

Representations in Support of the proposals

1. Blairderry Road (G-SUP-1040)

I write in favour of the proposals. A CPZ should help relieve parking stress and create safer roads by discouraging parking on corners and ends of roads.

2. Blairderry Road (G-SUP-1041)

I would like to support the proposals detailed in your statutory consultation notice 28th Feb-23rd March 2018. I hope the proposals will be beneficial in: deterring dangerous parking too close to junctions and bends in Streatham Hill West G area, encouraging some regular and effective parking enforcement, of which there is next to none in Blairderry Road. As a result there is regular nuisance parking on kerbs, across driveways. Speeding up action in terms of identifying and dealing with dumped vehicle.

3. Criffel Avenue (G-SUP-1004)

In response to your recent communication I am contacting you to express my full support for the introduction of a controlled parking zone to be implemented for Streatham Hill West 'G'. I live in Criffel Avenue, and can rarely park anywhere near my house during the day, often resorting to parking on Thornton Avenue which is a very busy and dangerous thoroughfare. The problem is a result of people parking in our road and the surrounding streets and then taking local public transport into work. The implementation of the CPZ Mon-Fri between the hours of 10am and 12noon would prevent this happening, and greatly improve the safety and the general environment of our residential area.

4. Criffel Avenue (G-SUP-1006)

I agree to the proposals described in your recent notice Streatham Hill cpz.

5. Criffel Avenue (G-SUP-1019)

I agree to the controls. It will greatly benefit us by reducing the sheer volume of the white vans that park on our street, one of which resulted in us being burgled after it being parked up for a whole week scoping out our property and making a move when we were all out.

6. Criffel Avenue (G-SUP-1027)

My husband & I are in full support of the introduction of a CPZ 10am-Noon Monday to Friday as parking on our road is becoming increasingly difficult.

7. Criffel Avenue (G-SUP-1028)

I strongly support the proposed Streatham Hill G CPZ.

8. Criffel Avenue (G-SUP-1030)

Further to your recent notice setting out the detailed results of the recent consultation I write to confirm my wholehearted support for the conclusions the officers have reached and their proposed action for the future. Thanks for dealing with is matter in such an open and democratic way.

9. Criffel Avenue (G-SUP-1042)

I am writing to let you know that I fully support the implementation of CPZ in my area. I live at XX Criffel Avenue and for the last five years it's been increasingly difficult to park near our house. At certain times of the day / week it's pretty much impossible to find a space, and we often park a street or two away. Not great when you have shopping to unload or my elderly mother has come to visit. I also believe that the new housing developments springing up nearby and the increasing popularity of Streatham Hill will put further pressure on parking spaces. Thank you for carrying out the consultation and for keeping me informed.

10. Criffel Avenue (G-SUP-1070)

I support these proposals.

11. Killieser Avenue (G-SUP-1001)

This email is just to confirm that we are wholly in favour of the proposed CPZ in the area around and including Killieser Avenue, London SW2 – the new Streatham Hill West G on the statutory consultation.

12. Killieser Avenue (G-SUP-1020)

I live in Killieser avenue and have done for 13 years. The parking on the streets nearby has increasingly become a major problem. Many commuters arrive and leave their cars for the day. Also many people including Man and Van commercial vehicles use it as a free parking drop zone overnight and through some days CPZ is welcomed by all who live in our roads who fight this problem daily. The increase in shopping sites post development and the bus garage drivers dropping their cars throughout the day is also a major problem.

13. Killieser Avenue (G-SUP-1025)

I understand that, following the construction period you are still looking for comments on the proposed CPZ in Streatham Hill. We live at XX Killieser Avenue, and are strongly in favour of the CPZ even if only for part of the day.

14. Killieser Avenue (G-SUP-1056)

I strongly support the introduction of the CPZ in Streatham Hill. I live on Killieser Avenue now and previously on Sternhold Avenue (previous 10 years). Parking has always been very difficult but has become truly awful in the last 5 years. I would find myself parked 4/5 roads away from my house and attempting to carry a baby, a toddler and shopping back to the house on a regular basis. This was not only dangerous but absolutely crazy. We recently had an individual that parked a van outside our house over the weekend and would pick it up on a Monday morning, leaving his car in the space that the van vacated. Obviously someone who lived elsewhere and using this space as his own private parking space. This continued for 3 months and only came to an end when we spoke to him. People genuinely coming to visit people on the road can never park as the road is full of commuter cars that park here and then jump on the train. I regular find myself parked here, there and everywhere which seems so unfair.

15. Kirkstall Road (G-SUP-1031)

We are in favour of a permitted parking area outside our house on Kirkstall Road for 2 hours in the morning. It's near impossible to park currently and I have 3 young children. I quite often have to park at the far end of the road and unpack my children and shopping which is extremely stressful and difficult.

16. Kirkstall Road (G-SUP-1046)

As residents in Streatham Hill West we are in support of a 2-hour CPZ, however, our objection is to the proposed fees for the cost of the annual residents permit and the individual visitor permits. We voted to support this CPZ with the primary reasons to discourage non-residents from parking outside our house, often for weeks at a time, and to stop cars from being abandoned on our street which we then have to report to get towed. The proposed minimal cost for an annual residents permit at £123 is double the price we would expect to pay for the minimum 2-hour restriction during weekdays when this doesn't even guarantee a parking space outside our own house, and the proposed cost of tradesman permits seems unreasonable. We feel Lambeth Council are taking advantage of our parking problem. I would encourage Lambeth Council to listen to the views of the residents who initially proposed this CPZ and be open to negotiating the proposed fees.

Officers Response:

The introduction of a Controlled Parking Scheme involves various set up costs for implementation e.g. road markings, signs, and 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. It should also be noted that local authorities are afforded discretion to set charges to reflect its parking policies.

17. Kirkstall Road (G-SUP-1048)

This is to confirm that I am in favour of the CPZ in Streatham Hill.

18. Kirkstall Road (G-SUP-1051)

As a long term resident of Kirkstall Road I have seen and suffered from the deterioration of car parking due to the fact we can't park anywhere near our home due to businesses and commuters parking in the area. I therefore support the proposals.

19. Kirkstall Road (G-SUP-1051)

I support the proposals for bringing in parking from 10-12 as the ability to park has deteriorated so much over the last few years. We have numerous cars that are left for weeks and even months on end. We also have lots of commuters who leave their cars here while they go off to work. The combination of these things it is often impossible to park anywhere near my house.

20. Montrell Road (G-SUP-1026)

I am writing to confirm my satisfaction of the CPZ proposed plan for Streatham hill area. I truly hope it goes to becoming a reality as soon as possible as the parking in Montrell and Tierney road has become truly unbearable. I spend over 30 min every time I park going round hunting for a place, ending up very far away from our house most times, with children and shopping, it's just impossible to have this several times a day. I have seen aggressive scenes going on as people end up fighting for places. Not to mention large vans manoeuvring for a long time very early on Sunday mornings to park and leave these vans there for weeks, clearly being stored there because of the free parking advantage, but not at all residential use.

21. Montrell Road (G-SUP-1036)

As a local resident (Montrell road SW2 4QB) I am very pleased to hear about the parking restriction you are planning to introduce. I feel that this will massively improve the regular parking problem we experience daily. Our road has a big problem of a number of commercial vehicles parked for days or weeks at a time.

My only concern regarding the scheme is that the time of operation is not long enough on our road. A lot of the parking congestion on the road is from local businesses particularly the bus garage which has employees arriving and leaving 24/7. I feel that if it operated from 10-6 this would discourage many more non-residents from parking on my road. I also feel that if it operated for longer we will get more value from the permit. This is because not just myself but many of our neighbours arrive back from work about 5-6pm. If the parking restrictions are not in place I feel that we will still be stuck with the same problem we have now of nowhere to park. This will lead to a lot of frustration at having to pay for the permit.

Officer response:

The informal consultation results have shown that the largest majority of respondents' for Zone G support the 10am-12 Noon 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. However, we will continue to monitor your road for parking pressure once the controls are introduced.

22. Rastell Avenue (G-SUP-1005)

I fully support the proposals set out in your letter and support the hours of restriction from 10am to noon It would be even better if there was a further period of restriction from 6pm to 8 pm to prevent overnight parking but 10 am to 12 noon is a good start to ease the impossible situation experienced in this street since the introduction of ZONE R.

23. Rastell Avenue (G-SUP-1050)

I am a long term resident of Rastell Avenue, SW2 having lived here since 1999. I wish to make representations in connection with the proposed Streatham Hill CPZ. I am fully in support of the proposed CPZ to be operational Monday to Friday 10am to Noon. Rastell Avenue and the surrounding roads (Tenham Avenue, Sternhold Avenue, Telford Avenue, Salford Road and Criffel Avenue) have effectively become weekday car parks. It is clear that many car users who park in these roads do not live in the area and are either commuters using Balham and Streatham Hill stations or who people who work locally (including at the schools in the area which are within walking distance). My road is within direct site of the adjacent existing CPZ area (Emmanuel Road and the Hyde Farm estate roads) and during the week there is ample parking there which of course is not available to me as I do not have access to permits. We often see vehicles which are parked in the above roads from Monday to Friday, only disappearing at weekends. We regularly see commercial and other vehicles parked and left for several weeks at a time. These cars often display permits for other areas of London so clearly do not belong to local residents (believe me, I can quite obsessed with spotting cars that have been left without moving for weeks!) If I ever manage to find a space in my road to park during the week, I consider myself very fortunate. The fact that Rastell Avenue has only houses on one side of the road should mean that there is ample space for parking. This was very much the case in the days before the adjacent CPZ was introduced. I regularly have to drive around in every increasing circles trying to find somewhere to park and I often end up at least a 5 minute walk away and often on the other side of Thornton Road. And of course parking in the existing CPZ zone is not available to me despite there's nearly always been available

spaces in that area. I am also concerned that the new development of flats at Streatham Hill (with very limited residents' parking) will only increase the demand for parking in the area in all of the roads to the west of Streatham High Road. There will no doubt be a ripple effect which will spread west down to the roads in my area.

24. Rastell Avenue (G-SUP-1052)

I am writing to express my support for the introduction of the CPZ as proposed for my street (Rastell Avenue) and the surrounding area. We currently find it very difficult to find parking spaces at times in the neighbourhood, chiefly because commuters and car owners from nearby areas already with a CPZ, travel to our streets to park. Thank you your attention and support in this.

25. Rastell Avenue (G-SUP-1053)

I'm a resident on Rastell Avenue and I fully support the implementation of CPZ. I have been living on Rastell Avenue since 2012 and also on Salford Rd for 12 years before that. I have been experiencing increasing difficulty in finding parking since I moved to the area.

Rastell Avenue is on the border of Tooting Common and the CPZ along Emmanuel Road so this throws up 2 main reasons why the street is constantly clogged up with non- resident vehicles.

1. I constantly see residents from surrounding streets, who already have CPZ, leave their vehicles on the proposed Streatham Hill CPZ area - with vehicles often parked for weeks without being moved.

2. Workers/commuters leave their vehicles all day. This includes teachers who walk to surrounding schools to workers walking to Balham and Streatham Hill stations. As someone who works shift patterns and often arrives home around 9 or 10 am I often have to park 6 or 7 streets away.

From a green perspective I believe the introduction of CPZ in the Streatham Hill area will make some commuters rethink their mode of transport to work and change to public transport. Also 2 car households in the area may well rethink their viability resulting in less cars on our streets.

Thank you very much for your time and effort.

26. Rastell Avenue (G-SUP-1054)

I am writing to make a representation FOR the proposal of the Streatham CPZ measures specifically 10-12 noon. We have been hugely affected by the current parking problems that exist in our area for many years now. Other than at weekends our road is impossible to park on during the day meaning needing to park the car up to 10-15 mins walk away and often after driving around for 20-30 minutes in order to find that space. We have two toddler children so having to do this can be very stressful on a daily basis. Many cars are parked on the road for days even weeks at a time, blocking spaces for families and elderly who need it. Having two small children and having to park far from our home so walking such long distances with pushchairs, a upset child and shopping is incredibly stressful to both myself and my children, especially in adverse weather conditions such as of late. We really do very much hope that the proposed measures will come about and can be implemented very soon.

27. Rastell Avenue (G-SUP-1055)

We live on Rastell Avenue and are writing to show our support for the introduction of controlled parking. The following are our main reason for support:

1) We are expecting our first child, and being unable to park even remotely close to our home is going to enormously affect our ability to care for our child in terms of simple everyday activities such as food shopping, and being able to reach our support network, especially when only one of us is available.

2) I am an NHS doctor, and regularly cannot find parking in the area after night shifts at the hospital. These are often long shifts, where I have been awake for up to 24 hours, and require sleep in order to prepare for the next night shift. I regularly have to wait for up to an hour to find parking, which has a massively detrimental effect on my health, and my ability to function at work.

We understand that people need to park to use the common, however it is often the case that parking on our road is taken for the entire day by people using it either as a convenient place from which they can commute, or by residents who live in areas with parking controls, but who don't have permits.

28. Rastell Avenue (G-SUP-1053)

Myself and my wife live at X, Rastell Avenue, and are very much in favour of the proposal for a CPZ in our area, for the following reasons:

1) The quality of our lives has been blighted ever since the introduction of the Thornton CPZ in 2002. We have lived here for 42 years, and the last 16 has been very difficult.

2) Safety has been compromised for both road users and pedestrians. The number of accidents has increased - thankfully most are minor. It is difficult for people crossing roads, particularly the elderly. Or infirm, or for people with buggies or toddlers in tow.

3) Parking is often a nightmare during the week. It is a relief when Friday afternoon arrives. Myself, neighbours and visitors often spend more than 5 minutes driving around. Many times I have had to park a 10 minute walk from my house, and then remember where I left the car the day before!

4) Following on from 3 above, some people are more vulnerable to attack/mugging when walking a longer distance to their house on a dark night.

These comments are respectfully submitted, and we look forward to recovering the quality of our lives (pre 2002).

29. Salford Road (G-SUP-1034)

I am delighted that it finally looks like are getting a CPZ in Streatham Hill. I has been a growing nightmare to park in the area and this is long overdue.

30. Salford Road (G-SUP-1035) & (G-SUP-1047)

I am writing to you in order to voice my support for the CPZ scheme for Streatham Hill West as described in your consultation. We live at the corner of Salford Road and Sternhold Avenue - SW2 4BE. We appreciate the effort that the council has made to get us to this point as there is an issue with parking in this area. There are regularly vehicles parked on the street by people who are not residents, resulting in undue inconvenience. They do so to use the public transport at Balham and Streatham Hill, this leaves no parking for residents. There is also an issue with tradesmen leaving vehicles parked on the streets during the day and over the weekends. This is categorically unfair to residents who struggle to find a space even somewhat close to their flats. This is in addition to all the people that drive and park on these streets to visit Tooting Common, which also strains the parking situation. I believe that these factors illustrate clearly why a CPZ is needed in this area. Even a small window of a CPZ as proposed, will help alleviate the issues. I actually supported a longer time-frame for the CPZ than the 10 - 12 time slot that is proposed. I also definitely think that is should be extended to include weekends as this will keep the tradesmen from leaving vehicles parked on our street over the weekend. One recent weekend, there were three Thames Water and two British Gas vans parked on our road all weekend long. This, again, is an example of how the residents are inconvenienced by vehicles that don't even belong to residents. I give my full support of the measures proposed, and would even support them being stricter. Please let me know if you need any further clarification on any of the points raised.

31. Salford Road (G-SUP-1045)

Thank you for sending the document outlining the proposed changes to parking in Streatham Hill. As a resident at XX, Salford Road I am someone who will be affected by these changes and I am writing to express my strong support for the proposed changes. I have lived in this property for five years and, during that time, I have found that the situation regarding parking has changed. I own a small car and I now find it increasingly difficult to park either in my own or any of the adjoining streets – this was not the case when I originally moved into my maisonette. Other than during the Christmas period it always takes a considerable amount of time and driving around before it is possible to park. I am aware that cars owned by non-residents in Salford Road are being left parked in the road for long periods of time. The road has also becoming a parking area for Zipcar. Changes in the area now mean that the only possible solution is to introduce a controlled parking zone and I hope that this can now be done as quickly as possible.

32. Sternhold Avenue (G-SUP-1010)

Further to your Consultation concerning a parking zone, and in receipt of document : Proposed Controlled Parking Zone 28 February - 23 March, I confirm that I am totally in agreement with the proposal to introduce a new Streatham Hill West 'G' CPZ, operational as outlined in the document. Since moving here in February 2015, the parking situation has become worse and worse, and some days I have to leave my (very small) car as far away as the junction of Thornton and Telford Avenues. This makes it difficult for me to unload my shopping as I am 84 years old. My neighbour, has just left on holiday and might not have enough time on her return to send you an answer, but I know that she too supports this measure.

33. Sternhold Avenue (G-SUP-1016)

This representation supports the proposal to establish a CPZ as described in the consultation document and the recommendations appear balanced, credible and proportionate. They appear to be the best solution in light of the outcome of the consultation. As a resident of Sternhold Avenue for over 7 years, I would want the Area 2 (Streatham

Hill West) to be introduced as soon as possible, as it is becoming increasingly difficult to manage the residents demand for parking spaces within the current arrangements. I hope this contribution is helpful and look forward to the final report and subsequent implementation.

34. Sternhold Avenue (G-SUP-1017)

Following receipt of the document regarding the Proposed Controlled Parking Zone in the Streatham Hill area, I have the following comments to make:

1. As a resident of Sternhold Avenue I am delighted that a CPZ will be introduced in Area 2 "Streatham Hill West", and agree with the proposed times of Mon-Fri, 10am - noon.
2. I would like this to be introduced as soon as possible.
3. While it is not going to directly affect me, the fact that the other side of Streatham High Road, particularly Area 3, is not getting a CPZ, will no doubt make life extremely difficult for residents in that zone as soon as the Streatham Hill West CPZ is implemented. All those commuters who currently use Sternhold Avenue and surrounding roads will park in the ABCD roads, and they will also have additional cars from the new development by Streatham Hill station. To split up the area in this way makes no sense to me.

Officer response:

We generally consider breaking the zones up into smaller areas due to the hours and days of operation chosen, natural geographical boundaries and to stop inter-zonal commuting. Our methodology, as within previously consulted areas, has been to analyse the results on a road by road basis which then informs our decision on how to proceed. A road by road analysis is necessary as the overall results can be misleading if roads from one particular area generated a higher response rate or more responses in general perhaps due to having more properties in that area. This is considered the most appropriate and fair method of analysing the results as not to impose parking controls into areas that had a majority respondents against the controls.

From the detailed results for this area it is clear that the majority of respondents were opposed to having controls. We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees.

Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads were to have parking controls introduced. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this. The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to the controls.

35. Streatham Hill (SUP-1044)

Apologies I missed the original survey on this. I would like to endorse the proposal and particularly the area East of Streatham Hill. As a resident I would like to bring to your attention that residents can no longer park outside their own properties until after 6pm when all the cars move. It's nose to nose and they are parking up to and over junction corners. This has resulted in a number of car accidents in the last months so there is a real risk of injury imperative here. I would like to support the proposal, I would like to strongly urge red line restrictions on a reasonable distance from each junction and encourage a longer period.

36. Telford Avenue (G-SUP-1011)

I am for the proposal to introduce a new Streatham Hill West G CPZ to be operational between Monday to Friday 10am to noon. I live on Telford Avenue and parking has becoming increasingly difficult over the last 2 years which has resulted in drivers parking near corners and blocking driveways. It can be dangerous to drive into Telford Avenue from adjacent streets as the view is often restricted and you have no choice but to pull out slowly in to the road to check for on-coming traffic. As a pedestrian it can be difficult to cross the road, not only because of the above, but sometimes you can't get to the pavement on the other side properly because cars are parked so tightly. This problem is especially noticeable when walking with children and when carrying bags etc. I often find it difficult to park close to my home on weekday mornings when I return from the school run which means driving around the local streets before I find a faraway space before heading off to work. I know that I am not the only one as I often see other drivers circling around, doing the same.

Telford Avenue, Blairderry Road and Kirkstall Road are particularly affected by drivers getting stuck as they try to pass each other along the road. My concern is that this situation will get worse when the new flats at Blairderry Road and Ardwell Road are fully occupied, since they'll only have limited residential parking. Blairderry Road is narrow and it bends and is already prone to blocking. Pressure on finding the very few spaces on Blairderry from additional residents, their visitors and works will force more traffic on to Telford Avenue and the surrounding streets.

I'm concerned that, welcome as these proposals are, that they may not be sufficient in the longer term. Deliveries are a nightmare; I once had a kitchen delivery returned as they could not reasonably park, even though the van was outside my house! I hope this is enough feedback but do let me know if you need anything further.

37. Telford Avenue (G-SUP-1021)

I am an owner-occupier living in Telford Avenue. My house is at the top end close to Streatham High Road. I am writing to agree the proposals for a CPZ in Streatham Hill West area. Parking has always been difficult in this area but has recently got very much worse. I suspect that this is due to the introduction of a CPZ in a neighbouring area. I envisage that the parking situation will be made worse by the completion of London Square on Streatham High Road. It is very difficult to find a parking space anywhere near my property during the day. Typically, I am obliged to park anywhere up to half a mile from my house. If I have to drop off shopping or an elderly mother in law, it means I am obliged to double park on Telford Avenue which leads to some congestion and a lot of bad feeling. There is no alternative to double parking. My mother in law, for example, has difficulty walking and would not be able to walk from one of our usual parking spaces (Western end of Kirkstall Road). It is not feasible to carry shopping or load garden rubbish when the car is so far away. I re-iterate my support for a CPZ in Streatham Hill West and the sooner the better.

38. Telford Avenue (G-SUP-1024)

I am writing to wholeheartedly support the introduction of a CPZ for Streatham Hill to the West of the A23. The issues faced were very well documented in the Consultation documentation and persist or are getting worse. I live in the South of the Ward abutting the Hyde Farm Estate CPZ and we suffer hugely from over-spill from all the Residents in Hyde Farm who do not wish to purchase a Permit. Other issues in this area include: - Commuter Parking by users of both Streatham Hill and Balham Stations; Parking of Trades Vans by small businesses and large. Effectively using our roads as a free Depot; Abandoned/never moved cars owned by dealers and individual traders. As a result cars are parked in inappropriate places such as on corners and across dropped kerbs making crossing the road safely to get to Tooting Common for Parents with Prams almost impossible. This also impacts Public Services such as Refuse and Re-cycling collection with lorries having to reverse back and forward to get round corners and the operatives having real difficulty getting the bins through gaps in the parked cars. Once again I wholeheartedly support the proposals.

39. Telford Avenue (G-SUP-1029)

In the midst of all the criticism around the outcomes of the consultation (in my local forum at least) I just wanted to lend my support to the decision. The outcome seems fair based on responses received and I do not think it should be changed by a now very vocal, but small, opposition.

40. Telford Avenue (G-SUP-1032)

Please, please instigate these parking restrictions as soon as possible. It is so frustrating- I have paid for two skips (on separate) occasions to be put on my drive only to have someone park over the white lines. I would also like to request speed cameras. A white van hurled up the street really fast. When I shouted for him to slow down he screamed obscenities at me and threw stuff out the window at me. I was trying to protect the many children who walk to school down Telford Avenue.

41. Telford Avenue (G-SUP-1039)

My wife and I are resident at XX Telford Avenue and we are writing to convey our full support for the proposed controlled parking zone, 'G' CPZ (Streatham Hill West) to be operational Monday to Friday between 10am to 12pm. We find it increasingly difficult to regularly find available parking in our street, and surrounding streets, at all times of the day. We've noted that due to the relatively close proximity to Streatham Hill railway station and Balham railway/tube station, that commuters are increasingly using the area in order to park up before travelling onward. Also, due to parking restrictions in nearby areas, we've also noted people are parking on our street and surrounding streets in order to avoid paying any CPZ parking permits already in situ for these areas, even though they may be resident on these streets. All these factors have combined to put a strain on the parking capacity of this local area and we feel that a CPZ for our area as detailed above would be a benefit to alleviating this strain on parking.

42. Telford Avenue (G-SUP-1072)

I want to add my thoughts in support of a CPZ residential parking being introduced in the Telford Park/ Streatham Hill area. It is very difficult to park at any time of day and as there are so few spaces for people to park, cars often park over other people's driveways, blocking them in or infringing on the white lines making it very difficult to get in

and out of drives. Visitors, tradesmen etc have a very difficult time trying to find any spaces unless very early in the morning or at the weekends. Therefore, I think having an hour restriction on parking would stop people parking in the area and leaving their cars there all day while they go to work via the train station or workers at the arriva bus depot.

43. Tenham Avenue (G-SUP-1022)

I am a resident of Tenham Avenue and I am writing in support on the proposal to introduce a controlled parking zone in our area 2 Streatham Hill West G.

44. Tenham Avenue (G-SUP-1049)

I wish to confirm SUPPORT FOR the proposed introduction of a CPZ in Streatham Hill West G, Monday to Friday 10am - noon. I am a resident of Tenham Avenue.

45. Thornton Avenue (G-SUP-1057)

I have lived on Thornton Avenue for some 6 years now and over the past 1-2 years parking has become an issue. I have noticed from your visual representation map that Thornton Avenue returned a 50/50 response in regard to controlled parking. I am very much in favour of controlled parking in all of Area 1 and I think if Thornton Avenue was excluded from the controlled parking it would lead to serious congestion on Thornton avenue. A busy bus route and cut through for many drivers and the congestion would be manic. So many commuters use the area during the day and it makes it very difficult for the people living in the area. I sometimes have to drive back to my house during the day after being out for a few hours and find myself having to park a number of streets away.

46. Thornton Avenue (G-SUP-1058)

Regarding the proposed controlled parking zones, I am very much in favour of introducing a new Streatham Hill West GPZ, and that the existing Thornton 'R' CPZ is extended and waiting time restrictions are introduced on various roads.

47. Tierney Road (G-SUP-1002)

I would like to register my support to introduce parking permits (CPZ) to Tierney Rd, Streatham Hill.

48. Tierney Road (G-SUP-1003)

Please accept this email as my support of the proposed CPZ scheme in Streatham Hill, I am a resident in Tierney Road.

49. Tierney Road (G-SUP-1012)

Thank you for the notification of the Statutory Consultation with regard to Proposed CPZ for Streatham Hill area. I am writing to confirm my support for the proposed plan but I have a few questions for which I would like answers please.

1. I note that Hawkshaw Close, Perry House, Staplefield Close, including Chipstead and Coulsdon Houses, are all correctly designated as "Private/Estate Roads/Area". These all have their own parking spaces. I do not support residents of these areas being able to register for CPZ in Tierney and Montrell Roads. Many of us have received penalty charges over the last 10 years for parking in their areas when unable to park in our own roads, there is no reason why those residents should have access to CPZ on Tierney and Montrell Roads in addition to private parking.

2. 43a Tierney Road (Alderney Works), which has a substantial amount of onsite parking, is not designated on your map as "Private/Estate Roads/Area". Nicholas Linford BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI, Principal Planning Officer (West), Lambeth for this development, imposed the following conditions on this planning decision in 2015, which he confirmed to me by email in 2015:

"3 The garages and car parking spaces to be provided shall be kept available for the parking of motor vehicles at all times. The garages/car parking spaces shall be used solely for the benefit of the occupants of the dwelling of which it forms part and their visitors and for no other purpose and permanently retained as such thereafter."

Currently the gates to this estate are permanently locked by the developer, Urban Spectrum, rendering access to the parking for residents of the 4 units at 43a inaccessible. We have frequently asked the Council to compel the developer to unlock the gates and make the parking area available to the residents – please can you now help us to sort this out? Residents of 43a should not have access to CPZ, the Council ensured that there were ample parking spaces allocated at the time of planning approval (100% - which is substantially more than has been included in any other Lambeth development). Please can you ensure that the residents of 43a are denied access to CPZ and are given access to their own parking spaces.

3. Several PBP areas are planned on Tierney and Montrell Roads. Please can you confirm the length of parking time planned for these PBP spaces?

I am in support of the Proposed CPZ for Streatham Hill area, however I believe that the planned 2 hour window (10am till midday) is not sufficient. Not all residents actually received a survey and I know that you are aware of this fact as many of us brought it to your attention. The residents in Tierney and Montrell Roads, who received it, did not realise that the Council would make a final decision based upon their answers to the survey. We were told by our councillors :

"This is an informal consultation, not a referendum or an election. It's just designed to give a feel of what residents want. Then, if it seems that there is sufficient demand, we can progress to a formal statutory consultation. This is definitely not the last time residents will get asked about this!"

Dreadful parking impact was imposed on us by you when you put in place the CPZ in Brixton Hill zone D that runs from 8.30 am till 6.30pm Monday to Friday. We are used as an overspill parking bay. I believe that we will still suffer from long term parkers who move out for the 2 hours and then come straight back, The 2 hour window doesn't help with bus drivers or people hoping into town for the afternoon/evening after midday.

Please ensure that these comments are properly taken into account prior to the final setting of the CPZ time window for Streatham Hill area. Please explain to us strategically, without referring to the survey that was not distributed to all, why you should not apply the same hours as you have applied to a swathe of streets on the other side of the South Circular to us?

Officer response:

Residents of private and estate roads that fall within in a CPZ boundary are entitled to purchase permits to park on the public highway. Generally residents in private or estate roads/areas will only purchase a permit for the public highway if absolutely necessary, therefore we do not believe that parking on the public highways roads in the zone will create additional parking pressure. If parking is maximised within a private or estate road they would have no alternative parking option. Therefore it seems fair and appropriate to allow them to purchase permits to park within the zone.

The PaybyPhone facility will allow for a maximum stay of 1 hour.

The informal consultation results have shown that the largest majority of respondents' for Zone G support the 10am-12 Noon hours of operation, from the options provided. The new zones introduced in the Brixton Hill area were also selected by the majority of residents within the CPZ boundary. The new 'D' zone chose Mon-Fri, 8.30am-6.30pm and the new 'F' zone chose the 2 hour option. 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. However, we will continue to monitor your road for parking pressure once the controls are introduced.

In regards to the gates at the entrance to 43A Tierney Road, this has been passed on to our Planning Enforcement team to investigate as it is a breach of condition.

50. Tierney Road (G-SUP-1013)

However I'm concerned that Hawkshaw Close, Perry House, Staplefield Close, Chipstead and Coulsdon Houses have all been marked here on your map "Private/Estate Roads/Area" indicating that their residents will be able to buy CPZ permits in the Streatham Hill West G zone. I feel that this should not be the case going forward as we, as residents in Tierney and Montrell Roads for example, are unable to buy permits for their private parking areas, so they should not be allowed to access our CPZ area. Furthermore you have not indicated that 43a Tierney Road, (Alderney Works) is also a "Private/Estate Roads/Area" which of course it is and again I'd object to them being able to purchase CPZ permits on Tierney and Montrell roads. At the 2015 PAC meeting it was agreed that residents of 43A Tierney Road would not be allowed to purchase CPZ permits as they have generous private parking spaces and garages allocated to them beyond the gates leading to Alderney Works. As it stands the gate is still currently locked by the developer, leaving the private parking inaccessible to residents of 43A and forcing them to park their vehicles on Tierney Road. As an aside please could you get the developer to unlock the gates so the parking pressure on Tierney Road is relieved! Finally I note from you plans that Pay By Phone parking will be in operation in several areas of the CPZ zone – please could you confirm how long non-residents will be able to park for in one day?

Officer response:

Residents of private and estate roads that fall within in a CPZ boundary are entitled to purchase permits to park on the public highway. Generally residents in private or estate roads/areas will only purchase a permit for the public highway if absolutely necessary, therefore we do not believe that parking on the public highways roads in the zone will create additional parking pressure. If parking is maximised within a private or estate road they would have no alternative parking option. Therefore it seems fair and appropriate to allow them to purchase permits to park within the zone.

The PaybyPhone facility will allow for a maximum stay of 1 hour.

In regards to the gates at the entrance to 43A Tierney Road, this has been passed on to our Planning Enforcement team to investigate as it is a breach of condition.

51. Tierney Road (G-SUP-1014)

Further to your recent letter re notification of the Statutory Consultation with regard to Proposed CPZ for Streatham Hill area, I would like to confirm my support for the proposed plan , especially in regard to Tierney Road. I see that Hawkshaw Close, Perry House, Staplefield Close, including Chipstead and Coulsdon Houses, are all labelled as "Private/Estate Roads/Areas" presumably because they all have their own parking spaces. I do not support residents of these areas being able to register for CPZ in Tierney and Montrell Roads. Please can you confirm that they will not be given access to CPZ on Tierney and Montrell Roads – we have been fined for parking in these areas in the past when Tierney Road has been chock a block. Especially as one of the residents has a couple of vans which are currently parked in Tierney Road - day in day out.

Officer response:

Residents of private and estate roads that fall within in a CPZ boundary are entitled to purchase permits to park on the public highway. Generally residents in private or estate roads/areas will only purchase a permit for the public highway if absolutely necessary, therefore we do not believe that parking on the public highways roads in the zone will create additional parking pressure. If parking is maximised within a private or estate road they would have no alternative parking option. Therefore it seems fair and appropriate to allow them to purchase permits to park within the zone.

52. Tierney Road (G-SUP-1018)

As a resident of Tierney Road for some 7 years, I am delighted to have the opportunity so let you know how much this is needed. The parking has become much more difficult during this time, not least due to the CPZs which have been put in place to the North of Streatham Place (South Circular). The occupancy by vehicles is virtually always 100pc, due to vans and workers such as those of Telford Bus garage, arriving in the early morning, parking and then travelling elsewhere to work. In the evening after work there are queues of traffic circling the area looking for somewhere to park. In late evening there is nowhere to park. I am therefore strongly in favour of a CPZ and would ask that those areas who have their own parking such as Perry House and the estate around Stapleford Close which includes Coulsdon and Chipstead Houses are NOT allowed to have permits for parking in our CPZ. I look forward to your quick positive response.

Would it be possible for M/cycles in Lambeth to be exempt from CPZs – as they are in Wandsworth. They take up little space and are more friendly to the environment, and, as such, their use should be encouraged.

Officer response:

Residents of private and estate roads that fall within in a CPZ boundary are entitled to purchase permits to park on the public highway. Generally residents in private or estate roads/areas will only purchase a permit for the public highway if absolutely necessary, therefore we do not believe that parking on the public highways roads in the zone will create additional parking pressure. If parking is maximised within a private or estate road they would have no alternative parking option. Therefore it seems fair and appropriate to allow them to purchase permits to park within the zone.

Motorcycles will only require a permit to park within the permit bays. If you intend to park in a solo motorcycle bay, then you would not be require to purchase a permit.

53. Tierney Road (G-SUP-1023)

I am resident of Tierney Road and strongly agree with the introduction of a CPZ in the Streatham Hill area. On Tierney Road in particular it is incredibly difficult to park and every morning I see commuters driving in and taking spaces before getting on the bus.

54. Tierney Road (G-SUP-1037)

We currently live and own our property on Tierney Road, house Number XX highlighted on your proposals maps and drawings to introduce parking restriction which Please note we are totally in favour of. However please note we are in the fortunate position of having a DRIVEWAY which has parking space for 2 vehicles! These are both in use by the owners of the flats within XX Tierney Road. This gateway will not work if only a SINGLE YELLOW line is put in place as we need constant access in and out of the drive and to assume that single yellow will deter illegal parking is unfortunately not going to work as currently we have a single white line which means nothing and we constantly have cars BLOCKING our exit and entrance hourly, Therefore we would encourage your planning to look seriously at UPGRADING the parking level across any of the white line markings on Tierney Road. I would only repeat that we have a proper driveway and not off street parking.

55. Tierney Road (G-SUP-1038)

I moved into Tierney Rd at the end of January, so missed the opportunity to respond to the CPZ consultation, but wanted to raise a comment. I support the introduction of a CPZ in Tierney Rd, but would urge the council to use some of the newly-freed up space to introduce on-street bike hangers, rather than retain all of the space for motor vehicles. With such a high proportion of flats on Tierney Road, there would certainly be demand for a facility. A significant change to a whole street like a new CPZ does not happen very often, so I would urge the council to take this opportunity to change how the street is used, and help achieve the ambitious modal shift targets in the Mayor's Transport Strategy.

Officer response:

The installation of cycle hangars follows a separate consultation and implementation process. I would recommend that if you and/or your neighbours who are interested in having cycle parking in the neighbourhood complete the request form on the council website. The following link can be used to request one in your road <https://www.lambeth.gov.uk/forms/register-your-interest-in-a-lambeth-bikehangar-form>.

56. Tierney Road (G-SUP-1043)

I am a resident at XX Tierney road and have been for about 4 years now. I owned a vehicle for about a year and a half and suffered the current parking situation which I hope you are trying to redress. Not being able to park my car was a major contributor to the decision to sell. It would often take 20min to find a space, morning or evening. It is greatly regrettable that people using our road to park while they work locally will now be forced elsewhere, however there is no better or fairer option. I support a 9am to 6pm residents parking area. I would also support 24hour residents parking and also the currently proposed 2hour window which will deter some day Parker's and also clear out the long term abandoned vehicles.

Officer response:

The informal consultation results have shown that the largest majority of respondents' for Zone G support the 10am-12 Noon 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. However, we will continue to monitor your road for parking pressure once the controls are introduced.

57. Tierney Road (G-SUP-1059)

Further to your notification of the Statutory Consultation with regard to Proposed CPZ for Streatham Hill area.

I confirm my very strong support for the proposed plan. I have a few questions:

1. Residents of private roads running onto Tierney or Montrell Roads should be able to benefit from our CPZ. Hawkshaw Close, Perry House, Staplefield Close, including Chipstead and Coulsdon Houses, are all "Private/Estate Roads/Area" and all have their own parking spaces. Please do not allow these residents access to our CPZ.
2. In addition the residents of 43a Tierney Road (Alderney Works) have a huge amount of onsite parking. They should be given access to this by their landlord, Urban Spectrum, and not allowed CPZ in Tierney and Montrell Roads. Please enforce the parking plan put in place as part of the planning approval for this site.
3. I very unhappy about the proposed 2 hour window (10am till midday) is not sufficient! I believe we should have a 10am till 4pm window. CPZ in Brixton Hill zone D runs from 8.30 am till 6.30pm Monday to Friday.

Officer response:

Residents of private and estate roads that fall within in a CPZ boundary are entitled to purchase permits to park on the public highway. Generally residents in private or estate roads/areas will only purchase a permit for the public highway if absolutely necessary, therefore we do not believe that parking on the public highways roads in the zone will create additional parking pressure. If parking is maximised within a private or estate road they would have no alternative parking option. Therefore it seems fair and appropriate to allow them to purchase permits to park within the zone.

The informal consultation results have shown that the largest majority of respondents' for Zone G support the 10am-12 Noon hours of operation, from the options provided. The new zones introduced in the Brixton Hill area were also selected by the majority of residents within the CPZ boundary. The new 'D' zone chose Mon-Fri, 8.30am-6.30pm and the new 'F' zone chose the 2 hour option. 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. However, we will continue to monitor your road for parking pressure once the controls are introduced.

In regards to access to 43A Tierney Road, this has been passed on to our Planning Enforcement team to investigate as it is a breach of condition.

58. Tierney Road (G-SUP-1060)

I am writing to confirm my very strong support for the proposed plan. I have a few questions:

1. I do not think that residents of private roads adjoining Tierney or Montrell Roads should be able to register for CPZ. Hawkshaw Close, Perry House, Staplefield Close, including Chipstead and Coulsdon Houses, are all correctly designated as "Private/Estate Roads/Area" and all have their own parking spaces. I feel very strongly that those residents should not have access to CPZ on Tierney and Montrell Roads in addition to private parking. Please ensure this is not granted.

2. 43a Tierney Road (Alderney Works) has a huge amount of onsite parking. This is not designated on your map as "Private/Estate Roads/Area". Nicholas Linford BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI, Principal Planning Officer (West), Lambeth for this development, imposed the following conditions on this planning decision in 2015, which he confirmed to Tierney Road residents in 2015:

"3 The garages and car parking spaces to be provided shall be kept available for the parking of motor vehicles at all times. The garages/car parking spaces shall be used solely for the benefit of the occupants of the dwelling of which it forms part and their visitors and for no other purpose and permanently retained as such thereafter."

This parking is inaccessible to the residents of 43a Tierney Road (Alderney Works) because the gates are kept permanently locked by the developer, Urban Spectrum. Despite our frequent requests, the Council have not helped us in any way to get these gates unlocked to allow access to the parking area. Please sort this out!!! It is completely unacceptable for residents of 43a to have access to CPZ, the Council insisted upon 100% parking spaces available to these residents at the time of planning approval. Please do not allow these residents to clog up our precious spaces when they have their own.

3. How long will people be able to park in the PBP areas planned on Tierney and Montrell Roads?

4. I very unhappy about the proposed 2 hour window (10am till midday) is not sufficient! Not all of us received the original survey and it was not made clear to us that the Council would make a final decision based on answers to that survey. This is what our councillors told us:

"This is an informal consultation, not a referendum or an election. It's just designed to give a feel of what residents want. Then, if it seems that there is sufficient demand, we can progress to a formal statutory consultation. This is definitely not the last time residents will get asked about this!"

CPZ in Brixton Hill zone D runs from 8.30 am till 6.30pm Monday to Friday. We are already used as an overspill parking bay. We shall become the new parking area for long term parkers, who move out for the 2 hours and then come straight back, bus drivers or people hopping off for the afternoon/evening after midday.

We need a full day CPZ 8.30am -6.30pm. Why have you not applied the same hours as exist in Brixton Hill zone D to Tierney and Montrell Roads?

Officer response:

Residents of private and estate roads that fall within in a CPZ boundary are entitled to purchase permits to park on the public highway. Generally residents in private or estate roads/areas will only purchase a permit for the public highway if absolutely necessary, therefore we do not believe that parking on the public highways roads in the zone will create additional parking pressure. If parking is maximised within a private or estate road they would have no

alternative parking option. Therefore it seems fair and appropriate to allow them to purchase permits to park within the zone.

The PaybyPhone facility will allow for a maximum stay of 1 hour.

The informal consultation results have shown that the largest majority of respondents' for Zone G support the 10am-12 Noon hours of operation, from the options provided. The new zones introduced in the Brixton Hill area were also selected by the majority of residents within the CPZ boundary. The new 'D' zone chose Mon-Fri, 8.30am-6.30pm and the new 'F' zone chose the 2 hour option. 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. However, we will continue to monitor your road for parking pressure once the controls are introduced.

In regards to the gates at the entrance to 43A Tierney Road, this has been passed on to our Planning Enforcement team to investigate as it is a breach of condition.

59. Tierney Road (G-SUP-1062)

Further to your notification of the Statutory Consultation with regard to Proposed CPZ for Streatham Hill area.

I confirm my very strong support for the proposed plan. Please note and answer my questions below:

1. I very unhappy about the proposed 2 hour window (10am till midday) is not sufficient! I believe we should have an 8.30am till 6.30pm window. CPZ in Brixton Hill zone D runs from 8.30 am till 6.30pm Monday to Friday. We should have the same.
2. Residents of 43a Tierney Road (Alderney Works) have a LOT OF onsite parking. Their landlords Urban Spectrum need to be forced to give them access to it as agreed in the planning approval for this site. These residents should not be allowed CPZ in Tierney and Montrell Roads.
3. Hawkshaw Close, Perry House, Staplefield Close, including Chipstead and Coulsdon Houses, are all "Private/Estate Roads/Area" and all have their own parking spaces. Please do not allow these residents access to our CPZ.

Officer response:

The informal consultation results have shown that the largest majority of respondents' for Zone G support the 10am-12 Noon hours of operation, from the options provided. The new zones introduced in the Brixton Hill area were also selected by the majority of residents within the CPZ boundary. The new 'D' zone chose Mon-Fri, 8.30am-6.30pm and the new 'F' zone chose the 2 hour option. 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. However, we will continue to monitor your road for parking pressure once the controls are introduced.

Residents of private and estate roads that fall within in a CPZ boundary are entitled to purchase permits to park on the public highway. Generally residents in private or estate roads/areas will only purchase a permit for the public highway if absolutely necessary, therefore we do not believe that parking on the public highways roads in the zone will create additional parking pressure. If parking is maximised within a private or estate road they would have no alternative parking option. Therefore it seems fair and appropriate to allow them to purchase permits to park within the zone.

In regards to access to 43A Tierney Road, this has been passed on to our Planning Enforcement team to investigate as it is a breach of condition.

60. Tierney Road (G-SUP-1064)

I am in support of the Proposed CPZ for Streatham Hill area, however I believe that the planned 2 hour window (10:00-12:00) is not sufficient. We are inundated with white vans and commercial vehicles who park over night from the afternoon making it impossible for residents to find parking in the evenings. I understood from Jennifer Brathwaite that the policy should be to ensure adjacent zones have the same parking restriction times in order to even out this kind of problem? Our zone should be aligned with Brixton Hill 'D' which borders the other side of Streatham Place and operates Monday - Friday, 8:30 - 6:30pm.

Officer response:

The informal consultation results have shown that the largest majority of respondents' for Zone G support the 10am-12 Noon hours of operation, from the options provided. The new zones introduced in the Brixton Hill area were also

selected by the majority of residents within the CPZ boundary. The new 'D' zone chose Mon-Fri, 8.30am-6.30pm and the new 'F' zone chose the 2 hour option. 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. However, we will continue to monitor your road for parking pressure once the controls are introduced.

61. Tierney Road (G-SUP-1065)

Tierney Road proposed parking restrictions I am in favour of a two hour ban for none residents rather than an all-day ban, I myself am disabled and require care from the district nurse a couple of times a week, an all-day ban would be very inconvenient for her.

62. Tierney Road (G-SUP-1066)

Further to your notification of the Statutory Consultation with regard to Proposed CPZ for Streatham Hill area.

I confirm my very strong support for the proposed plan. Please note and answer my questions below:

1. Hawkshaw Close, Perry House, Staplefield Close, including Chipstead and Coulsdon Houses, are all "Private/Estate Roads/Area" and all have their own parking spaces. Please do not allow these residents access to our CPZ.

2. Residents of 43a Tierney Road (Alderney Works) have a LOT OF onsite parking. Their landlord Urban Spectrum needs to be forced to give them access to it as agreed in the planning approval for this site. These residents should not be allowed CPZ in Tierney and Montrell Roads.

3. I am very unhappy about the proposed 2 hour window (10am till midday) is not sufficient! I believe we should have an 8.30am till 6.30pm window. CPZ in Brixton Hill zone D runs from 8.30 am till 6.30pm Monday to Friday. We should have the same.

Officer response:

Residents of private and estate roads that fall within in a CPZ boundary are entitled to purchase permits to park on the public highway. Generally residents in private or estate roads/areas will only purchase a permit for the public highway if absolutely necessary, therefore we do not believe that parking on the public highways roads in the zone will create additional parking pressure. If parking is maximised within a private or estate road they would have no alternative parking option. Therefore it seems fair and appropriate to allow them to purchase permits to park within the zone.

The informal consultation results have shown that the largest majority of respondents' for Zone G support the 10am-12 Noon hours of operation, from the options provided. The new zones introduced in the Brixton Hill area were also selected by the majority of residents within the CPZ boundary. The new 'D' zone chose Mon-Fri, 8.30am-6.30pm and the new 'F' zone chose the 2 hour option. 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. However, we will continue to monitor your road for parking pressure once the controls are introduced.

In regards to access to 43A Tierney Road, this has been passed on to our Planning Enforcement team to investigate as it is a breach of condition.

63. Tierney Road (G-SUP-1067)

I live in Tierney road, and for years people from out of town have parked here and taken busses to their work. Recently, since parking restrictions have been put in place in Kings Avenue, and other local streets, it has meant that both day and night, once our cars are taken out it is virtual impossible to get a space here, and our cars can be stuck 'streets away' for weeks. So the CPZ it a good thing, but I feel strongly that a 2 hour restriction in the middle of the day would be adequate, rather than the whole day which would cause us inconvenience for visitors and carers etc. Please put in place a 2 hour restriction only.

64. Telford Avenue (G-SUP-1068)

I am fully in support of the above CPZ zone. We are in great need of this as the road is packed with commuter cars/white vans/filming units etc.

65. Tierney Road (G-SUP-1069)

I am in favour of implementing parking permits in the Streatham Hill area.

66. Tierney Road (G-SUP-1071)

I am writing to confirm my very strong support for the proposed plan. I have a few questions however:

1. I am very unhappy about the proposed 2 hour window (10am till midday) it is not sufficient to make the desired effect on Parking Pressure.

It is quite clear that drivers outside the CPZ area will move elsewhere for 2 hours the re-park in our cpz areas thus clogging up our streets one again. Additionally, not all of us received the original survey and it was not made clear to us that the Council would make a final decision based on answers to that survey.

This is what our councillors told us:

"This is an informal consultation, not a referendum or an election. It's just designed to give a feel of what residents want. Then, if it seems that there is sufficient demand, we can progress to a formal statutory consultation. This is definitely not the last time residents will get asked about this!"

CPZ in Brixton Hill zone D runs from 8.30 am till 6.30pm Monday to Friday. We are already used as an overspill parking bay. We shall become the new parking area for long term parkers, who move out for the 2 hours and then come straight back, bus drivers or people hopping off for the afternoon/evening after midday.

We need a full day CPZ 8.30am -6.30pm. Why have you not applied the same hours as exist in Brixton Hill zone D to Tierney and Montrell Roads?

2. How long each day will people be able to park in the PBP areas planned on Tierney and Montrell Roads – we are again concerned that people outside the CPZ will clog up our parking if the period is a long time?

3. 43a Tierney Road (Alderney Works) has an absolutely huge amount of onsite parking. we are very concerned that this area is not designated on your map as "Private/Estate Roads/Area".

Nicholas Linford BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI, Principal Planning Officer (West), Lambeth for this development, imposed the following conditions on this planning decision in 2015, which he confirmed to Tierney Road residents in 2015:

"3 The garages and car parking spaces to be provided shall be kept available for the parking of motor vehicles at all times. The garages/car parking spaces shall be used solely for the benefit of the occupants of the dwelling of which it forms part and their visitors and for no other purpose and permanently retained as such thereafter." This parking is currently inaccessible to the residents of 43a Tierney Road (Alderney Works) because the gates are kept permanently locked by the developer, Urban Spectrum.

Despite our frequent requests, the Council have not helped us in any way to get these gates unlocked to allow access to the parking area. Please sort this out!!!! It is completely unacceptable for residents of 43a to have access to CPZ, the Council insisted upon 100% parking spaces available to these residents at the time of planning approval. Please do not allow these residents to clog up our precious spaces when they have their own.

4. I do not think that residents of private roads adjoining Tierney or Montrell Roads should be able to register for CPZ. Hawkshaw Close, Perry House, Staplefield Close, including Chipstead and Coulsdon Houses, are all correctly designated as "Private/Estate Roads/Area" and all have their own parking spaces. I feel very strongly that those residents should not have access to CPZ on Tierney and Montrell Roads in addition to private parking. Please ensure this is not granted.

Officer response:

The informal consultation results have shown that the largest majority of respondents' for Zone G support the 10am-12 Noon hours of operation, from the options provided. The new zones introduced in the Brixton Hill area were also selected by the majority of residents within the CPZ boundary. The new 'D' zone chose Mon-Fri, 8.30am-6.30pm and the new 'F' zone chose the 2 hour option. 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. However, we will continue to monitor your road for parking pressure once the controls are introduced.

Residents of private and estate roads that fall within in a CPZ boundary are entitled to purchase permits to park on the public highway. Generally residents in private or estate roads/areas will only purchase a permit for the public highway if absolutely necessary, therefore we do not believe that parking on the public highways roads in the zone will create additional parking pressure. If parking is maximised within a private or estate road they would have no alternative parking option. Therefore it seems fair and appropriate to allow them to purchase permits to park within the zone.

In regards to the gates at the entrance to 43A Tierney Road, this has been passed on to our Planning Enforcement team to investigate as it is a breach of condition.

67. Tierney Road (G-SUP-1074)

As a resident on Tierney Road, I am writing to confirm that the suggested CPZ is indeed a much welcome progress vs. the current status quo. I still believe it would also be necessary to regulate parking at night when trucks and

professional vehicles are blatantly coming to occupy the street to the detriment of the locals (we got fines again a fortnight ago because of a total lack of parking space in our street at night!). But the suggested CPZ is a good start which I confirm I approve.

Representations in Opposition of the proposals

1. Blairderry Road (G-OBJ-2025)

My objection to the consultation proposal is based on the fact that the original residents consultation was performed whilst a major building project was in progress in Area 2, which resulted in a large amount of disruption in the area, and reduced parking available at the time due to parking restrictions and a significant number of vehicles parked by the contractors working on the London Square development. Hence I would query whether the views of the local residents during this upheaval are entirely objective.

Officer response:

One of the many reasons residents have asked for parking controls is due to the London Square development and that the current level of parking will increase upon completion of the development causing more parking difficulties in the area. Although the London Square development is classified as "car free" this can only be enforced within a controlled parking zone as no permit entitlement will be allowed.

2. Blairderry Road (G-OBJ-2035)

In response to your Statutory Consultation 28 February 2018-23 March 2018 for a proposed controlled parking zone in the Streatham Hill Area, I take issue with the following points:

- 'The consultation resulted in a total of 1023 replies, representing a response rate of 14.2%.' - This is an extremely low response rate to attempt to justify implementing this proposal. Additionally I would note that the parking survey closed on 12th March but I received my letter with the results before 12th March.
- 'Local residents have told us repeatedly about parking problems in the Streatham area. Generally, residents feel the problem is being caused by commuters who park and complete their journey by public transport or those working in nearby businesses.' - I work from home in a ground floor property next to the High Road and I have never seen this happen, it is residents and builders parking here. I can assure you that nobody is driving up to Streatham Hill to use the public transport...since we are one of the most severely lacking boroughs in London in that regard. We have no tube and Southern Rail has rendered the train station almost useless so I find it unbelievable that people would travel from other parts of London to use our public transport!
- 'Parking stress surveys were conducted in the Streatham area that provide a representation of parking on a typical weekday and a Saturday in the areas.' These surveys were carried out in 2017 and as most people in the Streatham Hill area know, the past couple of years have by no means represented a 'typical weekday' or a 'typical Saturday' due to the fact that a massive construction project, namely London Square, has been ongoing in the area for the past 3 years, specifically on my road. The huge decrease in available parking spots has been largely due to builders and workmen carrying out jobs on this site. Again, I have seen this first hand from my own window. This work is now wrapping up and logically there will then be a reduced number of cars in the area. The new residents in the new development have underground parking. The 'Cash for cars' business on Ardwell Road has also contributed to a higher number of vehicles (some in a terrible condition) on the road, but this has reduced recently.
- 'Proposal to 'introduce a new Streatham Hill West 'G' CPZ to be operational Monday to Friday between 10am and noon (area 2).' - If your stated aims were to protect residents from people parking for shopping and visiting local businesses etc, this defeats the point. I doubt shoppers and traders will be deterred by a 2 hour parking limit. They will simply delay their visit to Streatham Hill until midday...logically the only people this restriction will hurt is those residents who leave their cars at home, and try to reduce traffic and be more environmentally friendly by using public transport.
- I notice in the recent issue of Lambeth Talk an article about a Council Tax boost for care leavers with a passage stating 'For 2018/19, the council has ensured that service cuts are kept to a minimum, with £6.8 million of new savings coming from increased income in parking, working with providers to reduce contract spend and from back-office efficiencies.' This makes me suspect that the council has already accounted for the revenue that introducing parking measures will raise in their budget for the next fiscal year and reinforces my view that this is a cynical measure to raise money.

If you visit Streatham Hill West G, Area 2, you will notice that the majority of houses in that area are expensive townhouses with their own driveways. Additionally on Blairderry Road, most of the terraced houses have their own small driveways. The aforementioned London Square has 100 parking spaces for those who could afford them. In my block of flats we are a large group of young professionals and young families who have moved to the Streatham Hill area in the past couple of years, who have helped inject a lot of money already into the local economy by supporting and utilising local businesses. The majority of us have purchased through a shared ownership scheme and many are in affordable housing. We moved to the area in good faith, with the knowledge that at least the parking would be free. Parking spaces in our residence were at a cost of £10,000, which is a luxury unaffordable to those who cannot afford to buy a flat without assistance. The free parking was a huge plus point to the area. A CPZ will discourage more young people like myself moving to the area, who can barely afford to in the first place, and will knock value off all of our flats. I am not sure how I could explain to a next buyer that there is no parking available to them. Because we are a new build, we are not even entitled to apply for a permit. I will be forced to either scrap my car, declare it SORN, or park across the A23 in Downton Avenue, Cricklade Avenue, Barcombe Avenue etc who rightly have opposed this CPZ. This will only increase congestion on their side of the highway, so you will simply be dispersing the problem. Additionally as a young woman who lives alone I will be forced to park far away from my flat, for a long walk back alone at night, crossing the dangerous A23 road. I am a heavy user of public transport and only use my car when I need to travel to other cities for business. Reducing people's options for travel in the Streatham Hill area is a very unfair move, given the decision to divert crossrail 2 to Tooting or Balham, who are already well-served by public transport, and secondly given the inaction over Southern Rail, who we are currently at the mercy of. The buses are frequent and reliable but could be hugely reduced in number if people had any other viable options.

This decision will further propagate people's general opinion of Streatham as being 'hard to get to/too far away/unreachable/a transport dead zone', as is the opinion of many young Londoners who are unwilling to make the trip to Streatham because of the lack of tube. I don't see how discouraging people from visiting Streatham and making it harder to visit us is the best option for an area that was on a good trajectory in terms of reputation and popularity. If this is in fact a genuine response to concern from local residents rather than a money-making scheme, then you will be equally concerned that only 14.2% of residents responded and will seek further public opinion before making changes. A small lobby is not enough to justify making changes that will negatively impact other residents' daily life and finances.

Officer response:

The council has made the appropriate recommendation and decision based on the results of the consultation as returned by residents / businesses in the area. Whilst the response rate may seem low, it's actually quite reasonable for this type of consultation. It was therefore considered appropriate to recommend proceeding to statutory consultation given the level of overall support for a CPZ from those who did respond, along with the evidence of high levels of parking stress within the consultation area. The council cannot force residents / businesses to participate in the consultation, but has used a number of methods of communication to enable people to get involved in the process.

The parking survey you mentioned was an attitudinal parking survey sent out to Streatham area wards to gauge the appetite for parking controls that need to be added to the future CPZ programme, as asked for by ward councillors. This survey had no bearing on the CPZ proposals for Streatham Hill area.

The CPZ proposals were initiated by residents through requests, petitions and campaigning the Council and their Ward Councillors to be consulted on parking controls to alleviate the parking pressure they experience. Parking surveys have also confirmed that the majority of the roads experience high levels of parking stress.

On this basis, the council took the decision to carry out an informal consultation in the uncontrolled areas in order to gauge the views of residents and businesses on the possible introduction of a CPZ. As results show that residents do believe there to be parking issues and are subsequently in favour of parking controls, this has since led to the statutory consultation.

One of the many reasons residents have asked for parking controls is due is to the London Square development and that the current level of parking will increase upon completion of the development causing more parking difficulties in the area. Although the London Square development is classified as "car free" this can only be enforced within a controlled parking zone as no permit entitlement will be allowed.

The informal consultation results have shown that the largest majority of respondents' for Zone G support the 10am-12 Noon hours of operation, from the options provided. This minimum restriction offers more flexibility to residents and their visitors than the part time or all day controls, reducing the amount of visitors' vouchers they would normally obtain, and is still effective in restricting long-term commuter parking. These operational times do not generally affect visitors to the area such as shoppers.

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.

3. Blairderry Road (G-OBJ-2051)

We are writing to express our objection to the introduction of a Controlled Parking Zone on and around Blairderry Road in Streatham Hill. Such measures will mean that residents who own cars will now either be required to pay significant amounts simply for parking their cars outside their own property and others will not even be permitted to do so and will be driven out of the area. Either in search of parking nearby in uncontrolled areas or by having to sell their cars. Although we appreciate that congestion and over parked areas cause issues and people park on dropped curbs causing health and safety issues, we are also very aware that a big part of the issue is our neighbouring car dealership that parks several cars on these streets. As a first measure, policing the area and giving fines to those that park on dropped curbs would seem appropriate to tackle the issue without driving residents away from the area. Additionally, residents that are excluded from the option to purchase permits are now in a position where visits from friends and family become almost impossible as they cannot park anywhere nearby causing a massive problem especially for those with disabilities. Further a 14% response rate is hardly representative of the area. Therefore we would like to propose a supplementary consultation to be conducted in the area with a minimum response rate to enact a measure which will have a significant impact on residents.

Officer response:

Parking obstruction at dropped kerbs outside CPZs (and after CPZ operational times) are only investigated upon request by the owner/resident.

Visitors to the area will be able to utilise the paybyphone facility for all on-street bays provided throughout the controlled times. Disabled badge holders are able to park free of charge in any of the on-street permit bays.

The council has made the appropriate recommendation and decision based on the results of the consultation as returned by residents / businesses in the area. Whilst the response rate may seem low, it's actually quite reasonable for this type of consultation. It was therefore considered appropriate to recommend proceeding to statutory consultation given the level of overall support for a CPZ from those who did respond, along with the evidence of high levels of parking stress within the consultation area. The council cannot force residents / businesses to participate in the consultation, but has used a number of methods of communication to enable people to get involved in the process.

4. Criffel Avenue (G-OBJ-2018)

I would like to object to the proposed CPZ in Streatham Hill West and in particular around Criffel Avenue I have lived on Criffel Avenue since 1992 and had many cars in that time. I have never experienced any serious parking problems in all that time. I accept not always parking directly outside my house but certainly within the close vicinity or adjacent streets. Therefore I do not understand the reason why this has been pushed through since November 2017. If you check the parking around the area at any time of the day you will find a parking space. As a result of this decision I now have to pay to park around my home £184.00 per year plus an additional £23 per week if I need families, friends or work men to park in the area between Monday to Friday 10am to 12 noon. It will be difficult to find work men available to work outside these times and days.

We already have parking wardens that check for double yellow line parking infringements and insurance and car tax issues. My understanding is that part of the annual fee is to pay for an extra parking warden to monitor this CPZ. We already pay for one so this extra warden cost is because of the new imposed restricted parking zone which we don't need.

I understand all revenue raised from this CPZ will be spent on transport related schemes in Lambeth. Is that in my area or does it all go in one government general pot. Am I entitled to a refund if I am unable to park in the CPZ between the hours of 10am and 12 noon Monday to Friday. You are imposing a large fine on me with no guarantees that the resident will be any better off or have any advantage to non-residents. So it is an enforced parking fine and appears to be about a means to raise money as opposed to solving any perceived parking problem. This is very unfair and unnecessary especially as surrounding areas are not being included in the CPZ. Especially at a time when the council tax rates are also expected to rise this year.

In effect your parking fine on residents of Criffel Avenue is to stop other people driving in from outside areas to park in Criffel Avenue. It would be valuable to know if the people driving in have CPZ's in operation where they drive from. If they have free parking where they live then I being penalised and paying Lambeth Council to deter drivers from those areas that have no cost to them for parking. Unfair and unnecessary.

I also point out that the parking fines that will be enforced on this CPZ were not and are not clearly stated. Instead I have to find out about them myself by accessing your website. They are not shown at all on the latest document you sent out which I find surprising as this is about any final objections (the cost being a major deciding factor for most people) and are also very confusing (some might say intentionally so) on the A4 sheet that has been posted on the lamp posts. Please see attached. These don't easily compare or line up with the details provided on the website.

Finally I am told that there is a 70% in favour in my area. That is not exactly accurate. The document I received says that overall only 58% support a CPZ and that 70% of that figure supports a Monday to Friday 2 hour slot. But most importantly the decision to go ahead is based on a very LOW overall response rate of 14.2% response rate. At best this means only 8% of the very small number of people that responded to the initial consultation want it to go ahead. This does not reflect an overwhelming majority as I seem to hear suggested from my local councillors.

Please can you reconsider your decision before implementing this unfair and unnecessary parking fine and I look forward to a response from you with regard to this objection.

There are a couple of additional points that I would like to raise that don't necessarily address my objection directly but are points that are valid in my response to the decision of an enforced CPZ in my area.

Are you able to disclose exactly how many residents have asked for a consultation about a CPZ in this area that prompted Lambeth Council to begin this costly process. Given the extremely low response rate to the initial consultation please can you reconsider this decision.

Officer response:

The CPZ proposals were initiated by residents through requests, petitions and campaigning the Council and their Ward Councillors to be consulted on parking controls to alleviate the parking pressure they experience. Parking surveys have also confirmed that the majority of the roads experience high levels of parking stress.

On this basis, the council took the decision to carry out an informal consultation in the uncontrolled areas in order to gauge the views of residents and businesses on the possible introduction of a CPZ. As results show that residents do believe there to be parking issues and are subsequently in favour of parking controls, this has since led to the statutory consultation.

The proposed CPZ will prioritise parking for local residents within the scheme and remove the majority of 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.

The Council is not a position to manipulate or interpret the figures to suit any preference. The council has made the appropriate recommendation and decision based on the results of the consultation as returned by residents / businesses in the area. Whilst the response rate may seem low, it's actually quite reasonable for this type of consultation. It was therefore considered appropriate to recommend proceeding to statutory consultation given the level of overall support for a CPZ from those who did respond, along with the evidence of high levels of parking stress within the consultation area. The council cannot force residents / businesses to participate in the consultation, but has used a number of methods of communication to enable people to get involved in the process.

5. Criffel Avenue (G-OBJ-2037)

I would like to object most strongly to the Controlled Parking Zone proposed for the Streatham Hill Area for the reasons detailed below.

1. I have lived on Criffel Avenue for ten years and have NEVER experienced a problem parking my car. Criffel Avenue and surrounding roads are made up of maisonette flats and therefore the area is fairly densely populated with 2-4 cars per building. Despite this, the furthest I have ever had to park my car is around the corner (1 minute walk away) which I believe is more than acceptable. The residents have not been provided with any evidence that there actually is a problem in this area – this should be presented to us by the Parking Design Team as soon as possible as otherwise there are no grounds for a consultation.

2. The outcome of the consultation stated that there was a response rate of 14.2%. This is not a quorum from which the proposal can be advanced to the council or implemented. It was also stated that '58% consider that they have parking problems on their area'. 58% of 14.2% is 8.2%. Therefore only 8.2% of residents consider there is a problem. This is a significant minority and it is not democratic to implement a proposal which would have such a significant impact without sufficient support.

3. If the cause of the problem is drivers from outside the area parking here, then it is not reasonable to penalise residents for this. If the intension of the CPZ is to improve residents parking (as stated in the consultation) then parking permits should be free to residents (including occasional permits for visitors and workmen) and parking charges introduced for non-residents. Otherwise, the introduction of a fee for residents is effectively a stealth tax which would penalise residents for the actions of drivers outside our area.

4. The introduction of a CPZ does not ensure guaranteed parking for residents and therefore charging for parking permits cannot be justified.

5. Introduction of the CPZ will encourage those residents with front gardens to convert them to driveways. This would, be environmentally undesirable, exempt those residents lucky enough to have front gardens from any fees, and reduce even further the road space available for parking, thus exacerbating the problem – this is already the case in parts of Telford Avenue and Salford Road.

Officer response:

The CPZ proposals were initiated by residents through requests, petitions and campaigning the Council and their Ward Councillors to be consulted on parking controls to alleviate the parking pressure they experience. Parking surveys have also confirmed that the majority of the roads experience high levels of parking stress.

On this basis, the council took the decision to carry out an informal consultation in the uncontrolled areas in order to gauge the views of residents and businesses on the possible introduction of a CPZ. As results show that residents do believe there to be parking issues and are subsequently in favour of parking controls, this has since led to the statutory consultation.

The Council is not a position to manipulate or interpret the figures to suit any preference. The council has made the appropriate recommendation and decision based on the results of the consultation as returned by residents / businesses in the area. Whilst the response rate may seem low, it's actually quite reasonable for this type of consultation. It was therefore considered appropriate to recommend proceeding to statutory consultation given the level of overall support for a CPZ from those who did respond, along with the evidence of high levels of parking stress within the consultation area. The council cannot force residents / businesses to participate in the consultation, but has used a number of methods of communication to enable people to get involved in the process.

The proposed CPZ will prioritise parking for local residents within the scheme and remove the majority of 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.

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

6. Criffel Avenue (G-OBJ-2048)

I am against having a CPZ in Criffel Avenue/Telford Park. I don't think we need one.

7. Deerhurst Road (OBJ-2012) Outside Boundary

I live in Deerhurst Road Streatham. I am opposed to introducing controlled parking zones in and around this area. We don't need parking zones as we don't have a problem. The only reason would be if the council create a problem by introducing parking zones so no one can park in streets nearer to the stations. These parking zones won't benefit the residents, but will be a way to make more money for Lambeth council.

8. Montrell Road (G-OBJ-2003)

I would like to make a representation against the notice which I received regarding Proposed Controlled Parking Zone (Streatham Hill Area). I am not happy with the agreed operational hours at Streatham Hill West 'G' CPZ which are Monday - Friday 10am - Noon. I live on Montrell road and it is so difficult to find parking here 6pm onwards every day of the week. This is because we have people who live locally who come and park here and I guess this is because they do not want to pay for parking permits for their roads and instead come and park here. Also, we have quite a few commercial vehicles who park here and sometimes one vehicle takes up parking space of approximately two normal cars. Most of the times I have to return home early to get a parking spot otherwise I have to park past Telford Avenue and walk 10-15mins to my house, this to be honest has become the norm for me. I think is absolutely ridiculous despite being a resident I am unable to find parking because other locals are taking up the spots. My mother who is an elderly person and a medical patient has to suffer from this as she is unable to walk long distances as I do not bother even coming on our road because 98% of the time I am aware there will be no parking available. Furthermore, I also feel the proposal set up for Streatham Hill West 'G' CPZ Monday - Friday 10am - Noon is absolutely pointless and this will not resolve anything for the people who have issues parking in this area. Even Monday - Friday 8:30am - 6:30pm will not be as effective as people who want to park here overnight will still continue to do so and people like myself who live in this area will find no parking. I am more than happy to pay for permits but I just want that peace of mind of 'whenever' I return home, I have a parking space. Therefore, I request you to put maximum restrictions of 8:30am - 6:30pm or higher (not just 10:00am - Noon).

Officer response:

The informal consultation results have shown that the largest majority of respondents' for Zone G support the 10am-12 Noon 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. However, we will continue to monitor your road for parking pressure once the controls are introduced.

9. Norfolk House Road (OBJ-2021) Outside boundary

It looks like from the plans that the area of Norfolk House Road and surrounding roads will not be covered by the new CPZ and therefore I make an opposition because bringing in CPZ in the neighbouring area that are included in these plans will only serve to increase the problem of Norfolk House Road and surrounds even further. As a resident on Norfolk House Road who drives I can never park near my house and am constantly having to manoeuvre my car into gaps and into reverse to navigate around the roads filled with cars either side leaving only space for one car. It's dangerous and full of cars who use these streets for commuting, which I can surmise because of the change of traffic at weekends. This area will benefit from having CPZ. Please confirm if I'm correct in deciphering your maps when I say Norfolk House Road won't be covered and please take this email as confirmation that if that's the case, I strong object because of the increased pressure and traffic it will put on Norfolk House Road and surrounds.

Officer response:

I can confirm that Norfolk House Road is not part of the current parking proposals, however, we will be carrying out CPZ consultation for your area in the near future.

10. Robson Road (OBJ-2011) Outside boundary

I object to the Council extending the CPZ to West Norwood and Tulse Hill. I think that there's already enough use of CPZ in West Norwood without Palace Road becoming a part of the zone. There's already more than enough parking in the area, and Council plans to remove parking areas along Norwood Road from Chestnut Road to Chatsworth Way as part of "Streetworks Norwood to Tulse Hill" will just make the problem worse. If you want to do

something constructive then abolish or significantly reduce parking fees for Waylett Place car park. I also oppose the CPZ on the grounds that residents already pay the Council more than enough money for services through council tax and business rates and vehicle owners shouldn't be further penalised for owning a car. I think the only way to make CPZ acceptable to residents is give everyone paying Council tax a free residents parking permit for their car and only charge for second or subsequent vehicles. You can verify eligibility for a free residents parking permit by cross checking the residents home address with the car owners registered address as recorded by the DVLA.

Officer response:

No parking controls are to be introduced in Palace Road at this time.

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.

11. Salford Road (OBJ-2010)

In relation to the proposed CPZ in Streatham Hill West (G) I have the following objection: I do not feel that introducing a CPZ will alleviate the problems described in your letter. It is true that the roads where I live (Salford Road) are often busy. However, this is simply due to several residents owning cars, which will still be the case under a CPZ. The overcrowding is not due to commuters parking on the streets and walking to the station, as suggested. I know this because: 1) the roads are a relatively long walk from the station so few commuters would use them; and 2) more importantly, the roads are still busy in the evenings when the working day is over. For example, last night I parked at about 10.30pm and had to park on the main road (Thornton Avenue). This is frustrating but I do not believe a CPZ would solve the problem, as local residents will still own the cars. Instead, it will simply mean you are forcing residents to pay an extra £100-200 per year for a parking permit. I think this is a shameless initiative to raise more revenue for Lambeth borough to the detriment of its residents. I used to live in Wandsworth borough which did have a permit system. However, council tax was that much cheaper than Lambeth, that it made a permit more acceptable. Please could you confirm that, should the CPZ be implemented, council tax would be reduced by a similar amount, so as to not force an unfair increase of living costs for your residents?

Officer response:

The CPZ proposals were initiated by residents through requests, petitions and campaigning the Council and their Ward Councillors to be consulted on parking controls to alleviate the parking pressure they experience. Parking surveys have also confirmed that the majority of the roads experience high levels of parking stress.

On this basis, the council took the decision to carry out an informal consultation in the uncontrolled areas in order to gauge the views of residents and businesses on the possible introduction of a CPZ. As results show that residents do believe there to be parking issues and are subsequently in favour of parking controls, this has since led to the statutory consultation.

The proposed CPZ will prioritise parking for local residents within the scheme and remove the majority of 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.

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

12. Streatham Hill CPZ (G-OBJ-2015) no address details received

I am opposed to any further parking restrictions in the borough. As a social worker I feel that these restrictions are not required in these proposed zones as it does not cause a nuisance to residents. As a professional who works with vulnerable individuals these parking restrictions impact on my safety to carry out my work as I am an essential car user who is required to use my car in my role as a SW. I'm at risk when I have to park far away from service users home and walk long distances from where so have parked to service users home. I walk with equipment which is valuable and therefore if stolen would impact on the service users life's.

Officer response:

The CPZ proposals were initiated by residents through requests, petitions and campaigning the Council and their Ward Councillors to be consulted on parking controls to alleviate the parking pressure they experience. Parking surveys have also confirmed that the majority of the roads experience high levels of parking stress.

On this basis, the council took the decision to carry out an informal consultation in the uncontrolled areas in order to gauge the views of residents and businesses on the possible introduction of a CPZ. As results show that residents do believe there to be parking issues and are subsequently in favour of parking controls, this has since led to the statutory consultation.

The introduction of a CPZ would generally increase the opportunity of finding a parking space closer to a patients property.

13. Streatham Hill CPZ (G-OBJ-2015) no address details received

against the proposed CPZ into Streatham Hill West area

14. Telford Avenue (G-OBJ-2002)

1. With regard to the proposals to impose a CPZ on Telford Ave (Zone G) from 10-12 noon Mon-Fri, we object on the basis of cost. We already pay a heavy and increasing council tax. We don't object in principle to a two hour permit only period. (We would object to a longer permit only period during the week or weekend). We do object to the fact it will incur us an almost £300 annual fee for any vehicle we need to park on the road during this time as well as expensive visitor permits for any visitors. Surely a two hour zone permit should cost less given it only needs to be monitored for a short duration of each day.

2. Not imposing a CPZ on the roads east of Streatham Hill, but imposing a CPZ across Zone G will only serve to push increased traffic to the east. Given those residents quite reasonably do not want a CPZ, it would be better to leave all roads as they are with no CPZ imposition than to create further problems as a result of partial CPZ.

3. A more critical concern on Telford Avenue and Thornton Road is the extremely dangerous roundabout which causes daily traffic issues, which we have raised with Lambeth and local councillors in recent years to no avail. Traffic passing along Thornton Road fails to recognise the roundabout and rarely stops. Passing north/south along Telford Ave over the roundabout is a daily battle for local residents. Cars also queue in traffic across the roundabout both ways on Thornton Rd, making it impossible to pass across on Telford Ave. The roundabout is similarly dangerous for pedestrians crossing. This is particularly of concern given the route passes to two nearby Primary Schools on the Hydefarm estate.

4. We raised before the parking and traffic issue re the corner of Telford and Rastell Avenues on Tooting Common. For some reason when yellow lines were put in place on a number of local street corners, the eastern corner of Telford and Rastell was left without yellow lines. Cars park on the corner and on an awkward sticking out piece of pavement as you turn onto Rastell in the direction of Emmanuel Rd. The parking here makes it very difficult for traffic passing in and out of Telford Avenue, makes visibility difficult and makes road crossing more difficult for pedestrians.

Officer response:

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

The majority of the respondents from areas 3&4 were against parking controls. The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

Once the CPZ is introduced, double yellow lines will be introduced at all junctions throughout the zone.

As part of the council's Our Streets programme, there will be improvements to the street environment including traffic calming works and road crossing improvements. Following recent engagement we've begun to draw up proposals that cover the points raised by residents and businesses in the Thornton, St Leonards, Streatham Wells and Streatham South wards. Please visit the website www.lambeth.gov.uk/ourstreets for more information.

15. Telford Avenue (G-OBJ-2047)

I am registering an objection to the proposed parking restrictions. I live in a flat at XX Thornton Avenue, with no driveway and can only park on the road outside. I am a pensioner with a limited income but reliant on my car. I note that most in favour of parking restrictions live in roads with houses where there are driveways, sometimes with space for up to 3 cars. Those in favour of restrictions complain on our local email of parking across their drive entrances. I propose having yellow lines across access to all driveways. This would address those complainants and not penalise those whose finances are already stretched and would not run to buying parking permits for themselves and visitors.

16. Thornton Avenue (G-OBJ-2047)

I would like to register my views in response to the above statutory consultation. I am a resident of XX Thornton Avenue. In my view the proposed parking restrictions are unnecessary and will not necessarily improve the congestion in the area. There may be a case for some traffic management measures (e.g. yellow lines) in key areas, but no such measures have been proposed. I object to the proposed CPZ on the grounds that they will (a) add unwelcome additional cost to residents (b) make it difficult for family and friends to visit the properties affected and (c) add unnecessary and intrusive bureaucracy.

Representations - Comments for the proposals

1. Killiesier Avenue (COM-3004)

I have been a resident on Killiesier Avenue for over 20 years and have only recently in the last 2-3 years had a problem with parking. Non-residents use our road during the week to park and then use the nearby train station to continue their journey into work. The weekend is an even bigger problem to park as non-residents use our road to go to the nearby tennis club. I'm frightened to move my car at the weekend as it's almost impossible to find a space to park until way after 9pm, and that if you are lucky to get one at all!!

Therefore - although I am not opposed to CPZ - I feel that the suggestion of controlled parking from Monday to Friday, 10am to 12pm, would not solve the problem we have with parking in the area. The proposal as it stands would make no difference to the residents. Instead it would create further frustration as we would find ourselves with nowhere to park while also having to pay for the pleasure of it. I propose that 8.30am to 6.30pm from Monday to Saturday would be of more benefit to give the residents a chance to secure a parking space.

Officer response:

The informal consultation results have shown that the largest majority of respondents' for Zone G support the 10am-12 Noon 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.

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.

2. Kirkstall Gardens (COM-3024)

As per the kerbside notice, I am writing by the deadline of 26th March 2018 to make a representation regarding the CPZ outside my property of XX Kirkstall Gardens. There are 2 matters:

1) I object to the area, which I have highlighted in black in the attached image, being zoned for business use. What businesses are nearby that require parking there? Looking at the responses from the consultation, there were no

responses from businesses in Kirkstall Gardens, which implies there are none in this residential area. Already there is a problem with unsightly vans being parked in this area for businesses which are located nowhere near here. Indeed, there has been an abandoned Spanish registration van in the road here for several months which has already been highlighted to the council. Could it instead be zoned only for residents and pay and display please?

2) The bays as demarcated would block access to my drive. Having only recently moved into the property, I have not yet been able to apply for a dropped curb and protected access to that driveway. I would not want the CPZ to prevent this application in the future. Would this cause a problem?

Officer response:

Although no businesses are on your road, these parking places can be utilised by "all zones" business permit holders such as property estate agents who regularly visit all zones in the borough as part of their work. The location of the shared use bays are generally in areas not directly outside residents properties, whilst still being available to residents to occupy.

The introduction of the CPZ will not create an issue regarding a dropped kerb application. Although it will be necessary to amend the traffic order in order to reduce the parking bay which can incur a fee.

3. Salford Road (COM-3012)

I live on Salford Rd and would like to give my opinion against the controlled parking zone.

1. I do not drive nor own a car. Most of the time, I use public transport.
2. However, there are some times when I need to use a taxi, especially as I have a 3yo child. To me, it is important that the taxi can legally park in front of my building for the duration of loading any luggage into the vehicle and/or car seat. It would be extremely difficult for me to hold my toddler, the car seat and anything else we are taking with us if the taxi couldn't park in front of our building.
3. Because I don't drive and I have back pain, I do my monthly food and grocery shopping online. It wouldn't make any sense if the delivery driver couldn't park in the streets legally at any time. I have to schedule the delivery time around my personal commitments especially work and not around specific times.

My recommendation should you feel a controlled parking zone is essential would be for:

1. Limited parking during peak hours eg 7 - 10am. This way people who simply want to leave their cars here and jump on the train won't be able to do so. During this time period, it should be OK for anyone to park for up to 15 minutes with no return within 1 or 2 hours. This way delivery drivers and taxis can still do their job and residents of the street can enjoy their services without limitations.
2. I would prefer for the restrictions to be Monday to Friday only. As a parent, it is important that our friends and family who have their own kids can visit us over the weekend. Parking restrictions over the weekend would mean that parents who come from far away would have to park far away and do several trips to get their kids indoors and overnight suitcases in and this might be a put off.

In conclusion, I would prefer no parking restrictions on Salford rd or limited parking Monday to Friday only during peak hours eg 7 - 10 am.

Officer response:

Vehicles may stop in a parking bay or on a yellow line to load or unload goods for a up to 20 minutes.

4. Tierney Road (G-COM-3007)

I'm very concerned about which roads are included in the CPZ that will be implemented.

a) - Private estates have their own parking spaces and therefore should not have access to CPZ's on Tierney Road and Montrell Roads. Private estates include the following:

Hawkshaw Close, Perry House, Staplefield Close, Chipstead & Couldson Houses. As Tierney and Montreal Road residents are not permitted to park in the spaces provided for these private areas, then they should not be able to register for CPZ.

b) - Another cause for concern is 43A Alderney Works incorrectly named 43A Tierney Road, private dwellings which have their own parking onsite therefore should not require access to CPZ on Tierney/Montrell Roads.

We were informed by the council that Urban Spectrum (who own the site and also developed it) would provide residents with garages and parking spaces but this has not been the case. This should be enforced and access to the gate given to the residents so that they can park onsite. No CPZ access should be given to those residents.

c) - please confirm when the CPZ will be enforced? Times and days specifically. What will be available to residents of Tierney/Montrell roads.

Officer response:

Residents of private and estate roads that fall within in a CPZ boundary are entitled to purchase permits to park on the public highway. Generally residents in private or estate roads/areas will only purchase a permit for the public highway if absolutely necessary, therefore we do not believe that parking on the public highways roads in the zone will create additional parking pressure. If parking is maximised within a private or estate road they would have no alternative parking option. Therefore it seems fair and appropriate to allow them to purchase permits to park within the zone.

In regards to the gates at the entrance to 43A Tierney Road, this has been passed on to our Planning Enforcement team to investigate as it is a breach of condition.

5. Tierney Road (G-COM-3009)

Speaking to my neighbours, the few who actually received a consultation letter, we all requested a 7 day CPZ as the parking in our road is worse at weekends and the bus drivers who clog the top end of the road work 7 days a week. I also feel it is unfair that the three estates in our road will be able to get parking permits and park in our road while we are not allowed to park on their estates. We were told when the development at 43a was applying for planning permission that they would have their own parking on site and would not be included in any future CPZ, why has this been changed? We also asked for the zone to last all day, yet the proposal is for two hours a day only, it would seem that the wishes of residents of Tierney and Montrell roads have been ignored and the council is proposing a CPZ that will cost us a lot of money and do very little to solve our parking problems, please reconsider.

Officer response:

Residents of private and estate roads that fall within in a CPZ boundary are entitled to purchase permits to park on the public highway. Generally residents in private or estate roads/areas will only purchase a permit for the public highway if absolutely necessary, therefore we do not believe that parking on the public highways roads in the zone will create additional parking pressure. If parking is maximised within a private or estate road they would have no alternative parking option. Therefore it seems fair and appropriate to allow them to purchase permits to park within the zone.

The informal consultation results have shown that the largest majority of respondents' for Zone G support the 10am-12 Noon 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. However, we will continue to monitor your road for parking pressure once the controls are introduced.

6. Telford Avenue (G-COM-3023)

As a resident of Telford Avenue, I can sympathise with concerns around the availability of parking at certain times and I do, on occasion, find it frustrating when there are no spaces available in the immediate vicinity of my house. However, as I said in my initial response to the request for feedback which was sent out a couple of months ago, I am generally able to find parking within 100-200 metres of my property most of the time. Whilst I understand that the imposition of a CPZ is now fairly inevitable, I would ask the Council and relevant Councillors to consider that imposing a financial penalty on existing residents is not a fair way to address the issues. The availability of Free On-Street Parking in the Telford Avenue area was one of the factors which played into my thinking when I was considering whether or not to live there. Some of my neighbours have the benefit of Off Street Parking, something which I don't have. I would suggest that a fair way of dealing with the imposition of a new CPZ would be to offer existing residents who have vehicles and require On Street Parking their first year's parking permit Free of Charge. In my view, to ask people who already live in the area to stump up somewhere in the region of £150-200 p/a is simply not fair and this financial burden should not be imposed on existing residents in the first year or two.

Officer response:

The introduction of a Controlled Parking Scheme involves various set up costs for implementation e.g. road markings, signs, 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.

7. Telford Avenue (G-COM-3025)

I write further to the above matter and apologise for the slight delay in writing to you; I have been away on holiday out of the country and received your Statutory Consultation Notice in my absence. I reside at xx Telford Avenue and therefore hope that you will still take into consideration my valid comments. I note that the Council intends to introduce measures for a CPZ on my road. I was not in favour of this as despite being a vehicle owner, I rarely have difficulty finding parking on my road and as such find it an inconvenience to have to purchase a periodic parking permit to be able to park on my road. Even today, there are several spaces available right outside of my property. The other and more problematic concern I have, is that if CPZs are introduced on roads in my area, what if, on the off chance, I am unable to find parking on my road. Will that mean that as a result of CPZs on my neighbouring roads, I won't be able to park on them? Where will I be able to park then? This will be a real issue and will put me in a far worse position than I am now. I would urge the Council to take this into account if it proceeds to apply CPZs in our area (i.e there should be the ability for a permit holder for Telford Avenue to be able to park on other roads close by with CPZs).

Officer response:

A permit for a CPZ entitles you to park in any of the roads within that zone that have allocated parking bays.

Representations and Officers' comments – Streatham Hill (Area 3 & 4)

Appendix D

Representations in Support of the proposals

1. Kingsmead Road (WR-SUP-1007)

I am content with the restrictions proposed on the corners only for Kingsmead Road in Plan 2. I would not support further controlled parking on this road.

2. Palace Road (WR-SUP-1009)

I am writing to give my strongest possible support to the introduction of double yellow lines on the southern side of Palace Road, from the junction with Daysbrook Road to the junction with Christchurch Road. I have lived at 10 Palace Road for 20 years. Cars were never parked on both sides of Palace Road until the completion of the development at 1 Palace Road and the introduction of disabled and ambulance parking bays on the northern side of the road. Drivers now park their cars on both sides of the road, which causes severe access restrictions for any vehicle over the size of a car. This has safety issues - restricted ambulance and fire engine access; practical issues -restricted waste disposal and delivery lorry access; and aesthetic issues: cars now drive on the grass verge for access and turning, leaving the verge a muddy mess. Please introduce double yellow lines as soon as possible.

3. Palace Road (WR-SUP-1015)

I own XX Palace Road and am writing in support of the proposed double yellow lines to one side of Palace Road between Daysbrook Road and Christchurch Road, as set out on your proposed plan. Cars currently park on both sides of what is a very narrow stretch of road, and this prevents any vehicle larger than a normal car from passing. Larger vehicles, including refuse trucks are left with no other option than to drive down the pavement and grass verge, causing obvious danger to pedestrians. These double yellow lines are therefore urgently required.

Representations in Opposition of the proposals

1. Amesbury Avenue (OBJ-2024)

I'm writing to voice my opposition to the location of the proposed Streatham CPZ. I live on Amesbury Avenue between the High Road and Emsworth and am one of many people who were in favour of a CPZ in our street.

At present on this stretch of Amesbury Avenue it is almost impossible to park near my home; I can go whole weeks with only being able to park on Barcombe or Cricklade Avenues as far up as St Margaret's church. At a weekend it is easier to park as commuters aren't using our street and Estate Agents don't work Sunday's. In close proximity we have Dexters, KFH, Acorn, Townsends and Haart who I've seen all use our street to park. With multiple cars in each

office this puts a considerable strain on our already overcrowded road. The proposed Streatham Hill West CPZ is incredibly short sighted in thinking it will ease commuter parking and allow residents to park more easily. Those residents within the proposed zone who do not wish to pay will simply park in the ABCD roads opposite. Those commuters who previously parked within this zone will simply be displaced again to ABCD roads. The fact that so many new flats have been built in the zone without adequate parking should not have been allowed and takes little account of local residents. The safety measures of double yellow lines are welcome but again will reduce parking space. As Amesbury Avenue voted for the CPZ why can't we be included then the other roads who voted against can feel the strain instead. I seriously ask for this to be considered. I do not like parking my car so far away from a safety point of view, should my car be broken into I will be sending the repair bill to Lambeth parking department.

Officer response:

A CPZ is not effective for 1 or 2 isolated roads. As the majority of respondents from area 3 & 4 were against parking controls, it was decided not to introduce the CPZ in these areas. The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

Please note: Due to a number of petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

2. Barcombe Avenue (OBJ-2013)

I object to the present parking system as it's not free for all, I also disagree with the number of cars in use today. We often get strangers parking taking liberties outside our doors all week and also on Sundays for church.

3. Barcombe Avenue (OBJ-2033)

I'm here to voice my concerns and categorically disagree with the parking restrictions being put in place in Streatham Hill. I live on Barcombe Avenue and it's already so horrendous to park on my road since so many people park here during the day to go to the station or to work in Streatham. I have been sent a petition and have unfortunately not got the time to drop it to the household who sent it. The reasons why I disagree with the proposed restrictions is because if Telford Avenue gets CPZ and we don't (we currently planned) more commuters are going to be parking on Barcombe Avenue, which will make our already difficult parking situation even worse. If you are going to have parking restrictions in Streatham Hill, make them the same across all streets. We didn't receive sufficient information when we received the questionnaire as to the possible scenarios. You have not made clear the extent of the yellow lines on my road, nor did you tell us that Streatham Hill would be split into areas. I am in favour of CPZ on my road, as are my three other housemates. If you continue this, it's going to be hell on earth for residents of this road trying to park. This is ill thought out and should not happen.

Officer response:

We generally consider breaking zones up into smaller areas due to the hours and days of operation chosen, natural geographical boundaries and to stop inter-zonal commuting. The consultation material provided to residents does not suggest that the area would be adopted as one entire zone or nothing at all. Our methodology, as within previously consulted areas, has been to analyse the results on a road by road basis which then informs our decision on how to proceed. A road by road analysis is necessary as the overall results can be misleading if roads from one particular area generated a higher response rate or more responses in general perhaps due to having more properties in that area. This is considered the most appropriate and fair method of analysing the results as not to impose parking controls into areas that had a majority of respondents against the controls.

We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees. Again, based on the results for this displacement question for areas 3&4, the majority chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads were to have parking controls introduced. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this. The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

Please note: Due to a number of petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

4. Barcombe Avenue (OBJ-2034)

We would like to object to your plans for the proposed CPZ in the Streatham Hill Area. We are the owners of XX Barcombe Avenue. We voted in favour of the CPZ during the consultation. By introducing an extensive CPZ in Areas

1 and 2 but not in Areas 3 and 4, your plans will relocate the acute demand for parking in Areas 1 and 2 (evidenced by those Areas overwhelmingly voting for a CPZ) into Areas 3 and 4, where Area 3 will be disproportionately affected due to its proximity to the Streatham Hill Station and bus routes towards Brixton and Central London. As we mentioned in our response to the original consultation, the Streatham Hill Area is abused as a Park and Ride car park due to its rail and bus links. Clearly, thus far, the brunt of this has been borne by Areas 1 and 2, but by introducing a CPZ in those areas and not in Areas 3 and 4, you will place a much greater burden on Areas 3 and 4. Whilst we appreciate that introducing a CPZ into any given area probably moves some of that demand to a neighbouring area, parking demand must in part be driven by factors such as transport links, and as Areas 1,2 and 3 (if not 4) share very similar transport links, it is likely that the majority of the demand for parking will now become focused on Areas 3 and 4, where there is already a challenging parking situation as indicated by my voting for the CPZ, particularly in the stretches of Barcombe, Cricklade and Downton that adjoin the A23. On this point, we think that it is telling that Amesbury Avenue voted in favour of the CPZ, where their seemingly more acute parking demand must be driven by proximity to the Streatham Hill Station. By focusing the parking problems in Areas 1, 2 and Amesbury Avenue onto the next nearest roads (Barcombe, Cricklade and Downton), without commensurately reducing the efficacy of the transport links that caused those problems, you will be disproportionately affecting the parking situation on those roads, without having properly consulted their residents, and leaving them with this problem for at least 2 years. We do not think that your original consultation gave the residents in Areas 3 and 4 sufficient information to have voted in favour of this result, and therefore, Areas 3 and 4 should be given the opportunity to vote again, with full information as to the implications of their vote. We would also suggest that, notwithstanding Areas 3 and 4 voting against a CPZ, the parking situation of the Streatham Hill area needs to be considered in the round, rather than determining each street on its individual voting patterns, where the vote of one street has a direct impact on an adjoining street that might have voted differently. Particularly where that eventuality was not clearly set out to either street. We do not think that you can look at each street in isolation because the parking demand is driven by the area's transport links, which are shared by all streets in the area. We think that your decision as to which streets have a CPZ should in part be governed by what affect introducing a CPZ on one street will have on another in the area. As you are no doubt aware, the new London Square development on the junction of the A23 and Sternhold Avenue has introduced hundreds of new homes into the area. They are charging tens of thousands of pounds for a parking space (not per year obviously, but with freehold of property). Clearly, with unrestricted parking in the adjoining streets, no resident is likely to spend this money which will therefore drive potentially hundreds of new cars onto the nearest unrestricted roads. Without a CPZ, you are in effect subsidising the attractiveness of the London Square development by providing free parking when they are charging for it. As this development has only just opened, the impact of these cars has not fully been felt by the residents of Area 3, but the prospect alone should be enough for you to reconsider your position. We very much hope that you will reconsider your position and give the residents of Areas 3 and 4 another chance to vote based on the materially new information. We would be very happy to discuss this with you in person.

Officer response:

Our methodology, as within previously consulted areas, has been to analyse the results on a road by road basis which then informs our decision on how to proceed. A road by road analysis is necessary as the overall results can be misleading if roads from one particular area generated a higher response rate or more responses in general perhaps due to having more properties in that area. This is considered the most appropriate and fair method of analysing the results as not to impose parking controls into areas that had a majority respondents against the controls.

We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees. Again, based on the results for this displacement question for areas 3&4, the majority chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads were to have parking controls introduced. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this. The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

Please note: Due to a number petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

5. Barcombe Avenue (WR-OBJ-2016)

I write to you in response to proposals in my area. I have noted that my road will have yellow lines implemented. I am a blue badge holder and have my badge until 2020. However, regularly, I will come home and find vehicles

without blue badges in disabled bays. I then have to park in available areas, sometimes where you've mentioned the yellow lines will be. I feel that your implementation of these yellow lines is designed to frustrate residents to eventually succumb to your proposals and implement these parking changes. I'm vehemently opposed to this as any such changes will not change the problems we have on our road. In the area around my house these are cars which have been clamped, cars without road tax, a car without wheels taking up space and several homes with more than one vehicle. These are the people you should be targeting specifically as it is they who cause all of these problems on our road. I would also ask what you propose to do about the problems I personally experience with inconsiderate non-blue badge holders parking in a space designated for me. Lastly, getting a renewal of my blue badge took 3 months. What would happen to me if this occurred again?

Officer response:

The double yellow lines are risk assessment / danger reduction measures and not an accident remedial measure. That is being proactive and not reactive after the event. It would be irresponsible of the Council to ignore the manner of obstructive parking that is currently taking place. The Council has duty and care to ensure the safety of all road users and to maintain access at all times, particularly for the public service vehicles and the emergency services. The Highway Code stipulates that motorists should not park within 10 metres of a junction. Every effort is made to minimise the extent of such restrictions. The Council's requirements for safety override the need for parking.

If you are concerned about a parked vehicle, you can contact our parking enforcement team to investigate. They will arrange for a Civil Enforcement Officer on duty nearby to visit the location as soon as possible and if appropriate, issue a Penalty Charge Notice. You can request enforcement by visiting the following link and providing the necessary details.

<https://www.lambeth.gov.uk/forms/report-a-parking-violation-or-request-parking-enforcement>

6. Barcombe Avenue (OBJ-2038)

We require that you resend the questionnaire because we feel that the residents were not given the full information in order to understand the implications of rejecting a CPZ in the Area 3. We declare that you did not make clear, the extent of the double yellow lines that are to be introduced when the CPZ comes into force in this area, which would further limit our parking further. You also did not make clear that Streatham Hill would be split into Areas for and against, and those against would suffer the consequences of those receiving a CPZ. Weighing up all of this, the following residents of Area 3 are in favour of the CPZ and wish you to take this into consideration before moving further with your plans.

Officer response:

We generally consider breaking the zones up into smaller areas due to the hours and days of operation chosen, natural geographical boundaries and to stop inter-zonal commuting. The consultation material provided to residents does not suggest that the area would be adopted as one entire zone or nothing at all. Our methodology, as within previously consulted areas, has been to analyse the results on a road by road basis which then informs our decision on how to proceed.

A road by road analysis is necessary as the overall results can be misleading if roads from one particular area generated a higher response rate or more responses in general perhaps due to having more properties in that area. This is considered the most appropriate and fair method of analysing the results as not to impose parking controls into areas that had a majority respondents against the controls.

From the detailed results for this area it is clear that the majority of 233 respondents were opposed to having controls with 166 in favour of controls. We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees.

Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority of 204 chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads were to have parking controls introduced with 194 in favour of controls. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this. The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

Please note: Due to a number petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

7. Barcombe Avenue (OBJ-2050)

We strongly object against the decision made by Lambeth Council to not include controlled parking to the east side of Streatham High Road. We live on Barcombe Avenue and parking for people who live here is already increasingly difficult. The new development of flats - Streatham Square does not offer free parking space to its inhabitants: the parking spaces there cost thousands of pounds. But why would anyone there pay for a space when they can get it for free on avenues A,B and C across the road? This is already placing pressure on the inhabitants of these roads. Likewise - many, many commuters simply park their cars on our road in the morning and leave them there all day, leaving residents no choice but to park streets away: particularly challenging for the many people with young children - or who are disabled. We do not see any rationale or logic behind the decision to split the CPZ: can you please explain why it will be on the other side of Streatham High Road, but not ours? Every neighbour I have spoken with is frustrated about this decision - not one person we have spoken with has agreed that it is a good idea. We urge you to please rethink your decision. Otherwise it is going to be chaos.

Officer response:

Our methodology, as within previously consulted areas, has been to analyse the results on a road by road basis which then informs our decision on how to proceed. A road by road analysis is necessary as the overall results can be misleading if roads from one particular area generated a higher response rate or more responses in general perhaps due to having more properties in that area. This is considered the most appropriate and fair method of analysing the results as not to impose parking controls into areas that had a majority respondents against the controls.

From the detailed results for this area it is clear that the majority of 233 respondents were opposed to having controls with 166 in favour of controls. We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees.

Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority of 204 chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads where to have parking controls introduced with 194 in favour of controls. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this. The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

Please note: Due to a number petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

8. Cricklade Avenue (OBJ-2031)

In response to the Statutory Consultation document received with regards to the Proposed Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in Streatham Hill Area I would like to make representation and an objection against this proposed plan. I am a resident of XX Cricklade Avenue and have over the years seen a huge increase in commuters and the like using the ABCD, Wyatt Park and Wavertree roads as a parking garage during working hours. Residents on these roads have to wait until after 7/8pm to find parking close to their homes, which is unacceptable and will only get worse should this part CPZ be introduced. The Statutory Consultation for the zone is proposing that the CPZ be only introduced into part of the original planned area as the original Streatham Hill area has now been split into "East" and "West". Nowhere in the Informal Consultation leaflet received by residents did it say that there was a possibility of the zone being split into "East" and "West". And I'm sure if residents were aware that this was a clear possibility then there may have been a different outcome to the consultation. The Informal Consultation received by resident's states in the section headed "What are the proposals" – This area is currently being proposed as a new a stand-alone zone thereby allowing the residents to choose the hours of operation. However based on the results of the consultation, it may be necessary for those supporting roads to become part of an extension to an existing neighbouring zone. If roads are added as extensions to the existing zones they will adopt the hours of operation of the existing zone it is added too." Nowhere does it mention that there this consultation was going to be reviewed on a road by road basis or in these new East and West Zones it says "this area" making reference to the visual representation in the document which shows the proposed zone as one area. "Displacement" – "When making your decision please take into account that if a CPZ is introduced in your neighbouring roads, it is likely that the vehicles displaced (commuters and residents avoiding charges) from neighbouring roads could increase pressure for parking

on your road". Again no mention that the original proposed CPZ would be split into East and West. The problems faced by residents of Streatham Hill "West" are also felt by "East" and introducing a CPZ to Streatham Hill West will only create further pressures to the residents of Streatham Hill East. I am surprised that the council can even consider splitting the area into two as it is very obvious what the end result will be. It's not difficult for commuters and other people to stop parking in Streatham Hill West to move over to Streatham Hill East. With the consultation only having a response rate of 14.2% and the original Informal Consultation provided to residents not stating the possibility of splitting the area into two this proposal should be reconsidered. The CPZ proposal should be for the original area and not these two separate areas.

Officer response:

We generally consider breaking the zones up into smaller areas due to the hours and days of operation chosen, natural geographical boundaries and to stop inter-zonal commuting. Our methodology, as within previously consulted areas, has been to analyse the results on a road by road basis which then informs our decision on how to proceed.

A road by road analysis is necessary as the overall results can be misleading if roads from one particular area generated a higher response rate or more responses in general perhaps due to having more properties in that area. This is considered the most appropriate and fair method of analysing the results as not to impose parking controls into areas that had a majority respondents against the controls. The consultation material provided to residents does not suggest that the area would be adopted as one entire zone or nothing at all.

From the detailed results for this area it is clear that the majority of 233 respondents were opposed to having controls with 166 in favour of controls. We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees.

Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority of 204 chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads where to have parking controls introduced with 194 in favour of controls. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this. The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

Please note: Due to a number petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

9. Cricklade Avenue (OBJ-2027)

In regard to the proposed Control Parking Zone Streatham Hill area, as a resident in Area 3, I would strongly object to the proposal. Area 3 is basically within the same radius with Area 2 from Streatham Hill station and other amenities. Which means current non-resident parking attempts would be simply concentrate into, most likely, Area 3 (I am aware that there are already many non-resident come and park sometimes all day on my street, perhaps for commuting to work). The resident would suffer even further from potential new yellow lines scheme rules which restrict our right to keep our vehicles near our houses. For that reason, I must say that this proposal is absolutely UNFAIR to Area 3 and need to be reconsidered. Lastly to add my personal concern, My husband recently suffered from a serious stroke, left with disability so I am considering driving for the family - there are lots of places public transport won't serve very well for disabled - I would lose the option if local parking condition worsens. Your kind consideration would be very much appreciated.

Officer response:

The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

The Council has duty and care to ensure the safety of all road users and to maintain access at all times, for public service vehicles and emergency services. In addition this will improve visibility and provide clear access particularly for vulnerable road users such as pedestrians, push chairs and wheelchair users. The Councils requirements for safety override the need for parking. The Highway Code stipulates that motorists should not park within 10 metres of a junction, however, every effort is made to minimise the extent of such restrictions.

Please note: Due to a number of petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

10. Cricklade Avenue (OBJ-2028)

1. This letter is to object to the proposed CPZs and introduction of DYL in the Streatham Hill area.
2. The imposition of a CPZ in an area displaces parking into the area without the CPZ. This is indeed one of the central points of the proposed CPZ area; namely that it is submitted that it ameliorates a problem created by the introduction of the Brixton Hill CPZs in 2017. It seems obvious that by creating CPZ zone G, much of the acute parking stress to the West of the A23 will be displaced to the East.
3. The problem is likely to be particularly acute on roads close to Streatham Hill station. The report shows unrestricted parking stress both at weekend and in the weekday is highest in the roads which (a) you are planning to reduce supply in, through the introduction of DYLs; and which are also (b) the closest roads to either Streatham Hill or, for Palace Road, Tulse Hill station, and therefore most likely to be both affected by and popular with commuter traffic. (pictured – weekdays, Lambeth Parking Study 2017)
4. All of the roads with arrows pointing to them are already (even at the time of the report in 2016) under acute parking stress; none are included in the proposed CPZ; in all are there proposed to be further parking restrictions.
5. Consequently, I further object to the creation of the Double Yellow Lines in the proposed area. Many of the roads in question to the East of the A23 are already at significant levels of parking stress. This measure would reduce supply further at a time of likely further demand, and there is no need for it either as part of the CPZ or independently.
6. The measures as a whole are likely to further degrade the ability of local businesses to trade, by creating a two hour period where customers have to pay to park.
7. Equally importantly, you are clear in your officer report that the Streatham Hill Parking survey is old evidence on which to make a decision. The traffic surveys upon which the CPZ is based predate the creation of 3 new CPZs and the extension of five existing CPZs in October 2017. The factual accuracy of that report in the current circumstances is therefore entirely unknown, so stark is the change in the facts. I find it extraordinary that such a comprehensive policy suggestion could be premised on evidence that is demonstrably out of date. Making policy decisions on bad evidence leads to bad results.
8. Finally I note that no attempt has been made to integrate the measure into its wider context; it is entirely disconnected from the TFL consultation and plan for the A23 in precisely the same area.
9. I must urge you most strongly to drop these plans or to continue to public enquiry stage. You lead yourself open to legal challenge – including from myself – if you do not do so.

Officer response:

The council has made the appropriate recommendation and decision based on the results of the consultation as returned by residents / businesses in the area. From the detailed results for this area it is clear that the majority of 233 respondents were opposed to having controls with 166 in favour of controls.

We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees. Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority of 204 chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads were to have parking controls introduced with 194 in favour of controls. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this.

The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

The majority of requests for parking controls in the Streatham Hill area including a petition came from the area west of Streatham Hill (A23), with only a few from the area on the east side. It is common practice to consult an area beyond the requested roads to anticipate the possible displacement effect when resolving parking difficulty in one area.

The existing red route TfL parking bays allow for a free short term stay which will continue to help passing trade for businesses.

Regarding the double yellow lines, the Council has duty and care to ensure the safety of all road users and to maintain access at all times, for public service vehicles and emergency services. In addition this will improve visibility and provide clear access particularly for vulnerable road users such as pedestrians, push chairs and wheelchair

users. The Councils requirements for safety override the need for parking. The Highway Code stipulates that motorists should not park within 10 metres of a junction, however, every effort is made to minimise the extent of such restrictions.

Consultations carried out by TfL follow different procedures and timelines.

Please note: Due to a number petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

11. Cricklade Avenue (OBJ-2041)

Following the receipt of leaflet informing us of the outcome of the consultation for the Proposed Controlled Parking Zone for the Streatham Hill area, I wish to register my objection to the proposed actions in response to the results of the consultation. Whilst I recognised an increase in traffic in our road and area, I did not think it had quite reached the stage where controlled parking measures were required. I was therefore part of the 42%. However, my opinion changes when the surrounding area are subject to parking controls. I would recommend that you therefore either extend the scheme to our area, or at least repeat the consultation in light of the new information and intentions.

Officer response:

The council has made the appropriate recommendation and decision based on the results of the consultation as returned by residents / businesses in the area. From the detailed results for this area it is clear that the majority of 233 respondents were opposed to having controls with 166 in favour of controls.

We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees. Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority of 204 chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads were to have parking controls introduced with 194 in favour of controls. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this.

The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

Please note: Due to a number petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

12. Cricklade Avenue (OBJ-2045)

I strongly oppose the recommendation not to introduce parking controls in AREA 2 since it is already very difficult for residents like myself who live near Streatham Hill to find parking near our homes. We are normally forced to park elsewhere between Monday to Friday 8am - 5.30pm. Should the council follow through on proposed plan to only implement controlled parking in Area 2, then the obvious effect will be to push parking into the no-controlled areas close to Streatham Hill station and shopping areas creating an even worse parking situation for residents of the ABCD roads. It should be noted that the further one is from Streatham Hill the easier it is to park and it is highly likely that those with cars who live closer to Streatham Hill would have voted for controlled parking as it is us who feel the impact.

Officer response:

The council has made the appropriate recommendation and decision based on the results of the consultation as returned by residents / businesses in the area. From the detailed results for this area it is clear that the majority of 233 respondents were opposed to having controls with 166 in favour of controls.

We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees. Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority of 204 chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads were to have parking controls introduced with 194 in favour of controls. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this.

The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

Please note: Due to a number petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

13. Daysbrook Road (OBJ-2005)

Introducing a CPZ on the other side of Streatham Hill is highly likely to mean that the parking (and safety) problems we already have in Daysbrook, Wavertree, and Wyatt Park Roads will get considerably worse, as a consequence of displacement. This has already happened following the introduction of the CPZ including Roupell Road between Upper Tulse Hill and Christchurch Road - the parking pressure in Daysbrook Road has got noticeably worse since. Therefore, it is reasonable to suppose that those parking for commuting purposes in Telford Avenue and nearby will simply come over to the other side of the hill. It is noticeable from the results of your initial consultation that residents in both Daysbrook and Wyatt Park Roads have identified a problem, which your proposals more or less entirely ignore. Placing double yellow lines on these roads will simply make matters worse, unless other measures (for instance, preventing the use of Daysbrook Road as a 'rat run') are put in place. It is also worth pointing out that the Streatham Hill end of Wavertree Road is a very different proposition from the Hillside Road end, which may explain why Wavertree Road is not also green on your outcomes map. Therefore, I categorically oppose the introduction of a CPZ in 'Streatham Hill West'/area 2 unless you also introduce a CPZ in area 3 at least. Our quality of life in this road has been deteriorating in recent years as a consequence of the parking and associated traffic issues (including noise and air pollution), and these proposals will hasten that deterioration still further.

Officer response:

The council has made the appropriate recommendation and decision based on the results of the consultation as returned by residents / businesses in the area. From the detailed results for this area it is clear that the majority of 233 respondents were opposed to having controls with 166 in favour of controls.

We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees. Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority of 204 chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads were to have parking controls introduced with 194 in favour of controls. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this.

The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

Regarding the double yellow lines, the Council has duty and care to ensure the safety of all road users and to maintain access at all times, for public service vehicles and emergency services. In addition this will improve visibility and provide clear access particularly for vulnerable road users such as pedestrians, push chairs and wheelchair users. The Councils requirements for safety override the need for parking. The Highway Code stipulates that motorists should not park within 10 metres of a junction, however, every effort is made to minimise the extent of such restrictions.

Please note: Due to a number petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

14. Downton Avenue (OBJ-2023)

Following the initial consultation results, I write to oppose your decision not to introduce parking controls to Streatham Hill East. Most of the area is already heavily congested, especially during weekdays where commuters leave their cars and head to Streatham Hill Station or the bus stops to Brixton to access the tube network, employees of local businesses and parents/employees of local schools leave their cars. This is worse, the nearer to Streatham High Road you get, however over the 5+ years I have lived on Downton Avenue, it is apparent the number of cars parking in this area has increased. Introducing a CPZ to the neighbouring area, Streatham Hill West will mean parking will be impossible and the problem will just move and escalate. As a resident I find this unacceptable and urge you to reconsider this decision.

Officer response:

The council has made the appropriate recommendation and decision based on the results of the consultation as returned by residents / businesses in the area. From the detailed results for this area it is clear that the majority of 233 respondents were opposed to having controls with 166 in favour of controls.

We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees. Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority of 204 chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads where to have parking controls introduced with 194 in favour of controls. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this.

The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

Please note: Due to a number petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

15. Downton Avenue (OBJ-2026)

I am emailing you to oppose the current intention to disallow a parking restriction to be introduced to Downton Avenue. I currently live at XX Downton Avenue and I already experience issues with trying to park on our road. I am confident that the introduction of parking restrictions on Telford avenue and surrounding roads but not Downton will exacerbate the problem, especially when coupled with the new flats which have been built beside Streatham Hill station. I also know, having spoken to many of my neighbours that they too have similar concerns, wanted a CPZ to be introduced and they were in disbelief that our road seemingly voted against it!? If there are any next steps I should take to petition against this please let me know.

Officer response:

The council has made the appropriate recommendation and decision based on the results of the consultation as returned by residents / businesses in the area. From the detailed results for this area it is clear that the majority of 233 respondents were opposed to having controls with 166 in favour of controls.

We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees. Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority of 204 chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads where to have parking controls introduced with 194 in favour of controls. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this.

The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

Please note: Due to a number petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

16. Downton Avenue (OBJ-2030)

I am emailing to make clear my opposition to the non-implementation of the parking restrictions on Downton Avenue. I currently reside at number XX with my young family and am a car owner. We already experience problems on week days and Saturdays parking anywhere near our house which then leads to issues as I try to transport the 2 children (aged 3 and 1) plus any luggage back from the car. By implementing parking restrictions on all the surrounding roads but not ours this problem is only going to get worse. There will be even less parking and when we go to park on surrounding rounds (which we need to at the moment during busy times) we won't be able to as we won't be permitted so I can only guess at how far away I'm going to have to park – but it will probably involve me having to get a taxi back to my actual door! All so some commuter from Kent can save themselves some money by using our road as train car park for their commute. Add to this the added traffic on the road as all cars are filtered that way to find a 'free space' and we have yet more issues with noise and potential accidents. I understand we had an opportunity to vote and my wife did vote for the permits being introduced. But the turnout was appalling – 55 out of 195 people I believe of which only 38 voted against the permits. So basically you are making a decision that 19% of the people 'consulted' are actually pro on a decision that could have a pretty big unforeseen impact on the other 80%. Now I understand everyone had the opportunity to vote so we can only blame ourselves for not voting – but I

feel had the road known that all the surrounding roads were implementing the restrictions and potential knock on effects – we would not have seen the same lack of enthusiasm in the voting. Please let me know any further steps I should take to petition against this decision.

Officer response:

The council has made the appropriate recommendation and decision based on the results of the consultation as returned by residents / businesses in the area. From the detailed results for this area it is clear that the majority of 233 respondents were opposed to having controls with 166 in favour of controls.

We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees. Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority of 204 chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads were to have parking controls introduced with 194 in favour of controls. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this. Whilst the response rate may seem low, it's actually quite reasonable for this type of consultation.

The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

The council cannot force residents / businesses to participate in the consultation, but has used a number of methods of communication to enable people to get involved in the process.

Please note: Due to a number petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

17. Downton Avenue (OBJ-2032)

In response to the above intention I wish to object to the proposal for Streatham Hill East - Area 3: no CPZ I live on Downton Avenue and already we suffer greatly, competing for a parking space on our road with commuters, shoppers and residents from nearby developments, which will only worsen once the new London Square development on Streatham Hill is fully occupied. Now the initial proposal has been published and residents are fully aware of the implications, an opportunity for further consultation should be provided to affected residents in this area. The original consultation coincided with the Christmas period and I fear many residents were otherwise distracted with domestic matters, preparing for the Christmas holidays/travelling, hence the low number of submissions at the time. I fully support the implementation of a CPZ in the whole Streatham Hill area which includes the east side roads, particularly affecting my road Downton Avenue. The plan needs to ensure that the whole area is uniform and not just pockets providing parking for all visitors to the area and residents in neighbouring zones who do not wish to purchase parking permits in their own zone. The current proposal is not fair or democratic as the original consultation did not make clear that the whole area would be split into smaller sections and consequently an unequal outcome could occur. The full proposal enables affected residents to see the exact plan, it is imperative that we are given further opportunity to consider. The original consultation count should have been for the whole area with the majority count for the 'whole' area providing the result, not, each road placed in separate 'Areas'.

Officer response:

We generally consider breaking the zones up into smaller areas due to the hours and days of operation chosen, natural geographical boundaries and to stop inter-zonal commuting. Our methodology, as within previously consulted areas, has been to analyse the results on a road by road basis which then informs our decision on how to proceed.

A road by road analysis is necessary as the overall results can be misleading if roads from one particular area generated a higher response rate or more responses in general perhaps due to having more properties in that area. This is considered the most appropriate and fair method of analysing the results as not to impose parking controls into areas that had a majority respondents against the controls. The consultation material provided to residents does not suggest that the area would be adopted as one entire zone or nothing at all.

From the detailed results for this area it is clear that the majority of 233 respondents were opposed to having controls with 166 in favour of controls. We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees.

Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority of 204 chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads were to have parking controls introduced with 194 in favour of controls. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this.

The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

Please note: Due to a number of petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

18. Downton Avenue (OBJ-2042)

I refer to the Council's proposals to implement a CPZ at Streatham Hill West only. I live on Downton Avenue, located in Streatham Hill East. Since we moved here in 2016, we have found it increasingly difficult to park within a 50 metre radius of our house. There are many families living on our road and the inability to access your car quickly with small children (also bearing in mind that the road is busy and on the P13 bus route) increases the difficulty and danger of what should be a straightforward task. People who do not live in the area already exploit the ABCD roads (of which Downton Avenue is one) for their proximity to the station and bus routes servicing Brixton. It is one of the very few areas left that offer good commuter links with no parking restrictions. As a result, the roads are permanently busy, an issue that has been compounded of late due to the London Square development directly opposite these roads. The inevitable consequence of your proposal will be to only exacerbate these issues. The flaw in this plan is self-evident, and it is highly concerning that the Council are disregarding entirely the displacement effect of such proposals on Streatham Hill East. Of greater concern is that the details provided in the consultation were entirely silent on the prospect of splitting the wards in the event that an overall consensus was not reached on both sides of the High Road. Had it been made explicit (or even mentioned at all) that a CPZ might be introduced on one side only, then it is highly likely that this would have produced a different outcome, and certainly would have encouraged more people to participate on the East side. Given the flaws and limitations of the original consultation, the Council must either re-consult or implement an equivalent CPZ on the East side without further consultation.

Officer response:

We generally consider breaking the zones up into smaller areas due to the hours and days of operation chosen, natural geographical boundaries and to stop inter-zonal commuting. Our methodology, as within previously consulted areas, has been to analyse the results on a road by road basis which then informs our decision on how to proceed.

A road by road analysis is necessary as the overall results can be misleading if roads from one particular area generated a higher response rate or more responses in general perhaps due to having more properties in that area. This is considered the most appropriate and fair method of analysing the results as not to impose parking controls into areas that had a majority of respondents against the controls. The consultation material provided to residents does not suggest that the area would be adopted as one entire zone or nothing at all.

From the detailed results for this area it is clear that the majority of 233 respondents were opposed to having controls with 166 in favour of controls. We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees.

Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority of 204 chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads were to have parking controls introduced with 194 in favour of controls. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this.

The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

Please note: Due to a number of petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

19. Hillside Road (OBJ-2004)

I write further to the above and the statutory consultation, and your recent bulletin informing that you will not introduce a CPZ in East Streatham Hill. I am a resident of the Streatham Hill East area where I own two properties. I don't own a car. I am pleased that you will not be introducing a CPZ here and that you have communicated your proposals clearly, and decided the matter fairly. I now see that you are proposing double yellow line restrictions and this email is a response to that. I OPPOSE the restrictions proposed, for the same reasons that the CPZ was not introduced: it is unnecessary, restrictive to residents and visitors, will be costly to impose for the Council and place additional strain on resources to administer. As far as Streatham Hill East is concerned, I do not think there are any parking issues, and visitors tell me the same. Parking is never an issue for my visitors. This is why I think restrictions would be unnecessary, or at least disproportionate to what might be achieved. I look forward to seeing the results of this latest consultation.

Officer response:

Regarding the double yellow line proposals, the Council has duty and care to ensure the safety of all road users and to maintain access at all times, for public service vehicles and emergency services. In addition this will improve visibility and provide clear access particularly for vulnerable road users such as pedestrians, push chairs and wheelchair users. The Council's requirements for safety override the need for parking. The Highway Code stipulates that motorists should not park within 10 metres of a junction, however, every effort is made to minimise the extent of such restrictions.

20. Kingsmead Road (OBJ-2037)

With regard to Plan 2 of the revised proposal, I disagree with the proposal to paint a double yellow line outside of 48 Kingsmead Road. I understand the spirit of what the double yellow lines are intended to accomplish, but in the case of 48 Kingsmead which involves a bend in the road rather than a 'T' junction, the result will be counterproductive by encouraging higher vehicular speeds and greater risks of accidents.

1/ At present, the nature of the parked cars on the road obliges all vehicles to slow as they approach the corner. This is a good thing, as there are numerous children, pram pushers, older people and dog walkers on the street at anytime, as the location is directly opposite the path into Hillside Park.

2/ Kingsmead road is not a through road, so all traffic is for access only, hence there is no need to increase the speed on this street. Traffic jams do not occur as there are sufficient dropped curbs in the vicinity to allow the natural 'give and go' for vehicles.

3/ Visibility will not be improved as No. 48 has a hedge at the front of the property, which runs the length of the proposed double yellow line

4/ As No 48 sits on the corner of the road, the proposed lines will run for a long distance and perhaps up to 10 ten parking spaces will be displaced, which will have a significantly negative impact on the current parking harmony of the area.

Officer response:

The double yellow line proposals have been removed from this locations.

21. Palace Road (OBJ-2019)

I would like to appeal against the proposed action resulting from this poll. The way in which Lambeth have chose to interpret the results is incorrect, undemocratic and will only lead to increased parking difficulties in that area where a CPZ has been deemed not to be necessary. The poll was based on the premise that respondents were asking to vote on the suitability of a CPZ for a given area. The result across the entire area is in favour of a CPZ. However, Lambeth have chosen to divide the poll results arbitrarily in a manner which was not mentioned as an integral part of the original survey i.e. a suggested CPZ for only part of the surveyed area. If this action is taken, it is clear that this will lead to a much increased parking problem in that sub- area deemed by Lambeth not to require a CPZ. This is one reason why the area which was surveyed must be dealt with as a whole, in accordance with the original survey. Therefore I would like Lambeth to either respect the original result of the survey i.e. a CPZ area-wide OR re-run the survey in a way in which respondents are made aware of how the results will be interpreted in a way which is absolutely transparent. Could you please let me know how I can officially raise the level of my complaint through the correct channels - I am of the view that the way in which Lambeth are acting in this matter is undemocratic, unrepresentative of the resident's wishes and self-defeating in a way which is likely to prove more expensive in the long run i.e. misadministration. Therefore I would be grateful if you could please let me know if there is a mechanism by which I can raise these concerns either within Lambeth or if appropriate to a local government ombudsman?

Officer response:

We generally consider breaking the zones up into smaller areas due to the hours and days of operation chosen, natural geographical boundaries and to stop inter-zonal commuting. Our methodology, as within previously consulted areas, has been to analyse the results on a road by road basis which then informs our decision on how to proceed.

A road by road analysis is necessary as the overall results can be misleading if roads from one particular area generated a higher response rate or more responses in general perhaps due to having more properties in that area. This is considered the most appropriate and fair method of analysing the results as not to impose parking controls into areas that had a majority respondents against the controls. The consultation material provided to residents does not suggest that the area would be adopted as one entire zone or nothing at all.

We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees. Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads were to have parking controls introduced. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this.

The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

Please note: Due to a number petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

22. Palace Road (OBJ-2020)

I am responding to the outcome of your recent Streatham Hill CPZ Consultation. Although delighted that Telford Park and the West side of the Streatham High Road has been granted a CPZ I am furious that we haven't been given one in Palace Road and the ABC Roads. So much so that I have started a petition on the Lambeth Website which currently has over 120 signatures. My points are :

- At NO POINT were we informed that you could/would segregate the ward into an E/W CPZ.. WE voted AS A WHOLE
- All you will do is push the parking problems in Telford Park, Tierney Road and Montrell Road across the Streatham High Road into the ABC Roads and Wavertree, Palace, Hillside road etc.
- The consultation was very poorly distributed and very few people seemed to know anything about it, as proven by the appalling 14% turnout.
- Palace Road is impossible to park in during the week due to Tulse Hill Railway commuters, Bus drivers parking during their shifts, Commercial vehicles being left for weeks on end sometimes and a garage in Parade Mews SW2 who uses the street as workshop overspill. Some of these cars are untaxed as well.
- Lambeth should be discouraging driving in the borough, all you are doing is endorsing it by allowing commuter parking.
- If you have a car in London you must be prepared nowadays to pay to park it on street, Fulham & Hammersmith, Chelsea & Westminster and Wandsworth all do it so why can't you??
- The petition has over 120 signatures now, you NEED to readdress your CPZ ideas and have a new consultation for the East Side of the High Road ASAP

Lambeth need to wake up and see what they are about to create, by introducing a new CPZ all you will do is migrate the parking problem elsewhere, its basic human nature, people will leave their cars where they can for FREE.. Not difficult to work out. A segregated CPZ is NOT what we voted on, we were told that it was a blanket vote for the ward as a whole, you have lied and wriggled on this consultation and everyone in Tulse Hill feels very let down by you. I look forward to hearing back from you and also would like to know where similar email responses can be viewed.

Officer response:

We generally consider breaking the zones up into smaller areas due to the hours and days of operation chosen, natural geographical boundaries and to stop inter-zonal commuting. Our methodology, as within previously consulted areas, has been to analyse the results on a road by road basis which then informs our decision on how to proceed.

A road by road analysis is necessary as the overall results can be misleading if roads from one particular area generated a higher response rate or more responses in general perhaps due to having more properties in that area. This is considered the most appropriate and fair method of analysing the results as not to impose parking controls into areas that had a majority respondents against the controls. The consultation material provided to residents does not suggest that the area would be adopted as one entire zone or nothing at all.

We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees. Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads were to have parking controls introduced. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this. Whilst the response rate may seem low, it's actually quite reasonable for this type of consultation.

The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

Please note: Due to a number petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

23. Probyn Road (OBJ-2029)

I am writing to provide input with regards to the ongoing Streatham Hill CPZ and to offer my strong objections to the current plan being proposed and challenge the conclusions you have drawn. I live on Probyn Road with my partner and our 17-month old daughter. We own a car and do not have any off-street parking available at our property. When we use our car during weekdays (Mon-Fri), it is virtually impossible to find an available parking spot on Probyn Road if we return during the daytime (roughly from 8am - 7pm). This means we end up parking on Lanercost Road (usually towards the top end of the road of circa 5-7 minutes walk from our property). This is very difficult for us as most times there is one parent with a young child and other things to carry (eg shopping).

My understanding of the current proposals is that our parking problems will be made worse by introduction of yellow lines on a street that already has restricted parking availability. Further, I contest that your studies to date demonstrate that Probyn Road should be made a CPZ for the following two reasons:

- 1) The Independent parking study seems to demonstrate that Probyn Road suffers from parking stress.
- 2) The map version summary of responses to the consultation show that Probyn Road residents were in favour of a CPZ.

I have spoken with Councillor Rezina Chowdhury who informs me that the primary factor for the decision is based on resident feedback to the initial consultation. On this basis, I would expect the Council to recommend Probyn Road for a CPZ based on points 1 and 2 above. I would also contend that Probyn Road has different attributes to adjacent roads (eg Lanercost Road, Palace Road, Kingsmead Road) that encourage the need for a bespoke solution:

- 1) The vast majority of properties on Probyn Road do not have off-street parking options (whereas a significant number of properties on adjacent roads do have off-street parking options).
- 2) A significant part of Probyn Road (I estimate 25%) is restricted parking of max 1 hour (red route parking zone); I believe that none of the adjacent roads have such a parking zone in place.
- 3) Probyn Road (with the exception of a small stretch of Palace Road) is closer to Tulse Hill railway station than other streets in the area and therefore most prone to commuter parking at the east end of the consultation zone.
- 4) The Tulse Hill "H" CPZ currently restricts parking on all the streets adjacent to Tulse Hill railway station with the exception of Probyn Road and the east ends of Palace Road/Leigham Vale. This increases the parking stress on Probyn Road that other roads in the east end of the consultation zone are less prone to.

I would like to share two other observations with you. Firstly, we have recently become friendly with another couple with a young child who live on Lanercost Road. They informed us that they opposed the CPZ – their rationale was that they have an off street parking space and so a CPZ could be inconvenient for visitors. It is disappointing to learn that residents who have alternative parking options have equal voice to residents who only have on-street parking as an option. I am surprised that residents were not asked to declare their situation during the consultation. Secondly, there is a disabled parking bay on Probyn road that is never used. I would like to understand what steps need to be taken to retire disabled parking spaces when they are no longer needed. In conclusion, I ask that you revisit your findings and I offer a counter proposal for you to extend the existing Tulse Hill "H" CPZ to incorporate Probyn Road. As you can see from the attached map taken from the Lambeth website, such a move would make

the Tulse Hill "H" zone (pink on the map) a better deterrent for protecting local residents from commuters parking to use Tulse Hill railway station. I look forward to hearing a response to my counter-proposal and a clearer understanding for the basis for your current decision as it relates to Probyn Road.

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. To request that an un-used disabled bay be removed please visit the council website <https://www.lambeth.gov.uk/forms/enquire-about-installingremoving-a-disabled-bay-form>

Please note: Due to a number petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

24. Pullman Court (OBJ-2029)

My objections and arguments. Firstly and foremost - parking for residents with cars registered within the streatham ward should be free, your pay to park permit scheme is nothing more than a tax on drivers. Issue the permit for free. The cost of any infraction of parking should be 100% placed on the offender NOT on residents. If there is a business opportunity for a warden zone, then it should be self-sufficient, and not cost us anything. You are trying to resolve a problem with permits that cannot possibly work, you are zoning streets that even if only residents parked, there would still be insufficient parking for all with said permits. I would like to demand contention ratios for these said parking permits, and also number and type of bay? eg:- resident / pay display. Ergo :- you won't be providing better parking for residents as there would still be insufficient parking. Also you seem to have a runaway success in the area's 1 and 2 on the map you provided, however looking at the only road i really use in that area Tierney road, i can see how residents of that street are completely fed up with the parking situation, it's at best a 1.5 car width road, and often has cars parked on the left and right - restrictions are not going to help when every residence on the street has a car, there is physically not enough room. This is why your results are skewed, as residents scramble in hope something's been done. You should see the bigger picture, when homes with 2 cars apply for permits is that allowed? see how many residents change their vote, when they see the contention for the parking spaces - see how many change their vote. The survey never mentions or asks the above 2 questions - people will not be happy once the zone is imposed and they find that they are £XXX.XX out of pocket per car or have to get rid of the second car. Finally, I'm wondering what will happen when the residents realise they will be charged to park on a same street and now have to pay, but have the same issue finding a parking space, will they feel they are getting a service worth buying. BTW i have private parking - in my estate, and would use external parking less than 4 or 5 times a year - on those occasions what would happen to me - would i need to buy the permit for which zone? a full years permit for ??? perhaps i needed to park on Tierney road one night and or on wavertree road.

Officer response:

The proposed CPZ will prioritise parking for local residents within the scheme and remove the majority of 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 do 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.

You would not be entitled to a permit to park in the Streatham Hill 'G' CPZ as you are not within the CPZ boundary. Therefore, you would need to consider parking in the uncontrolled areas such as Area 3 or within the CPZ outside the hours of operation.

25. Streatham Hill East (OBJ-2001)

I have received the proposal to introduce parking restrictions in Streatham Hill. I am writing from Dr Doolittles Pet Shop, corner with Downton Avenue. Your proposal not to introduce a 2 hours in the G area only, will push people parking even more on the Hill East side. People park all day to use the railway at Streatham Hill. You will make the situation far worse than at present as everyone will want to park this side of Streatham Hill. I am small business and struggling already as it is. I have a 20min loading bay outside my shop and customers get regularly fine for shopping even though they are loading as the sign suggests. Who did you consult? Who are the 1023 people that replied? I

was not consulted and neither were the many neighbours I have spoken to in the area. Please reconsider the plan by introducing a 2 hours no parking slot this side too.

Officer response:

The council has made the appropriate recommendation and decision based on the results of the consultation as returned by residents / businesses in the area. From the detailed results for this area it is clear that the majority of respondents were opposed to having parking controls.

We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees. Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads were to have parking controls introduced. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this. Whilst the response rate may seem low, it's actually quite reasonable for this type of consultation.

The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

The informal consultation for the proposals to introduce parking controls in the Streatham Hill area commenced on 13 November 2017 and ended on 8 December 2017. 7,222 premises were sent consultation documents containing a newsletter 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 properties could complete and submit their views including comments. This was the primary method of participation in the consultation.

Please note: Due to a number petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

26. Streatham Hill East, ARRIVA (OBJ-2006)

Arriva London South has 16 garages, with one of its largest based in Streatham Hill. Arriva would like to formally oppose this CPZ with reasons detailed below. We fully understand the needs of residents but the needs of nearby businesses must also be considered, as many residents use the services provided by those businesses; We employ over 400 staff at Brixton garage, which lies at the heart of Streatham Hill ward. We actively encourage our staff to travel by bus or train but these bus drivers travel in from a wide area, often very early and very late in the day, so many need to travel by car. Travelling by public transport is unfortunately not an option for all of our staff. We are actively searching for more bus garage accommodation in this area: we already have insufficient space for the buses we operate in this area, so cannot give any bus garage space over to car parking (and that is before we investigate the impact of petrol regulations). It is already a challenge to retain enough bus drivers to operate the services that we do; removing parking opportunities that bus drivers currently have will make it much more difficult. If the Council wishes bus services to continue at current levels, it needs to consider how bus drivers can get to and from their place of work at unsocial hours. When discussing this subject with you, you suggested launching a car pool. That is not a possible solution when the remaining areas surrounding the garage are also controlled parking zones. Drivers are on separate rotas and come to work at different times of the day. These sign on times can vary or change, sometimes at short notice. Compiling a car pool may work for one week, but not for the rest in the year. A staff bus has already been considered. Drivers live all over London, Sussex, Kent and Surrey and therefore there is no ideal line of route that would make this service beneficial for the travelling masses. Arriva fully understands the importance and pressures that are placed on Lambeth Council. A split CPZ and the issuing of business permits, if necessary on a sliding scale, to help facilitate the introduction of a parking zone that meets the requirements of both local homeowners and businesses would in our opinion be widely welcomed. If you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me. If you would like to discuss these collaborative options further in person, please feel free to get in touch.

Officer response:

Very little consideration is given to commuters or businesses representing their staff. CPZ cannot accommodate for commuters in any form as they are the reason CPZ's are generally introduced. Residents are required to pay on average £180 to park their vehicles in a CPZ. It would be counterproductive and unfair to make residents pay to park and then allow commuters back into the area.

27. Streatham Hill East (WR-OBJ-2014) no address details received

I oppose to the plans to put double yellow lines on the following roads:

Amesbury Avenue; Barcombe Avenue; Cricklade Avenue; Daysbrook Road; Downtown Avenue; Emsworth Street; Faygate Road; Hillside Road, Kinfauns Road; Kingsmead Road; Lanercost Road; Leigham Vale; Normanhurst Road; Northstead Road; Nuthurst Avenue; Palace Road; Probyn Road; Roupell Road; Wavertree Road and Wyatt Park Road.

I don't see that there is any problem with these roads the way they are. It would seem that you only want to reduce the amount of parking spaces to create difficulties for those who voted not to implement parking restrictions in the Streatham Hill east area in the hopes that they will change their mind. You are bullies and only interested in creating more revenue probably in exchange for personal bonuses and benefits. There was no need to implement the parking restrictions around the Tulse hill area. Many of those roads were always half empty. Lambeth doesn't even have the decency to give residents at least one free permit. You are just all about making money at other's expense.

Officer response:

Regarding the double yellow line proposals, the Council has duty and care to ensure the safety of all road users and to maintain access at all times, for public service vehicles and emergency services. In addition this will improve visibility and provide clear access particularly for vulnerable road users such as pedestrians, push chairs and wheelchair users. The Council's requirements for safety override the need for parking. The Highway Code stipulates that motorists should not park within 10 metres of a junction, however, every effort is made to minimise the extent of such restrictions.

28. Streatham Hill East (OBJ-2043) no address details received

I want to register my objection to your proposals for CPZ in Streatham Hill. I am very disappointed in the fact that - without any re-consultation and post the vote - you decided to carve up Streatham Hill giving CPZ to some areas and not to others. I live in Streatham Hill East and we will not have CPZ. You have NOT solved the parking issues that blight Streatham Hill - you have simply moved the problem into a small area - a ridiculous and very short sighted decision. Why do you think this is a good idea?? The whole area voted in favour of CPZ. You have ignored this and cut the area up without consultation. It was not made clear to us from the beginning that this could be an outcome. Had it been known then the residents of Streatham hill may have voted differently as the issue becomes even more localised. Regrettably the whole of the UK voted to leave the EU by a small majority - the government have supported this view. It has not been cut up into 'areas' post the vote - with some areas being allowed to remain - so why have you done this here? You should stick with the majority decision. You can't change the rules after the event. It is not fair or right. Very disappointed in Lambeth.

Officer response:

We generally consider breaking the zones up into smaller areas due to the hours and days of operation chosen, natural geographical boundaries and to stop inter-zonal commuting. Our methodology, as within previously consulted areas, has been to analyse the results on a road by road basis which then informs our decision on how to proceed.

A road by road analysis is necessary as the overall results can be misleading if roads from one particular area generated a higher response rate or more responses in general perhaps due to having more properties in that area. This is considered the most appropriate and fair method of analysing the results as not to impose parking controls into areas that had a majority respondents against the controls. The consultation material provided to residents does not suggest that the area would be adopted as one entire zone or nothing at all.

We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees. Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads were to have parking controls introduced. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this.

The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

Please note: Due to a number petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

29. Streatham Hill East (OBJ-2043) no address details received

I am writing to object to the proposed CPZ for the Streatham Hill Area. As the council is intending to introduce parking controls on the west side of Streatham Hill only, I believe this will displace the existing parking problems for that area, subsequently moving the problems over to the east side of Streatham Hill. If this is implemented it will not be fair that East-side residents will not only have to deal with the further problems created by this (increased, dangerous double parking and waiting, affecting motorists and pedestrians alike) but they also will have to wait for another couple of years for another review. I also believe this will particularly affect the Amesbury, Barcombe, Cricklade and Downton Avenues between Streatham Hill and Emsworth street where extreme parking congestion already exists. I have previously complained about the danger that the traffic congestion in this area already creates, including my husband having been struck by a car due to the congested traffic when he was crossing Cricklade Avenue. To introduce parking controls to one area only is a short sighted solution to the problem. It will also prove a waste of council time to simply deal with one part of the problem when in the future the increasing parking stresses will inevitably require parking controls to the East-side area.

Officer response:

The council has made the appropriate recommendation and decision based on the results of the consultation as returned by residents / businesses in the area. From the detailed results for this area it is clear that the majority of respondents were opposed to having parking controls.

We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees. Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads were to have parking controls introduced. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this.

The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

Please note: Due to a number petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

30. Streatham Hill CPZ (G-OBJ-2046) & (G-OBJ-2049) no address details received

Against the proposed CPZ into Streatham Hill west area.

31. Wavertree Road (OBJ-2009)

I am a resident of Wavertree Road and I am objecting to your decision to NOT have a controlled parking zone. I requested it to be a CPZ for the following reasons which, given we will be surrounded by a CPZ, will only increase the issues and hazards from: Firstly pollution of both fumes and noise from cars rushing up and down trying to find somewhere to park. Secondly the dangerous driving, and selfish and aggressive attitude from people who do not live in my street but use it as a free car park. Thirdly the parking by Parents of Streatham and Clapham Prep School during drop off and collect. They park over drop-down curbs restricting access to my OWN drive. Fourthly the parking from bus drivers going to work, which means we do have a problem with car parking spaces already! It is only going to get worse given we are not going to be a CPZ. I often report parking violations in Wavertree Road - yet I have never seen an enforcement officer here. My fear is that the private school and the bus company had an influence on this decision, and I would like the council to discuss this at the meeting. Have you undertaken an environmental survey of pollution level in my road? I live in this road and I know both the high volume of dangerous driving and parking violations that occur daily. Are you listening to your voters or big companies?

Officer response:

The council has made the appropriate recommendation and decision based on the results of the consultation as returned by residents / businesses in the area. From the detailed results for this area it is clear that the majority of respondents were opposed to having parking controls.

We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees. Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads were to have parking controls introduced. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this.

The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

Please note: Due to a number petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

32. Wavertree Road (OBJ-2022)

I am strongly for introducing a CPZ for reasons of traffic control, safety of adults and children and looking after the needs of residents. I am strongly against your decision not to include Streatham Hill East in your decision, and only include Streatham Hill West (area G). Given your decision in do a CPZ in only 1 area, the answers to Question 6 (would you support / oppose a CPZ in your road if neighbouring roads were included). Streatham Hill West and East are neighbouring, and so this question becomes the critical decision point. So let's analyse Q6: A) The overall response to that question in the entire CPZ was 597 Yes, 364 No. A majority of 54.8% B) I reside on Wavertree Road. If you take A,B,C,D roads, plus Normanhurst, Nuthurst, Wavertree and Wyatt the answers to Q6 are 153 Yes 135 No (assuming quick mental sums are correct!). Again this is a clear majority. Including roads like Daysbrook makes the case stronger. In summary, your decision to only part include a CPZ must now mean your decision making is shifted towards the impact of a part CPZ on the remaining of your consulted area - and the Q6 becomes the determining factor. A creative answer might be to include East in the CPZ, but leave roads like Faygate "open" for non residents to Park free of charge. A quick survey of Faygate would show you it is a wide road, with lots of space on a regular basis.

Officer response:

The council has made the appropriate recommendation and decision based on the results of the consultation as returned by residents / businesses in the area. From the detailed results for this area it is clear that the majority of respondents were opposed to having parking controls.

We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees. Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads were to have parking controls introduced. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this.

The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

Please note: Due to a number petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

33. Wavertree Road (OBJ-2035)

I am against these proposals. I live on Wavertree Road and the proposed parking regulations mentioned in your letter - with restrictions in place on the western side of Streatham Hill but only in certain parts of the eastern side - would considerably worsen the current congestion issues on my road and those surrounding it. The demand for a reduced number of unrestricted spaces from commuters etc. would create a nightmare parking scenario for local residents. In short, the proposed CPZ is going to worsen the parking situation for many residents rather than improve it. Given 58% of residents who took part in the consultation favoured the CPZ, I believe the best solution is to create a CPZ for all of Streatham Hill. The current proposals are not acceptable.

Officer response:

The council has made the appropriate recommendation and decision based on the results of the consultation as returned by residents / businesses in the area. From the detailed results for this area it is clear that the majority of respondents were opposed to having parking controls.

We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees. Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads were to have parking controls introduced. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this.

We generally consider breaking the zones up into smaller areas due to the hours and days of operation chosen, natural geographical boundaries and to stop inter-zonal commuting. Our methodology, as within previously consulted areas, has been to analyse the results on a road by road basis which then informs our decision on how to proceed.

A road by road analysis is necessary as the overall results can be misleading if roads from one particular area generated a higher response rate or more responses in general perhaps due to having more properties in that area. This is considered the most appropriate and fair method of analysing the results as not to impose parking controls into areas that had a majority respondents against the controls.

The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

Please note: Due to a number petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

34. Wavertree Road (OBJ-2039)

I wanted to register my objection to the proposed actions outlined in your recent consultation conclusions. I object to the proposed non adoption for the Streatham Hill area - I live on Wavertree Rd - on the basis the consultation was flawed and as such the findings cannot be acted upon. I won't spend much time outlining thoughts here as I've seen some of the responses already and you have your excuses lined up. You won't be listening to anyone and you don't seem to want to apply any common sense. The problem is an area problem and 58% wanted CPZ. By carving up the patch you are simply funnelling the problem into a smaller area - it will not go away. It was not clear that you would be carving up the area - why would you - and so I think people not responding or not pursuing CPZ needed to know that the problem was being concentrated into a smaller area. There are various petitions going around that show this is a common chain of thought, and I feel like I have been deliberately misled. You should consult again, quickly, and make it clear what you are asking for and what the options are. It is not acceptable to wait 2yrs to see what the impact will be - it is obvious. You must have seen this before. Why do you think the non-residents using this area will now find alternative means of getting to work? Very disappointed in Lambeth.

Officer response:

The council has made the appropriate recommendation and decision based on the results of the consultation as returned by residents / businesses in the area. From the detailed results for this area it is clear that the majority of respondents were opposed to having parking controls.

We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees. Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads were to have parking controls introduced. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this.

We generally consider breaking the zones up into smaller areas due to the hours and days of operation chosen, natural geographical boundaries and to stop inter-zonal commuting. Our methodology, as within previously consulted areas, has been to analyse the results on a road by road basis which then informs our decision on how to proceed.

A road by road analysis is necessary as the overall results can be misleading if roads from one particular area generated a higher response rate or more responses in general perhaps due to having more properties in that area. This is considered the most appropriate and fair method of analysing the results as not to impose parking controls into areas that had a majority respondents against the controls.

The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

Please note: Due to a number petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

35. Wavertree Road (OBJ-2040)

I would like the following areas of objection to be considered in making the final decision as to whether a further formal statutory consultation on the CPZ is to take place. I am requesting that I and the East area of Streatham Hill are included in the formal consultation.

Systra parking survey

- The Systra paper published states that 'Parking occupancy surveys will form an important requirement of the parking review process' and will identify the level of 'parking supply, demand and identify areas of parking stress'
- Systra highlight the 'ripple effect' caused by CPZ's.
- The survey was intended to determine stress levels street by street and to provide an understanding of parking supply.
- The overall parking stress level for this area was 'moderately high' with the majority 12 out of 20) of the roads in the Streatham Hill East zone having parking stress described as very high (9/12 between 80 and 100%, 3/12 above 100%).

Whilst the survey did identify parking stress on the majority of roads, it failed to take into account that many of the affected roads are significantly long, with one end at Streatham Hill – a natural point for people to park to get on buses toward the Brixton tube. Indeed the roads with highest stress, Wavertree, Wyatt Park, Palace, Barcombe and Amesbury all have a junction with Streatham Hill or, as in the case of Daysbrook and Roupell, are at the Streatham Hill end of the zone. It is notable too that the Lanercost, Leigham Vale and Probyn roads also have high parking stress and are close to Tulse Hill station.

It is puzzling that whilst the survey, at considerable costs to Lambeth residents, was commissioned, this survey did not lead to a more nuanced consultation, given that it was to form 'an important requirement of the parking review process'. I suggest that a more appropriate way of consulting about parking would be to further extend the consultation to more detailed 'zones' in order that the impact on those properties and residents closest to main public transport routes are effectively represented. Given that there is to be a formal consultation initiated in the Streatham Hill West area I would like for this to be extended to East and for a final report to take into account the location of responders as this can then feed in to better parking planning. For example, it may be necessary to put CPZ in those areas which support it, if those areas are geographically coherent. E.g. one of half of a long street.

Legal requirement

There is a legal requirement about the weight to be given to various factors when introducing parking subjects to permits...in particular regard has to be given to

- The need to maintain free movement of traffic
- The need to maintain reasonable access to premises
- The extent to which off street parking is available

In addition

- Air quality

Should be taken into account.

The current proposal does not address any of these areas. Indeed, it is apparent that at a variety of points during the day the congestion in the roads toward Streatham Hill is significant, causing traffic jams, risking emergency service movement. This congestion also contributes to an already well-established air pollution issue. In particular the congestion and gridlock that occurs on Wyatt Park, Wavertree, Nurthurst and Daysbrook is the cause of 'road rage' and horn honking and has over recent years caused significant upset to me and my children. The lack of CPZ also encourages people to drive into the areas and this adds further to the established issue, as documented by the Green party, of an increase in collisions on this stretch of Streatham Hill. In order to satisfy the legal requirement and indeed a reasonable democratic response, Lambeth council should include Streatham Hill East in the formal survey consultation.

Local business

Whilst it is proper that local business should respond to this consultation it is not clear, given that the consultation was an open consultation with anyone able to respond, giving any local address, that those who work in local business (rather than using them) were excluded from the survey.

Our experience is that the Streatham and Clapham school and the Telford bus garage give rise to significant parking stress and contribute to both congestion and air pollution

Ripple

Since the initial 'informal survey' and further formal survey has been implemented in the South Streatham Area. This, if a CPZ is agreed, is likely to have a significant 'ripple' effect on parking, further increasing the stress in the Streatham Hill East zones. The parking consultation phasings' have not supported the community to make well informed decisions. In fact, if residents had known about a possible CPZ in South Streatham they may have voted differently, given that the outcome could leave just a small pocket of free parking in this area which leave local residents with almost no availability and would further exacerbated the existing traffic congestion. It has now been proposed that there will be an increase in the yellow lines on the corner of the streets. We were not asked about this and it will further reduce available parking. This is very unwelcome. Given this additional consultation, the outcome for the West Streatham Hill zone (and the inevitable increased parking stress from this), it seems sensible to include Streatham Hill East in a formal consultation, particularly given the marginal nature of the overall result and the lack of opportunity for a review for two years. I request that this takes place.

Officer response:

Lambeth CPZ proposals are initiated by residents through requests, petitions and campaigning the Council and their Ward Councillors to be consulted on parking controls to alleviate the parking pressure they experience. Parking surveys have also confirmed that the majority of roads experience high levels of parking stress.

On this basis, the council took the decision to carry out an informal consultation in the uncontrolled areas in order to gauge the views of residents and businesses on the possible introduction of a CPZ. This has since led to the statutory consultation. The majority of requests for parking controls in the Streatham Hill area including a petition came from the area west of Streatham Hill (A23), with only a few from the area on the east side.

It is common practice to consult an area beyond the requested roads to anticipate the possible displacement effect when resolving parking difficulty in one area.

The council has made the appropriate recommendation and decision based on the results of the consultation as returned by residents / businesses in the area. From the detailed results for this area it is clear that the majority of respondents were opposed to having parking controls.

We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees. Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads where to have parking controls introduced. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this.

We generally consider breaking the zones up into smaller areas due to the hours and days of operation chosen, natural geographical boundaries and to stop inter-zonal commuting. Our methodology, as within previously consulted areas, has been to analyse the results on a road by road basis which then informs our decision on how to proceed.

A road by road analysis is necessary as the overall results can be misleading if roads from one particular area generated a higher response rate or more responses in general perhaps due to having more properties in that area. This is considered the most appropriate and fair method of analysing the results as not to impose parking controls into areas that had a majority respondents against the controls. Although many of the factors you have highlighted benefit from a CPZ, however, parking controls are only introduced in an area that have a majority in favour. The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

The double yellow line proposals were shown on the detailed plans and explained in the informal consultation newsletter. The Council has duty and care to ensure the safety of all road users and to maintain access at all times, for public service vehicles and emergency services. In addition this will improve visibility and provide clear access

particularly for vulnerable road users such as pedestrians, push chairs and wheelchair users. The Councils requirements for safety override the need for parking. The Highway Code stipulates that motorists should not park within 10 metres of a junction, however, every effort is made to minimise the extent of such restrictions.

Please note: Due to a number petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

36. Wyatt Park Road (OBJ-2007)

I am writing in response to the consultation results sent to our address on Wyatt Park Road, Streatham Hill.

I am very disappointed that the CPZ is not proposed for Area 3 although residents in Wyatt Park Road and several surrounding/adjoining streets supported it. Wyatt Park Road parking is a particular problem for residents as not only is the road much narrower than many surrounding streets (making passing other vehicles impossible) within the proposed Area 3 it is also very close to the school on Daysbrook Road, the Bus Station on Streatham High Road and the heavily used shops immediately at the end of Wyatt Park Road (Sainsburys Local and the Mediterranean Food Centre). People who work on Streatham High Road also park on the lower section of Wyatt Park Road because of its closeness to the High Road and public transport links. I would like to petition for the inclusion of Wyatt Park Road within any CPZ. Can Area 2 be extended to include the streets immediately around the bus station or within a set distance back from the High Road? If the CPZ is only applied to Area 1 and 2 this will apply even more pressure to the areas immediately adjacent within Area 3 and make parking for residents even more of a problem than now.

Officer response:

The council has made the appropriate recommendation and decision based on the results of the consultation as returned by residents / businesses in the area. From the detailed results for this area it is clear that the majority of respondents were opposed to having parking controls.

We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees. Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads were to have parking controls introduced. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this.

The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

Please note: Due to a number petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

37. Wyatt Park Road (OBJ-2008)

I am writing in response to the consultation results sent to our address on Wyatt Park Road, Streatham Hill.

I am very disappointed that the CPZ is not proposed for Area 3 although residents in Wyatt Park Road and several surrounding/adjoining streets supported it. Wyatt Park Road parking is a particular problem for residents for the following reasons:

- It is narrower than the other parallel roads feeding onto Streatham High Road making passing impossible.
- It is very close to the school on Daysbrook Road, the Bus Station on Streatham High Road, Sainsburys Local, the MFC Supermarket and the Edith Cavell Primary Healthcare Centre – all heavily accessed by car users.
- People who work on Streatham High Road park on the lower section of Wyatt Park Road, and commuters also park on it because of its proximity to public transport links.

If the CPZ is only applied to Area 1 and 2 this will apply even more pressure to the areas immediately adjacent within Area 3 and make parking for residents even more of a problem than now. I would like to petition for the inclusion of Wyatt Park Road within any CPZ. Can Area 2 be extended to include the streets immediately around the bus station or within a set distance back from the High Road?

Officer response:

The council has made the appropriate recommendation and decision based on the results of the consultation as returned by residents / businesses in the area. From the detailed results for this area it is clear that the majority of respondents were opposed to having parking controls.

We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees. Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads were to have parking controls introduced. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this.

The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

Please note: Due to a number of petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

38. Wyatt Park Road (OBJ-2036) – Lead Petitioner

On behalf of those who have signed the attached petition (original copies of the petition will be sent by post, with a copy of this letter, to the Parking Design Team), I would like to oppose the outcome of the consultation carried out last year on proposals to introduce a controlled parking zone in Streatham Hill, specifically with regards to Area 3, Streatham Hill East. We feel that the consultation process was thoroughly misleading and has resulted in a scenario for residents of Area 3, which will make parking and road safety in the area significantly worse than it is currently – and it is already incredibly bad. When responding to the consultation, we responded in relation to the area as a whole and as such would expect the introduction of CPZ in the whole area given the 58% vote in favour across the area. Nowhere was it made clear that following the collation of results, the area would be subdivided into smaller areas and CPZ would be introduced into some, but not all of these areas. What this is creating is a pocket of parking/driving chaos and danger in Area 3, where all those cars which historically parked in Areas 1 and 2 will be pushed into Area 3 (and less so Area 4 due to proximity). Rarely can we park anywhere near to our houses at the moment due to the parking of commuters/Arriva bus drivers/teachers/shop workers – hence the majority support of those living on Wyatt Park Road, Daysbrook Road, Nuthurst Ave, Amesbury Avenue, to the original consultation. Yet here we find ourselves, having been misled by the original consultation, in a situation where the problem will be exacerbated abundantly. We therefore petition Lambeth Council to re-consult the residents of Area 3, for a number of reasons as detailed below:

- The Streatham Hill area collectively voted in favour of the CPZ. At the time of consultation there was no indication that the Streatham Hill area would be divided into Areas following the collation of votes for and against the CPZ proposals – thus we declare that the consultation was misleading.
- We feel the residents were not given the full information in order to understand the implication of rejecting a CPZ in the Area 3.
- It was not made clear that those who voted against the CPZ would suffer the consequences of those receiving a CPZ – the already hugely problematic parking and road safety in Area 3 will be exacerbated immeasurably as a result.
- We feel that many of those who originally cast votes against the CPZ proposals would have voted differently had they understood that the area would be subsequently divided, and that they would suffer the consequences of those receiving a CPZ.
- Large areas of Area 3, including Wyatt Park Road and Amesbury Avenue, voted in favour of introducing a CPZ, yet are excluded from benefiting from the CPZ for which they voted in favour.
- Those in Area 3, including the large areas that voted in favour, will suffer a significantly worsened parking situation as a result of surrounding roads receiving a CPZ. Additionally this is likely to significantly enhance danger on the roads, particularly thin roads such as Wyatt Park Road / Wavertree where cars cannot pass one another. Lest we forget that this is a very family oriented residential area, with a school in the middle of the area. There are significant safety considerations which should be taken into account. Road rage, speeding and chaotic driving on Wyatt Park Road is already exceptionally bad – I can only imagine how this will increase danger on our road and surrounding roads.
- Finally we feel that Lambeth Council did not make clear the extent of the double yellow lines that are to be introduced when the CPZ comes into force in this area, which will limit parking further still.

We look forward to a speedy response to our petition and the various concerns raised, and hope that you come to the decision to re-consult Area 3.

Officer response:

The majority of requests for parking controls in the Streatham Hill area including a petition came from the area west of Streatham Hill (A23), with only a few from the area on the east side.

It is common practice to consult an area beyond the requested roads to anticipate the possible displacement effect when resolving parking difficulty in one area.

We generally consider breaking the zones up into smaller areas due to the hours and days of operation chosen, natural geographical boundaries and to stop inter-zonal commuting. The consultation material provided to residents does not suggest that the area would be adopted as one entire zone or nothing at all.

Our methodology, as within previously consulted areas, has been to analyse the results on a road by road basis which then informs our decision on how to proceed. A road by road analysis is necessary as the overall results can be misleading if roads from one particular area generated a higher response rate or more responses in general perhaps due to having more properties in that area. This is considered the most appropriate and fair method of analysing the results as not to impose parking controls into areas that had a majority respondents against the controls.

From the detailed results for this area it is clear that the majority of 233 respondents were opposed to having controls with 166 in favour of controls.

We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees. Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority of 204 chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads were to have parking controls introduced with 194 in favour of controls.

This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this. The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

Please note: Due to a number petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

Representations - Comments for the proposals

1. Barcombe Avenue (COM-3017)

I live on Barcombe Avenue, and was in favour of the CPZ in our area. I know a lot of residents were against it, but only because they thought it would be expensive. They never really thought much more about it. Certainly, no thought was given to the potential future of a partial decision which appears to have been made. ie. A CPZ on the East side of Streatham Hill, but not the West side. Surely, this will only push all the cars that are being parked there onto the already busy streets on the West side? Couple that with the increase in cars from the new development at Streatham Hill, surely you will need to revisit a CPZ in no time at all. Would it not be best use of public spending to deal with the issue in one go? Please reconsider the CPZ on the West side too.

Officer response:

The council has made the appropriate recommendation and decision based on the results of the consultation as returned by residents / businesses in the area. From the detailed results for this area it is clear that the majority of respondents were opposed to having parking controls.

We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees. Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads were to have parking controls introduced. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this.

The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

Please note: Due to a number petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

2. Daysbrook Road (COM-3002)

I am a resident of Daysbrook Road and am very disappointed at the councils decision not to implement Controlled Parking in my street. The proposed controlled parking in Thornton R EXT and Streatham Hill West will mean that parking in the Streatham Hill East and Tulse Hill West will become even more impossible and cause untold problems - PLEASE COULD SOMEONE ACTUALLY TAKE THIS INTO ACCOUNT!! and explain the knock on effect to all these people who think we don't need Controlled Parking. We are constantly bothered by the traffic using our road; Staff from Brixton Hill Bus Garage; Staff from nearby health Centre; Drivers using Daysbrook Road as a cut through when traffic backed up on Streatham High Road - especially during the evening rush hour -suggest you actually monitor this on a regular basis. Staff from Streatham Hill and Clapham School, Parents dropping and collecting children from Streatham Hill and Clapham School - again suggest you monitor this on a regular basis - often if they cannot park they just stop in the middle of the road and let their children out and then sit and wait till they have gone into the school causing complete chaos!! On the odd occasion we take our car out during the week it is quite typical that we have to park 2 or 3 streets away. WE ARE COMPLETELY FED UP WITH THIS CONSTANT parking/congestion/pollution issues. WE DEMAND THAT IN LIGHT OF NO CONTROLLED PARKING in our street that you address the traffic problems and implement at least some traffic calming measures - your proposed restrictions are completely inadequate and the ones we have now are never adhered to or monitored.

Officer response:

The council has made the appropriate recommendation and decision based on the results of the consultation as returned by residents / businesses in the area. From the detailed results for this area it is clear that the majority of respondents were opposed to having parking controls.

We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees. Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads were to have parking controls introduced. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this.

The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

As part of the councils Our Streets programme, there will be improvements to the street environment including traffic calming works and road crossing improvements. Following recent engagement we've begun to draw up proposals that cover the points raised by residents and businesses in the Thornton, St Leonards, Streatham Wells and Streatham South wards. Please visit the website www.lambeth.gov.uk/ourstreets for more information.

Please note: Due to a number petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

3. Daysbrook Road (COM-3006)

I write in response to your letter giving results of the recent CPZ consultation in the Streatham Hill area. I am resident in Daysbrook Road, in the 'east side' region of Streatham Hill (area 3 in your letter). In the small overall response rate 14.2%, area 3 voted against CPZ whereas the neighbouring area on the west side (area 2) voted for CPZ and the recommendation in your letter is that CPZ is introduced in area 2 but not in area 3. I am concerned that this divergence and subsequent differing status in parking in the two neighbouring regions immediately adjacent of the High Road will (obviously!) lead to further pressure in parking in area 3. Surely it is fair that all regions in the area have the same parking restrictions (or no restrictions at all). Rather than conduct another (no doubt costly) consultation when residents in area 3 become subject to unacceptable levels of parking pressure, I hope that this uniform approach for the region as a whole can be adopted from the outset.

Officer response:

The council has made the appropriate recommendation and decision based on the results of the consultation as returned by residents / businesses in the area. From the detailed results for this area it is clear that the majority of respondents were opposed to having parking controls.

We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees. Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads were to have parking controls introduced. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this.

The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

Please note: Due to a number petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

4. Daysbrook Road (COM-3011)

I am writing with my concerns and your decision not to implement parking restrictions on DAYSBROOK ROAD and WAVERTREE ROAD. I have lived at this address for over 20 years and I am very concerned of the amount of traffic -arguments and the roads being used as a cut through from the south circular. As a result of parking restrictions to the Brixton area across from Roupell road and other roads leading to Brixton. Your proposals for the areas to have parking restrictions introduced will only pushed the parking to our area and road, which is already increased over the past 2 years. We not only have to contend with the bus drivers parking on our Road (after their free parking was sold and flats built) we have a new set of flats built at the end of the road - new Doctors surgery and a new nursery where the old doctors surgery was! As well as the Streatham school on the corner which causes many arguments in the am and evening. This has increased the parking on our road. The road also has less parking and it is completely full by 6.30 when not only the bus drivers park, but many people park to catch the bus's on the High road and catch the train from Streatham Hill Station. I strongly feel that our road needs more than double yellow lines and no waiting bays! We are very congested already and with the new proposals it is only going to push the problem to our area and road which already has many traffic and parking issues. Since the opposite side of the South circular Roupell road and surrounding roads have restrictions - Palace road and Daysbrook have taken the traffic and parking! I will post you the photos I have taken to show the congestion — parking road rage every day on our road! It will only get worse! I witness fights arguments every morning and night time -where cars cannot get past each other. I cannot park in my road on many occasions and cannot even park in Wavertree or palace road at times. I would like our road to be considered to have restrictions to ease the congestion and road rage on this road.

Officer response:

The council has made the appropriate recommendation and decision based on the results of the consultation as returned by residents / businesses in the area. From the detailed results for this area it is clear that the majority of respondents were opposed to having parking controls.

We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees. Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads were to have parking controls introduced. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this.

The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

Please note: Due to a number petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

5. Downton Avenue (COM-3003)

I provide the following comment on the result of the CPZ consultation in the Streatham Hill East area. Although the majority of respondents in this area were against a CPZ, this masks a significant problem with parking in that part of the area which is nearest to Streatham Hill Station. To support my assertion from the findings of your

survey report dated 11/10/2017, I have compared Average Unrestricted Parking Stress for Emsworth Street (96%) and Faygate Road (52%). These two streets are of similar length do not have any residences in them, so the only explanation for this significant difference between these two streets must be that Emsworth Street is nearer to Streatham Hill Station. On the basis of this finding I suggest that the Streatham Hill West CPZ be extended as far as Faygate Road on the east side of Streatham Hill.

Officer response:

The council has made the appropriate recommendation and decision based on the results of the consultation as returned by residents / businesses in the area. From the detailed results for this area it is clear that the majority of respondents were opposed to having parking controls.

We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees. Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads were to have parking controls introduced. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this.

The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

Please note: Due to a number petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

6. Downton Avenue (COM-3005)

I understand that the consultation for the above, where I live at XX Downton Avenue, led to the public saying that they are/were not in favour for a CPZ in Streatham Hill East. I think the outcome is/was wrong and should be taken out of the public's hands. Now that Streatham Hill West has a CPZ, plus with the new M&S and other shops due to open and with the new residents moving into the London Square, it will mean that parking will become even more difficult for the residents at Streatham Hill East. I find it difficult enough to find parking relatively close to where I live now, let alone with the aforementioned change in circumstances. The number of commuters that already use the roads around where I live must be considerable. I also feel that LBC are missing a trick with not having additional CPZs to increase revenue, which could be reinvested back into the roads in the relevant areas. I understand that it would be quite an expensive initial cost but, as with the refuse/recycling wheely bins that were introduced relatively recently, I think that initial cost would be worth it and would earn money in the long run. Also, increased Council presence with parking wardens during the daytime may discourage fly tippers from dumping on roads such as Emsworth Road near Downton Avenue.

I do understand that it will be difficult for certain residents to afford the annual fee for parking but as per Council tax, this could perhaps be done on a ratchet mechanism. In sum, parking is difficult enough as it is on Downton Avenue without the increasing numbers coming in from the London Square development and the displacement due to be caused by introducing CPZs in Streatham Hill West. I do hope the decision to not have CPZs in SHE will be reconsidered and that we have them in the not-too-distant future.

Officer response:

The council has made the appropriate recommendation and decision based on the results of the consultation as returned by residents / businesses in the area. From the detailed results for this area it is clear that the majority of respondents were opposed to having parking controls.

We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees. Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads were to have parking controls introduced. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this.

The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

Please note: Due to a number petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

7. Downton Avenue (COM-3008)

I feel the recent results is a missed opportunity to address ever increasing parking issues in the proposed Controlled Parking zones for Streatham Hill. Nobody wants to have to pay for a resident permit but immediately the issues of trying to easily park close to your own property would be solved. I live at XX Downton Avenue and considering the distance from the main road I still struggle to get a parking space outside my home as many people park the full length of the road. The recent consultation result showing different proposals for area 1, 2 and 3 seem pointless due the relative closeness of the areas. All it does is overwhelmed the adjoining area which for example area 1 and 2 is separated by a main road. We have businesses like car dealers who park multiple vehicles on Downton Avenue as well as Faygate road which just adds to the problems. A permit scheme and restricted hours over a longer period are more effective than just a token couple of hours between 10am and midday and a small amount of double yellow lines at junctions etc. You just make it even harder for residents to park their vehicles close to their home during the day. We still have an ever dangerous mini roundabout on Downton Avenue with Faygate Road where we have constant accidents and even car fires yet having lived in Lambeth for 43 years I've yet to see Lambeth do anything about it. I thought Lambeth had improved but sadly ill thought ideas still rule.

Officer response:

The council has made the appropriate recommendation and decision based on the results of the consultation as returned by residents / businesses in the area. From the detailed results for this area it is clear that the majority of respondents were opposed to having parking controls.

We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees. Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads where to have parking controls introduced. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this. The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

The informal consultation results have shown that the largest majority of respondents' for Zone G support the 10am-12 Noon hours of operation, from the options provided.

As part of the councils Our Streets programme, there will be improvements to the street environment including traffic calming works and road crossing improvements. Following recent engagement we've begun to draw up proposals that cover the points raised by residents and businesses in the Thornton, St Leonards, Streatham Wells and Streatham South wards. Please visit the website www.lambeth.gov.uk/ourstreets for more information.

Please note: Due to a number petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

8. Downton Avenue (COM-3018)

I am the owner of and resident at XX Downton Avenue, Streatham Hill, London SW2 3TS. I recently completed your questionnaire on the Proposed CPZ in the Streatham Hill Area. I do feel there is an escalating parking problem in this area and opted for the 2 hour Mon - Fri parking restriction in Downton Avenue and surrounding streets to help eliminate daily commuter/shopper parking. I note with dismay that the majority of people in these roads either did not respond or felt there was no problem. I now gather that a CPZ will be established in Streatham Hill West "G" around Telford Avenue. This will make the parking in Streatham East roads 10 times worse than it is now as those vehicles formerly in the West are forced to park on our side of the High Road. I urgently ask you to reconsider your decision and make all residents fully aware of the implications of enforcing a CPZ in one zone and not the neighbouring zone.

Officer response:

The council has made the appropriate recommendation and decision based on the results of the consultation as returned by residents / businesses in the area. From the detailed results for this area it is clear that the majority of respondents were opposed to having parking controls.

We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees. Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads were to have parking controls introduced. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this. The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

Please note: Due to a number petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

9. Downton Avenue (COM-3023)

I write regarding the proposed parking as they affect my road. I am in favour of a CPZ being put in place in Areas 3 & 4. My house is next to a property which regularly has up to five vehicles parked outside or nearby, including a camper van and electric cars. I know that my neighbours on the other side object strongly to the CPZ, because they appear to believe that they own the space on the road belong to non-residents leaving their cars while they go to work. Downton Avenue is part of the P13 bus route. It is often difficult for the bus drivers to let down passengers as the stops on the road because of heavy parking and people waiting for the bus have to go on to the road to hail a bus which is dangerous, particularly for the elderly. Entry, into Downton Avenue from Streatham Hill is difficult for all traffic because of the other traffic and heavy parking. I have been attending meetings about the re-development of St. Margaret the Queen Church on Barcombe Avenue. Parking problems always cause discussion at these meetings. Most residents are not aware of this change to the area and the resulting need for parking. Anyone walking round area 3 will be aware of the parking in the through roads like Emsworth Street and Faygate Road which are fully parked every day and have no houses fronting them. Please re-consider introducing the CPZ in areas 3 and 4 as I believe that these areas cannot cope with more vehicles coming into the area looking for free parking. Most residents when responding to the consultation only thought about themselves and did not consider changes to the community needs of the area.

Officer response:

The council has made the appropriate recommendation and decision based on the results of the consultation as returned by residents / businesses in the area. From the detailed results for this area it is clear that the majority of respondents were opposed to having parking controls.

We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees. Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads were to have parking controls introduced. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this. The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

Please note: Due to a number petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

10. Palace Road (COM-3001)

Thank you for the results of the Proposed Controlled Parking Zone Streatham Hill Area.

With relation to Streatham Hill (areas 3 and 4) it outlines what measures will be taken for safety issues may I ask what if any weight has been placed on additional Disabled Parking Bays within the area given the new Centre for Adults with Learning Disabilities on Place Road/ Coburg Crescent and that of the Vulnerable and Disabled residents of Cheshire Estate / Abborfield Close and Palace Road Estate and those within the zone who are finding it increasingly more difficult to find parking on Place Road and surroundings given the limited parking that the Estate has to offer . I am aware that two Disabled Bays and an Ambulance Bay was introduced near the Palace Road Surgery without consultation and would hope that this consideration would be looked at. May I also ask that measures are taken to protect the Drop Kerbs in the area and especially along Place Road / Daysbrook Road and Roupell Road given the many wheelchair users who access the Place Road Surgery and that of the new Centre to be built.

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.

The Ambulance Bay and Disabled bay were introduced by the developer of the new surgery without consultation, therefore these bays will either be removed as part of the implementation works or a public consultation must be carried out in order to formalise these facilities.

Double yellow lines will be introduced at the junction of Palace Road (and continue to the cul-de-sac), Daysbrook Road and Roupell Road.

11. Streatham Hill East (COM-3015) no address details received

As residents who live on the east side of Streatham Hill, we are in favour of CPZ as long as residents are not charged for parking vehicles on our road because we already have to pay a high council tax bill and taxes to the government. Over the years, our residents have noticed that drivers who do the school run tend to park their car for a long time outside our road. My house is next door to a school and we have noticed an increased amount of traffic, creating increased noise and fumes along this road for a number of years between the hours of 8.00am to 8.30am and around 4.00pm. A solution would be for more children to take public transport or encourage children to walk to and from school. Other commuters going to work also tend to park their cars along our road, making it difficult for our residents to find a parking space for their own vehicles and for trades people who need to do work for residents. Also bus drivers tend to park their cars on our roads on weekends as well. What does "At any time" waiting restrictions in various roads at key locations mean? Especially if we need trades people who have to do work on our houses, for example: plumbers, electricians, builders etc, How would a CPZ affect these tradespeople if residents have to call them out to do a job? I am not in favour of a CPZ if residents have to pay a charge for our tradespeople to park. Our residents, family, friends (and traders who are working for residents) should be allowed to park their vehicles on their own roads and not be charged for parking at all. However, I do object to all other commuters parking for hours on our roads.

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.

As no CPZ will be introduced in your area Trades people will not require a permit or visitors voucher to park. At any time waiting restrictions are double yellow lines, to be introduced at junctions, cul-de-sacs and locations deemed unsafe for parked vehicles.

12. Wavertree Road (COM-3010)

I'm really disappointed that the Area 3 will not be part of the Parking controls, I live on Wavertree Road near the girls school which makes it impossible to park my car near my house, it's always a battle and I end up parking 200 yards away, I have a 2 years old child so this is extremely inconvenient. I also find many bus drivers park and leave their cars on our street, the road is becoming terribly busy and congested. Would it be possible to have a parking restriction up to Nurthurst Ave. I cannot understand why we could not to do?

Officer response:

The council has made the appropriate recommendation and decision based on the results of the consultation as returned by residents / businesses in the area. From the detailed results for this area it is clear that the majority of respondents were opposed to having parking controls.

We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees. Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads where to have parking controls introduced. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and

chose not to have controls in spite of this. The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

CPZs are only effective on an area basis, introducing one or two roads does not allow for overspill into adjacent CPZ roads in the case that your road has limited parking capacity.

Please note: Due to a number petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

13. Wavertree Road (COM-3016)

I am contacting you regarding the introduction of a CPZ in Streatham Hill (Area 3). Please resend the questionnaire, as I believe, the information given to the residents did not contain the full details we needed to fully understand the implications of rejecting a CPZ in Area 3. You did not make it fully clear, the extent of the double yellow lines that are due to be introduced when the CPZ is in force, and how it will limit the existing parking further. You didn't make it clear in the documentation that Streatham Hill would be split into areas for and against, and those deemed against would suffer the consequences of those receiving a CPZ. These consequences were only mentioned much later, when we could see the plans, and after most people had already submitted their response. I would like you to enter into another consultation with the residents of Area 3 allowing them to reconsider their views, now that the implementations of the introduction of a CPZ have been made clearer. I live in Wavertree Road, within Area 3, and am in favour of the CPZ.

Officer response:

The double yellow line proposals are shown on the detailed plans which were available on the councils website throughout the statutory consultation period. 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. The webpage that was created also contained all the relevant information and showing detailed plans of the Council's proposals. A public exhibition was also held allowing residents and businesses to discuss the proposed measures with officers. Whilst the council cannot force residents / businesses to participate in the consultation, it has used a number of methods of communication to enable people to get involved in the process using the necessary information provided to in order to make an informed decision.

We generally consider breaking the zones up into smaller areas due to the hours and days of operation chosen, natural geographical boundaries and to stop inter-zonal commuting. The consultation material provided to residents does not suggest that the area would be adopted as one entire zone or nothing at all.

Our methodology, as within previously consulted areas, has been to analyse the results on a road by road basis which then informs our decision on how to proceed. A road by road analysis is necessary as the overall results can be misleading if roads from one particular area generated a higher response rate or more responses in general perhaps due to having more properties in that area. This is considered the most appropriate and fair method of analysing the results as not to impose parking controls into areas that had a majority respondents against the controls.

From the detailed results for this area it is clear that the majority of 233 respondents were opposed to having controls with 166 in favour of controls.

We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees. Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority of 204 chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads where to have parking controls introduced with 194 in favour of controls.

This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this. The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

Please note: Due to a number petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

14. Wavertree Road (COM-3021)

I write to ask you to reconsider the decision not to proceed with a CPZ in the area east of the A23 in Streatham Hill. The informal consultation was seriously flawed as there was nothing to prevent non-residents from voting. It seems likely that some of the votes were from teachers and parents of the private school. It also seems likely that people working at Brixton Bus garage or those who use the area to park before getting public transport were able to vote against the proposal. The parking stress survey showed that there was significant parking stress. This is particularly the case near the A23. Could you consider a CPZ for the area between the A23 and Faygate Road / Nuthurst Avenue? This is where there are the worst problems. Lambeth must consider the additional pollution caused by allowing commuters to use their cars for part of their journey to work. Pollution levels are high. A CPZ is part of a strategy to reduce pollution by reducing car use.

We need a formal, secure, consultation on this issue.

Officer response:

The informal consultation newsletter is only delivered to residents and businesses in the consultation area. It only allows residents and businesses in the proposed CPZ boundary to take part. This is why we ask residents and businesses to use the Unique Reference Number (URN) provided to authenticate their submission. Only one entry per property is accepted, therefore any duplicate entries are removed from the results along with submissions from external areas.

The council has made the appropriate recommendation and decision based on the results of the consultation as returned by residents / businesses in the area. From the detailed results for this area it is clear that the majority of respondents were opposed to having parking controls.

We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees. Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads were to have parking controls introduced. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this. The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

Please note: Due to a number petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

15. Wyatt Park Road (COM-3014)

I was extremely disappointed to learn that Streatham Hill East will not form part of the CPZ. I currently live at Wyatt Park Road SW2 3TW and parking on this road is extremely difficult. Wyatt Park Road is an exceptionally busy road and cars are left here by commuters and bus drivers limiting the amount of parking spaces available for residents. The road is also used for parking by parents picking up children from Streatham and Clapham Girl's School. The road is very narrow and only one car can travel at a time. Often there is no room for cars to pull in which means that cars often have to reverse the length of the road to allow other cars to get past. This is often around corners with cars already parked there making it difficult for drivers to see and pedestrians to cross the road. Road rage, abusive language and dangerous driving is common and increases between 15:00 and 18:00. Normanhurst Road, Wavertree Road and Daysbrook Road experience similar problems. Parking issues will increase when the CPZ is introduced in the Telford Park area. Non residents who park here will now park in Streatham Hill East. I would like to see a residents only CPZ implemented in Wyatt Park Road and hope you would consider a further consultation?

Officer response:

The council has made the appropriate recommendation and decision based on the results of the consultation as returned by residents / businesses in the area. From the detailed results for this area it is clear that the majority of respondents were opposed to having parking controls.

We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees. Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads were to have parking controls introduced. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this. The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

Please note: Due to a number petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

16. Wyatt Park Road (COM-3019)

I am very concerned about the opposition to CPZ in the Streatham Hill East zone for the following reasons and would like to request that I am part of the formal consultation.

1). After the informal consultation was closed in this area a consultation went out to south Streatham. If residents had known about a CPZ in South Streatham it may have impacted their vote. We could end up having a pocket of available free parking between Streatham and Brixton station which would leave us with no availability.

2). The ripple effect of a CPZ zone in Area1 Thornton R Ext will put increased pressure on our already difficult parking conditions.

3). Amesbury, Barcombe, Cricklade and Downton are very long roads and the ends east of Faygate road are not near the High Road and transport links. I understand why these ends may not vote for a CPZ zone but this impacts the vote of those near the high road.

4). Wavertree, Wyatt park road and Daysbrook are narrow roads and when there are no parking spaces available they get blocked with passing traffic with no spaces to get past. This occurs particularly at school pick up times and when there is heavy traffic on the high road as people use it as a cut through. On the corner of Daysbrook and Wyatt park road and the corner of nuthurst and wavertree there are frequent episodes of gridlock and road rage. Would it be possible to put a CPZ on the narrower roads who are in support of a CPZ?

5) On Wyatt Park Road, daysbrook and wavertree we often are obliged to double park to drop off shopping outside our own houses due to no spaces available. Employees from the bus garage and parents from Streatham and clapham primary park their cars on these roads putting additional stress on availability of space.

6). The consultation has now suggested increasing the amount of yellow lines on the corner of the streets. We were not asked about this and it will further reduce available parking.

I am concerned by the outcome of the informal consultation and am very keen that this is reviewed. I am not keen on CPZ but it is already very difficult to park west of Faygate road and with the further ripple effect from local zones it would be worse. Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Officer response:

Your representation was received though the "Formal" consultation process.

A parking survey was developed with the Streatham area ward councillors who regularly receive request for parking controls from their local residents. Therefore it was decided to carry out an "attitudinal survey" on parking controls in these wards to gauge the appetite for parking controls before the council seeks funding to carry out the full consultation process, which is what has been taking place in Streatham Hill. This will help the council develop a strategic parking programme and therefore only further consult the areas that are in favour of parking controls and additional consultation.

The council has made the appropriate recommendation and decision based on the results of the consultation as returned by residents / businesses in the consultation area. From the detailed results for this area it is clear that the majority of respondents were opposed to having parking controls.

We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees. Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads were to have parking controls introduced. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this. The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

The double yellow line proposals are shown on the detailed plans which were available on the councils website throughout the statutory consultation period. The Council has duty and care to ensure the safety of all road users and to maintain access at all times, for public service vehicles and emergency services. In addition this will improve visibility and provide clear access particularly for vulnerable road users such as pedestrians, push chairs and wheelchair users. The Councils requirements for safety override the need for parking. The Highway Code stipulates that motorists should not park within 10 metres of a junction, however, every effort is made to minimise the extent of such restrictions.

Please note: Due to a number petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

17. Wyatt Park Road (COM-3020)

I am very concerned about the decision to introduce a CPZ West of Streatham Hill but not in the East. My reasons are outlined below and I would like to be part of the formal consultation.

1. Wyatt park Road, Wavertree Rd and Daysbrook Rd are narrow roads usually 100% parked. Two-way traffic cannot pass, so they frequently get blocked - particularly at school pick up times and rush hour when people use it as a cut through. On the corner of Daysbrook and Wyatt park road and the corner of Nuthurst and Wavertree there are frequent episodes of gridlock and road rage. Would it be possible to put a CPZ on the narrower roads who are in support of a CPZ?

2. Amesbury, Barcombe, Cricklade and Downton are very long roads and the ends east of Faygate road are not near Streatham Hill and transport links. I understand why these ends may not vote for a CPZ zone but this impacts the vote of those who do suffer considerable parking stress at the west end of the roads near Streatham Hill. Could the CPZ apply just west of Faygate Rd?

3. If the CPZ does go ahead to the west of Streatham Hill, there will be a bow-wave effect of cars being displaced to the area east - putting increased pressure on our already over-stressed parking conditions.

4. The consultation has now suggested increasing the amount of yellow lines on the corner of the streets. We were not asked about this and it will further add to parking stress.

5. After the informal consultation was closed in this area a further consultation went out to the other three wards in Streatham. If residents in Streatham Hill had known there was a possibility of a CPZ being introduced in all neighbouring wards they might have voted differently - as our streets could end up being the only pocket of free parking anywhere between Streatham and Brixton station!

6. On Wyatt Park Road, Daysbrook and Wavertree we often are obliged to double park to unload outside our own houses due to no spaces available. Parking by employees from the Aviva bus garage and parents from Streatham and Clapham High School puts additional stress on availability of space.

I am concerned by the outcome of the informal consultation and am very keen that this is reviewed. It is already very difficult to park west of Faygate road and if the current plan goes ahead it will become a lot worse.

Officer response:

Your representation was received though the "Formal" consultation process.

The council has made the appropriate recommendation and decision based on the results of the consultation as returned by residents / businesses in the consultation area. From the detailed results for this area it is clear that the majority of respondents were opposed to having parking controls.

We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees. Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads were to have parking controls introduced. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this. The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

The double yellow line proposals are shown on the detailed plans which were available on the councils website throughout the statutory consultation period. The Council has duty and care to ensure the safety of all road users and to maintain access at all times, for public service vehicles and emergency services. In addition this will improve visibility and provide clear access particularly for vulnerable road users such as pedestrians, push chairs and wheelchair users. The Councils requirements for safety override the need for parking. The Highway Code stipulates that motorists should not park within 10 metres of a junction, however, every effort is made to minimise the extent of such restrictions.

A parking survey was developed with the Streatham area ward councillors who regularly receive request for parking controls from their local residents. Therefore it was decided to carry out an "attitudinal survey" on parking controls in these wards to gauge the appetite for parking controls before the council seeks funding to carry out the full consultation process, which is what has been taking place in Streatham Hill. This will help the council develop a

strategic parking programme and therefore only further consult the areas that are in favour of parking controls and additional consultation.

Please note: Due to a number petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.

18. Wyatt Park Road (COM-3022)

There are many concerns re the decision for CPZ to be introduced into West but not the East of Streatham Hill they are:

Wyatt Park Road, Daysbrook Road and Wavertree Road are narrow roads usually 100%parked this results in two way traffic unable got pass so there is frequent blockages this is particularly at school pick up times when often bizarre and often dangerous incidents can occur - these often occur on the corner of Daysbrook and Wyatt Park Road and Nuthurst and Wavertree where cars block the road for periods of time with no one giving way resulting in road rage and very angry exchanges I have witnessed one driver mounting the pavement to get by. Amesbury, Barcombe Cricklade and Downton are long road sand the ends east of Faygate are not near transport links and therefore do not suffer from parking issues. Any area which has CPZ will immediately have an impact on areas such as the East without a CPZ zone particularly on the already congested roads indicated in first paragraph. Another point worth considering is that if Streatham Hill east is the only ward without CPZ this will have a further impact on the wards streets. The outcome of the informal consultation is extremely worrying and I would like this to be reviewed considering the council is very keen on reducing air pollution in the borough. Finally I look forward to your response and would like to be part of the formal consultation.

Officer response:

Your representation was received though the "Formal" consultation process.

The council has made the appropriate recommendation and decision based on the results of the consultation as returned by residents / businesses in the consultation area. From the detailed results for this area it is clear that the majority of respondents were opposed to having parking controls.

We are always mindful of the possible displacement effect which was highlighted in the consultation material and the questionnaire raising this particular point to consultees. Again, based on the results for this displacement question for this area, the majority chose not to have parking controls if their neighbouring roads where to have parking controls introduced. This indicates that those who did participate did consider the displacement effect and chose not to have controls in spite of this. The Council is not in favour of imposing parking controls which incur a permit fee to an area where the majority of respondents are opposed to controls.

Please note: Due to a number petitions received throughout the statutory consultation process, it has been decided to develop a report to be submitted to Cabinet in order to consider further consultation on parking controls in this area.