

Representations in opposition to the proposals

<p>49</p>	<p>Thank you for writing to local residents to let us know about the 'proposed controlled parking zone'.</p> <p>As a resident of Gleneldon Road (Stanthorpe triangle 'U') I feel if you were to go ahead with the proposed parking zone it would only be fair to give the residents of the affected areas one free parking permit per household. A big reason for moving to Streatham was the free parking which is brilliant! If this were not the case, I would object to the proposal.</p>
<p>67</p>	<p>As a lifetime Streatham resident, I have never had any trouble parking in the area, these CPZ are simply not required and are a blatant example of putting revenue collection ahead of the needs of local residents and businesses.</p> <p>These CPZs will in my opinion lead many residents to park in nearby unrestricted roads rather than outside where they live/work and as such put extra pressures on parking in those areas for the residents and businesses on those roads.</p> <p>Specifically to the CPZ that effects the road in which I live (Zone U) What exactly is the thought process between securing parking between 12pm–2pm? In my experience parking on these roads during these hours is much easier than usual as many residents who use their cars to commute are only parked there overnight.</p> <p>There simply is not a requirement for this</p>

99	<p>We object to the proposed CPZ for the Stanthorpe Triangle area for the following reasons:</p> <p>The initial consultation received so few responses from residents (8%) that it is not a statistically valid representation of the views of all residents. Only 8% have taken the trouble to highlight their concerns and over 50% of the responders in our street did not think there was a problem with parking that could be resolved by a CPZ.</p> <p>The previous consultation shows no mandate for having a CPZ on Stanthorpe Road or for extending the scheme to Stanthorpe Road should it be implemented in neighbouring streets. 57.9% of Stanthorpe Road responders said that they did not approve of having a CPZ introduced. Only 40.2% approved of the introduction of a CPZ on Stanthorpe Road even if it was implemented in neighbouring streets.</p> <p>A CPZ will not relieve the parking congestion on our street as the congestion is largely caused by cars owned by residents. This is evidenced by the street being totally full in the evenings and overnight. A two hour CPZ will have no impact on this and a longer period of enforcement will seriously inconvenience local people, visitors and those who work in the care home (24/7) on the street.</p> <p>The proposed scheme will not reduce the number of cars owned per household. Many of the properties in the area are multi-occupancy, converted flats or large family houses with multiple cars. This is the real issue in our area as well as a proliferation of ugly paved over front gardens affording parking.</p> <p>The CPZ does not prevent people with crossovers acquiring permits to park on the street and allows the potential ‘rental’ of off street parking.</p> <p>The CPZ will impact on businesses on the High Road making it more difficult for people to access shops, bars etc. We are lucky enough to live close to a lively High Road with handy shops and facilities and to preserve this we need to be prepared to share access to parking.</p> <p>The CPZ will displace traffic to adjacent areas thus creating a cascade of CPZs all over the area, which makes it difficult for elderly or disabled people with mobility issues to park anywhere without paying punitive charges.</p> <p>The CPZ does not guarantee parking and in fact this proposal does not provide any ‘resident only parking’ as anyone can pay to park within the 2 hour restricted period.</p> <p>Limited parking spaces in the area will be further reduced by the creation of parking bays and yellow lines – fewer on street parking spaces will be available to residents with the implementation of this CPZ. This has been evidenced everywhere that CPZs have been introduced.</p> <p>Please reconsider this decision based on the data from our road.</p>
----	---

<p>100</p>	<p>We object to the proposed CPZ for the Stanthorpe Triangle area for the following reasons:</p> <p>Bringing in a CPZ has not reflect the majority of residents on Stanthorpe road.</p> <p>A CPZ will not relieve the parking congestion on our street as the congestion is largely caused by cars owned by residents. This is evidenced by the street being totally full in the evenings and overnight. A two hour CPZ will have no impact on this and a longer period of enforcement will seriously inconvenience local people, visitors and those who work in the care home (24/7) on the street.</p> <p>The proposed scheme will not reduce the number of cars owned per household. Many of the properties in the area are multi-occupancy, converted flats or large family houses with multiple cars. This is the real issue in our area as well as a proliferation of ugly paved over front gardens affording parking.</p> <p>I am very concerned that the CPZ does not prevent people with crossovers acquiring permits to park on the street and allows the potential 'rental' of off street parking. If this CPZ goes ahead, then this should be a major consideration, as many crossovers already have space for two cars.</p> <p>The CPZ will impact on businesses on the High Road making it more difficult for people to access shops, bars etc. We are lucky enough to live close to a lively High Road with handy shops and facilities and to preserve this we need to be prepared to share access to parking.</p> <p>The CPZ will displace traffic to adjacent areas thus creating a cascade of CPZs all over the area, which makes it difficult for elderly or disabled people with mobility issues to park anywhere without paying punitive charges.</p> <p>I am also very concerned that the proposed CPZ allows for people to 'pay to park' anywhere within the street, rather than just near the high street, which in turn lessens the spaces for residents.</p>
<p>121</p>	<p>I live in the Stanthorpe Triangle and responded to the first consultation saying no to the proposed new parking scheme. I have not changed my view.</p> <p>The proposed parking scheme would incur yet more costs on residents to park outside their own house. It is difficult and expensive enough to drive and park in this city notwithstanding the new ULEZ permitter in October to the south circular. Those who can afford it won't care but as usual the working class folk, trades people etc have to suffer the ever increasing costs. This City is fast becoming a playground for the rich. I propose that residents register their vehicle on the system for a free parking permit. <u>Everyone else pay the proposed hours.</u></p>
<p>125</p>	<p>I do not agree with the proposal to impose parking restrictions on Gleneldon road. If this is to go ahead, I believe each flat/house should be entitled to one free parking permit.</p>

<p>127</p>	<p>I would like to formally and wholeheartedly object to the proposed CPZ that includes my street, Gleneldon Road.</p> <p>In response to the results of the previous consultation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I found it interesting that only 18 of the 275 consultations on Gleneldon Road voted for a CPZ. This says to me that although 69.2% of responses were for the CPZ, only 6.5% of the consultations actually wished for this change to our road. That is not a sufficient drive for change in my opinion. 2. 26 of 275 responses received totalled 31 cars and 3 motorcycles. This shows that the problems some residents may face regarding parking is of their own doing as this is more than 1 car per house - nevermind the houses converted into flats. <p>It is grossly unfair for a minority of residents who have the disposable income to pay for residents permits and impose a CPZ on everyone else. I do not support this.</p>
<p>143</p>	<p>I am writing to make representations AGAINST the controlled parking zone proposals for the Stanthorpe Road triangle on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lambeth states on its' website https://beta.lambeth.gov.uk/parking/parking-consultations-and-proposal-archive/streatham-area-parking-survey that the 2018 Lambeth Parking Survey (GB01T15C41) was undertaken in response to local residents' concerns around parking problems that are generally felt to be caused by commuters who park and complete their journey by public transport, or those working in nearby businesses. The survey (GB01T15C41) clearly shows (Table 1) that "the majority of vehicles in the weekday... stay for less than 2 hours". Therefore, contrary to resident's expressed beliefs, 'commuters' are not the primary cause of parking stress in Streatham. So, it follows that a CPZ active between 12pm – 2pm Monday to Friday, might well reduce commuter parking numbers, but will obviously not address the main causes of parking stress and will therefore not be worth the fees residents are being charged for parking permits 2. The same survey shows that, on Stanthorpe Road (pp. 87) average unrestricted parking stress was a mere 25% on weekdays, when the proposed CPZ will be enforced. Astonishingly, in contrast, there is no CPZ enforcement proposed over weekends when average parking stress on the road is a whopping 89%. Again, this shows that the empirical benefit to residents of the proposed CPZ enforcement will not be worth the fees being charged for residents' permits 3. The proposals do nothing to address the spatial distribution of demand against supply, which is a factor highlighted in the report and a factor which impacts parking availability for residents. Lambeth does not appear to have considered the provision of marked parking bays across the Stanthorpe Triangle – encouraging more efficient use of the available space – as an alternative to these plans to enforce CPZs and charge residents through the nose for parking permits 4. Since the stated aim of the survey (and subsequent CPZ proposals) is to enable residents and their visitors to park easily and conveniently, there is absolutely no reason why the fees for residents' permits should be scaled according to what type of vehicle one owns or the size of their vehicles' engine. There is also no reason why residents' permits should cost in excess of £300 per year. This feels like a fund-raising operation by Lambeth masquerading as an attempt to improve parking

	<p>5. The fees for residents’ parking permits are exorbitant when you consider that, even during the 2-hour parking restriction enforcement, non-residents may still park on these roads. The cost of a permit being up to £300+ does not represent value for money, since it only covers a 2-hour window and even then, does not guarantee, or significantly improve one’s chances of being able to park quickly and conveniently</p> <p>Contrary to the plans proposed, residents’ parking in the Stanthorpe Road area will be improved by a combination of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reviewing the locations of Disabled Bays, some of which are perpetually unoccupied, indicating that the residential property for which the bay was designated no longer has use of a vehicle or requires a Disabled Bay 2. Amending the unduly onerous ‘minimum dimension requirements’ that need to be met in respect of Lambeth allowing residential driveways and dropped kerb access. This would enable more residents to park directly outside their properties, thus reducing parking stress 3. Reviewing current dropped kerb provisions, to identify properties that have dropped kerbs despite residents clearly owning no vehicles. Reinstating raised kerbs outside these properties may result in a net increase in available parking space 4. Regularly towing away abandoned vehicles that are without tax, MOT and/or insurance instead of allowing them to sit clamped on the road, occupying much-needed parking spaces 5. Implementing residents-only parking west of Bournevale Road, active between 8am and 6:30pm Monday – Saturday 6. Charging residents a fixed permit fee which covers LBLs administration costs, and is commensurate with the actual benefits resulting from the CPZ instead of being a poorly-veiled tax on individuals based on which cars they own
162	<p>I wish to register my objection for a CPZ in the St Leonard area.</p> <p>Originally the application was made by the hard line few active members based on their assumption that people from outside their area park in the St Leonards area and go to work in the city.</p> <p>Following the pandemic, more and more people are working from home and that original argument to restrict parking to the residents is invalid.</p> <p>The well off people who can afford to pay have more than one vehicle emitting toxic fumes in the atmosphere while others use only one vehicle if that.</p> <p>I strongly oppose a CPZ zone in the St Leonards area, especially in the Stanthorpe triangle area - where I live.</p>

<p>256</p>	<p>I am emailing with particular reference to resident's visitor parking in Shrubbery Road within the Stanthorpe Triangle (Zone U). (I note that within the proposed scheme there are no resident's only parking areas).</p> <p>It is difficult for me to comment on the proposal when the details are unclear, despite attempts at clarification via phone calls to the Lambeth Council.</p> <p>The controlled hours are 12pm to 2pm Monday to Friday. However, the Rules of Use state that Visitor permit holders may park free of charge for the first and last hour of the controlled hours in a pay and display bay. Does this mean that Visitors park free? But a permit will have to be activated, so will a permit have been wasted which is equivalent to incurring a £4.90 charge?</p> <p>Even if money is refunded but permits are consumed on each visit, a limit of 50 permits in a 12-month period (equivalent to 1 visitor per week) is very restrictive. Groups of family members may come to stay for a couple of weeks, several visitors may come per week, particularly now much of my time is spent working from home, etc.</p> <p>For people with cars the proposed CPZ may offer some small advantage by deterring longer term non-resident parkers, but for people like me who do not own a car but have multiple visitors it is a burden rather than a benefit. Therefore, I do not support the proposal.</p>
<p>258</p>	<p>This proposal is a bad idea.</p> <p>The parking in this area is due to the cars of residents. This is obvious from Sunday evenings being the hardest time to find a parking space; and when I leave home on a weekday morning at 9am after a heavy frost it 's clear that only a couple of cars in the road have been moved that morning.</p> <p>If anything a CPZ will make parking harder for residents. They usually come with yellow line restrictions; in fact the last time a CPZ was proposed here literally half this road would have been yellow lined. This makes parking harder for residents, impossible for many, not easier.</p> <p>I see no evidence that this proposal helps residents in any way; instead it comes across as a money making scheme.</p> <p>Please do not go ahead with it.</p>

Representations in support of the proposals

8	<p>We are residents on the one way section of Gleneldon road, right off streatham high street and we WHOLEHEARTEDLY want to support the planned CPZ. The traffic on Shrubbery Lane makes leaving our home a journey that ends up being 15 minutes longer than necessary due to the parking situation.</p> <p>Thanks very much for the proposed parking relief.</p>
43	<p>I am a resident of Ashlake road, I own a car and have struggled with parking for years now. The proposed restrictions do not go far enough to ensure that the parking difficulties will be eased. If we are going to be expected to pay for residents permits then the restriction ems should be longer. 4 hours is better than 2hrs.</p> <p>Thank you Sophia Mordi</p>
56	<p>I am writing to give my opinion on the proposed controlled parking in my area. I am on Bournevale Road and controlled parking is very welcome as we have so many cars parking all day for use of streatham train station and a local car garage which parks broken cars in the area. Parking for residents is a nightmare. We are for the controlled parking.</p>
98	<p>I am writing with regards to the above CPZ</p> <p>I reside at xx Stanthorpe Road SW162xx and fully welcome the CPZ. I just wish we didn't have to wait for it to be implemented.</p> <p>However, can I make an application for an Electric Vehicle Bay outside number 20 Stanthorpe Road.</p> <p>I have an electric vehicle and charging it close to home would be very handy.</p>
130	<p>I'm writing in support of the proposed CPZ scheme in the Stanthorpe Triangle area. I'm a resident within the area affected. Please do implement the plan as proposed, it will help to ease parking congestion in this badly affected area.</p>
132	<p>I live on Bournevale Road and just saw the sign regarding the parking changes on the stanthorpe triangle.</p> <p>I fully support these changes, as do all the other residents I've spoken with. We're fed up of the garage leaving broken cars with flat tyres, smashed windows and missing bumpers everywhere and Uber/taxi drivers who are not residents taking up all the spaces.</p> <p>Hopefully these new measures bring these issues under control, making parking easier for residents and making the whole area a nicer place to live!</p> <p>I really hope these new changes do take place and many thanks for supporting them!</p>

Breakdown of most prevalent comments received

	Cost / Financial burden / Taxation	Low stage 1 consultation response / stage 1 consultation not in line with proposal
Ashlake Road	1	-
Bournevale Road	-	-
Gleneldon Road	4	1
Shrubbery Road	-	-
Stanthorpe Road	-	2
Not stated	-	-