

Representations in opposition to the proposals

12	<p>I have just received in the post a leaflet regarding controlled parking zones where I live.</p> <p>I am emailing as I am against this happening I live on a high road and the parking around here is awful as it is. I can't park on the ally way that the entrance to my house is on due to the double yellow lines and now I will have to pay for a parking permit or have no where to park my car this is not acceptable as I already find it difficult to find parking.</p> <p>The fact that you want to introduce this and expect us to pay for a parking permit is unfair.</p> <p>If this is what you wish to do then the people in the zones you are introducing this to should get a permit for free as you are now making parking harder then it already is.</p> <p>You may say that introducing this is going to make parking easier however I personally think you are wrong.</p>
86	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed controlled parking in St Leonard's and surrounding areas in Streatham.</p> <p>It is completely unnecessary as there are no excessive parking problems and it would cause difficulties and irritation to residents and their visitors.</p> <p>This is the third time since I have lived here that the council has proposed parking controls. They have been rejected both times before and I hope again now. These consultations are costing the tax payer a great deal of money and in none of the consultations has there been a good and substantive argument or reasons for implementing these schemes.</p> <p>I therefore object to the scheme on the grounds that it is unnecessary and a hindrance to residents.</p>
87	<p>I would like to give my views on the newly proposed parking restrictions in the St Leonards CPZ area. I have never really had an issue parking on my road, perhaps as I live on the corner and have multiple options to park on different roads if I don't get a space outside my door. However, I feel like I would not benefit from having to pay for a parking permit. Usually I drive to work so could avoid paying (except on my mid week days off), but I often find it more difficult to find a space outside the house after 5pm when the restrictions wouldn't apply.</p> <p>Therefore I am against the new changes.</p>

102	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed St Leonards CPZs for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Extending permit parking zones makes it harder for residents to receive visitors, deliveries etc. (not all visits count as loading), which reduces the range of social interactions and quality of life residents can partake in. Additionally, parking restrictions make it harder for older residents who require family members or care staff to visit them to help them with everyday tasks (visitor/carer permits, where available, are an extra admin burden). There was a reasonable amount of space before the CPZ was implemented and while residents may not have always been able to park outside their address, they could find space within a couple of hundred metres of it. 2. The scheme is based around the impact of "commuters", however due to COVID commuting has been reduced and is predicted by many analysts to never return to pre-COVID levels. Many large organisations such as HSBC, Nationwide and Barclays have talked about permanent work from home and "the end of the office," therefore there will be an ongoing reduction in the amount of parking pressure from commuters. Therefore, the commuter "problem" is likely to solve itself over time without the need for extra controls. Commuters do contribute economically to the local area and the national economy. 3. Streatham is a retail area and retail is undergoing a fragile recovery after lockdowns. Retail is under great pressure from the likes of Amazon even without the impact of COVID. Making it harder for shoppers to visit is likely to drive visitors away, either to other retail areas (you can find towns with an equivalent retail mix and free parking if you travel further down the A23) or to superstore/online retail. The red route bays do not allow long enough to visit many shops and can encourage extra driving by having to move every 30 mins/1 hour. While shoppers may visit by public transport, this isn't practical if buying large items. Shoppers only stay for a short time so do not create long term parking pressure. It would be a shame for the retail areas to enter decline because customers find it too hard to visit and therefore spend their money elsewhere, potentially creating more pollution and driving more miles as they travel further to locations with free parking. The proposed hours of control are right in the middle of the shopping hours, if the issue is those who park all day why not set the controlled time outside of shopping hours e.g. 8-9am.
126	<p>All of the residents have made it very clear that we don't want your changes to our roads. It's already a nightmare to drive and park for residents and visitors, more restrictions are damaging to the local area and businesses. Why would a cul-de-sac need a double yellow line? There are now Red roots on side roads and no stopping which is damaging local shops and businesses. The only ones that can survive are the large supermarkets you can afford to have a car park. We paid to drive into London, we pay to stop we pay our petrol, our tax, insurance, our MOT and maintenance. We can't afford anymore! I can assure you, you have already done enough damage so please leave our roads alone.</p>

Location/origination not stated or general issues raised - Statutory Consultation objections and comments received	Appendix I
---	-------------------

145	<p>I am against the proposal to introduce a controlled parking zone. There is nothing wrong with the roads as they are and I would appreciate that they are left alone. This is a time where more attention could be given to helping those affected by the pandemic instead of yet another way of the council trying to extract money from people who are already trying to budget.</p>
146	<p>I am writing to AGAINST the proposal described in this Notice. It would be an absolute disaster for us the local residents and businesses. As is, I'm struggling to find free parking space. This will be extra burden in terms of cost and will only benefit the council's bank account. Failure in my representation, I shall not vote for Labour Party ever again.</p>
151	<p>I would like to register my opposition to this. (Although the council don't normally listen to the residents). This will affect the local shops and comes at a time when they are trying to recover from the lockdowns. Also residents who have lost their jobs and struggling to pay for their cars will have to fork out again for permits. Unwanted LTNS and CPZs... the council have no idea. You can't persecute the drivers and bleed them dry . What would you do if people did stop driving. Who would you tax to the hilt then.</p>
155	<p>I am opposed to this new proposal as it will create loads of parking issues both for the local residents and for the people who want to shop on the high road, causing Streatham to be even more depleted and causing similar issues to the ones created when you did something similar on the roads next to Streatham hill train station. Stop creating more problems for Streatham please!</p>
167	<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>Further to this, I am a teacher at St. Leonard's primary school and this will have a major impact on the staff who travel to work by car. This will cost far too much money on parking fares and parents collecting and dropping off will also incur many problems.</p> <p>I hope you will take these comments into consideration.</p>

Location/origination not stated or general issues raised - Statutory Consultation objections and comments received	Appendix I
---	-------------------

172	<p>I am writing regarding the plans to introduce controlled parking in the St Leonard's North, St Leonard's Central and Stanthorpe Triangle areas of Streatham.</p> <p>While I am sure it would no doubt be a great money-spinner for the local council, I cannot see how it would improve parking situations in the local area.</p> <p>I object to the fact that the resident permits will vary in price relating to the size of the car engine, since a car will take as much parking space whether its engine is big or small. In addition, no mention is made in the notice of how the price bands will be split according to engine size and CO2 emissions.</p> <p>This move seems unlikely to reduce the number of commuters parking in the area in the long-term, and more likely to force local residents to sacrifice their gardens for driveways, resulting in a permanent loss of parking spaces generally.</p> <p>I respectfully request that you review your proposal carefully and consider abolishing these plans altogether.</p>
250	<p>Reference: St Leonard's CPZ</p> <p>My proposal is against having a controlled parking zone in St Leonard's & Streatham Vale West Area.</p> <p>My reasons for against is due to the parking in my area is fine and most properties have drive ways.</p>

257

I am writing to raise a number of concerns and objections to the proposals by Lambeth Council for a controlled parking zone in the St Leonard's Ward.

I am the chair of the ward Safer Neighbourhood Panel. However the panel has not discussed this matter and has therefore not arrived at any agreed position and I am therefore writing in a personal capacity as a resident of long-standing.

Ward based solution. It is quite obvious that parking pressures vary widely in different parts of the ward. The closer to the High Road and the railway stations you are the more serious they are. The situation at the bottom end of Drewstead Road, for example, and the top of Prentis is completely different and yet the council has adopted a one size fits all solution for everybody regardless of their circumstances – just because we are all living in the same ward (whose boundaries are decided on completely different criteria). It is even more of a ludicrous situation to introduce a ward-wide scheme as proposed in St Leonard's when no controls at all are proposed in Streatham Wells, including streets abutting the High Road where parking pressures are intense, while streets experiencing much less parking pressure in St Leonard's have to have a CPZ.

Loss of parking capacity. It is clear that many residential streets in the ward are going to suffer a serious loss of parking capacity. A large number of parking spaces are not going to be available for parking, apparently because they do not meet some very extreme standard of what is acceptable as a parking bay. Very few residents will have examined the proposals map in detail and/or are aware of the impact of these changes. An examination of the plans on site shows that numerous parking spaces in both Woodfield Ave and Woodbourne Ave, for example, which are currently available and which comfortably accommodate even large cars – all without in any way compromising road safety - will not be parking bays under the CPZ. These are a few examples of parking spaces which will disappear:

A similar situation pertains in nearby Hoadly Road, for example, where there is to be a serious loss of parking capacity.

It has emerged from earlier correspondence that the Council is unaware of its legal duty on parking provision. I was told by the Council officer responsible for this scheme: "The Council does not have a legal duty to ensure adequate parking facilities." This is in flagrant disregard of Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 which states that the highway authority has a duty to provide "suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway." It is further apparent that no assessment has been carried out of the loss of parking capacity or indeed of parking need, and without the consideration of these matters, and their public disclosure, it would be reckless and irresponsible of the Council to proceed.

Loss of front gardens. I am seriously concerned that the inevitable result of introducing a CPZ without planning controls over front gardens will mean that many will be paved over to become parking lots, resulting in a visual and environmental blight on the neighbourhood and damage to the street scene, as well as increasing pressures on the drainage system since rules regarding permeable surfaces are not observed or enforced.

263

Apologies for the lateness of my comments, but I have been away ill recovering in the country, only returning to London this weekend. I would appreciate if you could include my comments in your review.

St Leonard's CPZ - comments/ objection to current design

I believe one of your stated aims for the CPZ is to “facilitate residents parking near their own homes”. But also that other aims should be considered, e.g. shouldn't the scheme be designed to protect the environment and the character of the local homes. Sadly, I don't think the way you have planned this will achieve any of these. In fact, I fear that it will be highly detrimental to all, continuing to urbanise and pollute a once tranquil, leafy, residential community. It seems that the outcome will be to now charge residents to NOT be able to “park near their own homes”, whilst helping visitors to park at a reduced rate. The “parking” problem = visiting staff and parents to SCHS

Of course your plans are very likely to reduce car commuters driving in to use public transport at Streatham Hill or Balham. However, these seem to be comparatively low in number. All you need to do is look at the level of parked cars on a normal school day and compare it with the holidays to see that the biggest “parking” issue we have is how the private secondary school, Streatham and Clapham High School/ SCHS (42 Abbotswood Rd) now uses the majority of on-street parking as their staff car park. Currently residents are restricted from “parking near their own homes” by staff from SCHS parking outside their homes; I fear that your plans will exasperate this.

Per travel surveys (unaudited, self-collated by SCHS), it has been recorded that almost 50% of staff drive to the school every day and park in the streets of your proposed CPZ. This is over 50 cars per day. Lambeth's Planning team have supported SCHS in increasing this number over the last 5 years by allowing them to expand WITHOUT restricting the number of staff that drive to work. Efforts by residents to point this out have been met with legal threats from SCHS. Plus, per school disclosure, around 80% of students come from outside the borough and many are driven each day. SCHS seems to serve Wandsworth residents much more than Lambeth ones. And Lambeth seems to have turned a blind eye to the unnecessary, “luxury”, non-sustainable travel mode of SCHS staff and parents/ students, bringing cumulative pollution and congestion to the homes of local Lambeth residents.

Why your current design is wrong

Now as you plan to reduce by 25% the current parking in Hoadly Rd and yellow line much of the current available parking, this will be even worse for local residents. And presumably the school, with its rich income from school fees (>£8m pa) will simply buy Teacher parking permits and grab as much local parking as they can. If this scheme was truly to “facilitate residents parking near their own homes” why are:

- all spaces available to visiting Pay By Phone, setting up competition against local residents for spaces;
- almost half available to Business Users, again setting up competition against local residents for spaces: and
- there no “Resident Only” bays, to formally protect local residents parking access.

The Pay By Phone and Business User options significantly help the daily visiting staff to SCHS against local residents. And let's not forget that SCHS is a business venture that on being granted planning permission to expand its size by 50% was specifically NOT asked by Lambeth to make any S106 contribution to the community. Now it seems SCHS staff are being “facilitated” to drive more often and park more easily, to the direct detriment of Lambeth residents who will not be able to park “near their own homes”.

Location/origination not stated or general issues raised - Statutory Consultation objections and comments received	Appendix I
---	-------------------

270

I have lived in Streatham for over 31 years and every so often these schemes have been suggested. Every time local residents and businesses have fought tooth and nail against them. Every time they are proposed without, it seems, any real attempt to consult us. But this time is worse than ever - I have only just heard about this, not from any official notification but through the grapevine. This is not fair and seems underhand. Please pause and leaflet tweet, email, ring, put signs up etc etc - otherwise you have not consulted us, you have merely gone ahead with a measure that, unless everyone has changed their minds, the majority of the community do not want.

I see that representations had to be sent by June the 4th but given the circumstances I sincerely hope you will read and respond.

Representations in support of the proposals

33	I am very supportive of the proposals I received notification of, and believe they will ensure that on street car parking spaces are reserved for residents.
74	I am a resident in a street contained within the new proposed St Leonards CPZ. I am in favour of a CPZ in order to minimise parking stress, and for air quality and safety reasons. However, it would be useful to see provision for opportunities (and indeed cost) for residents to purchase visitor day permits, contractors permits etc. A 4 hour maximum provision through pay by phone for example would not suffice when building works were in place etc.
248	<p>Please see below for my comments on the proposed parking controls in the St Leonards area. I am a Streatham resident, living on one of the roads under consultation, and a car owner.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am generally in support of introducing the proposed CPZ, I think it will be good for residents. • I would also request the addition of speedbumps (or other traffic calming methods) on roads in the area immediately connecting to the High Road <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o There are often cars and bikes driving quickly down the roads (possibly in a burst of frustration being released when they are freed from traffic on the high road!) o I cannot confirm they are breaking the speed limit, but I would expect so o These vehicles could be quite dangerous to children and other pedestrians, especially combined with parked cars on either side reducing visibility both ways, and the various schools and nurseries in the area. • I may have misunderstood the plan for EV charging bays, but I believe that I disagree with the current plan. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o I think that the users of EV bays will also need to be permit holders o The air quality in the area is a significant health issue, so I think anything that can be done to promote electric vehicles (and therefore reduced emissions) is a positive for all residents o That should apply to both residents and visitors, I would rather a visitor to the Streatham area chose to travel by electric vehicle rather than petrol, and think we should be promoting that by allowing them access to the EV charging bays o (further the list of EV bays in the CPZ on the consultation letter did not include those on Norfolk House Road, perhaps that is an oversight) <p>Thank you for your time and effort on this initiative, and in general working for the residents of Lambeth.</p>
260	Torally agree with cpz in St leoards
261	Totally agree with cpz in this area