul-de-sac and practice handbrake turns at the bottom when they find the spaces taken by the residents of the close? We are also concerned at the continued failure to deal with the access & public order problems caused by the lack of double yellow lines on both sides of the whole badly lit lower section of Somers Road. Never mind the blocking of the pavement by cars whose drivers realise that although parking is permitted, the road is not wide enough for delivery vans etc. to pass without scraping; we tend to be more concerned with the dogging and frequent (more than weekly at the moment) piles of broken glass from smashed car windows.

Officers Response:

Prior to the Council assessing parking conditions on Archbishop’s Place, residents were completing the unsafe manoeuvre of reversing the length of up to 120 metres at their own discretion. Now that the Council has assessed conditions on Archbishops Place, we have a duty of care and are obligated to address the unsafe reversing practices by introducing double yellow lines to provide a turning facility. We cannot design for road users to carry out unsafe manoeuvres.

We appreciate the parking needs of residents; however, the Councils’ requirements for safety override the need for parking.

The Road Vehicles (Construction and Use) Regulations 1986 states that *‘A person shall not drive, or cause or permit to be driven, a motor vehicle backwards on a road further than may be requisite for the safety or reasonable convenience of the occupants of the vehicle or other traffic, unless it is a road roller or is engaged in the construction, maintenance or repair of the road.’*

You MUST NOT reverse your vehicle further than necessary. [Law CUR reg 106]

The double yellow lines proposed for the junctions in this area already fall below the Highway Code recommendation of 10 metres.

As a CPZ the area would be frequently enforced which should remove/reduce obstructive parking.

Archbishops Place (F-COM-3009)

I write in respect of the consultation on introducing CPZ to Archbishops Place and surrounding roads, as I have a number of concerns. Over the years I have been in agreement with some need to control the parking so I have never been someone who has been opposed to this. Indeed for a long time I thought that some restrictions were needed to support those more vulnerable members of our road: the elderly and those suffering from illnesses or limited mobility. Also and perhaps not in this category, but united in the need to have the ability to use their cars during the day: parents of infants and young children who might need to just run children to schools or pick them up again. And for those of us without such needs, I cannot tell you how frustrating it is for those of us who feel unable to use our cars during the day because we are all too aware that moving our vehicles from within street between the hours of 8 and 16.00 is likely to mean that we are forced to park in a neighbouring streets which can mean a fifteen minute walk back home and then again back to get the car. I appreciate that that doesn’t rank anywhere near social deprivation but it is annoying especially when you know that some of the car parking spaces are taken by people who are using by people who park in our street to avoid parking charges in their own street. This is why I am concerned that two of your proposals will hinder not help more efficient used of parking space. The first of these is the turning circle at the cul-de-sac end of Archbishop's Place has been proposed. I am not sure what the benefit of this will be but it will certainly reduce the number of parking spaces available significantly including the disabled space of a lady in her eighties. I am not sure if there is a requirement for a turning circle. I used to have an estate car and because the road is quite wide I had no trouble doing a three point turn in the road. Secondly, I am also not sure why you feel the need to mark the bays. Lots of us have small cars and we do not require the same size space as estate cars or four wheel drives. I also would like clarification as to whether the proposed CPZ will include any metered parking. I would be grateful if you could confirm that all planned spaces will be for the use of residents/visitors. Regarding a cycle storage shed. I do not think that this is an issue for Archbishops Place, where people have been parking their bikes in their back gardens since the penny farthing was invented. Finally, can I draw your attention to the fact that a number of the houses in this street, particularly the south side are currently rented out which means that there could be a danger of bias from ‘absentee landlords’.

Officers Response:

Prior to the Council assessing parking conditions on Archbishop's Place, residents were completing the unsafe manoeuvre of reversing the length of up to 120 metres at their own discretion. Now that the Council has assessed conditions on Archbishops Place, we have a duty of care and are obligated to address the unsafe reversing practices by introducing double yellow lines to provide a turning facility. We cannot design for road users to carry out unsafe manoeuvres.

We appreciate the parking needs of residents; however, the Councils' requirements for safety override the need for parking.

The Road Vehicles (Construction and Use) Regulations 1986 states that *'A person shall not drive, or cause or permit to be driven, a motor vehicle backwards on a road further than may be requisite for the safety or reasonable convenience of the occupants of the vehicle or other traffic, unless it is a road roller or is engaged in the construction, maintenance or repair of the road.'*

You MUST NOT reverse your vehicle further than necessary. [Law CUR reg 106]

The turning circle would improve the access to and from the relocated disabled bay at the end of the cul-de-sac. The double yellow lines proposed for the junctions in this area already fall below the Highway Code recommendation of 10 metres.

The parking bays will not be segregated into individual bays so residents would be able to park within the marked bays as they currently do.

The introduction of a CPZ will result in a perceived net loss of five parking spaces as a result of the CPZ. This is to keep the junctions clear to improve sightlines for all road users and creating the turning facility of Archbishops Place.

Residents displaying a valid permit or their visitors displaying a valid voucher would be able to park in any of the permit holder only or shared use bays (permit holders and pay by phone) within the zone during the hours of operation. There are no pay by phone (meter) only bays proposed in your zone.

Archbishops Place (F-COM-3014)

I wanted to re-iterate a number of points concerning the proposed introduction of a CPZ in Archbishops Place and the surrounding streets in the Upper Tulse Hill. I am writing as a resident of Archbishops Place. Rumour has it that the proposed Turning circle at the end of the cul de sac has something to do with Health and Safety.. If this is fact, then why has this aspect of things not been previously mentioned in the proposals? If there is a Turning Circle, then people will speed down the street towards it, making things dangerous in a street which has a reputation for being quiet and relatively safe. You can see the results of Terry O'Brien's survey, and how massively unpopular the Turning Circle would be. We hope you will pay some attention to this. It would also lose us precious parking spaces. I have only been unable to park twice in 10 years. The commuter fear is a myth ---- I am retired and go for my paper every AM between 8.30 & 9.30. I see the commuters, perhaps 3 or 4 of them, and after they've parked, there are generally a few spaces somewhere in the street. The worst time to park is on a Sunday evening, obviously nothing to do with commuters. Last week the street was full, bar 2 spaces, and I counted 100 cars/vans across Archbishops, Merredene & Somers Road. By the time double yellows have been painted there will be far less than the 102 promised and as others have said, the 6 - 8 on Somers Road, coming up from Brixton Hill are not viable due to appalling ongoing vandalism. As a Senior Citizen whose husband has very limited mobility and rapidly fading eyesight, amongst many other health problems, I cannot imagine how we are supposed to manage, if we come home to no parking space at all. My husband is unable to walk far and is very frail. I am beside myself with worry about this aspect of the CPZ Implementation. At the moment we manage. Without a car we would be totally housebound. Our already limited quality of life would plummet. I would very much appreciate your response, particularly in relation to the position of Senior Citizens ---- we are clearly not the only people in this situation. I have twice had to contact Lambeth in recent weeks concerning other matters, have requested a response and have received nothing whatsoever.

Officers Response:

Prior to the Council assessing parking conditions on Archbishop's Place, residents were completing the unsafe manoeuvre of reversing the length of up to 120 metres at their own discretion. Now that the Council has assessed conditions on Archbishops Place, we have a duty of care and are obligated to address the unsafe reversing practices by introducing double yellow lines to provide a turning facility. We cannot design for road users to carry out unsafe manoeuvres.

We appreciate the parking needs of residents; however, the Councils' requirements for safety override the need for parking.

The Road Vehicles (Construction and Use) Regulations 1986 states that *'A person shall not drive, or cause or permit to be driven, a motor vehicle backwards on a road further than may be requisite for the safety or reasonable convenience of the occupants of the vehicle or other traffic, unless it is a road roller or is engaged in the construction, maintenance or repair of the road.'*

You MUST NOT reverse your vehicle further than necessary. [Law CUR reg 106]

The total number of unrestricted spaces quoted in the independent parking survey we commissioned shows a total of 102 spaces for Archbishop's Place, Merredene Street and Somers Road. However this did include 9 spaces on the unrestricted areas of Somers Road. Somers is not wide enough to accommodate any parking. Taking the existing available parking spaces to 93. Using an average of 5 metres per space to calculate the proposed parking capacity, there will be a total 88 parking spaces available on these roads. Resulting in a net loss of five parking spaces as a result of the CPZ. This is to keep the junctions clear to improve sightlines for all road users and creating the turning facility of Archbishops Place.

The parking bays will not be segregated into individual bays so residents would be able to park within the marked bays as they currently do.

The proposed CPZ will prioritise parking for local residents and their visitors within the scheme and remove all non-essential parking from the area e.g. commuters, residents from adjacent CPZs who do not want to pay for parking. All other vehicles without a permit would be unable to park in these roads except for those who need to stop for loading/unloading purposes. With commuter vehicles removed from any included road, the Council is confident that there would be enough parking spaces for the use of residents within this scheme. A CPZ does not guarantee residents parking spaces in front of their houses but by removing non-resident parking it will make parking easier within 100 metres of their homes and will help remove traffic congestion and pollution caused by those motorists who currently travel from road to road looking for a parking space.

Athlone Road (F-COM-3001)

Once again I see that the council are intent of implementing an extension to the CPZ in our area and this time with only a 7.6% response to the informal consultation which is half the response rate (14%) of the last 'consultation report for the previous extension (see attached file). I would like to point out that the chaos and distress that the last revision of the Q CPZ caused in our area and I would have thought the council Officers would have learnt that relying on such a small survey response is only asking for more dissatisfaction and complaints of railroading on your part. I include an article from the local press after the last CPZ was introduced. I also enclose the Ombudsman's response to our complaint about the last consultation and implementation of the CPZ extension. While it found in favour of the council it still is critical of the way the procedure was implemented. Consequently I strongly feel that a further more complete consultation should take place which results in a much higher response rate to get a realistic picture of the need of the area.

Officers Response:

The Council can only make the appropriate recommendation and decision based on the results of the consultation as returned by residents / businesses in the area. Whilst it is disappointing to have such a low response the council is still obliged to assist those who did take the time to participate in the consultation process. We can only provide the necessary information required to make an informed decision, the Council cannot force residents to participate.

The newsletter delivered to residents in the informal consultation explained the proposals, describing the reasons for the consultation, how a CPZ works and how to participate in the consultation. A Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ's) document was also provided to answer common CPZ related questions and Lambeth's Permit Pricing Structure information showing the cost of the various parking permits at the time of the consultation. A webpage was also created which contained all the relevant information with detailed plans of the Council's proposals. On these webpages are links to a survey where households could complete and submit their views including comments. For those properties who were unable to access the information on the website, or complete the online survey, a telephone request line was created where respondents could request maps and hardcopy questionnaires. The details of this telephone request line was in the Newsletter sent out to all properties. A3 posters were erected on lamp columns in and around the Housing Estates to raise awareness of the consultation. The poster contained a short link to the council website for detailed information and the telephone request line number. A public exhibition was also held allowing residents and businesses to discuss the proposed measures with officers.

All the above information is also available on the council website throughout the statutory consultation stage. The on street notices and advert in the Lambeth Weekender are the minimum statutory requirements to which the Council must adhere to. In addition to this, we send a newsletter to all properties in the affected area and supply both an email and postal address where they can make their representations.

Holmewood Gardens (F-COM-3003)

We are residents of XX Holmewood Gardens and we are writing in response to the statutory consultation on the Brixton Hill CPZ. We feel strongly that, if the proposed CPZ F is introduced, it should operate Monday – Friday 10am – noon rather than noon – 2pm as in the consultation document. This would be much more convenient as regards lunchtime visitors to our home and it seems to us that it would be just as effective in

reducing pressure on parking spaces. The existing adjacent CPZ Q is already 10am – noon (ie Elm Park and northwards). Surely CPZ F should be the same as that one. CPZ H is noon to 2pm (around Tulse Hill station) but that is much less relevant to CPZ F. We have shared our view (that the proposed hours of operation of CPZ F should be changed to 10am – noon) with neighbours through the Holmewood Neighbourhood Association googlegroup and have received e-mails in support from 8 other households. We have not received any e-mails expressing disagreement. With the assistance of neighbours we are also collecting signatures in support and these will be forwarded to you in the post. Can you assure us that this request will be taken into account by officers in the final report to be considered by the Council?

Officers Response:

During the Informal Consultation we offered a 2 hour option and not a specific 2 hour slot to give us the ability to assess the outcome of the results and choose the appropriate 2 hour slot for each specific area. The 12noon-2pm slot was chosen for this area because the existing adjacent zone operates at 10am to 12 noon. It is difficult for Civil Enforcement Officers to get around a 2 hour zone, therefore we stagger the hours so enforcement can get around both (existing Zone Q and proposed Zone F) zones over a 4 hour period instead of having to enforce both zones over a single 2 hour period.

Any change to the hours of operation would require a further separate consultation which would delay the implementation of the zone by 6-12 months. We have not received a significant amount of requests from the area to support a change in hours.

Any request for changes can be investigated upon review of the zone.

Holmewood Gardens & Cotherstone Road (F-COM-3004)

We represent the residents at XX Cotherstone Road and XX Cotherstone Road and XX Holmewood Gardens and as residents on 3 of the affected properties and owners of 2 shared vehicles and 1 bike, we would like it noted that we agree in full with the email below:

We are residents of XX Holmewood Gardens and we are writing in response to the statutory consultation on the Brixton Hill CPZ. We feel strongly that, if the proposed CPZ F is introduced, it should operate Monday – Friday 10am – noon rather than noon – 2pm as in the consultation document. This would be much more convenient as regards lunchtime visitors to our home and it seems to us that it would be just as effective in reducing pressure on parking spaces. The existing adjacent CPZ Q is already 10am – noon (ie Elm Park and northwards). Surely CPZ F should be the same as that one. CPZ H is noon to 2pm (around Tulse Hill station) but that is much less relevant to CPZ F. We have shared our view (that the proposed hours of operation of CPZ F should be changed to 10am – noon) with neighbours through the Holmewood Neighbourhood Association googlegroup and have received e-mails in support from 8 other households. We have not received any e-mails expressing disagreement. With the assistance of neighbours we are also collecting signatures in support and these will be forwarded to you in the post. Can you assure us that this request will be taken into account by officers in the final report to be considered by the Council?

Officers Response:

During the Informal Consultation we offered a 2 hour option and not a specific 2 hour slot to give us the ability to assess the outcome of the results and choose the appropriate 2 hour slot for each specific area. The 12noon-2pm slot was chosen for this area because the existing adjacent zone operates at 10am to 12 noon. It is difficult for Civil Enforcement Officers to get around a 2 hour zone, therefore we stagger the hours so enforcement can get around both (existing Zone Q and proposed Zone F) zones over a 4 hour period instead of having to enforce both zones over a single 2 hour period.

Any change to the hours of operation would require a further separate consultation which would delay the implementation of the zone by 6-12 months. We have not received a significant amount of requests from the area to support a change in hours.

Any request for changes can be investigated upon review of the zone.

Holmewood Gardens (F-COM-3006)

I support the times 10.00am to 12 noon for the Holmewood zone.

Officers Response:

During the Informal Consultation we offered a 2 hour option and not a specific 2 hour slot to give us the ability to assess the outcome of the results and choose the appropriate 2 hour slot for each specific area. The 12noon-2pm slot was chosen for this area because the existing adjacent zone operates at 10am to 12 noon. It is difficult for Civil Enforcement Officers to get around a 2 hour zone, therefore we stagger the hours so enforcement can get around both (existing Zone Q and proposed Zone F) zones over a 4 hour period instead of having to enforce both zones over a single 2 hour period.

Any change to the hours of operation would require a further separate consultation which would delay the implementation of the zone by 6-12 months. We have not received a significant amount of requests from the area to support a change in hours.

Any request for changes can be investigated upon review of the zone.

Holmewood Gardens (F-COM-3008) (F-COM-3010)

We would like to request that, given it is likely that this will become a CPZ, the hours of operation would be 10am - noon (not noon till 2pm). We've talked to a number of our neighbours who agree with us and there are several reasons for this preference:

- a) it is more convenient for having lunchtime visitors (a number of residents are retired or at home with young children)
- b) it would be better for parents if they arrive early to collect their children from Orchard School in Cotherstone Road if there is free parking available
- c) we think it would be more of a deterrent to would-be commuters - it's possible that commuters might park up to midday and then move their vehicle but would be less likely to park here if they had to move their car at 10am.

Also, please could you reassure us that we shall retain the same *number* of parking spaces that we have now, when this scheme is implemented i.e. that we shall retain the current parking formation (fish-bone style) at the pointed end of the gardens and a few at the other end too. (From looking at the detailed plan on your website, it looks as if this will be the case, but we'd appreciate confirmation please).

We appreciate that you are taking the trouble to consult with us, the residents, and hope that you will implement our preference.

Officers Response:

During the Informal Consultation we offered a 2 hour option and not a specific 2 hour slot to give us the ability to assess the outcome of the results and choose the appropriate 2 hour slot for each specific area. The 12noon-2pm slot was chosen for this area because the existing adjacent zone operates at 10am to 12 noon. It is difficult for Civil Enforcement Officers to get around a 2 hour zone, therefore we stagger the hours so enforcement can get around both (existing Zone Q and proposed Zone F) zones over a 4 hour period instead of having to enforce both zones over a single 2 hour period.

Any change to the hours of operation would require a further separate consultation which would delay the implementation of the zone by 6-12 months. We have not received a significant amount of requests from the area to support a change in hours.

Any request for changes can be investigated upon review of the zone.

Every effort is made to maximum parking where it is safe, practical and doesn't impede the flow of traffic. I assume when say "fishbone style" of parking, you mean the parking bays that are perpendicular to the kerb. Yes we are maintaining this type of parking, however it was necessary to remove/reduce some of these spaces for the reasons stated above. The exact layout can be viewed on the Council webpage at, www.lambeth.gov.uk/bhczp.

Holmewood Gardens (F-COM-3012)

We are residents of XX Holmewood Gardens and we are writing in response to the statutory consultation on the Brixton Hill CPZ. We feel strongly that, if the proposed CPZ F is introduced, it should operate Monday – Friday 10am – noon rather than noon – 2pm as in the consultation document. This would be much more convenient as regards lunchtime visitors to our home and it seems to us that it would be just as effective in reducing pressure on parking spaces. The existing adjacent CPZ Q is already 10am – noon (ie Elm Park and northwards). Surely CPZ F should be the same as that one. CPZ H is noon to 2pm (around Tulse Hill station) but that is much less relevant to CPZ F. We have shared our view (that the proposed hours of operation of CPZ F should be changed to 10am – noon) with neighbours through the Holmewood Neighbourhood Association googlegroup and have received e-mails in support from 8 other households. We have not received any e-mails expressing disagreement. With the assistance of neighbours we are also collecting signatures in support and these will be forwarded to you in the post. Can you assure us that this request will be taken into account by officers in the final report to be considered by the Council?

Officers Response:

During the Informal Consultation we offered a 2 hour option and not a specific 2 hour slot to give us the ability to assess the outcome of the results and choose the appropriate 2 hour slot for each specific area. The 12noon-2pm slot was chosen for this area because the existing adjacent zone operates at 10am to 12 noon. It is difficult for Civil Enforcement Officers to get around a 2 hour zone, therefore we stagger the hours so enforcement can get around both (existing Zone Q and proposed Zone F) zones over a 4 hour period instead of having to enforce both zones over a single 2 hour period.

Any change to the hours of operation would require a further separate consultation which would delay the implementation of the zone by 6-12 months. We have not received a significant amount of requests from the area to support a change in hours.

Any request for changes can be investigated upon review of the zone.

Merredene Street (F-COM-3005)

I live at XX Merredene Street, SW2 2AG. In the past I've been opposed to the introduction of a CPZ, mainly as a result of living through a badly implemented scheme in a neighbouring borough. However, I realise the trend is now to move forward and with the recent addition of 4 new houses in Somers Place, without any parking facilities, and the noticeable impact of 'Park and ride' type visitors, I'm coming round to the idea. However I'm concerned by the following elements within the scheme :

1. the addition of new yellow lines on and near the corners of merredene and somers road. I believe this will unnecessarily reduce parking space and isn't necessary in, what to all extent and purpose, is a quiet cul de sac.
2. The creation of a turning circle at the bottom of Archbishops also looks to severely reduce parking space, especially for neighbours at that end of the road. I'm especially concerned that this addition will threaten the quiet nature of the street. Drivers will tend to speed up as they near the end of the road and this will endanger children playing and the peaceful nature of the street.
3. The cost of 'visitor' vouchers is exorbitant and I understand that there will be an annual limit to numbers. There's an obvious fallacy in the name 'visitor' and this penalises those of us without our own cars who are forced to pay over the odds for occasional parking - I choose not to operate my own car but instead rent a vehicle 5 or 6 times a year. Equally I have guests and occasional workmen with vehicles. It will be necessary to rethink that approach if I'm not able to park because I don't have a costly voucher.
4. The outlined spaces shown in documentation seem too long. The cars in the street are mostly mini, golfs/polos and similar small cars, do they really need 5m each and won't this further constrain parking?
5. I can't see any sign on documentation of whether the CPZ also plan to include metered parking. Please can you confirm that all planned spaces will be for the use of residents/visitors and there'll be no areas where parking is only via meter?
6. will the creation of CPZ enable cycle parking? I'm concerned it will do the opposite - by monetarising parking aren't we making it less likely that one or two spaces will be set aside for those residents who cycle? I've made a number of requests to Lambeth and cycle hoops and remain in the dark. We should be encouraging greener, healthy forms of transport.
7. As a side note, I've noticed that the red lines and allowed parking on the junction of Upper Tulse Hill reaches too far into the corner with Brixton Hill. This means that vehicles can't always turn into Upper Tulse Hill and are by default encouraged to use somers road as a rat run. It would be encouraging if the current exercise could resolve that issue.

Officers Response:

The double yellow lines proposed for the junctions in this area already fall below the Highway Code recommendation of 10 metres.

Prior to the Council assessing parking conditions on Archbishop's Place, residents were completing the unsafe manoeuvre of reversing the length of up to 120 metres at their own discretion. Now that the Council has assessed conditions on Archbishops Place, we have a duty of care and are obligated to address the unsafe reversing practices by introducing double yellow lines to provide a turning facility. We cannot design for road users to carry out unsafe manoeuvres.

We appreciate the parking needs of residents; however, the Councils' requirements for safety override the need for parking.

The Road Vehicles (Construction and Use) Regulations 1986 states that *'A person shall not drive, or cause or permit to be driven, a motor vehicle backwards on a road further than may be requisite for the safety or reasonable convenience of the occupants of the vehicle or other traffic, unless it is a road roller or is engaged in the construction, maintenance or repair of the road.'*

You MUST NOT reverse your vehicle further than necessary. [Law CUR reg 106]

Many areas within Lambeth have a high demand for parking spaces which is why we currently restrict residents to purchasing a maximum of 50 visitor vouchers for each household within a 12 month period.

Although extra permits may be issued in exceptional circumstances it's important that we limit the number of vouchers issued to keep the balance between the number of residents and parking demand as fair as possible. It's a careful balance and if we issued vouchers based on resident's preferences this could upset this balance leading to insufficient spaces in some zones to meet demand.

In addition because of the demand for parking space and the fact that vouchers can be used in any vehicle, regrettably, some resident would choose to sell their vouchers for a profit.

Whilst visitor voucher cost more than annual residents permits (partly due to the additional administration costs involved) they still offer much better value for visitors wishing to park all day compared to purchasing pay and display tickets.

Workmen etc should be purchasing Traders Permits which have no cap.

The alternative to visitors using vouchers they could use the Pay by Phone (metered) facility in the shared use bays in the zone.

The parking bays will not be segregated into individual bays so residents would be able to park within the marked bays as they currently do.

There are no pay by phone (meter) only bays proposed in your zone. Residents displaying a valid permit or their visitors displaying a valid voucher would be able to park in any of the permit holder only or shared use bays within the zone during the hours of operation.

Unfortunately we are not responsible for the introduction of cycle hangers. I have provided a link where you can request to have one installed in your road. <https://www.lambeth.gov.uk/forms/register-your-interest-in-a-lambeth-bikehangar-form>

At the moment the Council is in the middle of a retendering the contract for installing and maintaining the hangars, so they have a delay in dealing with incoming requests. However, I would recommend that you and your neighbours who are interested in having cycle parking in the neighbourhood complete the request form on the website.

Somers Road (F-COM-3011)

Further to the consultation on introducing CPZ to Archbishops Place and surrounding roads, I am writing to you to lodge my concern about a number of the elements included within it. 1. The most significant issue is the proposed turning circle at the cul-de-sac end of Archbishop's Place. This is unnecessary and will reduce the number of parking spaces available significantly. Drivers have managed without this facility for about 100 years (and without power steering) so there is no requirement for it. I'm especially concerned that this addition will threaten the quiet nature of the street as drivers will tend to speed up as they near the end of the road and this will endanger children playing and the peaceful nature of the street. 2. The parking problems will worsen rather than improve if the length of parking bays are marked out, as this will significantly reduce parking spaces further, whereby small cars (many on the street are minis, golfs, polos and similar smaller cars) will take up the same space, rather than allowing drivers to park efficiently, thus maximising parking. As residents will be paying to park they will expect to have sufficient parking spaces, otherwise we will be no better off than we currently are, and may even be worse off. 3. The addition of new extended yellow lines on and near the corners of Merredene and Somers Road will unnecessarily reduce parking available and isn't necessary, especially on a quiet cul-de-sac. I would also request that you remove the double yellow lines from a single space at the stopped-up road outside number 27 Somers Road, which would allow one more to be available. 4. If parking bay lengths are not demarkated, the proposed double yellow lines on the corners shortened and the disabled bay outside the old King of Sardinia PH is moved to one end of the parking bay, this would potentially allow two small cars to park in front/behind it, thus adding one more space and making it easier for the disabled driver to park. 5. The cost of 'visitor' permits is exorbitant and I understand that there will be an annual limit to numbers. The name 'visitor' is a misnomer as those of us without our own cars would be forced to pay dearly for occasional parking, such as when neighbours hire cars for short term use. Furthermore, we all need to have parking available for guests, workmen, childcare etc, the need for which would vary by household and year to year. I also understand that Guest/Visitor permits are not renewable i.e. once you have used your permits, you cannot be reissued with more the same year. This was presented as anecdotal evidence from residents in another newly established CPZ in Lambeth at one of the previous meetings. There needs to be more flexibility for the number of vouchers that can be purchased per household. 6. I can't see whether the proposed CPZ includes any metered parking. I would be grateful if you could confirm that all planned spaces will be for the use of residents/visitors and there'll be no areas where parking is only via a meter? 7. Cycle parking: I am concerned that once a CPZ is in place, there would perhaps understandably be opposition from car owners to giving up a parking space to a bike hangar. My husband, myself and our two children all use bikes and public transport and have never owned nor do we have plans to own a car and unfortunately do not have sufficient outdoor space to store four bikes. Any resident's decision not to own a car helps reduce pressure on space for parking and reduces air pollution so should surely be encouraged by Lambeth. I am afraid however that the introduction of a CPZ without any bike hangar provision at the same time will have the opposite effect. 8. Total number of spaces: Of the 102 spaces currently across Archbishops Place, Meredene Street and Somers Road you say are included in our CPZ allocation, does that include the 6-8 spaces on Somers Road? This road is notorious for having car windows smashed (as there was again last week) and residents avoid parking on this road because of

this. Also, please bear in mind that there will likely be more cars in the neighbourhood with the 4 x 4-bedroom houses currently on the market on Somers Place. More residents competing for fewer spaces would likely mean residents end up being fined. 9. The costs of permits per year: I understand that the Acre Lance CPZ increased its costs by 100% in the first 9-12 months of operation and Leander Road had agreed the amount of time, days of the week and cost of the permits with Lambeth Council when they agreed to CPZ, yet when it was introduced it was for longer hours, on more days, and at a significantly higher cost than agreed, and went up significantly every year. What reassurances can you give us that if we agree to 12-2pm, Monday to Friday for the costs listed, that a) you will implement what we agree b) that prices will only go up by inflation (or close to inflation) each year. While we understand the council is under pressure to cut its costs, using its residents as a cash cow would not go down well. 10. I would like to take this opportunity, again, to point out that one of the cul-de-sac signs has faded so much it is illegible and request that you replace it. 11. It took over a year to have a disabled bay removed this year, and about 3 years to have the one removed from outside #19 and various neighbours have written to Lambeth about a car that has been dumped here for 6 months - yet it's still here (now with a yellow boot on). If Lambeth were more efficient in dealing with these sorts of issues, it would soften the blow of having to pay to park on our own street. In conclusion, although many of us have been opposed to the introduction of CPZ, if it will be brought in on neighbouring streets we may well feel we are left with no choice but to accept it as we often have parking issues already, mostly due to commuter parking (often by Council workers but, if you maximise the number of spaces available, run the scheme for 2 hours Mon-Fri and keep the costs to a minimum, it will make this bitter pill a little easier to swallow.

Officers Response:

Prior to the Council assessing parking conditions on Archbishop's Place, residents were completing the unsafe manoeuvre of reversing the length of up to 120 metres at their own discretion. Now that the Council has assessed conditions on Archbishops Place, we have a duty of care and are obligated to address the unsafe reversing practices by introducing double yellow lines to provide a turning facility. We cannot design for road users to carry out unsafe manoeuvres.

We appreciate the parking needs of residents; however, the Councils' requirements for safety override the need for parking.

The Road Vehicles (Construction and Use) Regulations 1986 states that *'A person shall not drive, or cause or permit to be driven, a motor vehicle backwards on a road further than may be requisite for the safety or reasonable convenience of the occupants of the vehicle or other traffic, unless it is a road roller or is engaged in the construction, maintenance or repair of the road.'*

You MUST NOT reverse your vehicle further than necessary. [Law CUR reg 106]

The parking bays will not be segregated into individual bays so residents would be able to park within the marked bays as they currently do.

The double yellow lines proposed for the junctions in this area already fall below the Highway Code recommendation of 10 metres.

Many areas within Lambeth have a high demand for parking spaces which is why we currently restrict residents to purchasing a maximum of 50 visitor vouchers for each household within a 12 month period.

Although extra permits may be issued in exceptional circumstances it's important that we limit the number of vouchers issued to keep the balance between the number of residents and parking demand as fair as possible. It's a careful balance and if we issued vouchers based on resident's preferences this could upset this balance leading to insufficient spaces in some zones to meet demand.

In addition because of the demand for parking space and the fact that vouchers can be used in any vehicle, regrettably, some resident would choose to sell their vouchers for a profit.

Whilst visitor voucher cost more than annual residents permits (partly due to the additional administration costs involved) they still offer much better value for visitors wishing to park all day compared to purchasing pay and display tickets

Workmen etc should be purchasing Traders Permits which have no cap.

There are no pay by phone (meter) only bays proposed in your zone. Residents displaying a valid permit or their visitors displaying a valid voucher would be able to park in any of the permit holder only or shared use bays within the zone during the hours of operation.

Unfortunately we are not responsible for the introduction of cycle hangers. I have provided a link where you can request to have one installed in your road. <https://www.lambeth.gov.uk/forms/register-your-interest-in-a-lambeth-bikehangar-form>

At the moment the Council is in the middle of a retendering the contract for installing and maintaining the hangars, so they have a delay in dealing with incoming requests. However, I would recommend that you and your neighbours who are interested in having cycle parking in the neighbourhood complete the request form on the website.

The total number of unrestricted spaces quoted in the independent parking survey shows a total of 102 spaces for Archbishop's Place, Merredene Street and Somers Road. However this did include 9 spaces on the unrestricted areas of Somers Road. Somers Road is not wide enough to accommodate any parking. Taking the existing available parking spaces to 93. Using an average of 5 metres per space to calculate the proposed parking capacity, there will be a total 88 parking spaces available on these roads. Resulting in a net loss of five parking spaces as a result of the CPZ. This is to keep the junctions clear to improve sightlines for all road users and creating the turning facility of Archbishops Place.

The Council has a set permit pricing structure and is the same for all CPZ's.

Your request to have the faded cul-de-sac sign replaced has been forwarded onto the Highways department for further investigation.

The introduction and removal of disabled bays are subject to its own consultation processes.

The council is determined to assist people with disabilities and recognises that disabled parking places greatly improve the quality of life for many users. As a result we are keen to ensure that only those parking places that are not being used are removed.

Disabled bays are not registered to a single person or an applicant and therefore can be used by anyone with a blue badge. The bay will remain as long as required by any blue badge holder. We only remove disabled bays when they are unused by any blue badge holder at any time. If, as part of the consultation process, we receive a representation advising us that a bay is in regular use even though this may not be by the person who originally requested the bay then our current policy is not to remove the bay.

The removal of disabled parking places is a sensitive issue and the council only investigate removals upon request as not to cause unintentional distress.

REPRESENTATIONS IN SUPPORT OF THE PROPOSALS

No representations received.

REPRESENTATIONS IN OPPOSITION OF THE PROPOSALS

Athlone Road (Q-OBJ-2001)

I have received the proposed Controlled Parking Zone Brixton Hill Area Statutory Consultation leaflet, 22 March - 12 April 2017. I would like to oppose the proposed CPZ for the reasons mentioned below and I would like to ask the following questions.

Reasons to oppose.

My view is the council are using the fact that most people would like some form of parking control as an excuse to bring it in, but I think the questionnaire was vague, and I don't think it gave examples of charges, in the questionnaire itself, which I think would certainly have influenced the replies, and the outcome.

I am asking if the consultation was done correctly, and the questions contained enough detail of charges in the questions themselves, to obtain very accurate consultation results, and not just a very vague question and a very vague reply. It will cause more problems than it will solve, same amounts of cars in the area, just moving the problem to a different area. Will the charge be fair and reasonable, and the money that is raised spent correctly July 2013 A high court victory by residents of a north London borough (Barnet) who rebelled against a steep rise in charges for parking permits will force all councils to stop using parking charges as a means to raise revenue. The questions of the consultation in Oct 2016 were worded in such a way so as to influence the replies and outcome, Of course people would like some form of parking control, but at what price, £100 maybe, £200 too much in my opinion I dont think the price of the permit was included in the questionnaire. If the price of the permit was included in the questions, the outcome of the replies would certainly have been different. I do not think the most important key facts (the cost of the permit) were mentioned in the consultation questionnaire, and if not, they should have been, therefore inviting the response the council wanted. In my view it is not necessary to charge the proposed amounts. How does the council justify the charges,

1) Why is it so expensive.

A guy who lives on Cressingham Estate tells me it costs £50 per year (£1 per week !!) to park on the council estate, so he parks in Athlone Road and Hillworth Road instead. I am sure many people do the same.

2. Why will the parking permit for a diesel car cost nearly £200 per year,

(Four times as much to park in Athlone Road, as it costs to park across the Roadon Cressingham Estate) (including an extra amount for a diesel car) when the Road Tax or Vehicle Excise Duty only costs £110 per year for the same diesel car.

3. The Annual Vehicle Excise Duty costs less for a diesel car, but the Council are charging £40 more, why is this.

4. Why will the parking permit cost nearly twice the annual Road Tax, or Vehicle Excise Duty, per year, for the same diesel car.

3. What happens to the money, will it be spent correctly, or just be spent on other council services.

4. The decision seems a foregone conclusion anyway,

5. Surely this will only move the parking problem to the boundaries of the proposed Controlled parking zones, which has already happened all along with the exiting Controlled Parking Zones, and created the situation we are in now.

Officer Response:

The Informal Consultation packages which was distributed to all properties within the consultation area contained all the relevant information, such as permit prices, frequently asked questions and other CPZ related information for residents and businesses to make informed decisions. This information is still available on the Council website, www.lambeth.gov.uk/bhczp

Housing Estates are considered to be private land and subject to its parking enforcement plans and pricing. Permit pricing is not subject to this consultation.

All income generated from CPZ's are used for running, maintaining and enforcing the CPZ's, any excess goes back into Transport related projects.

Please note that local authorities are afforded discretion to set charges to reflect its parking policies. As part of our commitment to act against air pollution, and to combat the harm that it does to our health and the environment, we introduced a pricing structure for our resident parking permit scheme based on the level of emissions produced by a vehicle. This means that owners of vehicles that produce more pollution will pay more for resident parking permits than owners who choose to drive a vehicle that emits less pollution.

REPRESENTATIONS - COMMENTS OF THE PROPOSALS

No representations received.

REPRESENTATIONS IN SUPPORT OF THE PROPOSALS

Brockwell Park Gardens (H-SUP-1005)

As a resident of Brockwell Park Gardens (No XX), I am in favour of the CPZ proposal for our road. There is a serious problem with parking on our street, which is making life very difficult for residents. Brockwell Park Gardens adjoins the park and therefore attracts lots of visitors in cars to walk dogs or to enjoy family time in the park. This is obviously desirable. However, combined with other pressures, it is frequently making it impossible for residents to find a parking space. Often it is not possible for us to park on Trinity Rise either. The other pressures include:

1. Abandoned vehicles left for weeks or months on the street, presumably because it is effectively a free car park. The council have recently addressed this issue more positively.
2. Lots of contractor vehicles are parked on the street each day.
3. A number of commuters park cars on BPG and leave them all day, whilst they commute from Herne Hill or Tulse Hill stations.
4. An increasing number of residents reserve spaces with wheelie bins, which is antisocial behaviour.
5. The two-way nature of the street frequently results in log jams and altercations as drivers move up the street both ways looking for parking opportunities.
6. Drivers using the street as a cut through between Norwood Road and Tulse Hill.

The only effective way of addressing these issues is through a CPZ, preferably a two hour window from 12-2pm. I would also urge that consideration is given to making Brockwell Park Gardens and Trinity Rise one way streets (in opposite directions) to ease traffic flow in the area.

Officer Response:

Brockwell Park Gardens and Trinity Rise are being added as an extension to the Tulse Hill 'H' CPZ. As an extension your area will be adopting the same hours of operation as the zone it is being extended to. Therefore it is proposed to operate for 2 hours Monday to Friday from 12 noon to 2pm to match up the Guernsey Grove area.

Any change to the hours of operation would require a further separate consultation which would delay the implementation of the zone by 6-12 months. We have not received a significant amount of requests from the area to support a change in hours.

Any request for changes can be investigated upon review of the zone.

Brockwell Park Gardens (H-SUP-1006)

This is a note in STRONG SUPPORT of the proposed BRIXTON HILL CPZ changes outlined in your note here: <https://www.lambeth.gov.uk/parking-transport-and-streets/parking/proposed-controlled-parking-zone-brixton-hill-area> As the informal consultation showed, there is an enormous majority in favour of these proposals, which we fully support. There has also been a petition running in favour of the proposals, at [change.org](https://www.change.org). This attracted over a hundred supporters, and can be seen here:

<https://www.change.org/p/lambeth-council-introduce-a-noon-2pm-controlled-parking-zone-in-brockwell-park-gardens-and-trinity-rise/u/20017121>

Brockwell Park Gardens (H-SUP-1007)

I write in support of the proposed extension to the Brixton Hill CPZ as a resident of Brockwell Park Gardens, London SE24 for the following reasons: Brockwell Park Gardens and Trinity Rise lie between Tulse Hill and Herne Hill train stations and major bus routes into Brixton and Croydon. As there are currently no parking controls commuters circle in the mornings to park free of charge as soon as residents' cars leave, restricting access for friends, contractors and residents who don't do a daily commute. The severe restrictions on parking are really difficult for disabled residents and those with limited mobility. When I give a neighbour a lift to hospital appointments I frequently have to park in the middle of the road so she can get into the car. Bumper to bumper parking on both sides of the road has caused some really unpleasant road rage incidents, as cars cannot easily pass and drivers cutting through get angry. I've had several of these myself. Creating marked bays should provide more passing places. I would encourage consideration of one way flows on each road to avoid this issue. The pressure on parking can cause tensions between neighbours as we compete for the limited spaces. Abandoned cars stay on the street for prolonged periods as there are no parking patrols, also restricting access for residents (this has improved recently). One car stayed outside my house for 2 weeks - cheaper than paying airport parking if you're going on holiday. Lambeth is not maximising the potential income. In London people expect to pay for parking. The 2 hour window will contribute some funding, if modest, towards the upkeep of roads in the borough, as will residents' parking permits. The 2 hour window will still enable access for park users. It is a fantastic community resource. Any changes should not restrict this, and by deterring all day parking the proposed changes should enhance access.

Brockwell Park Gardens (H-SUP-1008)

I am in favour of the proposed CPZ scheme that will incorporate Brockwell Park Gardens. I have lived at this address for 4 years and have seen parking in the street get steadily more congested with commuter parking in the street. This is compounded by people parking in the street to use the park.

Brockwell Park Gardens (H-SUP-1009)

I am in favour of the proposed CPZ scheme that will incorporate Brockwell Park Gardens. I have lived at XX, Brockwell Park Gardens for 4 years. I can only use my car on dull weekends. A sunny weekend, you would never be able to park if you left home. In the weekday you would never get your space back because of dog walkers, and dog walker profit making companies that could give something back to the borough. It leaves you in a position that the only day you may be able to use your own car and still park - a rainy weekend. I welcome visitors to the park and dog walkers. I welcome a scheme that could support both residents and visitors.

Norwood Road (H-SUP-1004)

Representations for the proposals

1. Majority of the available parking in Brockwell Park Gardens and Trinity Rise to be residents (HR) or business (HB) only between 12-2pm Mon-Fri. Between 12-2pm, 1 hour stay limit pay by phone £3/hour. Great advantage as this will stop commuter parking.
2. The above will mean that anyone can park at all other times of the day. This will be of enormous benefit for users of Brockwell Park – it is the only section of free parking around the entire perimeter of the park.
3. Limited stay parking in Brockwell Park Gardens, free for 1 hour, no return within 1 hour. To enable customers of the businesses 6-16 Norwood Road to park. My understanding is that there will be 8 spaces in the north section of Brockwell Park Gardens between the gatehouse gate on the Norwood Road corner and the first entrance.
Is there a possibility of a couple of more spaces at the bottom of Trinity Rise?
4. The “12-2pm, 1 hour stay limit pay by phone £3/hour” in Brockwell Park Gardens and Trinity Rise will mean that if there are no available free spaces at the bottom of Brockwell Park Gardens, then our clients can still come between 12-2pm, pay the £3 and should easily find a park.
5. Helpful to reassess disabled bays, as with time some are made redundant and new ones are required, eg: the disabled bay at the bottom of Brockwell Park Gardens was issued to Mr and Mrs XXXX who were moved into residential care in early 2017. This makes up part of the proposed “Limited stay parking in BPG, free for 1 hour, no return within 1 hour”. As this is no longer required by them the space could be reassigned to become part of this.
6. A motorcycle bay at the bottom of Trinity Rise is a very good idea, as motorcycles will have their own assigned place. They frequently park in the “½ hour limit” area in front of the shops 6-16 Norwood Road reducing the available car parking space from 3 to 2 cars.

Representations against the proposals, and suggestions.

1. It will be essential that the parking is policed well, as currently other local businesses and residents have been parking their vehicles all day long in the “1/2 hour zone” in front of the shops on Norwood Road. This greatly inconveniences customers and deliveries to these businesses.
2. Norwood Road Vet Surgery currently employ 10 staff. I am a resident (XXx Norwood Road), 6 drive to work (2 of these sometimes cycle), 1 is driven to work, 2 walk, and 2 sometimes cycle and we have a business van. Of these 4 are part-time, equating to one full-time equivalent employee. I fully understand that to improve the parking for residents and businesses alike there has to be a cost. However as business permits are to be £630 each, we face a huge extra bill for permits (9 own cars, not always using them to get to work). On top of this Lambeth has doubled our council tax bill this year (now £7000pa). Is there a precedent to take into account part time employees, for example having one business permit to cover the 4 part-time staff, none of whose shifts overlap?
We would very much appreciate your consideration of this as we know that Lambeth has a mandate to encourage small businesses in the borough.
3. Staff of some of the local businesses and the commuters who can no longer use Brockwell Park Gardens and Trinity Rise for free, are likely to shift their car parking to the nearest free parking, ie: Rosendale Road, thus exacerbating the ongoing squeeze for available parking Lambeth and London-wide. Rationalising the pricing and distribution of business parking permits would enable *local* staff and *local* employees to make use the spaces created when *local* residents go to work.
Please see the letter I sent to Cllr Jack Hopkins in October 2016. He responded very favourably - He responded “Ellie many thanks for your considerate points raised. I will have a discussion with the

Business Improvement District team about any potential CPZ's and coordinating an engagement with and a sourcing of views from within the business community”

4. If business permits were more reasonable priced, more businesses would be tempted to purchase them for their staff.

A bicycle shed at the bottom of Trinity Rise would be a great help. Many of my neighbours and also staff have had their bicycles stolen from the bike parking stations in front of the shops 6-16 Norwood Road.

Officer Response:

Trinity Rise has residential property on both sides of the road and on street parking is already reduced due to the number of vehicular crossovers in place at the Norwood Road end of Trinity Rise. Therefore Trinity Road could not accommodate any free parking, which would remove parking from residents.

Lambeth has no precedent for a shared business permit and our current permit pricing structure does not accommodate for such usage. The Parking Permit Pricing structure is not subject to this Statutory Consultation. Local authorities are afforded discretion to set charges to reflect its parking policies.

The introduction and removal of disabled bays are subject to its own consultation processes.

The council is determined to assist people with disabilities and recognises that disabled parking places greatly improve the quality of life for many users. As a result we are keen to ensure that only those parking places that are not being used are removed.

Disabled bays are not registered to a single person or an applicant and therefore can be used by anyone with a blue badge. The bay will remain as long as required by any blue badge holder. We only remove disabled bays when they are unused by any blue badge holder at any time. If, as part of the consultation process, we receive a representation advising us that a bay is in regular use even though this may not be by the person who originally requested the bay then our current policy is not to remove the bay.

The removal of disabled parking places is a sensitive issue and the council only investigate removals upon request as not to cause unintentional distress.

The request for the removal of the disabled bay has now been forwarded to the relevant department for further investigation.

Our aim is to provide a level of enforcement which ensures that residents permit holders are able to park near their homes, while also looking to reduce congestion across the borough in line with our ambitions to improve air quality. Our contractors monitor information retrieved on a daily basis from our on-street operations and other sources to ensure that we're deploying proportionate numbers of staff to manage the demand, compliance and congestion levels for parking across the borough.

Business permits are not meant for staff to be able to commute to work, it is meant to be used for vehicles required for the running of the business.

The installation of cycle hangars follows a separate consultation and implementation process. The following link can be used to request one in the road <https://www.lambeth.gov.uk/forms/register-your-interest-in-a-lambeth-bikehangar-form>

At the moment the Council is in the middle of a retendering the contract for installing and maintaining the hangars, so they have a delay in dealing with incoming requests. However, I would recommend that you and your neighbours who are interested in having cycle parking in the neighbourhood complete the request form on the website

Trinity Rise (H-SUP-1001)

Just to say we hope the council will proceed with the implementation of the parking zone. We live on Trinity Rise which is surrounded by roads already in the CPZ which means the people around who don't want to pay for a parking permit all park here plus the commuters to Tulse Hill and Herne Hill stations. This makes parking here for residents extremely difficult. So please please please let us have the CPZ.

Trinity Rise (H-SUP-1002)

I live in Trinity Rise and fully support the proposed parking restriction extension zone H mon-fri 12noon -2pm.

Trinity Rise (H-SUP-1003)

I am writing this email supporting the proposals to introduce a CPZ on Trinity Rise. It is getting increasingly difficult to park near our own homes - and whilst I would rather not pay for to park here, I feel it is the only way to give us a chance to park near our home. It is particularly frustrating with small children - getting them plus shopping etc to the house. Issues here included: Commuters parking for the day and apps which show roads that are free to park on. Cars being left here long term - there are a couple of camper vans that do not move and also cars left here without tax etc. There are large housing estates nearby where residents have to pay for parking - yet it is free on Trinity Rise. I urge to you to introduce a CPZ on both Trinity Rise and Brockwell Park Gardens.

REPRESENTATIONS IN OPPOSITION OF THE PROPOSALS

Trinity Rise (H-OBJ-2001)

If these proposals look like coming in to force I wish to voice my objection to residents of these areas being subjected to buying parking permits in order to be able to park on their roads. Residents are already being hit extremely hard by the fact that tax in the area is being raised by its maximum amount - 4% - to fund social care. I am happy to contribute to this and understand we are in the midst of a social care crisis. But this proposed CPZ strikes me as a not-so-subtle attempt to get more money from residents. If the CPZ's, must come in to force, then your stats clearly tell you there are a lot of people who are NOT residents coming and parking in the area. Therefore I implore you to give residents in these areas FREE parking permits should they come in, and charge those people coming and parking in the area and taking the residents spaces. This seems a no brainer to me if it this consultation is genuinely about helping residents who cannot park outside their home. So free residents permits for residents please, and the council can redeem all the funds from these supposed large numbers of people coming and parking in the area.

Officer Response:

The introduction of a Controlled Parking Scheme involves various set up costs for implementation e.g. road markings, signs, and pay and display machines, advertising the TMOs along with the cost of enforcing and maintaining the zone. Guidance for Controlled parking schemes recommends that they should be at least self-funding. Charging residents, visitors and businesses to park in return for a permit can fund this cost. As per the legislation any "surplus" revenue generated must be used in accordance with section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

Please note that local authorities are afforded discretion to set charges to reflect its parking policies.

REPRESENTATIONS COMMENTS OF THE PROPOSALS

SUSTRANS

LB Lambeth Brixton Hill Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) consultation

QW Proposals & the proposed Brixton Hill CPZ

As part of The Mayor of London's Quietways programme to get more people cycling and walking, a new route is being proposed between Peckham Rye and Streatham High Road in partnership with LB Lambeth, LB Southwark, TfL and Sustrans.

The proposed route alignment can be found here.

LB Lambeth's CPZ proposal for Brixton Hill offers an excellent opportunity to improve conditions for cyclists and pedestrians as well as addressing local resident's issues over commuter parking. The Tulse Hill section of the proposed QW (see sky blue line in Figure 1) runs through CPZ sections 'F' & 'H' Sustrans welcomes LB Lambeth's CPZ proposals and offers the following recommendations for the CPZ proposals to compliment the proposed QW.

On site observations suggests that motorised vehicles often accelerate on the approach to the junction to avoid the existing long red signal phase. This creates a dangerous pinch point for cyclists when transitioning from primary position into the existing advisory filter lane. Sustrans recommends that the circled parking bays are removed from the proposals to mitigate against this conflict and allow cyclists a safe approach to the junction.

For cyclists turning on/off High Trees sightlines are restricted by car parking on the shop side of Upper Tulse Hill. Sustrans recommends shortening back the shared use parking bays adjacent to the shops.

Officers Response:

The Quietway proposals are subject to its own Statutory Consultation, which carries a risk of the scheme proposals changing or at worst being abandoned. The CPZ proposals are a separate entity which is not advisable to be amended to accommodate a cycling scheme at this stage as it would be subject to its own Statutory Consultation.

Sustrans proposals for reduction and removal of parking should be dealt with through its own Statutory Consultation process.

Brockwell Park Gardens (H-COM-3001)

I speak specifically about Brockwell Park Gardens.

Definitely there is a problem parking in this road, some of which is commuters and others being visitors to the park, particularly in summer. As identified there needs to be a scheme that favours residents and their visitors.

It would not be the first time that I have driven 1 hour to visit my very aged mother, found nowhere to park and had to drive home. As regards visitors to the park why cannot ticketed space be provided inside the park for say 30 cars. Dawn to dusk entry could use the gates opposite 46 BPG and be one way with the exit at the existing gates at the top end of BPG. Speed limit 10mph? The path inside the park, running parallel to the road is little used by pedestrians. Any Disabled/ Blue badge parking should be on the non-residents side of the road only. Nowhere can I find reference to the number of parking permits to be issued for how many residents parking places in the road. Who are defined as residents – BPG and/or Trinity Rise and/or Norwood Road ??

Officer Response:

Parks in Lambeth are considered to be private land under ownership of Lambeth Parks, the same as Lambeth Housing Estate. Lambeth's Highways authority to introduce parking restrictions does not extend onto private land.

REPRESENTATIONS IN SUPPORT OF THE PROPOSALS

No representations received.

REPRESENTATIONS IN OPPOSITION OF THE PROPOSALS

Clarence Avenue (L-OBJ-2001)

I live in a cul-de-sac off Clarence Avenue, nos. 75 to 89 Clarence Avenue. In that cul-de-sac you have proposed single yellow lines and residents' bays. We do not want these parking restrictions in the close. You have put single yellow lines in the turning bay - that is used regularly as parking for 2 cars and is very useful for all of us for parking for our visitors. There is no need to restrict parking in there - there's plenty of room to turn around in the close. Additionally, we don't need residents' bays. If we have to have any parking restrictions, would rather just have very limited operational hours as in Clarence Avenue main section, ie for an hour or 2 in the morning. But preferably, you wouldn't introduce parking restrictions to our close. It is very useful for visitors and workmen to be able to park in the close.

Officer Response:

In a cul de sac the Council intends to safeguard turning heads so that drivers are not forced to reverse long distances. Additionally, the Council cannot design for vehicles to turn around using private driveways, particularly when a turning head is available. The Council appreciates the parking needs of residents; however, The Councils' requirements for safety override the necessity for parking.

Your road is being added to the existing Clapham 'L' CPZ which will operate as the same hours of Monday to Friday from 10am to 12noon.

REPRESENTATIONS COMMENTS OF THE PROPOSALS

No representations received.