

Representations in opposition to the proposals

6	<p>I'm responding to the ST LEONARDS'S CPZ proposal. I'm a resident on Gleneagle Road SW16 6AZ and fully support the proposal. I would even suggest taking it further and restricting weekend parking for a couple of hours a day.</p>
9	<p>I write to object to the proposed hours of control for St Leonard's Central (Zone O) of 8:30AM – 6.30PM.</p> <p>Upon reviewing the responses in Appendix F – Stage 1 consultation Results – St Leonards Central, I can see that out of 235 responses to Q8 (If a CPZ was introduced, which hours of the day would you like the controls to be in place?) only 100 selected this proposed timeframe, while a greater number (123) selected a shorter timeframe, with many of these opting for the shortest of 2 hours.</p> <p>In my opinion the responses of these 123 participants have not been correctly taken into account, and the correct choice should be the 10AM – 4PM slot. My own response was the 2 hour choice, however I can see that there are a significant number of residents that would prefer a longer enforcement time period, and I accept that there must be compromise. In this case though, there has been no compromise made to opinions of the 123 residents who oppose this very long restriction period.</p> <p>In addition, the proposed length of restriction will make it very difficult for any maintenance, repair or delivery vehicles to access these areas without residents incurring additional expense in the form of guest passes, or paying hourly parking rates for visiting contractors. This could easily drive the price of urgent home repair too high for some residents. A shorter time period will prevent all-day parking, while still allowing for times when plumbers/roofers/electricians etc. can visit.</p> <p>It is also my belief that the three proposed CPZ zones should be merged into 1, to allow greater flexibility to residents to park on any of the roads in the area, and to simplify the issuing of permits. This would also provide greater flexibility for those roads which have a surplus of residents vehicles already, for which a CPZ will not help the lack of parking.</p> <p>I also object to the CPZ proposal for St Leonard's Central (Zone O) in its entirety, although I do concede that there is a parking problem in the area. I propose however, that there are better remedies for this parking problem than introducing a CPZ which will cause an additional expense for residents at a time when many are struggling financially already due to the Covid crisis and general poverty of the area.</p> <p>Has there been a full evaluation of the number of parking bays available in the Zone, and a comparison with the expected number of residents permits required? If this has not been done, then how is it known that the current parking problems are not caused by residents already, as is my belief, due to the large number of houses which have been converted to flats? The bulk of</p>

	<p>parking problems in the area South of Mitcham Lane in the Zone are caused by private hire taxi vehicles parking at the Ambleside Avenue end of Gleneagle Road and Babington Road, causing residents to have to park further down these 2 roads, and then also filling up Fairmile Avenue and Conyers Road. This could be easily remedied by making these 2 roads No Entry from Ambleside Avenue, which would have the benefit of removing 'rat run' traffic through to Mitcham Lane. There have been a number of accidents recently on Gleneagle Road and Conyers Road caused by speeding drivers taking this route, and I believe Lambeth Council have a duty of care to their residents to consider road safety as part of any parking consultations.</p> <p>In the area North of Mitcham Lane I note that the majority of residents on Riggindale and Rydal roads already do not feel that there is a parking problem in their area, and subjecting them to this CPZ, especially of the hours proposed is to completely ignore their position. I do appreciate however that if the surrounding roads were to be placed into a CPZ then these roads should also be included. For the other roads in this area including Thirlmere and Tooting Bec Gardens, there is a large influx of parked vehicles coming from Tooting Bec Road. If the connection between Tooting Bec Road and Tooting Bec Gardens was also made no entry, this influx of vehicles from Tooting (where a CPZ is already in force) would be reduced. Again, this would reduce 'rat run' traffic through to Mitcham Lane which, although there is already a 'No Right Turn' restriction at the end of Riggindale Road is still quite high, as this is largely ignored by drivers who cross into Conyers Road and then perform a U-turn before turning left onto Mitcham Lane.</p>
14	<p>I would like to be against of the parking zone going all the way to end of Gleneagle Road and Conyers Road, there's always spaces to park here and there's no need for controlled zone.</p> <p>Owning a car is expensive enough without another added cost. I agree it is ok nearer to the main Streatham High Street and Station but maybe just not so far!</p>
15	<p>You want comments, here are some comments:</p> <p>As if living in Lambeth weren't expensive enough (second highest Council Tax Bills in the UK), you now have decided to charge us for the 'privilege' of parking our vehicles in the roads we live in - just so you can squeeze more money - we do not have - out of us! TypicalAnd under the guise of environment and emissions you are making living in Lambeth even more impossible....</p> <p>Why should residents suffer - when the problem has always been other traffic and vehicles using our roads to park in to avoid all the other parking limitations in the borough.</p> <p>your logic is flawed and your intentions stink as bad a this corrupt government we are currently living under.</p> <p>Our councillors who most likely push for this CPZ are the Green Party - a party determined to force residents out of the borough in the name of environmental lobbying.</p> <p>WHY ARE RESIDENTS NOT BEING GIVEN A PARKING PERMIT MAKING</p>

	<p>THEM EXEMPT FROM THESE 'FLEECING MORE CASH OUT OF PEOPLE' TACTICS AND POLICIES. After all we pay enough to live here as it is!</p>
16	<p>I live in 41 Ambleside Avenue and I object the proposal to introduce a new CPZ "St Leonard's Central Zone (zone O)" as it will be an unnecessary burden on the residents. Without the restrictions there is ample parking available and even on Ambleside Avenue, the busiest road in the zone, the proposed parking restriction will not help traffic flow.</p> <p>The proposal does not benefit the residents in any way, it will not solve any traffic flow or parking availability problem, and will just make our lives worse.</p>
34	<p>I live on Thirlmere road and have lived on Conyers, Riggindale and thirlmere for the past 20yrs. In that time parking has rarely been an issue for me. There have only been two occasions on which I have to park at the end of our road rather than directly outside our house and they have been at prayer times and have not been an issue for me at all. I would be deeply dissatisfied if Lambeth decided to make thirlmere parking restricted. There is no need and it would show a blatant disregard for residents feelings. Why charge residents £150 for a right they have already? It stinks of opportunistic money making. Concentrate on the speeding vehicles instead please.</p>
42	<p>We are residents on Gleneagle Road and wish to object to the proposed CPZ in our area.</p> <p>It does not seem necessary to us as it is always possible to park on the road or nearby.</p> <p>The scheme proposals do not detail the costs but looking at the costs elsewhere for parking on the Lambeth website they seem wholly disproportionate.</p> <p>Please do not implement this scheme.</p>
45	<p>As resident of Thirlmere Road I do not see any issue with parking space and I am absolutely contrary to a new controlled parking zone.</p> <p>It will also have an huge impact on me and others as additional cost for resident permit, guest and tradesman.</p> <p>ABSOLUTELY CONTRARY TO A NEW CPZ in STREATHAM, Thirlmere Road.</p>
46	<p>I have been a resident with a car in Fernwood Avenue SW16 for over 20 years and would like it known that I am totally AGAINST the proposed CPZ in St Leonard's Central (Zone O).</p> <p>Lambeth already has one of the most expensive yearly Council Tax bands and now you are penalising the residents of this area with another hefty yearly Pricing Structure - just to be able to park at least somewhere near our homes.</p> <p>NON residents of these areas should be made to pay for parking, but Residents should have FREE Permits - that should be covered by our Council AND Road tax!</p> <p>With the uncertainty of the current Covid-19 restrictions where many people have been forced to work from home, and many Offices are now contemplating keeping more staff to work from home - we will all have to be paying extra because we are being forced - with no other choice - than to pay your extortionate car rates for living in this area.</p>

	<p>AGAINST.</p>
48	<p>I live on Fernwood Avenue and I strongly object to proposed measures for paid parking - I park my car on the road every day and I am gobsmacked that you are proposing to charge for parking.</p> <p>I think these proposals are appalling and I will fight this all the way - I have the right to park for free on the road where I live.</p>
50	<p>I'm am a resident and run a preschool and childminder setting in Rydal Rd.</p> <p>I do not remember receiving any consultation paper on CPZ in 2019 but I am AGAINST any CPZ for this road or area.</p> <p>I don't understand why we require all day zone and do not want it. Even 1 hr resident only parking is preferable to all day inconvenience to our guests, tradespeople, visitors and carers etc.</p> <p>Please lodge my objection to this unnecessary scheme. I believe roads south of Mitcham lane may need it due to the taxi drivers loitering and idling with vehicle engines running and other anti social behaviour but this is not required on Rydal Rd.</p> <p>By introducing CPZ in STREATHAM it will cause a creep to the whole area due to the ripple effect of moving traffic on to areas thereby inconveniencing an area which previously had no issue rather than fix the issue in the area that has the issue rather than moving issues on ..</p> <p>Really annoying ..</p>
53	<p>I was shocked to hear from my neighbours that a CPZ was proposed in my Street, Thirlmere Road, and that it would extend from 8.30 to 6.30pm. When and how was this circulated? How many times? Was it emailed?</p> <p>I thoroughly object to this.</p> <p>I have lived here for 15 years now and have never found a problem with friends family parking on the street. I recall rejecting this proposal years ago.</p> <p>I have read the consultation report, and the feedback from this looks scant. I question how well you connected with the residents to receive such a poor response.</p> <p>Only 7 out of 64 residents consulted replied, which I find hard to believe. When did you send these out? Of this 10% consulted, most wanted a 2 hour parking restriction.</p> <p>Why was this not recirculated. This is not a reflection of the residents' wishes.</p> <p>I am utterly shocked that this is at this stage.</p> <p>The consultation figures state that 237 residents responded out of 2037 (11.6%). This highlights a real inadequacy in your consultation method.</p>

	I strongly urge that you reconsult to get a true reflection of the majority wishes.
55	I'm resident living on Riggindale road, I would not agree on the CPZ proposal. The reason is that it will add extra cost on our living expenses and this will put more pressure on my financial situation. Hence I will object the CPZ for Riggindale road.
59	<p>I am a resident on Riggindale road and am sending this email to raise my objection with the proposed controlled parking zone in my area. I strongly object to any measure of controlled parking on Riggindale road, especially all day restrictions.</p> <p>In the time I have lived on Riggindale road I have owned a car and I do not experience issues with parking on my road, there is always ample space on the road. I haven't noticed all-day commuters parking on the road, the road is not positioned close enough to the mainline railways to be impacted by this. Also we do not experience drivers hovering in vehicles either.</p> <p>The road is used by residents in an appropriate manner. As such, I see no reason to enforce paid for parking permits upon residents.</p>
61	As a resident of Riggindale Road, I would like to raise my objection to the proposed controlled parking zone impacting my area. I do not experience parking issues outside my property, not do I feel that my road is used by commuters. The road is used by residents in an appropriate manner, and enforcing parking permits (including an annual charge) is not in the interest of residents.
62	<p>I would like to formally voice mine and my housemate (Elizabeth Addy) objection to the proposed CPZ restriction being put in place on Riggindale Road.</p> <p>We live in Flat 1 72 Riggindale Road. I think the 8:30-18:30 restriction is extreme and my preference would be to no restriction but think a 2 hour restriction would suffice with free permits for residents of the street.</p>
63	<p>Objection to CPZ for Riggindale Road.</p> <p>Not necessary, the Road is not congested and already has a 'no right turn' at the junction of Mitcham Lane which courses cars to U turn in both Mitcham lane and Conyers Road.</p>
65	I'd like to object to the new proposed controlled parking zone in St Leonards & Streatham Vale West Area. I live on Rydal Road and this will have a significant impact for those of us on this street and surrounding areas, which my neighbours and I are very unhappy about.

<p>66</p>	<p>I am very shocked to receive notification that the Council is pursuing a CPZ in my area. I live on RIGGINDALE ROAD and objected when the consultation was first circulated, but I hear the general response was incredibly low (11%). How could it proceed on based on these shockingly poor numbers? This certainly does not mean people are in favour of it..surely residents should be given a further opportunity to lodge an objection?</p> <p>I have lived here for 18 years now and have never found a problem with friends family parking on the street.</p> <p>The consultation report doesn't make very convincing reading. Of those consulted, most wanted a 2 hour parking restriction, like the other St. Leonard's areas. What is the justification for 8.30-6.30pm controls here?</p> <p>Why was the consultation not recirculated. It is clearly is not a reflection of the residents' wishes.</p> <p>I strongly urge that you reconsult to get a true reflection of the majority wishes.</p>
<p>68</p>	<p>I am writing to formally note my objections to the proposals for a CPZ on Riggindale Road. I have lived on this road for nearly 30 years and in my experience parking during the hours proposed is not an issue.</p> <p>On reading the consultation report the feedback is scant to say the least and given the additional cost to residents I would strongly advocate another consultation is undertaken before any changes are implemented. At the moment this very much feels like an additional revenue stream into the council without any benefits to the residents whom would have to find the additional monies to pay for something that most have not been fully consulted on.</p>
<p>71</p>	<p>I represent xx Mitcham Lane, London SW16 6xx. Trading in excess of 50 years in Lambeth I object to the proposed restrictions for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introducing CPZ's and permit parking only moves the problem from one area to another. 2. an earlier consultation in this area proved that daytime parking was less than night time parking although this seems to have now been ignored. 3. as a business owner & rate payer in the area I find it quite unbelievable that any consideration for local businesses seems to be ignored. If pay by phone charges were introduced during the full working day we would defiantly lose business due to either the cost or the hassle of having to register to pay. 4. if this proposal goes through there should be a discount for permits to park for Business & employees who work in the area, similar to the residents discount. 5. this could be the final nail in the coffin. I would possibly lose staff due to this, but I am not prepared to subsidize them for parking on top of very high business rates that we already pay for virtually no services.

<p>72</p>	<p>I have heard of a plan to add controlled parking to Riggindale Road and the surrounding areas, the St Leonard's Central (SW16 1QL). I object to this plan. I have never ever had any trouble parking on this street, and neither have visiting friends, family and tradespeople. We are far away from the train station, and there is no parade of shops where people need to visit. It makes no sense to implement this. To the argument that all other areas are having this implemented, so there being a 'ripple effect', I say we should review at that stage.</p> <p>I don't see any benefits to residents for having the CPZ, only permit money being spent and added frustration from visitors. Additionally, many people with two cars park one in the driveway and the second one in front of it. With CPZ, parking on the white line would not be allowed, so the second cars would have to be parked elsewhere on the street, reducing the overall number of parking slots available.</p>
<p>75</p>	<p>I was shocked to hear from my neighbours that a CPZ was proposed in my Street, Thirlmere Road, and that it would extend from 8.30 to 6.30pm. When and how was this communicated to impacted residents as I have not heard anything by post or email?</p> <p>I thoroughly object to this.</p> <p>My family have never found a problem with friends or family parking on the street. I recall rejecting this proposal years ago.</p> <p>I have read the consultation report, and the feedback from this looks scant. I question how well you connected with the residents to receive such a poor response.</p> <p>Only 7 out of 64 residents consulted replied, which I find hard to believe. When did you send these out? Of this 10% consulted, most wanted a 2 hour parking restriction.</p> <p>Why was this not recirculated? This is not a reflection of the residents' wishes.</p> <p>The consultation figures state that 237 residents responded out of 2037 (11.6%). This highlights a real inadequacy in your consultation method.</p> <p>I strongly urge that you reconsult to get a true reflection of the majority wishes.</p>

76

Thank you for your letter informing us that the council is proceeding with a statutory consultation to introduce new Controlled Parking Zones in the St Leonard's North (Zone I), St Leonard's Central (Zone O) and Stanthorpe Triangle (Zone U) areas.

I live on Rydal Road in Zone O, where you plan to introduce a CPZ with controlled hours of 8.30am-6.30pm, Monday-Friday.

You have stated that you have come to this conclusion following the outcome of the Stage 1 Consultation carried out in September 2019.

I have looked at the results of the Stage 1 Consultation for Rydal Road and note the following:

- There were 10 replies of 79 consulted.
- To the question: 'DO YOU FEEL YOU HAVE A PARKING PROBLEM IN YOUR ROAD?', 7 said 'NO', 2 said 'YES' and 1 was undecided.
- To the question: 'WOULD YOU SUPPORT OR OPPOSE A CPZ IN YOUR ROAD IF NEIGHBOURING ROADS WERE INCLUDED?', 4 said 'YES', 5 said 'NO' and 1 was undecided.
- To the question: 'IF A CPZ WAS INTRODUCED, WHICH HOURS OF THE DAY WOULD YOU LIKE THE CONTROLS TO BE IN PLACE?', all 10 replied '2 HOURS'.

While I have concentrated on my road, the results of the roads neighbouring Rydal Road are very similar.

Armed with the above results, I am totally at a loss how the council can conclude that a CPZ is supported by the residents?

In addition, I cannot understand how the council can conclude that it has consulted widely and strongly, given the number of residents in all areas who participated? Didn't anyone at any stage consider that the council should try and consult again, instead of forging ahead with preparing results based on so few replies.

However, notwithstanding the above, how can the council conclude that a CPZ between the hours of 8.30am-6.30pm is what should be consulted on, when ALL of the Rydal Road replies opted for the 2 hours controls?

I have lived on Rydal Road for over 14 years and I have always been able to park, as have family and friends visiting. There are odd occasions when I have to park a bit further away from my house, when there are local events etc., but nothing more or less than expected, living in a busy London borough.

I completely object to the introduction of a CPZ and I strongly urge you to use this consultation to listen to your residents and reconsider your conclusions to the Stage 1 Consultation.

78	<p>Thank you for your letter informing us that the council is proceeding with a statutory consultation to introduce new Controlled Parking Zones in the St Leonard's North (Zone I), St Leonard's Central (Zone O) and Stanthorpe Triangle (Zone U) areas.</p> <p>I live on Rydal Road in Zone O, where you plan to introduce a CPZ with controlled hours of 8.30am-6.30pm, Monday-Friday.</p> <p>You have stated that you have come to this conclusion following the outcome of the Stage 1 Consultation carried out in September 2019.</p> <p>I have looked at the results of the Stage 1 Consultation for Rydal Road and note the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were 10 replies of 79 consulted. • To the question: 'DO YOU FEEL YOU HAVE A PARKING PROBLEM IN YOUR ROAD?', 7 said 'NO', 2 said 'YES' and 1 was undecided. • To the question: 'WOULD YOU SUPPORT OR OPPOSE A CPZ IN YOUR ROAD IF NEIGHBOURING ROADS WERE INCLUDED?', 4 said 'YES', 5 said 'NO' and 1 was undecided. • To the question: 'IF A CPZ WAS INTRODUCED, WHICH HOURS OF THE DAY WOULD YOU LIKE THE CONTROLS TO BE IN PLACE?', all 10 replied '2 HOURS'. <p>While I have concentrated on my road, the results of the roads neighbouring Rydal Road are very similar.</p> <p>Armed with the above results, I am totally at a loss how the council can conclude that a CPZ is supported by the residents?</p> <p>In addition, I cannot understand how the council can conclude that it has consulted widely and strongly, given the number of residents in all areas who participated? Didn't anyone at any stage consider that the council should try and consult again, instead of forging ahead with preparing results based on so few replies.</p> <p>However, notwithstanding the above, how can the council conclude that a CPZ between the hours of 8.30am-6.30pm is what should be consulted on, when ALL of the Rydal Road replies opted for the 2 hours controls?</p> <p>I have lived on Rydal Road for over 14 years and I have always been able to park, as have family and friends visiting. There are odd occasions when I have to park a bit further away from my house, when there are local events etc., but nothing more or less than expected, living in a busy London borough.</p> <p>I completely object to the introduction of a CPZ and I strongly urge you to use this consultation to listen to your residents and reconsider your conclusions to the Stage 1 Consultation.</p>
----	--

79	<p>I was surprised to hear from my neighbours that a CPZ was proposed in my Street, Rydal Road, and that it would extend from 8.30 to 6.30pm.</p> <p>I thoroughly object to this.</p> <p>I have lived here for 20 years now and have never found a problem with friends family parking on the street.</p> <p>I strongly urge that you reconsult to get a true reflection of the majority wishes.</p>
81	<p>I own a flat at xxx Gleneagle Road at the Conyers Road end of the street. I have lived here for 7 years.</p> <p>I am also a property professional and appreciate the job that you have to do as town planners.</p> <p>I am however extremely against the local council bringing in parking permits. I have never had an issue parking my car in Gleneagle Road no matter what time of day.</p> <p>I appreciate that the area's proximity to two train stations may make it prime location for commuter parking to access the train to Victoria or the city from Streatham or Streatham Common Station however I believe this is very nominal and not really an issue at all. If anything will have massively reduced with the amount of people now working from home which is set to continue into the future.</p> <p>There has been an increase in people carrying out works at their properties and it is likely that more contractors have been parking on the street more regularly. However these are essential services and also essential to the value growth of the properties and the local area.</p> <p>If anything there is an issue with people converting their front gardens into private driveways and I believe there is a planning restriction on this - however some have still chosen to go ahead and do it anyway without a drop kerb. This removes valuable on street parking from others. May I ask please if the council has checked and surveyed the road before implementing any permit system in order to see what the on street parking situation is and how it is impacted by non-permitted driveways? Could I request that this is done as part of the process of not done already?</p> <p>Largely I am against the council implementing this as it only penalises residents and their guests and imposes yet another road tax upon local residents parking in their own street. It is completely unnecessary.</p> <p>I hope that you will consider that many residents are happy with the parking and do not want parking restrictions implemented in our streets.</p>

83

I live on Thirlmere Road, in Zone O, where you plan is to introduce a 8.30am to 6.30pm CPZ Monday to Friday.

You say in the letter that you have decided on this based on the Stage 1 Consultation of September 2019. I have looked at those results and would like to highlight the following:

1. 14 replies our of 64 consulted
2. 8 NO v 3 YES v 3 undecided to the question "Do you feel you have a parking problem"
3. 11 No v 1 YES v 2 Undecided to the question "Would you support a CPZ zone if your road and neighbouring roads were included"

I understand that the same result was true for other streets, with the majority of respondents not having any problems with parking.

Given the above, I don't understand how the council concludes that a CPZ is supported by the residents?

Also, we weren't living here in 2019 and we did not receive the survey this year. I am aware that this is the case for other current residents. This means that the results the council holds may not be complete as various households did not receive the survey and were not able to give an opinion.

Therefore, I think that the council should try and consult again making sure that all residents receive the survey!

Since I have been living here (March 2020) we have never had issue with parking nor have our friends and family when visiting.

I completely object to the introduction of a CPZ and I strongly urge you to use this consultation to listen to your residents and reconsider your conclusions to the Stage 1 Consultation.

84

Thank you for your letter informing us that the council is proceeding with a statutory consultation to introduce new Controlled Parking Zones in the St Leonard's North (Zone I), St Leonard's Central (Zone O) and Stanthorpe Triangle (Zone U) areas.

I live on Rydal Road in Zone O, where you plan to introduce a CPZ with controlled hours of 8.30am-6.30pm, Monday-Friday.

You have stated that you have come to this conclusion following the outcome of the Stage 1 Consultation carried out in September 2019.

I have looked at the results of the Stage 1 Consultation for Rydal Road and note the following:

- There were 10 replies of 79 consulted.
- To the question: 'DO YOU FEEL YOU HAVE A PARKING PROBLEM IN YOUR ROAD?', 7 said 'NO', 2 said 'YES' and 1 was undecided.
- To the question: 'WOULD YOU SUPPORT OR OPPOSE A CPZ IN YOUR ROAD IF NEIGHBOURING ROADS WERE INCLUDED?', 4 said 'YES', 5 said 'NO' and 1 was undecided.
- To the question: 'IF A CPZ WAS INTRODUCED, WHICH HOURS OF THE DAY WOULD YOU LIKE THE CONTROLS TO BE IN PLACE?', all 10 replied '2 HOURS'.

While I have concentrated on my road, the results of the roads neighbouring Rydal Road are very similar.

Armed with the above results, I am totally at a loss how the council can conclude that a CPZ is supported by the residents?

In addition, I cannot understand how the council can conclude that it has consulted widely and strongly, given the number of residents in all areas who participated? Didn't anyone at any stage consider that the council should try and consult again, instead of forging ahead with preparing results based on so few replies.

However, notwithstanding the above, how can the council conclude that a CPZ between the hours of 8.30am-6.30pm is what should be consulted on, when ALL of the Rydal Road replies opted for the 2 hours controls?

I have lived on Rydal Road for over 14 years and I have always been able to park, as have family and friends visiting. There are odd occasions when I have to park a bit further away from my house, when there are local events etc., but nothing more or less than expected, living in a busy London borough.

I object to the introduction of a CPZ and I would ask you to use this consultation to listen the views of the residents and reconsider your conclusions to the Stage 1 Consultation.

<p>88</p>	<p>I am writing regarding the letter in which a CPZ was proposed in my Street, Riggindale road, and that it would extend from 8.30 to 6.30pm.</p> <p>I thoroughly object to this.</p> <p>I have lived here for 9 years now and have never found a problem with friends family parking on the street.</p> <p>I have read the consultation report, and the feedback from this looks poor. I question how well you connected with the residents to receive such a poor response.</p> <p>Why was this not recirculated. This is not a reflection of the residents' wishes.</p> <p>I am utterly shocked that this is at this stage.</p> <p>I strongly urge that you reconsult to get a true reflection of the majority wishes.</p>
<p>91</p>	<p>I am directly responding to the statutory consultation relating to ' introduce a new controlled parking zone "St Leonard's Central (Zone O)" with controlled hours 8.30am-6.30pm Monday-Friday. Pay by Phone facility to operate with a 4-hour maximum stay and no return within 1 hour'.</p> <p>The original purpose of introducing a CPZ zone was to prevent commuters from parking there all day and preventing parking be available to those who are residents or who wish to visit the area to attend the various religious and community centres or use the shops and restaurants locally. The parking restrictions imposing controlled hours running from 8.30am to 6.30pm are far more than is required to resolve the problem identified, as a shorter 30 minute period in the middle of the day would do this without the knock-on impact on local residents and community users.</p> <p>Based on the controlled hours proposed, this is instead a way for the local council to raise money from residents and visitors in parking charges and fines. It will not improve access, or reduce the environmental impact as the parking wardens on their smelly, noisy motorbikes will be up and down our street all day waiting to pounce when the metered time runs out. It will push parking into other zones which don't have CZP yet, enabling further consultations and arguments to introduce zones. It will not deal with the real issue which is mini-cab and Uber drivers who idle with their engines on whilst they wait for a fare. it won't deal with the rubbish they drop in the street or their anti-social behaviour. Lambeth needs to tackle the issues that residents care about, not just introduce all-day CPZ</p>

<p>92</p>	<p>I am writing on the behalf of xxxx who is the owner of xxxx. He would like to object to the proposed CPZ restriction to St. Leonards north (zone 0) the reasons are as follows: As a business owner and resident within this zone he believes that the issue with parking becomes worse within the hours not covered by the restrictions therefore deems them to be nonsensical and unjust. The next issue he has is that any customers that would park locally to use his establishment to have their hair cut could potentially end up paying more for their parking than the services he is providing thereby stopping them from using him and going somewhere else removing money from the local area which seems preposterous. I have owned and lived in the area for 53 years, during this time this end of Streatham has become one little community in which everyone greets each other with a smile and a wave but this has started to fade and almost disappear most likely due to stress and the parking restrictions are not going to help this. Many businesses this end of Streatham have been here for years together and have an established customer base which keeps Streatham bustling, but these restrictions would force these small independent businesses to either close for good or move out of London which in turn takes wealth and finance away from the capital. One final note, times have been extremely hard during Covid for everyone but keeping a small business going has been nearly impossible and should be recognised not punished and these restrictions could result in the fight which has been tough to be lost, meaning the struggle, pain and sacrifice of the last 14 months would have all been in vain.</p>
<p>96</p>	<p>I have just received the proposal. My first reaction is that it is a pity that the 3 zones are not treated the same way. If the aim is to prevent commuter parking the 2 hour period works as well. It allows visitors, family, services and trades people a time to park without cost. All day parking restrictions impose a cost which directly or indirectly will fall on the neighbourhood . My wife and I live at 117 Babington Rd. We have a drive so are less personally inconvenienced but we are in our 70s and would not want any sort of visitor to be discouraged by the cost of parking.</p>
<p>97</p>	<p>As a resident within the new St Leonards Central O proposal I wish to make my objection to the proposal of an 0830 to 1830 controlled zone. I undertook the original proposal and agreed that controls would be helpful to local residents to prevent issues of parking on the street from people using the station but a simple noon to 2pm was the easy solution to that.</p> <p>I cannot see any logic whatsoever to make our area the worst hit in streatham. we're not the busiest part of the high street yet the North I and triangle U get a 2hr window? surely parity is for Central to have the same?</p> <p>by having no cpz south of Central around natal / Lewin Road etc when implementing measures to the North equally makes little sense as it will just mean those roads become congested from the displaced measures North?</p> <p>As a local resident I want friends & family to be able to come and see me, with their vehicle and children in tow and not face having to pay for 4hrs parking. for the residents within Central O it's a harsh punishment to be significantly more affected by the measures than residents in the surrounding area.</p> <p>I know from speaking to other residents they are similarly concerned about the adverse effect these measures will have on them, the additional costs for</p>

	<p>residents passes and prevention of visitors to them without undue costs of parking.</p> <p>The sensible thing is parity for all residents when we all face equal issues.</p> <p>I implore you to see sense and amend the proposal to a noon to 2pm for Central O to mirror the surrounding CPZ's.</p>
<p>101</p>	<p>Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to comment on the proposed introduction of parking restrictions in Riggindale Road and Tooting Bec Gardens. The residents of Pinkerton Place (comprising 24 flats) and Directors of the Freehold owning company are in support of the better management of our environment and reduction in carbon emissions etc. However, we do not consider that the introduction of parking restrictions in the area will achieve such aims.</p> <p>The introduction of permits simply generates an income on top of our council tax. It does not necessarily reduce car use. Many residents at Pinkerton Place travel by Public Transport, bike and on foot but still own a car for other reasons such as holidays, big shopping trips, visiting family etc. These needs will not change and, post introduction of permits, some residents will in any event continue to use on-street parking as the flats have considerably less than a 1:1 car parking ratio and there are no visitor spaces within the development. Residents at Pinkerton Place feel that street parking is very rarely an issue in practice and currently benefit from the convenience of free street parking as and when required. We are already able to reliably park close to our flats and delivery vehicles are already able to pull up off-street, inside our development. Riggindale Road/Tooting Bec Gardens are not particularly close to any railways or shops, and although people may park there to access the common, this is not causing issues for residents.</p> <p>Any benefits from a permit arrangement (if there are any) will be outweighed by the cost and hassle of obtaining permits and managing visitors. .</p> <p>On a matter of detail, the hours of restriction in the St Leonard's central zone are particularly excessive compared to the other zones, 8:30am – 6:30pm compared to 12 – 2pm. A 2 hour restriction is adequate at most.</p> <p>Overall, the majority of residents at Pinkerton Place are against the restrictions. Lastly, should Riggindale Road/Tooting Bec Gardens become the last remaining streets in the area to not be subject to parking restrictions then, reluctantly, we would have to accept, indeed support, the inclusion of these roads. Otherwise, parking in these roads could become problematical due to residents seeking to avoid restricted areas.</p> <p>We hope you can consider these arguments as part of the consultation process</p>
<p>103</p>	<p>I hereby object to the proposed changes to parking rules in the St Leonard area of Streatham. In particular, the proposed double yellow line changes to Conyers Road & Potters Lane are completely unnecessary as it is a dead end road with very little traffic, and therefore the reasons for making the parking zone changes (i.e to allow better traffic flow) do not stand up. The area is almost exclusively used for residents parking and changing the area to double yellows seems a nonsensical decision.</p> <p>With regards EV bays, I support the proposed initiative as a step in the right direction, although to really encourage a greener Streatham I feel the roll out needs to be far more expansive and incorporate far more roads than the three (3) sites proposed. Only mass roll out of these bays will create a material change in residents choice of EV vehicles.</p>

	<p>I urge your planning team to reconsider these proposed changes.</p>
<p>112</p>	<p>Whinfell Close is a Private Road within the proposed Streatham Central “O” Zone owned by Ryclose Management Ltd, whose Directors are the owners of houses in Whinfell Close.</p> <p>At our AGM we objected to the zone covering the Central “O” area as this would put pressure on parking on our private road. We have no means of stopping others parking in our road as previously Lambeth Council refused us planning permission for gates on the Close. There is only sufficient room in Whinfell Close for the owners of the properties and we feel that to include the area surrounding our Close would mean that people would try to park in our road to avoid paying for parking in Riggindale or Rydal Roads.</p> <p>We do not feel that there is a parking problem in the proposed Central “O” area and that the scheme is merely to provide more income for Lambeth Council.</p> <p>If you insist on including this area in the proposed scheme then we feel that any parking restrictions should be limited to 12noon-2pm as per the remainder of the area.</p>
<p>135</p>	<p>We write with great concern at the proposed controlled parking zone you wish to introduce at St Leonards Central/Streatham area. We are fully against such a proposal and oppose this for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Restrictions are to generate revenue for the council. 2. Parking is currently not an issue there is no justification for a controlled parking zone. 3. It's not acceptable to have to pay to park outside/near your own home - financial burden. 4. Security for our cars and homes bringing unnecessary footfall to our road. 5. The controlled times are too restrictive for family and friends to come and visit us pensioners. 6. The restriction times are longer for Fairmile Avenue and for absolutely no reason. <p>We hope you will take these comments into consideration, my husband and I can only reiterate we fully oppose this.</p>
<p>137</p>	<p>I have recently received the 'Proposed Controlled Parking Zone' notification outlining what will be happening to the parking on the road i live on, Gleneagle Road.</p> <p>Other than the obvious why is this whole thing being thought of in the first place, can you please explain why it has been proposed that St Leonards Central 'O' zone has restrictions from 8.30am - 6.30pm MON - FRI, and the other proposed zones are 12NOON-2PM.</p> <p>Also, WOW, the prices....</p> <p>amongst all the other fees, how can the above be justified when family or friends visit, i think this and all the other fees are a blatant way of raising funds from us residents who pay a hefty council tax each month.</p> <p>I cant imagine that other residents are happy with this 'consultation' and the prices you will be charging.</p>

<p>138</p>	<p>I am writing to let you know that our strong objections to these proposals as a resident of St Leonard's Central 'O' with the most restricted parking but at the same time with much longer paid parking period than neighbouring zones. This will only lead to displacement of vehicles parking and, in particular, onto private uncontrolled estates within this zone in which we live.</p> <p>We already experience daily unauthorised parking and anti social behaviour within our large 14 space car park for the seven houses on our development.</p> <p>The parking and traffic situation at the north end of Babington Road has only got much worse since the road was closed (due to the Babington Piazza scheme) and made a dead end.</p>
<p>139</p>	<p>I was shocked to hear from my neighbours that a CPZ was proposed in my Street, Riggindale Road, and that it would extend from 8.30 to 6.30pm. I thoroughly object to this. This is totally unnecessary.</p> <p>I object to ANY CPZ, even for one or two hours.</p> <p>I have lived here for 25 years now and have never found a problem with friends family parking on the street.</p> <p>I understand there is a parking issue with mini cabs in Gleneagle rd and Babington Road, which needs resolving which triggered the introduction of the CPZ for our wider area. Surely if this is the case there must be other ways to solve this problem! All residents are being punished because of an issue that is nothing to do with them.</p>
<p>148</p>	<p>Re the statutory consultation to introduce new Controlled Parking Zones in St Leonard's:</p> <p>You are proposing to introduce a CPZ with controlled hours of 8.30 am- 6.30pm Monday to Friday, on Rydal Road, Zone O, which is the street I live on and have done so for over 30 years.</p> <p>You state that this proposal is based on the outcome of Stage 1 Consultation carried out in September 2019, although the number of residents who replied to that consultation was a very small proportion and not a reliable indication of residents' views on the matter. In fact, amongst the local Riggindale support WhatsApp group very few people were aware of this consultation. (I know I have been consulted on this before and objected before, but can't remember for sure when this took place but it seemed longer ago than September 2019)</p> <p>Having lived on Rydal Road for many years I have never had any significant difficulty parking and neither have family or friends visiting. People making deliveries or providing a service to residents have also not had difficulties with parking.</p> <p>There is no need for a CPZ in the Rydal/Riggindale/Thirlmere triangle and I strongly object to its introduction. There certainly is NO need for a whole day CPZ.</p>

<p>150</p>	<p>I write in response to the statutory consultation regarding the introduction of new controlled parking zones in St. Leonards.</p> <p>I have been resident in Rydal Road, zone O, for over 30 years.</p> <p>The number of responders in your stage 1 consultation in September 2019 was low and therefore does not constitute a reliable indication of residents views. It is therefore not appropriate to base this proposal on the outcome of that earlier consultation.</p> <p>Over 30 years there has NOT been significant difficulty in finding parking for residents, visitors, deliveries, and emergency services. Many local roads are wider than average, which facilitates things further for delivery and emergency vehicles. Parking was at its fullest approximately six years ago, and has decreased slightly since then. This could be due to many factors including conversion of properties into flats, reductions in car ownership, and the development of offstreet parking.</p> <p>The only exception to the above is mid day on Fridays when the area is extensively used for visitor parking in order to attend local religious meetings.</p> <p>I therefore strongly suggest there is no need for a daily CPZ in the Rydal/Riggindale/Thirlmere triangle, either whole day or part day.</p>
<p>152</p>	<p>Thank you for the notice you posted through my door regarding the proposed controlled parking zone.</p> <p>I live on Riggindale Road (Zone O) where you propose to introduce a CPZ with controlled hours of 08:30-18:30, Monday to Friday.</p> <p>I have lived in Riggindale Road for 10 years and was surprised to discover that a stage 1 consultation of residents regarding the CPZ took place in 2019. I was not aware of this at the time and do not think that Lambeth made sufficient efforts to inform residents of the plans - I would certainly have replied and made clear my objections to the plans.</p> <p>I have reviewed the results of the survey here: https://moderngov.lambeth.gov.uk/documents/s128721/Appendix%20F%20-%20Stage%201%20Consultation%20Results%20-%20St%20Leonards%20Central.pdf</p> <p>The results show that 17.9% of residents of Riggindale Road responded to the survey. Of these, 62.9% opposed the imposition of CPZ in their road, and 8.6% were not sure.</p> <p>In addition, the results of Q8. IF A CPZ WAS INTRODUCED, WHICH HOURS OF THE DAY WOULD YOU LIKE THE CONTROLS TO BE IN PLACE? show that 38.9% of respondents favoured a 2 hour control, and 26.5% favoured 10am-4pm.</p> <p>The results of this limited survey of residents therefore show a large majority against a CPZ at all. The majority of respondents also expressed an opinion for a short controlled period should a CPZ be imposed.</p>

	<p>Taking the wishes of their residents into account, I am therefore at a loss as to understand why the council is choosing to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) impose a CPZ at all b) set the control period for the longest possible period <p>As mentioned above I also do not accept that the council made sufficient efforts to survey residents in 2019.</p> <p>I am a long term resident of the area and have always been able to park. There is no parking problem in Riggindale Road and the surrounding area and I question the motivation for imposing a CPZ. I would like to strongly object to the introduction of this CPZ and I urge you to take the wishes of your taxpayers and residents into account before you impose these unwanted controls.</p>
<p>158</p>	<p>I would like to plead that you do not introduce the controlled parking zone to Conyers Road. We don't have much of a problem to be honest. Yes some cars are parked outside my house for months on end during the lockdown but generally there are always spaces for parking on my road.</p> <p>If you must impose this upon us then we need the 1 or 2 hour paid parking slot, like in Wandsworth, this seems effective I don't see why we can't have the same. To have 8.30am to 6.30pm is totally ridiculous and unfair on the parking costs that will need to be paid for by us residents.</p>
<p>160</p>	<p>I write to you to oppose the St Leonards CPZ plan. I am a resident of Conyers Road and I do not think we have a problem, furthermore looking at the data collated from residents and local businesses, proportionally its only 50% in support from a total of only 11.6% response.</p> <p>If you do decide to enforce CPZ I strongly urge you to take a more measured approach and set in place 2 hr time slots, which I believe will be enough to deter commuters, local businesses, taxi drivers leaving cars for extended periods of time.</p> <p>I would also like to raise that since the pandemic, office working is now changed forever with hybrid flexible working leading to fewer people commuting altogether now, and thus I do not see a problem along Conyers Road, more so with people dumping cars which CPZ will not resolve.</p>

<p>164</p>	<p>I object to the introduction of CPZ control on Riggindale Road and the surrounding area. I have lived here for 11 years and there has never been an issue with parking spaces on this road and the surrounding areas. Also since the first steps taken were back in 2019, the pandemic and the changing working life will now result in more people working from home. The idea of introducing CPZ controls needs to be reassessed in the current climate. The CPZ is inappropriate and disproportionate to address the issue it is apparently trying to solve, namely some anti-social behaviour at the High Road end of Gleneagle Road. The CPZ will not solve this, nor will it address other concerns mentioned in the responses, such as parking in disabled spaces or difficulties parking directly outside your own home. It will, though, impose significant cost and inconvenience on a large number of residents of surrounding streets. I live on my own and am regularly visited by friends and family but now this may significantly reduce due to them having to pay to park when visiting. At a time when people have been struggling to make ends meet and for the sake of their mental wellbeing it is now more important than ever that people have regular contact with their friends and family in person.</p> <p>The CPZ will result in fewer parking spaces for residents, marginal spaces, near corners or driveways, will be yellow-lined to create the limited number of marked spaces; and owners of driveways will no longer be able to park second cars, visitors, tradespeople and skips across their entrances. As a result, residents may sometimes end up having to park even further away from their homes than they do now, even in adjacent streets. Although the charges to residents have been dismissed as trivial, which now does really matter at a time when many people have lost their jobs and are struggling to make ends meet, people do not need another cost put on them at this moment in time. The costs will be well over £100 per year and take no account of ability to pay, or whether you need your car for work, for health reasons and/or for transporting children and elderly relatives. There are also extra charges linked to permits for visitors, tradespeople and skips, and significant time and hassle is involved in organising these via the Council. The premise for the all-day CPZ was that it would deal with commuter parking, but this is not the case as the streets to the east, between the stations, will not have chargeable restrictions. If there is still a problem with anti-social actions at the top of Gleneagle, then these should be dealt with directly – the CPZ is inappropriate and is just another means of getting money from people.</p>
<p>168</p>	<p>Objections to proposed CPZ St Leonards Central O</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The consultation to date has not penetrated the local population sufficiently. The response level of under 10% bears this out. 2. There is no parking problem at present except perhaps with the exception of Fridays for prayers at the Mosque in Streatham High Road. 3. Why is there a 10-hour restriction being proposed for St Leonard's Central when the other areas are having only 2 hours restrictions proposed? 4. Why should we be financially penalised for our friends, family and tradesmen to park in our street? 5. If this about making money, the Council should at least be honest enough to say so. <p>We still strongly object to the proposed scheme.</p>

<p>169</p>	<p>Objections to proposed CPZ St Leonards Central (Zone O)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The consultation to date has not penetrated the local population sufficiently. The response level of under 10% bears this out. 2. There is no parking problem at present except perhaps with the exception of Fridays for prayers at the Mosque in Streatham High Road. 3. Why is there a 10-hour restriction being proposed for St Leonard's Central when the other areas are having only 2 hours restrictions proposed? 4. Why should we be financially penalised for our friends, family and tradesmen to park in our street? 5. If this about making money, the Council should at least be honest enough to say so. <p>We still strongly object to the proposed scheme.</p>
<p>170</p>	<p>I write with great concern at the proposed controlled parking zone you wish to introduce at St Leonards Central/Streatham area. I am fully against such a proposal and oppose this for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Restrictions are to generate revenue for the council. 2. Parking is currently not an issue there is no justification for a controlled parking zone. 3. It's not acceptable to have to pay to park outside/near your own home - financial burden. 4. Security for our cars and homes bringing unnecessary footfall to our road. 5. The controlled times are too restrictive for family and friends to come and visit 6. The restriction times are longer for Fairmile Avenue and for absolutely no reason. <p>I hope you will take these comments into consideration.</p>
<p>173</p>	<p>I write to strongly object to the proposed CPZ in St Leonard's Central. As usual, the proposals are being pushed through without proper consultation with the local population and against the wishes of the majority.</p> <p>The consultation to date has not penetrated the local area sufficiently, the very poor response rates bear this out.</p> <p>We object to any parking restrictions in the area, we don't believe there is a problem and this is more about the Council raising revenue. The only time there is sometimes a possible parking issue is on some Fridays for prayers at the Mosque.</p> <p>Why is St Leonard's Central being proposed 10 hours a day restrictions 08.30 - 18.30 when other areas have a 2 hour proposal? This seems unfair. Why should we have to pay for our children's elderly grandfather to park so he can visit? Why should we and our neighbours have to bear the cost of parking for plumbers, builders and other tradespeople working at our homes?</p> <p>We object to these proposals in the strongest terms and beg that you do not impose them on us.</p>

<p>175</p>	<p>I have received the Statutory consultation newsletter and I am very concerned with the proposal to impose the 10 hours of controlled parking in St Leonards Central (ZONE O) for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The consultation to date has not penetrated the local population sufficiently. The response level of under 10% bears this out. 2. There is no parking problem at present except perhaps with the exception of Fridays for prayers at the Mosque only in Mitcham Lane and Babbington road. 3. Why is there a 10-hour restriction being proposed for St Leonard's Central when zones I and U are having only 2 hours restrictions proposed? 4. Why should we be financially penalised for our friends, family and tradesmen to park in our streets? 5. I feel this is about making money, the Council should at least be honest enough to say so. <p>We still strongly object to the proposed scheme.</p>
<p>176</p>	<p>I write to strongly object to the proposed CPZ in St Leonard's Central. As usual, the proposals are being pushed through without proper consultation with the local population of residents and the businesses and against the wishes of the majority.</p> <p>Delivery vans will have to pay, thus increasing the costs of goods. The consultation to date has not penetrated the local area sufficiently, the very poor response rates bear this out. Effort should be made by the councilors to inform the residents by leaflets.</p> <p>We object to any parking restrictions in the area, we don't believe there is a problem and this is more about the Council raising revenue. The only time there is sometimes a possible parking issue is on some Fridays for prayers at the Mosque. This only affects Gerrards road, Gleneagle road and Babbington roads only during Friday lunchtime prayers and on the festive days.</p> <p>Why is St Leonard's Central being proposed 10 hours a day restrictions 08.30 - 18.30 when other areas have a 2 hour proposal? This seems unfair. Why should our children's elderly grandparents or the grandchildren to visit their grandparents have to pay for the simple joys in life. Why should we and our neighbours have to bear the cost of parking for plumbers, builders and other tradespeople working at our homes?</p> <p>We object to these proposals in the strongest terms and ask for the consultation be held in public place, so that the public can voice their opinions. Not everyone reads the communication from the council, as such the responses are very poor. The majority have not voiced their opinions and as such to impose these charges is undemocratic.</p>

<p>177</p>	<p>I write to strongly object to the proposed CPZ in St Leonard's Central. As usual, the proposals are being pushed through without proper consultation with the local population of residents and the businesses and against the wishes of the majority.</p> <p>Delivery vans will have to pay, thus increasing the costs of goods.</p> <p>The consultation to date has not penetrated the local area sufficiently, the very poor response rates bear this out. Effort should be made by the councilors to inform the residents by leaflets.</p> <p>We object to any parking restrictions in the area, we don't believe there is a problem and this is more about the Council raising revenue. The only time there is sometimes a possible parking issue is on some Fridays for prayers at the Mosque. This only affects Gerrards road, Gleneagle road and Babbington roads only during Friday lunchtime prayers and on the festive days.</p> <p>Why is St Leonard's Central being proposed 10 hours a day restrictions 08.30 - 18.30 when other areas have a 2 hour proposal? This seems unfair. Why should our children's elderly grandparents or the grandchildren to visit their grandparents have to pay for the simple joys in life. Why should we and our neighbours have to bear the cost of parking for plumbers, builders and other tradespeople working at our homes?</p> <p>We object to these proposals in the strongest terms and ask for the consultation be held in public place, so that the public can voice their opinions. Not everyone reads the communication from the council, as such the responses are very poor. The majority have not voiced their opinions and as such to impose these charges is undemocratic.</p>
<p>178</p>	<p>I write to strongly object to the proposed CPZ in St Leonard's Central. As usual, the proposals are being pushed through without proper consultation with the local population of residents and businesses and against the wishes of the majority.</p> <p>Delivery vans will have to pay, thus increasing the costs of goods.</p> <p>The consultation to date has not penetrated the local area sufficiently, the very poor response rates bear this out. Effort should be made by the councillors to inform the residents by leaflets.</p> <p>We object to any parking restrictions in the area, we don't believe there is a problem and this is more about the Council raising revenue. The only time there is sometimes a possible parking issue is on some Fridays for prayers at the Mosque. This only affects Gerrards road, Gleneagle road and Babbington roads only during Friday lunchtime prayers and on the festive days.</p> <p>Why is St Leonard's Central being proposed 10 hours a day restrictions 08.30 - 18.30 when other areas have a 2-hour proposal? This seems unfair. Why should our children's elderly grandparents or the grandchildren to visit their grandparents have to pay for the simple joys in life? Why should we and our neighbours have to bear the cost of parking for plumbers, builders and other tradespeople working at our homes?</p> <p>We object to these proposals in the strongest terms and ask for the consultation</p>

	<p>to be held in a public place so that the public can voice their opinions. Not everyone reads the communication from the council, as such the responses are very poor. The majority have not voiced their opinions and as such to impose these charges is undemocratic.</p>
182	<p>I write to respond to the consultation regarding parking controls in St Leonards Central.</p> <p>The recommendation that this area become CPZ with controlled hours between 8.30 and 6.30pm is both unnecessary, unwanted and which I strongly oppose.</p> <p>I am a Conyers Road resident (for over 20 years) and have had no difficulties parking in my road. I have 2 vehicles. Throughout the pandemic, residents have parked freely in the road with no difficulty. Indeed, throughout the past year I have been able to park in front of my home. This confirms that when the road has additional cars parked, these stem from commuters using both Streatham and Streatham Common Stations. I would suggest that should a cpz be necessary, then the lesser intrusive controlled hours between 12.00 noon and 2pm would be more appropriate.</p> <p>The Council is proposing a sledge hammer to crack a nut, and would undoubtedly result in more residents using their front gardens as driveways, which has environmental consequences and will lose the character and ambience of the area. Please rethink.</p>
183	<p>I have had no reply so I would like to just register my thoughts on the CPZ regarding our business.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Several of my tenants have expressed they may need to leave the co-share unit that we have, as a business permit would be too cost prohibitive. The shared unit is mostly comprised of artists so it will be a shame to lose them -One of my tenants has a photography studio, with visiting clients who use the studio for the day, so having an all day CPZ will not work for them at all. -We have 2 manufacturing businesses, which need vehicles for work so not feasible to take public transport so will need to get business permits <p>We propose that Conyers Road has a 2 hour window CPZ, as an all day one seems excessive. Ideally we do not feel that we need one, I have always been able to park on Conyers Road but im aware that if Gleneagle and surrounds get CPZs then all traffic would move to conyers road, so this also isnt a great option.</p>
184	<p>We do not feel that Conyers Road needs a CPZ, however if surrounding roads get them then all traffic will be pushed to our road.</p> <p>Our business we have regular visitors, subcontractors and delivery drivers we would propose that the CPZ is 2 hours for our road (to stop commuters) but the space between our premises and in front of the waterworks should be a few bays for 1 hour free parking, to allow visitors and delivery drivers to safely visit us. (like what they have outside of Amesbury Ave to allow people to visit the shop)</p>

<p>188</p>	<p>This is an ill thought out untidy plan which has obviously not reached many people in time for them to for them to give a thoughtful response. Why is the Central "O"zone designated an 8.30 - 6.30 restriction when the North "I" and Stanthorpe Triangle "U" are restricted from 12.00 - 2.00? This does not make sense as both these zones are very near stations.This has not been explained clearly. The restrictions at Ambleside/Gleneagle are seldom enforced: if the cars were constantly clamped, ticketed or towed away over a 3 week period the drivers would give up and find somewhere else. Why doesn't the enforcement agency to this? The restrictions will not discourage the abandonment of vehicles. This will inconvenience residents unless the vehicles are removed immediately. The 8.30-6.30 restrictions will not deter early evening parking in Gleneagle Rd so those residents will be no better served. On a more personal note: I am a single occupier older resident who often needs maintenance work done on my property as I am not able to do this myself . It seems discriminatory for me to be penalised for needing help by having to pay for permits. Again I do not understand why the number of responses does not have the same weight as the content. After all some people are not as eloquent or as educated as others - another form of discrimination perhaps, had you thought of that? I do object to this proposal on the grounds that it is neither fair or proportional. It sounds as if it will be another income stream for the council. If so own up and be honest and I am sure that residents would be less hostile.</p>
<p>189</p>	<p>We write with great concern at the proposed controlled parking zone you wish to introduce at St Leonards Central/Streatham area. We are fully against such a proposal and oppose this for the following reasons: 1. Restrictions are to generate revenue for the council. 2. Parking is currently not an issue there is no justification for a controlled parking zone. 3. It's not acceptable to have to pay to park outside/near your own home - financial burden. 4. Security for our cars and homes bringing unnecessary footfall to our road. 5. The controlled times are too restrictive for family and friends to come and visit us pensioners. 6. The restriction times are longer for Fairmile Avenue and for absolutely no reason. We hope you will take these comments into consideration, my husband and I can only reiterate we fully oppose this.</p>
<p>190</p>	<p>I am surprised and disheartened to learn of the proposals you are intending to impose on certain zones within Lambeth. They reinforce the slow growth of the strangulation of normal life of those living in such zones. Is it, I wonder, all about raising money for the Covid 19 starved council funds without concern for the daily social interactions between residents? If it is to restrict parking in areas adjacent to rail stations, why not impose a time limitation to restrict those commuters from leaving their cars parked all day? Additionally, there is no explanation for different restrictions in certain zones, particularly the one in which I live. Is it really necessary for visitors, tradesmen and families, to have to pay over £30 per day for a 10 hour stay? I believe there should be a better and fairer way to impose such restrictions, which differ from some zones and are punitively expensive.</p>

	<p>I think your proposals need to be thought through with more concern for those living here and I wish to lodge my formal objection.</p>
<p>191</p>	<p>. The consultation to date has not penetrated the local population sufficiently. The response level of under 10% bears this out.</p> <p>2. There is no parking problem at present except perhaps with the exception of Fridays for prayers at the Mosque.</p> <p>3. Why is a 10 hour restriction being proposed for St Leonard's Central when the other areas are having 2 hours restrictions proposed?</p> <p>4. We should we be financially penalised for our friends, family and tradesmen to park?</p> <p>5. If this about making money, the Council should at least be honest enough to say so. We still object.</p>
<p>192</p>	<p>I was shocked and angry to hear that a new CPZ is being proposed for my street, Riggindale Road, and that the plan is that it would extend from 8.30 to 6.30pm, the longest period proposed, as we sit in St Leonard's Central (Zone 0). I thoroughly object to this.</p> <p>I have lived here for nearly 4 years now and have never found a problem with friends or family parking on the street. Also due to Covid making public transport use unsafe, I have owned a car for the last year & park it on our road. I recall rejecting this proposal years ago as it is absolutely not needed or wanted. You are essentially penalising residents in the area & adding to their living costs.</p> <p>I have seen stats from the consultation report, and it appears that only approx 10% of residents gave feedback & of those, most were either happy with our current parking & objected to a CPZ, or at the very most only wanted 2 hour parking restrictions. I am in a WhatsApp group with residents on my street along with the surrounding Thirlmere Road & Rydal Road, & the feedback from this group is unanimously against a CPZ. I question how well you connected with the residents to receive such a poor response to your survey & to conclude that a CPZ is required when this is not a reflection of the residents' wishes.</p> <p>I am utterly shocked that this is at this stage.</p> <p>The consultation figures state that 237 residents responded out of 2037 (11.6%). This highlights a real inadequacy in your consultation method. Perhaps a door to door survey might result in more accurate answers? Certainly more resident surveys are needed than just the one that was carried out in Sept 2019.</p> <p>I strongly urge that you reconsult to get a true reflection of the majority wishes and also present more reasons as to why you believe this CPZ is required. Our road is a 15 minute walk from Streatham Station and Streatham High Street so I can't understand why anyone would choose to park here to reach either. Which again leads me to the conclusion that you are penalising residents who own cars just for living on their own street, which is absolutely unacceptable.</p> <p>I look forward to discussing this matter further before any final decisions about the St Leonard's CPZ are made.</p>

194

I am a resident on Gleneagle Road and have lived here for nearly 20yrs. I live in a first floor Victorian conversion and have back issues. I park my car across the front of the driveway on the street (the driveway belongs to an elderly lady downstairs and doesn't let anyone use it even though she does not own a car) I would like the decision about the CPZ to be reversed, I appreciate some neighbours have encountered on-street problems, and these are regrettable and hugely frustrating for them. But the lower demand since the pandemic, which is likely to continue as more people work from home, should be enough on its own to suggest the Council should reconsider.

It's noticeable there are generally spare parking spaces available in these streets (as well as many empty driveways); they are not full – and just to restate, I've never had a problem parking in Gleneagle Road in 20years. The CPZ is inappropriate and disproportionate to address the issue it is apparently trying to solve, namely some anti-social behaviour at the High Road end of Gleneagle Road. The CPZ will not solve this, nor will it address other concerns mentioned in the responses, such as parking in disabled spaces or difficulties parking directly outside your own home. It will, though, impose significant cost and inconvenience on a large number of residents of surrounding streets.

Some further reflections on the correspondence: It may not be generally realised that the CPZ will result in fewer parking spaces for residents. This is because marginal spaces, near corners or driveways, will be yellow-lined to create the limited number of marked spaces; and owners of driveways will no longer be able to park second cars, visitors, tradespeople and skips across their entrances. As a result, residents may sometimes end up having to park even further away from their homes than they do now, even in adjacent streets.

Although the charges to residents have been dismissed as trivial, they will be well over £100 per year and take no account of ability to pay, or whether you need your car for work, for health reasons and/or for transporting children and elderly relatives. There are also extra charges linked to permits for visitors, tradespeople and skips, and significant time and hassle is involved in organising these via the Council. The CPZ also puts a spotlight on the issue of off-street driveways – under a CPZ, the stretch of road at the entrance to each driveway has in effect been privatised as neither local residents nor the Council can benefit from it; but driveway owners don't pay CPZ charges. Nothing at all personally against driveway owners, but this seems unfair.

The premise for the all-day CPZ was that it would deal with commuter parking, but this is not the case as the streets to the east, between the stations, will not have chargeable restrictions. If there is still a problem with anti-social actions at the top of Gleneagle, then these should be dealt with directly – the CPZ is inappropriate and disproportionate.

It is unfair to make residents incur costs to park their cars with no guarantee of being able to park anywhere near they're home. It makes no sense only more money in Lambeth council's pocket.

195

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the recent report on a consultation about parking in the St Leonard's Central zone. I would like to register my objection to a CPZ in this zone because it is inappropriate and disproportionate.

Reading between the lines, it looks like the main motivation for all-day parking restrictions in St Leonard's Central is to discourage anti-social activity activity at the Ambleside Avenue end of Gleneagle Road. Such activity is distressing for residents and should be addressed, but the proposed restrictions are unnecessary and excessive.

I appreciate some neighbours have encountered parking problems, and these are regrettable and hugely frustrating for them. But the lower demand since the pandemic, which is likely to continue as more people work from home, should be enough on its own to suggest the Council should reconsider.

It's noticeable there are generally spare parking spaces available in these streets (as well as many empty driveways); the streets are not full – I have never had a problem parking in Conyers Road in 26 years. The CPZ is not the right solution to address the issue it is apparently trying to solve, namely any anti-social behaviour at the High Road end of Gleneagle Road. The CPZ will not solve this, but it will impose significant cost and inconvenience on a large number of residents of surrounding streets. Only 47% of consultees agreed with a CPZ (in fact, only 55% felt there was any kind of parking problem), and there was a pro-CPZ majority in only 7 of the 22 streets in the zone. So the majority of residents will bear additional, permanent cost and inconvenience in a bid to alleviate perceived problems in some small areas (even in Gleneagle Road, only 51% support any kind of CPZ).

Overall, the CPZ will result in fewer parking spaces for residents. This is because marginal spaces, near driveways for example, will be yellow-lined to create the limited number of marked spaces; and owners of driveways will no longer be able to park second cars, visitors, tradespeople and skips across their entrances. As a result, residents may sometimes end up having to park even further away from their homes than they do now, even in adjacent streets. The charges to residents will be significant and take no account of ability to pay, or whether you need your car for work, for health reasons and/or for transporting children and elderly relatives. There are also extra charges linked to permits for visitors, tradespeople and skips, and significant time and hassle will be involved in organising these via the Council.

The premise for the all-day CPZ was that it would deal with commuter parking, but this is not the case as the streets to the east, between the stations, will not have chargeable restrictions. If there is still a problem with anti-social actions at the top of Gleneagle Road, then these should be dealt with directly with targeted solutions, not by a CPZ.

Would it be possible for the Council to re-run the consultation? I believe the minority of people who were in favour of a CPZ may be even fewer post-pandemic, when any problems have diminished considerably.

<p>197</p>	<p>Due to the pandemic our studio has been closed for most of 2020 and 2021 and this proposal would have a devastating impact on our ability to restore our business to pre-pandemic levels.</p> <p>Our key objection to St Leonards Zone O is that having this in operations between 8:30am to 6:30pm Monday to Friday would have a huge negative impact on our studio hire business as we hire out our studio between 10am and 10pm meaning that all of our clients could be affected. Our typical bookings are for four hours (10am - 2pm, 2pm - 6pm or 6pm - 10pm). Therefore if they can reduce the restricted hours to 10am to 12pm or 12pm to 2pm, this would reduce the impact and reduce impact on our customer base but also discourage parking by commuters.</p> <p>As we are at the outer boundary of the St Leonards Central (Zone O) many roads that are much closer to streatham station and streatham bus garage are in less restricted zones with a 12 noon to 2pm controlled hours.</p> <p>Another core customer base for our business are families who come from all around London and across the South East for family photo sessions who often travel by car. A 8:30am - 6:30pm controlled zone will also prevent many of our clients from this demographic from booking with us and select photographers in neighbouring boroughs with less restrictive on-street parking.</p> <p>As a working photography studio we also have to bring many bulky items and deliver large pieces of wall art to clients. According to the Lambeth website (https://beta.lambeth.gov.uk/starting-business/business-parking-permits) a business parking permit is £645.12 for 12 months. As you can imagine for a business recovering from a massive reduction in revenue due to the pandemic, this is a massive additional cost.</p> <p>We appreciate the need to improve the parking provision for residents and encourage more sustainable transportation, but for creative businesses like ours, many of our clients have bulky equipment or multiple outfits to bring to the studio. For our family clients travelling by car is a much more practical especially if this is the only chance they have to create a lasting memory to share with loved ones.</p> <p>I hope that you are able to consider our views when evaluating a change to the current proposal.</p>
<p>198</p>	<p>My name is xxxx and I am a resident at Fernwood Avenue, that seems it may be affected as it falls under St Leonard's Central 'O'.</p> <p>One of the reasons I got a car was that I didn't have to pay for parking on my street, however, it has proven to be difficult to find a parking spot at times.</p> <p>Depending on how much the parking permit will be for residents, I would be happy to pay that amount provided that this would improve the parking options, not only at Fernwood Av, but the surrounding areas as well.</p> <p>However, I would like to express my concerns that this may not improve the parking situation for residents due to nearby shops, pubs, places of prayer, etc, and having to pay a monthly fee to park but not able to find a parking space, and in that case I would oppose.</p> <p>If possible, I would like to see the pros and cons of this proposal. I appreciate the consultation, however, not further information aside from the areas affected is being provided, at least I am not able to find it. Only then I would be able to express a concrete opinion.</p>

200

1. I write to object because the public consultation so far shows that there is no demand in the streets near me for a CPZ.
2. I object to the introduction of a Controlled Parking zone in the street where I live, Riggindale Road. Parking is not a problem here, and never has been during the day. Care workers, tradespeople and visitors have always been able to park in this road. It is used by few commuters, and even fewer during the covid period. With the likely long-term position that fewer people will be returning to central London office working, any lack of parking space problem that there used to be will be reduced.
3. I object to the 8.30am-6.30pm proposal for this area too. This is longer than the areas North 'I' and Stanthorpe 'U' which are nearer the local railways stations, and yet will be controlled only 12noon to 2pm! Why is that?
4. However, I recognise there could be "displacement" if every adjacent road is controlled on weekdays.
5. Therefore, if a CPZ has to be introduced, the maximum period here should be one hour 10am-11am weekdays which would end any commuter or displacement problems, if there are any.
6. A CPZ was introduced where I lived previously. After all the new paint had been applied to indicate where parking was allowed, there were actually fewer places to park than before!
7. Currently I park on the area in front of my long-established dropped curb, which is indicated by a white line. I understand that's not possible in a CPZ, so that will reduce the spaces in our road instantly.

202

I am writing to express my objections to the proposed CPZ for St Leonard's, but in particular, against the draconian measures for St Leonard's Central. It would appear that the original consultation did not extend far enough and one would have presumed that further consultation would have been sensible before proceeding with something that was neither wanted or deemed necessary by most of the local residents.

Based on the numbers consulted the council surely cannot claim to have delivered to a wide audience and the responses reflected that there was not a bad parking problem in the area, that there was no call for a CPZ and if there was to be a CPZ then a 2 hour time limit would be preferred. So, we were shocked to find that this proposal was still going ahead and annoyed to discover that we are facing a 10 hour CPZ.

In discussions with friends in the general St Leonard's area, even people without cars are generally against these proposed restrictions as it will have an impact on everyone's finances. Why should our elderly neighbour, with no car herself, have to pay for parking for her gardener, window cleaner, plumber etc. to come to her house to do work for her. This will have a negative effect on many small local businesses who are already suffering so badly after the last 18 months.

My neighbours and I are horrified at the prospect of having 10 hours a day of a CPZ meaning that at any time of the day our friends, family and anyone carrying out any works in our properties will have to pay to park. We are at a loss to understand why, if we have to have a CPZ at all, we have been saddled with 10 hours when the other 2 areas, St Leonard's North and the Stanthorpe Triangle, are only being subjected to a 2 hour restriction. Is the reason behind this to garner more money for the council? That is the only reason we can think of because it can't possibly be to help the local residents otherwise you wouldn't be proposing something so grossly unfair. If it is to stop commuters from parking then surely 2 hours would suffice.

This will create more parking problems for people living in the vicinity - there are a high percentage of properties with off street parking currently. At the moment their visitors can park over their driveway - this will no longer be possible so any visitors will be taking up the parking spaces on the street so as a result there will be less spaces for other people.

In conclusion I wholeheartedly object to these over zealous restrictions and plead with you not to carry out your proposals.

<p>207</p>	<p>I object to the proposed CPZ, in St Leonards.</p> <p>I live on Riggindale Road and in our road ant the surrounding roads there is no parking problem.</p> <p>If only 11.6% of residents replied to the consultation, how can you possibly read into that that most residents want controlled parking and looking at the data I cannot see how you have come up with most people wanting all day restrictions.</p> <p>In one road, your data says that 100% of residents want controlled parking where in fact only one resident replied so what about all the other residents wishes?</p> <p>I do not believe that an 11.6% response rate reflects the feeling of the residents of St Leonards, and with a response rate so low this should have never moved not the next stage.</p> <p>I strongly urge that you start the consultation process again to get a true reflection of the majority wishes.</p>
<p>208</p>	<p>I was disappointed when I received your letter that a CPZ will be introduced in my Street Riggindale Road from 8:30pm till 6:30pm.</p> <p>I did receive a questionnaire in the post a while ago and I filled it in as a two hour slot only if was needed but I don't see the need for it.</p> <p>Me and the rest of the Riggindale Road residents have all discussed this and the overwhelming majority are not in favour of this CPZ.</p> <p>Also it has become clear that the big majority of the local residents have not filled in the form and as such surely this decision cannot go ahead as the return of forms is so small surely this cannot be considered a fair result/decision.</p> <p>I would kindly ask you to reconsider this decision as I do feel it's been made without the majority of residents being in favour.</p>
<p>210</p>	<p>I'm writing to oppose the introduction of an 0830-1830 CPZ in our area which seems entirely inappropriate for an area which has little to no parking issues associated with the area.</p> <p>The suggestion seems contrary to the very small amount of feedback given in the initial consultation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 100 of 2037 residents wanted the hours above. That's 4.9% . Do you think it's appropriate to bring in a measure with such low support in consultation? - 77 wanted two hour. That's 3.8%. Meaning you are basing a decision on 1.1% preference which is entirely inadequate to infer preference given the low level of feedback <p>The suggestion (0830-1830) also seems inappropriate and penal given areas closer to public transport will not have such long restrictions introduced.</p> <p>It's clear that the plan is not supported by the evidence of the consultation and indeed makes a mockery of the idea of meaningful consultation.</p> <p>I strongly oppose these plans.</p>

<p>212</p>	<p>I am a resident of Gleneagle Road and have been for the last 28 years. Prior to living at this address I have lived in and around Streatham for about 35 years.</p> <p>I would like to express that I am not in favour of such a scheme at all.</p> <p>I drive a car most days to work and back and do not experience any great difficulty in parking reasonably close to my home and I understand that only 51% of people in this road think that introducing this scheme will be a good idea so they probably have the same experience.</p> <p>I leave for work before 8.30am and get home after 6.30 as, I imagine, most people do so this would not benefit me or many others in any way.</p> <p>I understand that there is a belief that there are people who commute to the Streatham stations from afar, park up and continue into town to work. I think that such people will easily be able to afford the daily parking fee and so will not lessen any burden on available parking spaces. I also think that this scheme was dreamt up before covid and there is a massive rush for the type of person I mention to be working from home in the future and so the demand will naturally lessen.</p> <p>I have not been able to find any mention anywhere of the cost of implementing this scheme and can only imagine the huge price tag - I am absolutely convinced that there are a plethora of better ways to use this money to benefit the whole community if this area. I also cannot find any mention of the cost of a residents parking permit either which worries me- how can I be in favour of something that I have no idea of what it will cost me either now or in the future.</p> <p>I also object to this scheme on the basis that the necessary street furniture to inform the public of this cpz area will ugly, obtrusive and will degrade the general appearance of an area I love .</p> <p>To conclude, I cannot see what this scheme hopes to achieve for I cannot see the problem.</p> <p>I hope that you make note of my objections and consign this scheme to the bin.</p>
<p>213</p>	<p>In reference to the recent consultation with regards to introducing a new CPZ, I live in Riggindale road and am part of a residents social media group consisting of my street and the surrounding ones within the proposed CPZ. We are a fairly small group of only 107 households which I realise does not represent everyone but it does appear that practically the only thing people agree on is that this is not in the interest of the residents and I would like to suggest that you host a meeting with the residents to discuss it on the streets.</p> <p>Please could you reply to let me know your intentions and we can try and set up a large zoom meeting to discuss as a group.</p> <p>Also given how many people I know have objected without a response please could one of you do me the courtesy of confirming that you have received this email.</p>

<p>214</p>	<p>I have been informed by my neighbours that a CPZ was proposed in my Street, Rydal road, and that it would extend from 8.30 am to 6.30pm.</p> <p>I strongly object to this.</p> <p>I have lived here for 5 years now and have never found a problem with friends family parking on the street.</p> <p>I have read the consultation report, and the feedback from this looks poor. I am wondering how well you connected with the residents to receive such a poor response.</p> <p>Only 7 out of 64 residents consulted replied, which I find hard to believe. When did you send these out? Of this 10% consulted, most wanted a 2 hour parking restriction.</p> <p>So this is not a reflection of the residents' wishes.</p> <p>The consultation figures state that 237 residents responded out of 2037 (11.6%). This highlights a real inadequacy in your consultation method.</p> <p>I strongly urge that you reconsult to get a true reflection of the majority wishes.</p>
<p>217</p>	<p>I live on Rydal Road and I am emailing to express my disagreement with the CPZ arrangement on Rydal Road.</p> <p>I have never had trouble parking on my road; no park restrictions was a contributing factor in my decision to move to Rydal Road and i responded to the original consultation with my disagreement for this. Could you explain please how this decision has been made?</p> <p>Council Tax in Lambeth has gone up significantly in the last few years - far more than inflation. As seen below, Band D has increased by 10% in 2 years.</p> <p>2019/20 - £1445 2020/22 - £1592</p> <p>This is becoming unsustainable. If you add in a parking permit for the year, in which the council will undoubtedly look for an excuse to rise every year - it'll be unaffordable to live in this area.</p> <p>This is clearly a simple ploy for extra financing and it's unacceptable to all local residents.</p> <p>I would like statistics please on how many people have responded positively in wanting this CPZ.</p>

<p>218</p>	<p>1. I write to object because the public consultation so far shows that there is no demand in the streets near me for a CPZ.</p> <p>2. I object to the introduction of a Controlled Parking zone in the street where I live, Riggindale Road. Parking is not a problem here, and never has been during the day. Care workers, tradespeople and visitors have always been able to park in this road. It is used by few commuters, and even fewer during the covid period. With the likely long-term position that fewer people will be returning to central London office working, any lack of parking space problem that there used to be will be reduced.</p> <p>3. I object to the 8.30am-6.30pm proposal for this area too. This is longer than the areas North 'I' and Stanthorpe 'U' which are nearer the local railways stations, and yet will be controlled only 12noon to 2pm! Why is that?</p> <p>4. However, I recognise there could be "displacement" if every adjacent road is controlled on weekdays.</p> <p>5. Therefore, if a CPZ has to be introduced, the maximum period here should be one hour 10am-11am weekdays which would end any commuter or displacement problems, if there are any.</p> <p>6. A CPZ was introduced where I lived previously. After all the new paint had been applied to indicate where parking was allowed, there were actually fewer places to park than before!</p> <p>7. Currently I park on the area in front of my long-established dropped curb, which is indicated by a white line. I understand that's not possible in a CPZ, so that will reduce the spaces in our road instantly.</p>
<p>219</p>	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed new parking zone. I currently live in an area where there have always been issues with parking but do not believe the solutions you are proposing will help with these. I also don't see how they will assist with anti social behaviour on Gleneldon and this should be tackled as a separate issue.</p> <p>Fernwood Avenue has a particular issue with parking and believe this is primarily due to the many places of worship in walking distance and therefore a 4 HR restriction would not help as services are usually 1-2 hrs long.</p> <p>If all residents were allocated a space per property with their annual charge, I know I would feel more favourable towards this. However, I believe the CPZ will result in fewer parking spaces for residents. This is because marginal spaces, near corners or driveways, will be yellow-lined to create the limited number of marked spaces; and owners of driveways will no longer be able to park second cars, visitors, tradespeople and skips across their entrances. As a result, residents may sometimes end up having to park even further away from their homes than they do now, even in adjacent streets.</p> <p>Although the charges to residents have been dismissed as trivial, they will be well over £100 per year and take no account of ability to pay, or whether you need your car for work, for health reasons and/or for transporting children and elderly relatives. There are also extra charges linked to permits for visitors, tradespeople and skips, and significant time and hassle is involved in organising these via the Council. The CPZ also puts a spotlight on the issue of off-street</p>

	<p>driveways – under a CPZ, the stretch of road at the entrance to each driveway has in effect been privatised as neither local residents nor the Council can benefit from it; but driveway owners don't pay CPZ charges. Nothing at all personally against driveway owners, but this seems unfair.</p> <p>The premise for the all-day CPZ was that it would deal with commuter parking, but this is not the case as the streets to the east, between the stations, will not have chargeable restrictions. If there is still a problem with anti-social actions at the top of Gleneagle, then these should be dealt with directly – the CPZ is inappropriate and disproportionate.</p> <p>I sadly believe this is yet another decision that will have already been made but please take this as my objection</p>
<p>221</p>	<p>I write to object to the introduction of CPZ in my area for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The public consultation so far shows that there is no demand in the streets near me for a CPZ. 2. I object to the introduction of a Controlled Parking zone in the street where I live, Riggindale Road. Parking is not a problem here, and never has been at any time si the six years I have been here. I'm almost surprised when I don't park directly outside my front door and always find a space a couple of meters away. I've never not sound a space on the road at anytime. Our road is used by few commuters and we never have any issues parking. Now with remote working becoming ever more popular following Covid, the likely long-term position is that fewer people will be returning to central London office working so it is unlikely this will become an issue. 3. I object to the 8.30am-6.30pm proposal for this area too. Why is this a longer period than that proposed for areas North 'I' and Stanthorpe 'U' which are nearer the local railways stations, and yet will only be controlled only 12noon to 2pm? This clearly hasn't been thought through. We do not have a parking issue in our area. 4. I do recognise there could be "displacement" if "every" adjacent road is controlled on weekdays. This is why the whole proposal needs to be reviewed. <p>Riggindale Road is a lovely street that can welcome trades people, care workers, family and friends. We have no issues with parking whatsoever. I therefore strongly object to this proposal.</p>
<p>222</p>	<p>I HEREBY PLACE AN OBJECTION TO THE INTRODUCTION OF THE CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE ON GLENEAGLE ROAD.</p> <p>THE RESIDENTS OF THIS ROAD SHOULD NOT HAVE TO PAY TO PARK IN THEIR OWN ROAD.</p> <p>THIS DOES NOT ALLOW FAMILY MEMBERS TO BE ABLE TO VISIT WITHOUT INCURRING FINANCIAL COST.</p>

<p>223</p>	<p>I am writing to strongly object to the proposed plans for controlled parking zones in the St Leonard's areas.</p> <p>My family and I were not given a formal indication of consultation of the council's plans so were only alerted via neighbours; after which time we recieved a letter in the post that this had proceeded to the next stage. We therefore feel unduly excluded from any consultation to date.</p> <p>We have however looked at the response rates & outcomes of the previous consultation & would like to strongly object to the introduction of a CPZ on the following bases:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the previous consultation report shows that there is no demand in the streets in our neighbourhood for a CPZ. - there is not problem with parking here, and never has been during the day. Care workers, tradespeople and visitors have always been able to park in this road. It is used by few commuters, and even fewer during the covid period. - with the likely long-term position that fewer people will be returning to central London office working, any lack of parking space problem that there used to be will be reduced. - there is a completely abject discrepancy between the zones in the immediate area - the one proposed for our road is a full day one, whilst for adjacent roads it is only for one hour per day. Neither makes sense given we do not live close to a commuter station <p>Please take into consideration the pronounced objections from your constituents and dismiss this proposal or at the very least put in place a proper process for consultation. The decision to introduce new measures is absolutely at odds with local feeling.</p>
<p>224</p>	<p>I would like to submit my view on the proposed CPZ for St Leonards Central CPZ. I object to the proposed hours because I consider a 2 or 4 hour restriction Monday to Friday is sufficient to address the issues with cars being left by non residents for long periods.</p> <p>There should also be meters to take payment for those that do not have the ability to pay by telephone e.g. my elderly father would struggle to use a telephone payment system. I am also concerned that residents who have carers (my elderly neighbour has carers every day) should not have to pay for permits for the individuals who help her with personal care.</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to read this.</p>

228

I was shocked to hear from my neighbours that a CPZ was proposed in my Street, Thirlmere Road, and that it would extend from 8.30 to 6.30pm. When and how was this circulated? How many times? Was it emailed?

I thoroughly object to this.

I object to the introduction of a Controlled Parking zone in Thirlmere Road. Parking is not a problem here, and never has been during the day. Care workers, tradespeople and visitors have always been able to park in this road. It is used by few commuters, and even fewer during the covid period. With the likely long-term position that fewer people will be returning to central London office working, any lack of parking space problem that there used to be will be reduced.

I have lived here for 15 years now and have never found a problem with friends family parking on the street. I recall rejecting this proposal years ago.

Currently I park on the area in front of my long-established dropped curb, which is indicated by a white line. I understand that's not possible in a CPZ, so that will reduce the spaces in our road instantly.

I have read the consultation report, and the feedback from this looks scant. I question how well you engaged with the residents to receive such a poor response.

Only 7 out of 64 residents consulted replied, which I find hard to believe. When did you send these out? Of this 10% consulted, most wanted a 2 hour parking restriction.

Why was this not recirculated? This is not a fair reflection of the residents' wishes.

I am utterly shocked that the consultation is already at this stage!

The consultation figures state that 237 residents responded out of 2037 (11.6%). This highlights a real inadequacy in your consultation method.

I strongly urge that you reconsult to get a true reflection of the majority wishes.

<p>243</p>	<p>I am writing to express my objection to the proposal for CPZ in my road (Riggindale) and the surrounding streets.</p> <p>There is no evidence of any parking issues in the immediate vicinity as would clearly be evidenced if you were to accurately review the situation during the day time hours. Your proposals would clearly impact on daily life in a negative way re: carers, deliveries, child commitments, primary health visits, social care visits etc.</p> <p>I understand that the introduction of a CPZ elsewhere may result in an overspill to surrounding roads but again I would have liked to have seen evidence that this has been modelled accurately.</p> <p>I do not believe that a CPZ is required but if one was felt necessary then a simple 1 hour during the day would meet your parking exclusion goal.</p> <p>Finally, I urge you to consider once again the impact of unnecessary street furniture on the roads through increased signage and road markings.</p> <p>Thank you for considering this communication</p>
<p>244</p>	<p>(1) I am responding to raise an objection to this proposal because Lambeth Council's public consultation thus far shows that there is no demand in the streets near me for a CPZ. I also object because your previous consultation had a very poor response rate.</p> <p>(2) I object to a CPZ in Riggindale Road (where I live). Parking is not a problem here and previously has not been during the working day. Tradespeople and other visitors have always been able to park quite easily in this street. It is used by few commuters living elsewhere as it is not near a railway station and there were even fewer during the pandemic. Moreover it is becoming increasingly less likely in the long-term that office workers will be returning to work in central London thus alleviating any parking place problems that may have occurred previously.</p> <p>(3) I also object to the 8.30 am - 6.30pm restriction proposal. This is far longer than what is proposed for the neighbouring areas of St. Leonard's North (Zone 'I') and Stanthorpe Triangle (Zone 'U') which are nearer the local railway stations. Such a proposal does not seem to make sense.</p> <p>(4) If a CPZ is forced upon us, the maximum period in this street should be 10am-11am on weekdays only.</p> <p>(5) I understand that if a CPZ is introduced, it is likely that it would probably result in a reduction of parking places overall.</p> <p>(6) I have a dropped curb for the crossing in front of my house. Will the painted white line there (for which I paid the Council) be allowed if a CPZ was introduced?</p> <p>I am copying this message to the elected Councillors for St Leonard's Ward.</p>

246	<p>I was shocked to hear from my neighbours that a CPZ was proposed in my Street, Thirlmere Road, and that it would extend from 8.30 to 6.30pm. When and how was this circulated? How many times? Was it emailed?</p> <p>I and my family thoroughly object to this.</p> <p>I have lived here for 15 years now and have never found a problem with friends family parking on the street. I recall rejecting this proposal years ago.</p> <p>I have read the consultation report, and the feedback from this looks scant. I question how well you connected with the residents to receive such a poor response.</p> <p>Only 7 out of 64 residents consulted replied, which I find hard to believe. When did you send these out? Of this 10% consulted, most wanted a 2 hour parking restriction.</p> <p>Why was this not recirculated. This is not a reflection of the residents' wishes.</p> <p>I am utterly shocked that this is at this stage.</p> <p>The consultation figures state that 237 residents responded out of 2037 (11.6%). This highlights a real inadequacy in your consultation method.</p> <p>I strongly urge that you reconsult to get a true reflection of the majority wishes.</p>
249	<p>I am writing to object to this proposal.</p> <p>The area does not need it - I have lived here 14 years (Riggindale Road) and we have seen no problems.</p> <p>The previous consultation shows there is no demand for this in our street. And why is the proposal for all day controls? Quite unnecessary.</p> <p>Please reconsider this. We don't want it.</p>

253

We should like to respond to the consultation on the proposed introduction of a CPZ in the St Leonard's Central zone.

Specifically, we should like to object to the introduction of the proposed CPZ in the St Leonard's Central zone and to the controlled hours proposed based on a flawed, outdated and inadequate consultation process, and specifically for the reasons below:

1. According to the consultation results from a year a half ago (which should no longer be valid), in our street (Ambleside Avenue) only 3 out of 106 residents consulted felt there was a problem with parking. In the seven years we have lived in Ambleside Avenue, we have rarely had an issue with parking on either our road or neighbouring roads. Overall in the St Leonard's Central zone, only just over half of those that responded felt there was a problem with parking, far short of a large majority that would be expected to justify the council taking such as major decision as this and imposing additional costs and compliance burdens on local residents. Given that only 10% of those consulted responded, this means that the decision to impose a CPZ zone is being based on only 5% of those consulted saying they felt there was a problem with parking.

2. Less than half of the small number of respondents to the consultation in St Leonard's Central zone actually supported the introduction of a CPZ, with almost an equal number saying they did NOT support a CPZ. Overall a majority either did NOT support a CPZ or were unsure. So a CPZ would be being introduced without the support of a majority of residents, and explicitly against the wishes of a large minority of the community.

3. When asked what hours residents would prefer IF a CPZ was introduced, a greater number of respondents to the consultation supported either 10-4pm or 2 hours than supported 8.30-6.30pm. From the council's own impact assessment, the times of most parking stress in the immediate area are Fridays from 10-3pm (associated with visitors to South London Islamic Centre). It is therefore entirely unjustified to propose 8.30-6.30 based on the consultation and responses from the community.

4. Imposing the CPZ as proposed will lead to: greater costs/financial burdens for residents and their visitors at a time of greater financial pressure and future financial uncertainty from the impacts of COVID 19; and more residents turning their front gardens into parking degrading the quality and environment of our local area and removing vital and threatened greenery and shared amenity for the community.

5. Pay by phone has been shown to discriminate against older and more vulnerable people and those for whom English is a foreign language who may struggle or be unable to use the service and fall foul of enforcement. The impact on the significant and important local minority community and businesses has not been addressed in the impact assessment.

6. The principle for imposing any sort of additional burdens on residents is that any benefits should clearly and unambiguously outweigh costs and disbenefits. Based on the consultation evidence, that parking is broadly not a significant local community concern, the case for imposing the considerable burdens of a CPZ with the hours proposed on the community has NOT been demonstrated adequately.

	<p>7. Despite the traffic that uses our roads, we are a very residential and largely peaceful neighbourhood. Having uniformed parking enforcement officers patrolling these streets would feel intrusive to the relaxed feel of our local community. Having 8.30-6.30 hours would make the presence of enforcement officers even more all-pervasive and intrusive for the community.</p> <p>8. The validity of both the original consultation - as born out by the small proportion of responses, the leading consultation questions and partial information provided to residents (nothing on costs in the leaflets provided) - and this second consultation a year and half later - with only an email address detailed in one place on a multiple-page hard copy provided to apparently make responding as hard as possible - is inadequate and unacceptable. The impact assessment claims that "We generally also hold a public exhibition for the local community to meet officers face to face to discuss/raise any concerns or queries they may have. The local community's input is a vital part of the process." There has been no such efforts as part of this consultation. The impact assessment also claims that "Street notices will be posted on lamp columns in the affected area" - no such notices have been posted on our road or neighbouring roads. Indeed several of our neighbours we spoke to were unaware of the proposals or consultations and were unhappy upon finding out. Effective consultation is vital and needs to be undertaken with thought and care.</p> <p>On a general note and from personal experience, in all government there is a fine balance between supporting community and over-stepping the mandate the community has provided (particularly when it comes to raising money / imposing costs/taxes and restrictions). The consequences of overstepping the community's mandate is a weakening trust and confidence in government and democracy, and an increase in feelings of resentment and powerlessness. This isn't good for any of us. It may just be a CPZ zone, but it's the small things that add up and matter - please consider and decide humbly and carefully!</p>
<p>264</p>	<p>Specifically regarding "St Leonard's Central (Zone O)". Controlled hours of 8.30am to 6.30pm Monday to Friday are unnecessarily long. A far shorter control period, such as proposed for Stanthorpe triangle, is enough to address the issues that some residents complain of, namely commuters parking all day and vehicles being dumped for lengthy periods. I don't believe the longer control period proposed would make much difference to the other key issues: antisocial behaviour at the high street end of Gleneagle rd, which should be handled by police; and the area's extensive use as a waiting zone by minicab drivers.</p> <p>A shorter control period would mean less impact on local shops and also still allow local residents to have visitors arriving by car for most of the day without incurring costs.</p> <p>In addition only having a pay by phone facility is unacceptable. There must be a way to pay on street.</p>

269	<p>I write to object because the public consultation so far shows that there is no demand in the streets near me for a CPZ.</p> <p>I object to the introduction of a Controlled Parking zone in the street where I live, Riggindale Road. Parking is not a problem here, and never has been during the day. Care workers, tradespeople and visitors have always been able to park in this road. It is used by few commuters, and even fewer during the covid period. With the likely long-term position that fewer people will be returning to central London office working, any lack of parking space problem that there used to be will be reduced.</p> <p>I object to the 8.30am-6.30pm proposal for this area too. Please do not make it CPZ.</p> <p>As local tax payers I make a contribution to developing the social and economic quality of our area. Is it really in the best interests of local people for the council to increase parking control in a road that simply does not need it? Wouldn't it be better if the money spent on the consultation and potential implementation of this scheme was spent on increasing the quality of our roads (the potholes in the borough are increasing daily, damaging local people's cars) or investing in local social and welfare projects? This scheme is simply not the best use of tax payers pounds and therefore not in the public interest. We strongly ask for this scheme to be reconsidered with the logical conclusion that it simply is not necessary".</p>
-----	--

Representations in support of the proposals

1	<p>Just to formally respond in favour of the proposed controlled parking zone. This will greatly increase road safety and discourage the proliferation of Uber drivers using the road as a stop off zone instead of the residents of the street. It cannot come soon enough.</p> <p>It would be useful to know when the parking enforcement will begin and if temporary visitor passes will be made available to residents.</p>
2	<p>I am in favour of the proposed new controlled parking with controlled hours 0830-1830 Mon-Fri. Pay by phone facility to operate with a 4-hour maximum stay and no return within 1 hour.</p>
3	<p>I am strongly in favour of a CPZ in St Leonard's Central from 8.30am to 6.30pm. Glad to hear the recommendations were approved by the council on 23 April 2021.</p> <p>As a resident of nearly fifteen years in Gleneagle Road, prioritising parking for residents in core hours Monday to Friday is long overdue. Being so central and being near the train station and the high road we have many issues with commuters, minicabs (and also dumped cars) and we really need some controls. Some days there are simply no spaces at all for residents. Another more urgent issue is intimidating behaviour by our non resident visiting mini cab drivers. This would put paid to that and make our female residents feel a lot safer.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing the outcome of the recommendations but cannot back this strongly enough, brilliant idea.</p>
4	<p>I just got the leaflet about the proposed CPZs in my area through the door. I live on Fairmile Ave and would like to endorse the proposed zone.</p> <p>We do not own a car but are a member of a zoned car sharing scheme (Zipcar), and so increased parking availability would be very useful for the short period a shared car needs to be parked. The CPZ should also discourage long term parking and commuter parking due to the proximity to public transport which tends to clog the street.</p> <p>There are some areas of parking (particularly close to Gleneagle road) which are not directly outside anyone's house, while this is not the subject of this consultation I wanted to indicate that I would be in favour of using that or other existing parking for a street bike hangar and/or a micro park/bed to improve the amenity of the area.</p> <p>The paving around some dropped kerbs could also do with repair.</p>
7	<p>I live at xx Conyers Road, SW16 6xx and I would like to express my strong approval for your proposal to control parking in Central St Leonard.</p> <p>Our area is full of uber/bolt drivers --in addition to cars from the garage on Mitcham Lane and they park everywhere. I live in a house with its own driveway and have a no-parking sign (very respectfully written but very clear) but various drivers feel free to park in front of my gate making it impossible for me to access my own house. When I tried to explain to them that I have the right to access my own house-- since I have my own driveway) they often become very aggressive.</p>

	<p>Therefore your proposal to safeguard the residents would be appreciated.</p>
10	<p>Thank you for the update on the Proposed Controlled Parking Zone for St Leonards & Streatham Vale West Area.</p> <p>I am strongly in favour of a CPZ in St Leonard's Central from 8.30am to 6.30pm and pleased to hear the recommendations were approved by the council on 23 April 2021.</p> <p>As a resident of Gleneagle Road, prioritising parking for residents in core hours Monday to Friday is long overdue. As we don't have off street parking unfortunately parking on the street can be more than challenging I also welcome the plans for more EV bays in the area.</p>
13	<p>I am strongly in favour of residents parking in St Leonard's. We live on Babington Road and the number of minicabs who use it as a car park is getting worse. They park with no respect to drive ways and leave them here for days on end. Furthermore the road is increasingly being used as a high speed cut thru to avoid the traffic lights at Ambleside/Mitcham. Who should I discuss speed bumps with? Children and dogs/cats are at risk presently and dead foxes have been found.</p>
19	<p>I've recently brought a property: xxFernwood Avenue, London, SW16 1xx which is covered in the CPZ consultation.</p> <p>Firstly I fully support the plans to add restrictive parking/design and control suggested in the "O" hours as I have found it difficult to park on the road I live. I'd additionally add support in addition on Saturdays should it be an option in the future.</p> <p>I'm writing to also enquire about the EV bays. In regard to these EV bays, I am currently going through the process of upgrade of my car to become electric and wanted to understand the criteria for getting a permit in the bays proposed, and whether it would be an option to install an EV bay in front of my house in the future.</p> <p>I see that EV bays are planned on being situated at 1 and 10 Fernwood avenue, was this because it was requested by the owners of those properties, or is it due to access of electrical points? If I was to install an electric point outside my home (for my use only) would this be a future possibility for criteria, or would it need to be public access?</p> <p>Any help/guidance you can give me would be much appreciated as I'm just determining options.</p>

21	<p>As head teacher of St Leonard's Primary School on Mitcham Lane, I wish to wholeheartedly support the introduction of this proposal.</p> <p>Having worked at St Leonard's for 10 years, the standard of driving and inconsiderate, illegal parking in the area has been appalling. I'm ashamed to say that much of this has been caused by drivers dropping children to school and collecting them at the end of the school day.</p> <p>I particularly feel for the residents of Campbell Close, Keens Close, Conal Court (not shown on your diagram and needs to be included) and Swallow Gardens who are constantly affected by the inconsiderate and anti-social behaviour of others.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the behaviour of some of our families, the practice by the tyre replacement garage opposite of parking their vehicles illegally on the pavement is a constant nuisance and obstruction.</p> <p>The school is well served by bus routes and at the last time of our data collection, over 90% of our pupils live within SW16, therefore a walkable distance.</p> <p>Anything that can be done to reduce the amount of traffic along Mitcham Lane is going to be of benefit to our pupils, both in terms of health and well-being as well as in terms of road safety.</p> <p>I thank you in advance for giving due consideration to this perspective.</p>
22	<p>I am a resident of Fernwood Avenue, SWxx. I am fully supportive of this proposal.</p> <p>The parking on this street has become so bad that, more often than not, I cannot park on the road at all, let alone close to my house. This is particularly problematic with a young daughter.</p> <p>I would ask that priority is given to residents' parking, with not too many paid-for bays, otherwise the objective of freeing up the road is lost.</p> <p>It would be helpful, as well, to have an allowance of visitors parking permits for tradesmen, etc.</p> <p>Will the street be patrolled more often by parking attendants as a result?</p>
25	<p>I live on Fernwood Avenue and I saw the plans for a St Leonard's CPZ. I think it would be really transformational for our neighbourhood. Could you advise when it will be implemented?</p> <p>Also, just to clarify: I think it's really important that the CPZ is in force all day as a lot of the problems arise from people who come and go. A shorter window would not deal with the antisocial behaviour issues.</p>
28	<p>I would like to register my support for the introduction of a CPZ on Fernwood Avenue, Leonard's central.</p> <p>Parking has been so difficult since we moved here in 2016. We regularly have to park our car on another street because Fernwood Avenue is full. This is particularly difficult for us as a family with small children as it is difficult to load and unload the car when it is parked far away. We also end up going around the Ambleside/tooting bed gardens one way system several times while searching for a parking space.</p> <p>A CPZ on our street would be wonderful!</p>

29	I'm writing to give my full support to the proposed CPZ on Fernwood Avenue from 8.30 to 6.30, Monday to Friday. This is a long overdue, much needed control of the parking congestion on our road. The sooner this happens, the better it will be for the area. I am a resident and house owner on the road - number 3.
30	I'm writing to give my full support to the proposed CPZ on Fernwood Avenue from 8.30 to 6.30, Monday to Friday. This is a long overdue, much needed control of the parking congestion on our road. I struggle to park near my house all the time often having to resort to parking streets away with my young daughter. The sooner this happens, the better it will be for the area. I am a resident and house owner on the road - number 3. I also own and manage a flat at number 18 on same road.
32	<p>I'm a resident on Fernwood Ave and I'm reaching out to you about Parking. I would like there to be paid permit parking on this street like they have in Wandsworth. I'm happy to pay a fee to ensure that I can find a spot to park on my street. Today we have so many people parking on the street who are non-residents. It makes it difficult for those of us who live here to find parking.</p> <p>I'm hopeful that you will approve this.</p>
35	I am writing to let you know that we are in total favour of introducing a CPZ to St Leonard's- this is very much due and will resolve the issues with cars being dumped for months in end, taxis taking up residents space and people blocking our drive.
36	<p>As a resident on Fernwood Avenue, the new parking proposals will make a really positive difference.</p> <p>We currently struggle to park outside of our property, or in fact anywhere near and we struggle every time we require workmen or deliveries of large objects as often larger vans cannot stop on the road and park up.</p> <p>This proposal should mean more space for actual residents of the road.</p>
37	<p>Absolutely for the cpz in the areas marked. I would also have hoped it could stretch to include Sunnyhill Road/Valley Road as the area around the school is always incredibly congested and with playgrounds adjacent it is a painful sight.</p> <p>The cpz will, I hope, stop the loss of the established front gardens that owners feel pushed into using as a bay due to the parking situation.</p> <p>The installation of the crossovers causes traffic movement across pavements with danger to pedestrians and manouvres that are made all the more difficult due to the sheer amount of parking.</p> <p>The overall movement and reliance on cars has to be reduced in Streatham and I hope this is the start of a wider reduction campaign.</p>
40	I received the letter of cpz and absolutely agree with it as a resident of Babington Road. When will it be started from ?
41	As a resident of Babington road i absolutely agree with the cpz

<p>44</p>	<p>I am a Gleneagle Road resident of 21 years and could not be more in favour of a comprehensive CPZ arrangement for this ward. In addition to 08:30-18:30 controlled hours, the area between 2-30 Gleneagle Road requires a bespoke and suitably robust parking enforcement regime.</p> <p>Illegal parking at this location is rampant and poses a serious threat to pedestrians at the junction with Ambleside Avenue. I also feel strongly that the following will be resolved if properly addressed:</p> <p>-ASB -Pollution (through mini-cab engine idling) -Illegally parked vehicle owners threatening residents (women in particular) -Men openly relieving themselves before members of the public -Littering</p> <p>The area has become an extensive mini-cab hub and car park. Moreover, the police, Lambeth enforcement teams and TfL are simply unable to effectively deter illegal parking. At times it is impossible to see significant sections of the double red & yellow lines. This must be dealt with.</p> <p>I live in hope the CPZ will be implemented as soon as practicable. There is no doubt in my mind that implementation is the only solution.</p>
<p>47</p>	<p>Thanks for sending the consultation a few days ago by post.</p> <p>I am really happy and keen for that project to go ahead as the residents are struggling to park on the street (Fernwood Avenue) Many people not from the area come and park at round 8 am every day during the weeks to take the train and commute to work. They only return at around 6pm and this means the residents do not benefit from any parking spots during the day. Same happens during the week-end because most people access the park nearby and also park on Fernwood Avenue. It takes 2 or sometimes 3 attempts to park when lucky because we have to go around using A214 and then streatham high road/ Mitcham lane which are always extremely busy. So it takes 15/20 minutes sometimes.</p> <p>So I really appreciate that we are now making a step forward towards a resident permit</p>
<p>52</p>	<p>This is to give my support for the proposed controlled parking zone St Leonard's Central. I support all day parking as proposed. This is because I see the current severe strain on parking, particularly in Riggindale Road, as a result of the following types of parking activity:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cars being left on Riggindale Road/Tooting Bec Gardens for weeks at a time by non-residents 2. Cars being left on Riggindale Road/Tooting Bec Gardens during the daytime by commuters who leave their vehicle for a day at a time to work elsewhere (not in the St Leonards Central zone) 3. Vehicles being parked by the residents/visitors of the thirty-six Pinkerton Place residences, which have their own gated parking (not available for use by residents of Riggindale Road/Tooting Bec Gardens) but who prefer to leave vehicles on Riggindale Road/Tooting Bec Gardens - with all day controlled parking Pinkerton Place residents/visitors may choose to use their gated parking facility. <p>As a result of the above, it is at present frequent to find no parking space available on the whole of Riggindale Road.</p> <p>Thank you for putting in place the new parking zone.</p>

58	<p>I whole heartedly support the establishment of a St Leonard's Controlled Parking Zone.</p> <p>With the increasing conversion of properties in Babington Road and others in the area to multi-occupancy and the corresponding increases in car ownership the pressure for on-street parking is considerable.</p> <p>In the 52 years I have lived at my address this has become particularly acute at the bottom end of Babington Road where two new developments in Conyers Road and the consequential blocking-off of parking spaces by the contractor, places even more pressure on what parking is available.</p> <p>This is further exacerbated by the five or six mini-cabs that regularly park for days outside the houses at the bottom end of Babington Road. Pre-lockdown this was further worsened every Friday lunchtime by cars from the South London Islamic Centre parking at the bottom of Babington Road. Cars also park across garages with impunity believing that a Disabled Parking Badge gives them the right.</p> <p>The establishment of a St Leonard's Controlled Parking Zone would create fairer parking for all but particularly council-tax paying residents who live in the area. You may not have the right to park outside your house - but it would be nice if you could!</p>
64	<p>I think it is an excellent idea and I am all for it! I live on Riggindale Road and can rarely find a space to park. In the 9 years I have lived here, and with the direct correlation with the introduction of Uber, the parking situation has become worse and worse. Cars are often left abandoned on our road, either permanently or while people go abroad etc. I would welcome the restrictions. It would also give the council a well needed income boost.</p> <p>I request that you keep my name and details off any records as the mood is running high on the street regarding this and I do not want my name and opinions known to my neighbors.</p>
80	<p>I live and own a property on Gleneagle Road and strongly agree with the comprehensive CPZ arrangement for this ward. In addition to 08:30-18:30 controlled hours, the area between 2-30 Gleneagle Road requires a bespoke and suitably robust parking enforcement regime.</p> <p>Something needs to be done with the antisocial behaviour right outside my house as the taxi drivers illegally park on the double yellow and reds, litter and the other day threatened to kill me. This makes me feel very nervous and not safe as a young female. (My police report ref is xxxx)</p>
118	<p>I understand at the moment there is a consultation underway of an introduction of a full day restricted parking zone area on Rydal Road, where I am a resident. I would like to suggest the introduction of a 2hr restriction only in St Leonard's area of SW16.</p> <p>Introducing a resident's parking would really help stop the commuter traffic in the area which can get intolerable at times. After the instruction of a 2hr hour permit, I would then suggest this is reviewed and if the desired impact isn't felt then look to increase the restricted zone to a full day.</p> <p>A lot of feedback in my area is from people who have their own driveways wanting to reject this proposal. However, as someone who doesn't have a driveway, I struggle to find parking at times due to commuters and find the introduction of value.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing more about the conversation around the introduction of a CPZ.</p>

123	<p>I write in support of the proposed CPZ. Parking congestion is a real issue in the road where I live (Babington Road) as well as people parking across driveways when there are no spaces. As part of the CPZ I would very much welcome formal parking bays being introduced to prevent this from happening.</p> <p>I very much hope this will go ahead.</p>
128	<p>I am writing to state my full support for the proposed CPZ in St Leonards, Streatham. As a recently new resident of Babington Road I have found the parking situation on the street to be absolutely appalling. Residents are very rarely able to park anywhere near their own properties due to the number of abandoned vehicles and private hire cars (Uber etc) left along the road. Many of the drivers of the private hire vehicles remain in them with engines idling which is not acceptable given the current air quality and climate concerns that we are facing on both a local and national level.</p> <p>I very much welcome the proposed restriction period of 08:30am to 06:30pm (Monday to Friday), as I believe that given our close proximity to the rail station, a shorter duration restriction period would not realise any benefits to the residents of the road.</p> <p>As someone who has previously lived on streets which have implemented resident only parking restrictions, I have experienced first hand the benefits which they provide and believe that these benefits drastically outweigh the small annual fee proposed by the council.</p> <p>I do hope that the proposals are approved by the Deputy Leader of the Council (Sustainable Transport, Environment and Clean Air) and implemented as soon as possible so that the residents of the area can have some reassurance that it will be easier access to their vehicles and that there will be no abandoned vehicles outside of their properties.</p>

<p>129</p>	<p>I live on Babington Road near Ambleside Avenue and have only once been able to park outside my house since living here. I had a severe accident in 2019 which has left me with reduced mobility so being able to park near my house is essential to where I live. I regularly park at the bottom end of the road by Conyers Road or on some occasions I am not even able to park on the road and have to park on Conyers Road or when there has on occasions been no spaces had to leave for an hour or so and come back to try again.</p> <p>I regularly have to leave the car with hazards on in my neighbours driveway when I am carrying in any shopping or when bringing my elderly mother over when she comes to visit. I then have to attempt to find parking and park quite a distance from the house and the minimum it takes me if I am lucky is 5 minutes to walk back from the car to the house. I now have to add on this 5+ minutes to my daily commute. By the time I am home my food has on occasion melted as I have not been able to get it in the freezer and have had to spend a long time looking for a space and then the time it takes to walk back.</p> <p>Who is parked on Babington Road? - This is a question I ask daily, all my neighbours are furious about the situation and have collectively agreed there are several cars which have been sat on the road for months on end and don't belong to anyone. The majority of cars outside my house are being used by Uber/taxi drivers waiting for a job. I believe people are using the spaces to drive to and commute into London rather than commuting from their own homes.</p> <p>Most of the houses on the street have had to install drives which is ok for certain houses and if you can financially afford to do it but I don't feel I should have to turn my front garden into a parking space. Our house doesn't have a deep enough front garden to accommodate a drive so even if we were able to afford the cost (which we cannot) we would be unable to do anything about it.</p> <p>My neighbours who have several children regularly struggle to get their children and children equipment to the car in one journey and this takes a toll on their already busy lives.</p> <p>I approve of the introduction of controlled parking zone St Leonard Central Zone O - Monday - Friday 08:30 - 18:30. I would also encourage there to be limitation on Saturdays as a controlled zone.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and I look forward to the introduction of these parking restrictions.</p>
<p>140</p>	<p>We live in St Leonard's Central and are very much IN FAVOUR of the proposal to introduced a parking scheme. A couple of things to highlight:</p> <p>1/ An increasing number of cars are evidently parking on our street, Riggindale Road, before taking onward journeys by public transport (bus: 249/319 down to Tooting Bec) and from Streatham train station. We see people making this journey often. It is increasingly difficult to park on our road.</p> <p>2/ Other utility vehicles are also increasingly parking for a period of time. Case in point: this lorry has been parked outside our house since yesterday - I don't think it belongs to a resident (FYI, the guy in the picture is another frustrated resident and not the driver!).</p>

<p>147</p>	<p>As a resident of Babington Road, I am delighted to hear that Lambeth Council is proposing to introduce a controlled parking zone in our area.</p> <p>It will help to address the following longstanding issues on our road:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abandoned vehicles • No spaces for residents to park • Vehicles left by non-residents for weeks and months on end • Taxi drivers treating it as a parking lot • Idling engines, excess pollution • Littering • Anti-social behaviour <p>Not having to put up with these issues will dramatically improve residents' quality of life, and I fully endorse your recommendations on the areas covered, the days of the week and timings. Parking fees, which discourage car use and help raise vital funds, are standard in other London boroughs, and it is about time Lambeth got in on the act.</p> <p>To improve things further, it would be fantastic if the Council blocked access to Babington Road from Ambleside Avenue. This measure will prevent cars from using Babington Road as a shortcut route to Mitcham Lane. Speeding cars in a residential area with many young children and older adults is inappropriate and dangerous to all residents. Over the years, several vehicles have crashed into other cars or garden walls at the bend towards the bottom of the road and now is the time to do something about it before someone gets badly hurt. Thames Water blocked the road to cars last week for maintenance work, and not having to put up with all the usual traffic was a wonderful experience for us all.</p> <p>During the pandemic, the residents of Babington Road have grown closer and developed a genuine community feel. There are planters on the road, we are looking at planting trees, we want to have a street party, and several of us take turns picking up litter and dog mess. The parking measures you have proposed will help take things to the next level and massively improve the look and feel of the street.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
<p>153</p>	<p>I support the proposed introduction of a new controlled parking zone, "St Leonard's Central (Zone O)".</p> <p>I would also support extending the controlled hours to include evenings and weekends, as these are the times when the problems of non-residents parking on Gleneagle Road are most acute.</p>
<p>159</p>	<p>I think this is a fantastic scheme and desperately needed in Gleneagle Road for the vast majority of the day during the week.</p> <p>However at the top end of Gleneagle Road we have a long double yellow line. I think part of this (maybe 50%) could be allocated to residents parking too? Parking is precious here and any spaces that can be freed up for residents would help a lot.</p>

<p>165</p>	<p>I am a resident of Streatham residing as Sw166ay. I would like to show my enthusiasm for the proposed CPZ consultation. We have had extreme issues on our street, Gleneagle road, including the formation of an informal mini cab rank forming at the top of our street. This has encouraged extreme unsocial behaviour from taxi drivers including intimidation of women, open public urination and littering all over our street. It has also caused over crowding of cabs parked on double red lines and poor visibility for pedestrians, resulting in a hit and run incident at the end of 2020. There have also been several residents who have experienced ongoing harassment and intimidation from these men, almost always women. I myself have been sexually harassed multiple times by them. I believe the CPZ will make our neighbourhood a lot safer for all residents and prevent further over crowding of our streets due to idling cars and ones which are improperly parked. I would also like to highlight that the mini cab drivers have also used our street as a gathering place throughout Covid lockdown where they crowded the side walks and imposed on pedestrians without masks, posing a seriously health risk especially to elderly residents. I think these issues could help helped by the CPZ and I know several residents on our street have made complaints to the police regarding these issues.</p> <p>I look forward to the CPZ being in place and a happier, safer neighbourhood for all.</p>
<p>166</p>	<p>I am resident on Fernwood Ave (SW161xx) and the road is included in the proposed CPZ for Streatham St Leonards. I am 100% supportive of this been implemented as parking and traffic levels have always been a problem and pressure point in this part of the borough.</p> <p>Fernwood Ave is a one way street with limited parking for all users of community , a CPZ would greatly improve access for everyone.</p> <p>I look forward to this been implemented</p>
<p>179</p>	<p>I am responding to the letter we have received regarding the possibility of having a parking permit put on our road (Babington Road -central 0) I am for this as it is extremely hard to park on our road.</p> <p>I am unable to drive to work and I have to get TFL. If I go to work by car when I come back I will not have parking. The longest amount of time I have waited in my car outside of my house has been for 4 hours on a awful rainy day. This is not fair for someone who has been living here for a numerous amount of years.</p> <p>I have not been off work since covid has happened as I work in the NHS so my work has not closed and it is very draining having to constantly be sat at my window looking for parking on the days I decide to travel by car.</p> <p>My family and I will be more than happy to pay for permit for our vehicles outside if this will ensure we receive a parking spot.</p> <p>We have had a high number of break ins on vehicles on our road and I do not feel comfortable parking all the way at the bottom strip of my road due to this.</p> <p>Please note we are happy to pay for this as all we want is to enjoy going out with our vehicles but are unable to as the parking has been a nightmare for years.</p>

<p>180</p>	<p>I am responding to the letter my family and I received regarding proposed controlled parking zones on Babington Road SW166AN.</p> <p>I am a delivery driver and I have been working throughout the majority of the pandemic. It is extremely hard for me to find parking outside my own house! I am appalled at this as we pay for rent and all of our bills on time and I am not even able to park on my own street.</p> <p>I am for the parking permit as I work from early hours in the morning and when I get home I have to wait at least 45 minutes - 1 hour sometimes even longer to be able to find parking for my work van.</p> <p>Many people know that this road is free parking therefore, they leave their vehicles for weeks or months on end and this is very frustrating for those of us who live on the street. We have had a huge number of abandoned cars on our road who end up clamped and then towed away as people just leave them parked for weeks as mentioned above.</p> <p>My family and I are more than happy to pay for our vehicles as this would guarantee I have spaces free to park.</p> <p>Please consider this as this is an on going issue that consumes a lot of our time after a busy shift at work.</p>
<p>203</p>	<p>As a resident of Babington Road, I am delighted to hear that Lambeth Council is proposing to introduce a controlled parking zone in our area.</p> <p>Our road is a prime location for people to abandon their vehicles. My neighbours and I report abandoned vehicles weekly.</p> <p>It will help to address the following longstanding issues on our road:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abandoned vehicles - my neighbors and I report vehicles nearly every week. • No spaces for residents to park - I and other parents have to circle around the block for at least 10 minutes every day and most days are lucky to get a parking a couple of streets away. My young kids then have to walk 10 mins to their house while taxi drivers and non residents leave their cars parked on the road for days and weeks. • Vehicles left by non-residents for weeks and months on end • Taxi drivers treating it as a parking lot • Idling engines, excess pollution • Littering & Anti-social behaviour by non-residents <p>Not having to put up with these issues will dramatically improve residents' quality of life, and I fully endorse your recommendations on the areas covered, the days of the week and timings. Parking fees, which discourage car use and help raise vital funds, are standard in other London boroughs, and it is about time Lambeth got in on the act.</p>
<p>215</p>	<p>As a resident of Gleneagle Road, within the proposed St Leonard's Central 'O' Zone, I support these plans as the road is extremely busy at all times. However, it will be pointless unless enforced. Currently the road seems to be used as an unofficial taxi rank for minicabs and uber drivers who idle their engines however little in the way of enforcement action is taken against them. I would also suggest the restrictions should apply on a Saturday as parking remains a problem at the weekends.</p>

216	<p>I am in favour of the above proposed CPZ.</p> <p>Would it be at all possible for St Leonard's Central, Zone O to have the 2 hour operating times in line with Zone I and Zone U?</p>
241	<p>We are residents of xxx Gleneagle Road (aka ground floor flat), London, SW16 6AF. We write with reference to the statutory consultation for the proposed controlled parking zone in St Leonards & Streatham Vale West Area, reference ST LEONARD'S CPZ.</p> <p>We strongly support the CPZ proposal. We have had to consistently report cars illegally parking on Gleneagle Road, in particular across our dropped kerb at xx Gleneagle Road, but also on the double yellow lines and we are of the strong opinion that the CPZ, provided there is continued and effective enforcement of it, will not only reduce illegal parking but also assist in allowing residents to park near their homes and in reducing the anti-social behaviour of those who are illegally parking in the area and who can be rude/aggressive towards residents. We would also request that there is an effective and clear reporting mechanism for residents to report breaches of the CPZ rules.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>Alexander and Shareena Swan</p>
262	<p>I am a resident of Fairmile avenue. I write in support of the proposed CPZ for st Leonard's</p>

Other comments received regarding the proposals

<p>23</p>	<p>You need to be fair and consistent in your approach in Streatham</p> <p>You cannot put for the majority of Streatham 10-12 and then put 8.30-6.30 in St Leonards Central Area</p> <p>The report clearly states that having 8.30- 6.30 in St Leonards is going to make no difference by having 2 hours or 10 hours.</p> <p>We should look to have 2 hours across the board</p> <p>Also the parking fees should be subsidised for local residents</p>
<p>107</p>	<p>I am contacting you with regards to the CPZ consultation received in the post this week. I live and own my property at 15 Tooting Bec Gardens and am a car owner. I am concerned about Tooting Bec Gardens being within Zone O and having 4 hour maximum stay when the other areas have a one hour maximum stay as the road is already incredibly busy and I worry that given our maximum stay is longer than the others, it may drive even more traffic to our road when what we need is less. Please can this concern be flagged and raised in the next consultation?</p> <p>I would also like to now approximate costs proposed for resident permits - can you confirm this?</p>
<p>119</p>	<p>Hello - I am a resident of Babington Road which is one of the streets which will form part of the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ).</p> <p>There is a high volume of cars which park on our street during much of the day and evening, particularly when residents return home and wish to park. Obviously this initiative will help to reduce the inconvenience of not being able to find a park.</p> <p>Whilst I do not disagree with the majority of this proposal, can I please ask that it would be considered to re-invest the money raised through the CPZ into the road (particularly that of Babington and Gleneagle), to upgrade the road itself and the footpath? These are both in poor (dangerous) condition and there are a number of trip hazards present on the footpaths and potholes in the roads which present a danger to both vehicles and pedestrians alike.</p> <p>Another request is to please consider installing speed humps or the like into Babington Road, or indeed restricting vehicular flow from north to south. Babington Road is used by a high volume of cars as a cut through to Mitcham Lane, some of which travel down the road well in excess of the speed limit (40-50mph+). This causes a serious risk to pedestrians, particularly children that play in the area, along with a risk to damage of cars and properties. It is only a matter of time before a serious injury (or worse) results.</p> <p>I would ask that both of these suggestions please be considered once the CPZ is implemented.</p> <p>Happy if someone wants to call to give further details.</p>

124	<p>I am a shop owner in Gleneagle road. The area around my shop is controlled by tfl Because cab drivers and visitors to the local cafes around here use the spaces all day my customers and myself find it difficult to pick up or deliver goods to my shop</p> <p>If the proposed parking restrictions are allowed it will make it even more difficult for people to stop and shop locally</p> <p>May I suggest that the restrictions should be the same. 12 till 2 pm. To coincide with the other close areas. At least this will deal with commuters.</p>
187	<p>Hi, I have reviewed your proposal and apart from the fact that on hte previous consultation our local roads stated they did not want to be included in the scheme, you appear to have forced it upon us.</p> <p>The current proposal seems to have removed several available spaces on the road that would normally have been used by residents and visitors alike. Specifically spaces outside no. 2 , 4 , 14 and 18 Rydal Road. These are clear spaces without any dropped curb or junctions, but are now single yellow lines.</p> <p>By removing these you are further reducing the spaces available to residents and visitors when we don't have a problem at the moment.</p> <p>Please could you reconsider this and maximise the parking spaces available.</p>
211	<p>Thank you for your letter informing us that the council is proceeding with a statutory consultation to introduce new controlled Parking Zones in the St Leonards North(Zone 1), St Leonards Central (Zone 0) and Stanthorpe Triangle (Zone U) areas.</p> <p>I live on Rydal road, where you plan to introduce a CPZ with controlled hours of 8.30am-6.30pm, Monday to Friday.</p>
239	<p>I understood the proposal to be a solution to problems with commuter parking including on my road - Conyers Rd, but it does not seem consistent with the absence of restrictions on the streets directly around Streatham Common and Streatham Stations, where commuters would clearly park first, and other CPZs which only get a lunchtime restriction. Are the all-day parking restrictions in St Leonard's Central actually to discourage anti-social activity at the High Rd end of Gleneagle Road? I know these disturbances are distressing for residents as a friend moved away because of them, and they should be addressed, but the proposed restrictions seem to be an inappropriate attempt to solve this matter, at cost and inconvenience to residents. Please reconsider these proposals as there is not an overwhelming majority of people supporting them, especially in Gleneagle Rd.</p>

271	<p>I am writing to you as we have received the letter regarding the Proposed Controlled Parking Zone - St. Leonards & Streatham Vale West Area which provided a link to a map with a the detailed road-by-road plan of the proposed CPZ in Zone O - St. Leonard's Central.</p> <p>To my dismay, I note that as per above print screen our property at 90 Gleneagle Road still has not been captured correctly as having a vehicular crossover. This is despite having sent numerous online requests in early 2020 and further emails since August 2020 all of which were so far ignored by the Lambeth Parking team, which is unacceptable.</p> <p>As per your decision notice and issue of certificate of lawful use or development (proposed) number 17/01072/LDCP the crossover was approved by Lambeth Council and paid for by cheque in December 2017 and finalised by a council appointed contractor. As Lambeth council changed contractors which caused some delays, the dropped curb and white line were completed in August 2018.</p> <p>In light of the potential introduction of a CPZ it is important to have the plans corrected asap.</p> <p>Please confirm receipt of this email and confirmation that the required amendment has been actioned on by May 21st, 2021. Pleae ensure that updated map is https://moderngov.lambeth.gov.uk/documents/s127311/Appendix%20A%20-%20Revised%20Detailed%20CPZ%20Proposal.pdf</p>
-----	--

Breakdown of most prevalent comments received

	No parking problem / No need for a CPZ	Proposed CPZ hours too long	Cost / Financial burden / Taxation	Low stage 1 consultation response / stage 1 consultation not in line with proposal	Negative effect of business
Ambleside Avenue	1	1	1	1	-
Babington Road	-	2	-	-	-
Conyers Road	5	8	4	2	2
Fairmile Avenue	6	8	6	3	1
Fernwood Avenue	-	-	4	-	-
Gleneagle Road	4	5	7	1	1
Mitcham Lane	-	-	-	1	2
Pinkerton Place (off Riggindale Road)	1	1	1	-	-
Riggindale Road	18	10	6	12	-
Rydal Road	5	4	1	6	-
Thirlemere Road	6	-	2	4	-
Tooting Bec Gardens	-	-	-	-	-
Whinfell Close (off Riggindale Road)	1	-	-	-	-
William Dyce Mews (off Babington Road)	-	-	-	-	-
Not stated	5	7	4	7	1