

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>
5	<p>I agree with creating CPZs in principle. However, I think residents shouldn't have to pay to park outside their own property.</p> <p>People should have to register their vehicle and get one parking permit per-household.</p> <p>I'm sure setting up a CPZ costs money but this is just another form of stealth tax for people who have been living in these areas prior to the CPZ.</p> <p>The structure and system you're using must already exist how can the costs being suggested be justified.</p> <p>There is a case for introducing it for new residents, that they know up front they'll</p>

	<p>have to pay for this before moving in but it's not acceptable for existing residents to have to pay for this.</p>
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>
6	<p>Thank you for the confirmation email. However, after further consideration I would like my comments removed.</p> <p>I now realise the fees involved in parking in our local area and feel they are unaffordable to many residents. Particularly the £20 a day for tradespeople. There are always builders/scaffolding/plumbers carrying out work to improve homes on our road and adding a substantial fee to this work could mean houses are not maintained long term.</p> <p>Also, it creates fees to families to have friends and family visit which is not necessary.</p> <p>The main concern with parking is the very top of Gleneagle Road where taxis park on double redlines and have been abusive towards women. Perhaps this area should be a no parking area or patrolled regularly by parking attendants.</p> <p>Please consider a 2hr weekday window to discourage commuter parking if this is a concern.</p>
7	<p>I live at x 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>
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>

9

I write to object to the proposed hours of control for St Leonard's Central (Zone O) of 8:30AM – 6.30PM.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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>9</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 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>
<p>10</p>	<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>

<p>11</p>	<p>I received the proposed CPZ for St Leonards and Streatham Vale West and I am truly dismayed that you are not going to put a CPZ in St Leonard's South which we desperately need. Before COVID it was impossible for residents to find parking as this (Natal Road SW16 6H) and neighbouring roads are used a lot by commuters using Streatham and Streatham Common Stations and the Bus Terminal at Tesco's. It is also used a lot by people going to the leisure centre instead of having to pay for parking underground as well as the church on Sundays and the mosque in Estreham Road on Fridays. The effect of this parking issue has been highlighted by the fact that during the last year and particularly during lockdown parking has not been an issue, proving that non-residents are causing the parking problems.</p> <p>There have been many occasions where I have had to park several streets away from my house (Natal Road) before COVID. As people start to return to work this issue is going to return. It is also likely to get worse as people will start using this area for parking as they can no longer park in the new CPZ areas and your proposal of more double yellow lines makes the situation even worse.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider your proposal and include this area in your CPZ.</p>
<p>12</p>	<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.</p> <p>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> <p>I hope to hear from you soon</p>
<p>13</p>	<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>
<p>14</p>	<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 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>
17	<p>I'd like to vote against ST LEONARDS CPZ 'I' zone in which Moorcroft Road is included.</p>
18	<p>Ref: St Leonard's CPZ</p> <p>I live at xx Drewstead Road, Streatham, SW16 1xx.</p> <p>I'm very much in favour of the CPZ proposal for my area - St Leonard's North 'I'.</p> <p>Anything that reduces traffic in general in London is a good idea.</p> <p>The proposal for controlled hours of 12-2pm Mon to Fri would seem to be a sensible compromise - discourages commuter parking by people trying to access Streatham Hill station, but lets visitors/shoppers find places to park.</p>

<p>19</p>	<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>
<p>20</p>	<p>I am a resident at xx Kingscourt Road (SW16 1xx). My wife and I strongly support the introduction of a CPZ.</p> <p>As I have discussed with Counsellor Griffiths, post Covid we are seeing a lot more cars on the road. Further, I observe daily instances of "road rage" when cars are unable to pass, and I am concerned that one day this will escalate to violence.</p>
<p>21</p>	<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>

<p>22</p>	<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>
<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>24</p>	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed creation of Saint Leonards North I zone covering Drewstead Road and Mortimer Close.</p> <p>I live on Mortimer Close and one of the attractions of this area compared with Wandsworth where I used to live was the absence of any residents' parking permit scheme here.</p> <p>In my experience these schemes simply create more bureaucracy, and rather than addressing the real problem they simply move the parking problem to the next zone along, creating ongoing pressure to create more and more zones.</p> <p>They create resentment from residents like me who end up having to fork out for visitor permits whenever they need a plumber, and who see these schemes as simply a way for the council to make money. They are particularly troublesome for elderly people who need visits from carers etc.</p> <p>In one sense the scheme does not directly affect me since I have the luxury of a paved front yard where I park my car off-street. However a parking scheme would reduce my inclination to turn this area back into garden and grass, which would have had environmental benefits, and may create the reverse pressure for other people who currently have a front garden to apply to concrete over that valued green asset.</p> <p>Over the last eight months I have had building work done on the property which has involved numerous contractors needing to park on the street outside the property. Had this scheme been in place, this would have created a major, major headache and additional expense for me as well as completely unnecessary hassle for them. During the entire period of the work there was not a single day when they did not have space to park on the street - so I see absolutely no reason why these controls are needed!</p> <p>The controls will also be bad news for local businesses – for example, on the rare occasions when I have call to drive from this location elsewhere, I will often stop en route to grab a coffee or sandwich at a local café or shop. Having schemes like this all around the area will significantly reduce the likelihood that I shall do so, therefore depriving local businesses of the income.</p>

	<p>Finally, whilst in most instances I am a pedestrian or cyclist, I am also an occasional motorist and have great sympathy with those who need to use their cars more frequently than I do, for example to take children to school, transport those with mobility issues etc. They are currently suffering a wave of overregulation in this area at a time when they are also being encouraged to use private car transport more in order to reduce the risk of Covid transmission.</p> <p>I do wish that local councils would stop this mad, ever-increasing wish to impose new regulation on things that are not broken and do not need fixing. The backlash you have received in relation to the no through traffic zones elsewhere in the borough does not seem to have taught you anything. When it comes to regulating parking and car use, please just go away and leave us alone!</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>
25	<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>
26	<p>Pretty frustrating to receive the news of a new tax in the form of a resident parking scheme on my road Kingscourt road in streatham.</p> <p>If we are going to now receive the new yearly tax, do we think we could sort fibre broadband for the road too and use the money to pay for that as the current copper wire direct to exchange is pathetic? Particularly as we all work from home. It simply doesn't work.</p> <p>No doubt you will reply and say that the broadband is a responsibility of Openreach, but frankly fixing that issue using the money generated from the new parking scheme is pretty much the only reason I could find to justify it.</p> <p>Looking forward to hearing plans of the broadband being installed.</p>
27	<p>I wanted to let you know that we are all completely against the useless parking measures you want to put on our road as it is a quiet private road where the measures do not need to be introduced as they will only make our life harder. We will not be happy about this and are very upset at these silly measures. Please rethink what u are planning to do as it is useless , on hoadly road atleast.</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. A CPZ on our street would be wonderful!</p>
29	<p>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.</p>
30	<p>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</p>

	<p>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.</p>
31	<p>I would like to object to the statutory consultation to introduce CPZs in St Leonard's North, St. Leonard's Central and Stanthorpe triangle.</p> <p>These measures are penalising residents who do not use their cars to commute and use other greener modes of transport to do so. This has become far more common since the start of the pandemic as more residents work from home and has not been taken into account in the Stage 1 consultation which was carried out in September 2019.</p> <p>The measure also disproportionately disadvantages those who live in less expensive houses or flats without drive-ways.</p> <p>This is clearly just a way for Lambeth Council to generate money from residents who already pay extortionate council tax.</p>
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>
33	<p>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.</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>
35	<p>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.</p>
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>
38	<p>I am against this proposal as outlined in this Notice posted to me, to introduce new controlled parking zone.</p> <p>I am a retired resident, living on De Montfort Road and I park my car outside my house throughout the day. I pay my road tax, and I do not know why I should pay another extra charge during the working week to park my car on the road that I reside on. Why should residents be panelised for parking their car on the road they live on.</p> <p>Residents who live in these zones should have free parking within these zones, as it is currently is (free).</p> <p>This is another indirect tax for the poor residents who live in these zones, and this is the reason that I am against this.</p> <p>I think more should be done about cars that are untaxed or abandoned that are parked within these zones. We have traffic wardens just walking or cycling up and down the road just looking for, and giving parking tickets to cars parked illegally on double yellow lines and ignoring these cars. We have a car parked on this road with no number plates which has been currently ignored by these traffic wardens for many months!</p>
39	<p>I am a local resident Woodfield Ave SW16 and in support of this scheme. I hope it will encourage people to not think about driving to this area to park but cycling or walking instead.</p>
40	<p>I received the letter of cpz and absolutely agree with it as a resident of Babington Road. When will it be started from ?</p>
40	<p>I received the confirmation letter of the cpz for Babington road and I am over the moon with it.</p>
41	<p>As a resident of Babington road i absolutely agree with the cpz</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>
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>

44	<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>
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>
47	<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>
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 paking.</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>
49	<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>
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>

51

1. I am strongly in favour of the proposed St Leonards North CPZ in general, for the following reasons:

- It will put an end to the long term parking (and dumping!) of vehicles that transferred to this area when the Hyde Farm CPZ was introduced.
- It will put an end to commuters and other long stay users driving to the area and parking all day in order to access Balham and Streatham Hill stations.
- It will hopefully reduce car commuting by staff of the rapidly expanding Streatham and Clapham High School for Girls in Abbotswood Road, whose parked cars make life difficult for residents, delivery drivers, refuse truck drivers and others.
- By reducing parking demand, it will contribute to the wider objectives of reducing carbon emissions and air pollution, encouraging the use of more sustainable modes of travel, and improving the quality of the local residential environment by reducing the dominance of parked and moving vehicles.
- It will improve the safety and quality of London cycle route No. 5 that passes through Abbotswood Road.

2. However, some improvements could and should be made to the CPZ arrangements in Drewstead Road, to improve road safety and especially to reduce the driver aggravation and frustration that currently occurs throughout the day. The problem arises because there is insufficient width between vehicles parked on either side of the road for two vehicles to pass. The opportunity should be taken, with small modifications to the CPZ, to tackle this problem, as explained below.

There are two sharp bends in Drewstead Road where lack of forward visibility creates situations where vehicles get stuck, and reversing and juggling has to occur to unblock the situation. These bends are at the junction with Woodfield Avenue, and (particularly) near the entrance to the railway sidings. The presence of parked vehicles (especially vans) on the inside of these bends often restricts forward visibility and therefore frequently creates the jams I have described. In my view, therefore, the inside of these bends should be painted with double yellow lines.

In addition, jams occur when two or more drivers proceed together (stupidly) to a passing place that has insufficient length to accommodate them, again causing a jam and the need for reversing to free up the situation. Therefore, the 2 further locations in Drewstead Road where passing occurs should also have double yellow lines, extending either side of the junction/access way in the same manner as at the junction with De Montfort Road. These 2 locations are: the entrance to the undercroft parking (opposite No 34), and the junction with Dingley Lane. The situation with the weekly refuse vehicles would also be greatly improved with these additional measures.

51	<p>The suggested increase in double yellow lines will of course marginally reduce total parking capacity. However, the creation of the CPZ will reduce parking demand, and so I would judge that there would be no adverse consequences in terms of the balance of supply and demand.</p> <p>I note from the stage 1 consultation results that only 34% of Drewstead Road respondents felt they had a parking problem. It should not be taken from this that there is no problem to be dealt with. While many residents of Drewstead Road may not have difficulty parking their cars (especially those living in the section west of Woodfield Avenue), the parking situation causes a great deal of difficulty for those driving through the section between Woodfield Avenue and Streatham Hill station, as I have described above.</p> <p>(3. Finally, an alternative solution for Drewstead Road - and the area generally - would be to cut off the rat-run between Garrads Rd and Streatham Hill Station that is formed of Woodfield Avenue and Drewstead Road. However, I recognise that this goes beyond the CPZ issue, and would be a discussion to be had further down the line.)</p> <p>I will be happy to discuss any of the above further.</p>
52	<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-residents2. 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>

<p>53</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 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> <p>I strongly urge that you reconsult to get a true reflection of the majority wishes.</p>
<p>54</p>	<p>Just to ensure that my views as part of the consultation in regards to controlled parking Statutory Consultation, St Leonard's & Streatham Vale West Area 07 May 2021 - 04 June 2021 are taken into consideration as part process.</p> <p>As a resident I am strongly in favour, this has been long overdue as it will reduce traffic flow in and around the environmental common area and dangerous parking in and on the island at Mortimer Close.</p> <p>It will also raise much needed revenue for the council.</p> <p>I can not support this motion more strongly.</p>
<p>55</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Hence I will object the CPZ for Riggindale road.</p>
<p>56</p>	<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>

57	<p>Thanks for the follow up letter about St Leonard's CPZ.</p> <p>I had a look at the proposal, however I am not certain why there is a difference between St Leonards Central and North zones (I guess due to the previous consultations)? As a resident in the North zone, I don't think proposed CPZ adds any value in the current term of 12.00noon-2pm Monday-Friday, having in mind it's close proximity to the station and regular commuters taking advantage of the area to park their vehicles all the time. Also, cost versus benefit for the residents is very minimal, as cost will outweigh the benefit, unless Central and North zones are both combined and controlled in the same way (e.g. 8.30am-6.30pm Monday-Friday). The other thing that stands out is the ratio of pay by phone to residents permit holders spaces, there are way too many pay by phone spaces, which won't make parking any easier in the area (could even make it worse and congested). Having also in mind recent council tax hike, I disagree with the current plan, unless St Leonards North zone is being operated and controlled as the Central 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>
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>
60	<p>in reply to the proposed CPZ's of St Leonards North, Central and Stanthorpe Triangle I would like to point out that this is going to disproportionately affect those of us who live next to these zones with people parking in our area. Parking in the roads around Streatham Common Station is already very difficult and this would make the situation even worse. In the original consultation I 'voted' for CPZ on my road - Pathfield Road. I would still like to include this area in the CPZ plans.</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>
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>
65	<p>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>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>

67	<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>
68	<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>
69	<p>I wanted to get in touch regarding the parking consultation review. I am in full support of parking restrictions being put in across Streatham due to how busy the roads currently are without them, in particular the street I live on - Kingscourt Road. The fact that are few parking spaces means cars often cannot pass each other on the road, which I have often seen resulting in arguments and road rage when I have been walking on the road.</p> <p>I must say I am however incredibly surprised to see that the restriction in the St Leonard's North will only by 12-2pm while the Central Ward is 8:30-6:30pm. It seems quite pointless considering that 2 hours is unlikely to be a deterrent, people with either just 'gamble' and leave their car there when visiting the area of pay the cost and the street will still be full.</p> <p>Do you know why this is? I'd like to share my view that the parking restrictions should be 8:30-6:30pm like St Leonard's Central.</p>

70	<p>Thank you for your leaflet outlining proposed CPZ for St Leonards & Streatham Vale West area.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. My objections / views are that parking on Pathfield Road is already extremely difficult following the changes you have already made within our Road. Introducing the measures you further propose will just make matters worse still, moving parking from the Zones outlined I & O & U will force parking to other zones, so in my view, if you introduce parking controls in those zones, then you must absolutely consider the knock on effect it will have on further areas. 2. Parking on Pathfield Road is already a nightmare because we are so close to the station plus the fact we lost approximately 13 car parking spaces last year through the introduction of a one way system and more double yellow lines. 3. It is extremely irritating to arrive home and not be able to park anywhere near where I live. 4. Introducing more DYL in our area will just simply make our situation worse than it already is. 5. If you are to introduce CPZ in the proposed areas, then, please, please, please, I also urge you to introduce them in Pathfield Road.
71	<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.
72	<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.</p> <p>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</p>

	<p>second cars would have to be parked elsewhere on the street, reducing the overall number of parking slots available.</p>
73	<p>I would like to express my support for the proposed Controlled Parking Zone in St Leonards, Streatham. For the past few months it has become almost impossible to park in Kingscourt Road where I live.</p> <p>Thank you for your work on our behalf.</p>
74	<p>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.</p>
75	<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	<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>
76	<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>
77	<p>Thank you for addressing the needs of residents in the area with the proposed CPZ. Parking in my road (Kingscourt) has become so difficult recently and this should really help.</p>

<p>78</p>	<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>78</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>
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>
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>

82	<p>Response to your consultation.</p> <p>I live in Becmead Avenue, in the proposed St Leonards North zone.</p> <p>I have no strong objection to the proposed 12.00-14.00 weekday parking zone, but could you please be clearer about how it will be applied and enforced. For example, Becmead Avenue currently has a lot of dropped kerbs where houses have off-street parking. Usually these have white lines on the side of the road which are intended to keep the entrances clear. In practice, however, cars often park across those lines, making access to driveways difficult and obscuring a clear view of the road when you exit the driveway. Usually such parking is only for short periods, but it is irritating and potentially dangerous. Could you clarify please what you propose will happen within the parking zone:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Will you enforce no parking on the white lines outside driveways? And if so, will that apply only during the 2 hour operating period, or at all times?- Do you propose replacing the white lines (which I understand have no legal status) with more formal 'no parking' markings?- It is often helpful for tradesmen to be able to park on the white lines, for easier access to properties – will that continue to be possible (with permission from the relevant homeowner)?- What do you propose will be the charge for resident permits and for single parking sessions?
----	---

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 out 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.

<p>84</p>	<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>84</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 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>

<p>85</p>	<p>As a resident in the proposed Zone I (St.Leonard's North), I object to the scheme on the basis of what it won't do, rather than the little that it will do.</p> <p>The scheme provides no new bike hangers for people such as myself, who live in multiply occupied buildings and tenements, where it doesn't feel safe to leave bicycles out in the communal gardens, or where residents do not enjoy a garden.</p> <p>It provides no free-bike scheme stations which we need in the pandemic and shall need in the post-pandemic period and which should be decentralised from central London.</p> <p>It provides no privileged parking bays for (electric) car hire schemes.</p> <p>It also does not provide a residents' parking scheme, which charges progressively according to the volume of fossil fuels residents' vehicle burn (with, for the time being, a zero charge for those which are electric).</p> <p>It does nothing to prevent more affluent, multi-car owning, detached and semi-detached home owners unsustainably cutting down the trees and shrubs in their front gardens and converting the latter into concreted and tarmaced private parking lots.</p> <p>Once the scheme has incorporated the above amendments, its time period should be extended to 24 hours.</p>
<p>86</p>	<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>
<p>87</p>	<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>

88	<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>
89	<p>I am writing to express my objection to the proposed parking measures in St Leonard's North.</p> <p>I recently purchased my car in direct response to the horrific circumstances in the local area that saw a woman murdered, in the knowledge I am able to park it outside my flat and travel around safely- especially at night.</p> <p>It was the final straw and the only solution to me feeling safe enough to live, work and travel around the city and the ability to park on my own road was of paramount importance.</p> <p>Your proposed measures are going to directly impact this and I don't think Lambeth Council take people's circumstances into consideration whatsoever.</p> <p>I was recently handed a PCN for driving down a restricted road, Amesbury Avenue, at night, to drop my friend, another young female, to her door, in the dark.</p> <p>It was made extremely clear that unless I was literally on the way to hospital or something of that level, my representations would be rejected, so I paid it.</p> <p>FYI your vehicle restriction signs don't show up on maps.</p> <p>But it just one more example of the lengths you are taking to control traffic without considering people- especially women's safety, I am disappointed and really hoped as a council would have done more (I am yet to see a single measure put in place to ensure women's safety since her murder).</p> <p>There is also absolutely no word of permits in the letter sent to me, or whatever enormous cost this would be to a resident either.</p> <p>Looking forward to hearing from you soon.</p>

<p>90</p>	<p>RE: Statutory Consultation - 7 May to 4 June 2021 St Leonard's North (Zone I)</p> <p>As a resident of the above zone, I am writing to confirm my support for the introduction of a CPZ in my street and the wider area as designated by Zone I. My reasons for supporting this proposal are summarised as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The introduction of a CPZ in Sternhold Avenue has created a huge overspill of long-term parking, now very evident in my road and the surrounding roads. - This overspill has created issues for vehicles over 7tonne in weight, that now routinely reverse back past my house, due to their turning angle being restricted as they turn left into Abbotswood Road. This includes 44 tonne articulated lorries, that on occasion have been stuck for well over an hour. - This situation is now causing obvious anxiety for some neighbours, resulting in angry notes being left on vehicles and vehicles left long-term with notices saying, "This vehicle is not abandoned". - Discourteous drivers parking over my driveway, which has a dropped down curve and whiteline, installed at a large expense. This causes stress to my household, and also means that it is then impossible to park our electric van on the driveway in order to charge the batteries. <p>I think that the only sensible and equitable solution is to introduce a CPZ. I have checked the cost for my household to park one vehicle in a bay close to my house and, I think that it is fair and reasonable.</p> <p>Once again, I fully support these proposals.</p> <p>I am quite happy to discuss any of the above in further detail with a representative from Lambeth Council.</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</p>

	<p>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>
92	<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>
93	<p>I am generally in favour of the proposals. I live in zone '1' according to the plans. Preferably I think it would be better to introduce a one way system or speed humps down Kingscourt road and Norfolk House road to mitigate the ridiculous levels of car and motorcycle speeding down these narrow hilly streets. I am assume as this is not part of your plans that it is not feasible for some reason. To mitigate that would suggest ensuring sufficient provision / length for double yellow lines to allow for passing places, I notice there is some on the plan but it could benefit from more. The noise and beeping created by cars meeting head on who refuse to budge is frustrating whilst having to work at home. This is also true for delivery vehicles for parcels or groceries blocking the street. Additionally noisy mopeds using Kingscourt road to Mount Ephaim lane as a cut through to Bedford hill or vice versa to the high street is ridiculous given it is signposted as a no through road. It would be beneficial to improve enforcement here. I am also in favour of increasing the length of time/hours for controlled hours for longer than 12-2pm given people are often using the parking for schools and other taxi idling.</p>
94	<p>I strongly AGREE with the proposal, parking has become a nightmare in St Leonard's North, I often have to park a 5 or 10 minute walk away from my house.</p>
95	<p>I would like to oppose the St Leonard's Central CPZ plans. I am a local resident on Southcroft Road SW16 and already struggle to park outside my own house.</p>

96	<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 our70s and would not want any sort of visitor to be discouraged by the cost of parking.</p>
97	<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 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>
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>

<p>99</p>	<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>99</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>

100	<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>
100	<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>This CPZ will make parking more difficult for residents, and it raises the costs when tradesmen are called out, as the extra parking costs will be passed onto the residents – should they actually be able to park.</p> <p>Please reconsider this decision based on the data from our road.</p>

101

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.

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.

Any benefits from a permit arrangement (if there are any) will be outweighed by the cost and hassle of obtaining permits and managing visitors. .

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.

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.

We hope you can consider these arguments as part of the consultation process

<p>102</p>	<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.
<p>102</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. The cost of permits adds a financial burden on households who in many cases are struggling due to economic conditions. A cynic may suggest the scheme is a revenue-raising opportunity for the Council instead of addressing the needs to the community and road users. The limited visitor parking is "pay-by-phone" only, an inherently exclusionary method which requires ownership of, and working technology and mobile phone plans (some pay-as-you-go plans charge up to 25p/minute for calls). Furthermore, there is no visitor parking available for the whole period of control. <p>Therefore, I must object to the proposals, or at least suggest the area is reduced and the implementation refined.</p>

103	<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>
104	<p>Thank you for the consultation. I live at xx Kingscourt Road.</p> <p>I think some parking control would be fine but we need a way that we as residents can leave our cars in the road. I assume there will be a residents parking permit scheme if so? I don't need my car every day for work as I go in by transport or cycle.</p> <p>It is difficult for us as people come and work and park in the road - all part of Streatham being lively - but parking is increasingly hard for us and i often have to park a little way off.</p>
105	<p>I am resident at 7 Mortimer Close, SW16 1AQ. I support the proposal to introduce a Controlled Parking Zone in St Leonard's North subject to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarification that the two grass islands in Mortimer Close will have double yellow lines around them. The reason for this is that the large refuse vehicles and delivery trucks will have sufficient space to enter and leave the close without out damaging the grass verges; - That the parking bays at the east and west ends of the inner close (outside numbers 1 and 2, and 11 and 12) should remain as angle parking bays in line with custom and practice for the last 30 years. This will ensure sufficient parking bays for the residents of Mortimer Close.
106	<p>I would like to propose double yellow lines round the islands on Mortimer Close and angled parking bays outside number 1,2, 11 & 12.</p>
107	<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>

108	<p>I live in Mortimer Close and really hope we get CPZ here Cars are left here for weeks and months because there are no parking restrictions. The 2 grass verges are constantly parked on and the pavements as well. I really support CPZ. It really needs to have warden control here</p>
109	<p>I live in the st Leonard's North cpz and am strongly in support of the scheme as neighborhood parking has become impossible and we are in need of control parking.</p> <p>My only comment would be I would be in support of extending the proposed hours of the cpz from 830 -1830 to reflect controls in surrounding areas.</p>
110	<p>I live at xx Moorcroft Road within the proposed St Leonard's North "I" CPZ and received your consultation letter.</p> <p>I am strongly in favour of a CPZ in the area. Parking has become increasingly scarce in our roads. We rarely find parking on our road and normally have to park several roads away to find space. The lack of spaces means that cars sometimes have no choice other than to park over the lines on corners (even if they risk a ticket).</p> <p>The problem is particularly acute on Norfolk House Road, Moorcroft Road, Kingscourt Road, Brancaster Road, Blake more Road and Mount Ephraim Lane. This may be due to the tight terraces and multiple flats, plus the proximity to the High Road.</p> <p>My only suggestion would be that the zone hours should be longer: 8.30am - 6.30pm. The current parking issues are a day long problem.</p>
111	<p>Further to the proposed PCPZ, I live in Mortimer Close, SW16 1AQ. I am in favour of the proposals. Thank you.</p>
112	<p>Whinfall 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 Whinfall 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 Whinfall 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>

113	<p>I would like to lodge my disapproval of this proposal as outlined in this Notice posted to me, to introduce a new controlled parking zone.</p> <p>I am a resident on De Montfort Road who has parked his car outside his house for many years throughout the day free of charge. I am not sure, why after many years parking my car outside the house I live in, I should be charged to do so! The poor residents who have cars that are parked within these zones are being penalised by Lambeth Council as another indirect tax to fund the council.</p> <p>Have any considerations been given for residents that park their cars outside their house throughout the day?</p>
114	<p>As a local resident and employee at a local business I wanted to take the time to respond to the above stated consultation.</p> <p>Having responded to the original consultations and surveys, I welcome the provisions for a new CPZ with one hour control to help open up parking and prevent commuters parking all day, whilst allowing visitors and shoppers to not pay parking fees, encouraging visitors to our high street and local businesses.</p> <p>However I would like to state a few points of concern from the plan that has been proposed.</p> <p>Firstly putting single yellow lines over driveways. I can see the need for this on thinner roads where there may be a lack of passing points, but on roads where the council are already removing the amount of parking available by reducing the number of bays, this restricts some residents from parking. Residents in the borough and other boroughs currently enjoy being able to park in front of their own driveways, along with their guests. If the council would like to institute this, can it be justified compared to leaving white lines blocking dropped kerbs.</p> <p>Secondly this would be electric car charging. We already benefit from a few public chargers based on Norfolk House Road, but if the council were serious about the move towards net zero, surely the encouragement in the uptake of electric vehicles for seasoned drivers would be encouraged? Although current policy is to reduce the number of drivers overall, there are some people that have to drive and having the benefit of on-street charging will help to encourage them to switch over. The chargers that are already installed are also rather inaccessible as they are always occupied by the same vehicles. Surely increasing the number of electric only bays would encourage drivers who can afford it to switch over, and the increase in 'lamp-post' chargers will further this.</p> <p>Many thanks for your consideration, and I welcome your input to the above.</p>

<p>115</p>	<p>I write in relation to the proposed CPZ in St Leonards. I have been a resident in Becmead Avenue for more than 20 years. While the number of cars parking in the street has increased, the problem for residents is not that great as the vast majority have off street parking in this road. The introduction of a CPZ particularly at the hours of 12-2 pm will have the effect of making it very difficult for residents to have their friends or family visit them at lunch time as the pay by phone facility will only operate for 1 hour during that time. This will force residents who want to invite friends or family to visit to be restricted.</p> <p>There are a number of restaurants and cafes on the Streatham High road which would also be impacted by the timing of the CPZ and might lose trade as people cannot park (even if they were happy to pay) to use the facilities on a week day. After the disruption that covid 19 has bought to this sector, surely the council should be doing all it can to help these businesses get back on their feet not limit their ability to attract customers.</p> <p>At present many residents in this street with off street parking have a white line in front of their property which they can use to allow visitors or trades people to park on while they visit their property. What would be the status of the white line once a CPZ is introduced. If no parking on the white lines is enforced by the parking wardens the street effectively loses a number of spaces that reduce the pressure on the rest of the street and would require residents to pay for friends or tradesperson parking which is unnecessary. The treatment of white lines is not clear in the proposal.</p> <p>I object to the introduction of the CPZ as I do not believe it is needed in Becmead Avenue and surrounding streets and will cause inconvenience and cost to local residents.</p>
<p>116</p>	<p>I am writing to object to the Propose Controlled Parking Zone. I live on Lewin Road in the St Leonard's South area which you have proposed not to put any parking zones. This road is situated between two key railway stations and next to popular public facilities such as the Streatham Ice and Leisure centre, Streatham Common, the large Tesco's to name just a few. Because of this people frequently take up parking spaces down our road and those adjacent to visit these locations. This also comes hand in hand with unwanted and excessive noise, where cars idle right outside my house, playing loud music and or talking loudly on the phone, loud banging of doors etc. Because different cars are coming and going all day long, this happens frequently throughout the day.</p> <p>I hope you reconsider the proposal and consider implementing controlled parking zones in the roads in the St Leonards's South area.</p>
<p>117</p>	<p>Thank you for letting me know about the proposed CPZ</p> <p>This could not have come soon enough ... Kingscourt Road is a nightmare. If I'm honest I'd have liked the times that are residents only, to be longer but this is better than nothing</p> <p>During Lockdown 1 it was a real eye opener as the street was so much quieter with people not going to work, but by lockdown 3 it was worse than ever. This would be down to a combination of two factors. Firstly people were driving instead of getting public transport, and the fact that when the ABC roads got their CPZ, almost overnight we were flooded with the usual dumped cars. Most of these never move and have flat tyres etc.</p> <p>I honestly have been thinking of moving as some nights I drive around the block for</p>

	<p>up to an hour when I get home.</p> <p>I couldn't be happier that this will possibly be a thing of the past. I fully support the CPZ</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>
119	<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>

120	<p>I hope you are well today.</p> <p>I am writing with ref to your letter about the proposed controlled parking zone on Norfolk House Road in St Leonard's North, Zone I.</p> <p>I have lived at xx Norfolk House Road since Sept 2010, and have noticed that it has become more and more difficult to park on our road since we moved in.</p> <p>This is why I would like to voice my preference for longer controlled parking hours than the 12 - 2pm which have been proposed. I feel that 8.30am - 6.30pm would be more helpful and make more of a difference to local residents. Our main issue is school run parking and workers parking here during the day - this became obvious during the first lock down when suddenly parking became much easier.</p> <p>Longer controlled parking hours would reduce traffic and pollution, as well as road rage incidents (these are becoming much more frequent on this road). It would also help encourage walking to school and taking public transport to work. And of course would also mean locals can actually park on their own street!</p> <p>Thank you for input on this,</p>
121	<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.</p> <p>It is difficult and expensive enough to drive and park in this city notwithstanding the new ULEZ permitter in October to the south circular.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>This City is fast becoming a playground for the rich.</p> <p>I propose that residents register their vehicle on the system for a free parking permit.</p> <p>Everyone else pay the proposed hours.</p>

<p>122</p>	<p>I am writing in response to the notice to introduce parking restrictions in St Leonards Ward.</p> <p>As a resident in the St Leonards (North) ward, I object to the introduction of parking restrictions in this and the surrounding area. As a Motorbilty car leaseholder who parks on Drewstead Road, I have never found there to be any issue with parking availability on the street at any point over the last 15 months since I moved into my property.</p> <p>In the document 'ODDR - Proposed St Leonards Streatham Vale West CPZ.pdf' it is noted that there is no clear majority support for the introduction of these measures and strong objection by resident respondents in my area. I also find there is a significant lack of data supporting the justification to import controlled parking zones on the grounds of climate and air quality, or reduced parking on the street/improved accessibility.</p> <p>There is reasonable to good availability of parking over each day on Drewstead road and no clear data showing an issue with people parking up to then use the station and travel via train/bus. The inclusion of parking restrictions will not make any short-medium term impact on the number of residents owning and parking cars on the streets, apart from becoming an extra tax on local residents during the context of a pandemic and increased financial vulnerability of residents. This is in the context of one of the highest council taxes in the capital.</p> <p>Charging parking fees on the basis of emissions again is not required to promote air quality. The imminent expansion of ULEZ to the south circular will hasten this change alongside other London wide and national regulation, as well as the increasing imposition of low traffic neighbourhoods and other measures locally that make cars often the slowest means of transport. I also note that the relatively poor provision of EV charging points in the borough both regular and rapid charging points compared to other parts of the borough and neighbouring boroughs such as Wandsworth, is inconsistent with your stated urgency of responding to the climate emergency.</p> <p>I fail to see how this policy meets its stated aims and objectives, especially in the context of the majority of local residents reporting minimal issue with parking availability in your previous consultation. I see no clear link between taxing residential cars that will not suddenly disappear from the neighbourhood just because a new tax is introduced, and the aim of reducing congestion of parked cars.</p>
<p>122</p>	<p>Also, as a former TfL employee with responsibility for statutory consultation on major infrastructure projects, I do not believe this consultation has been carried out in line with the best practice tools available. A link to an immediate to fill out form would be an easier way to respond than expecting residents to compose individual emails. This type of interactive form has been available in other local consultations such as low traffic neighbourhoods.</p> <p>It also fails to collate the level of information on objectors at this point that a set form would do. I hope you consider how you can improve your consultation methodology in future to encourage wider participation.</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>
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>
125	<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>
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>
127	<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: 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. 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>128</p>	<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</p>

	<p>children equipment to the car in one journey and this takes a toll on their already busy lives. 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>
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>
131	<p>I am writing in regard to the proposed parking scheme on the street I live on, Kingscourt Road in St Leonard's. I am very much in favour of bringing in parking restrictions. I live at 10 Kingscourt Road, it is extremely difficult to find a parking space during the day and evening time. Each morning I see cars park up on our road, the occupant will get out with a bag or briefcase and head to Streatham Hill train station. I have talked to these people and they have confirmed they aren't from the area and just used the road as a spot to park their car whilst they commute to work.</p> <p>Sometimes when I go to work I need to bring some heavy tools with me and as I can't find a park nearby i have to lift them along way to my car. Recently I changed my car to an electric hybrid to help the environment.</p> <p>There really needs to be some parking controls on this street as it causes a lot of stress and grief to people when there is no parking. The road can't fit two cars down it so if a delivery driver needs to park they can't and end up blocking the road. Then cars have to reverse all the way back down the road. Once an old man got stuck in the middle of the road and was extremely stressed that it had to reverse back down the road as it was blocked. It just creates a constant sea of arguments of who needs to reverse. Sometimes these can become quiet heated as no one wants to back down and reverse. It really is a mess at present and definitely needs some parking controls.</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>
133	<p>We live on Abercairn Road. It is already very difficult to find a parking spot on the street and these changes will exacerbate the problem by pushing more drivers towards us. Streatham Vale is a residential area and one of the requirements of a family home is to be able to park one's vehicle close to the front door in order to load kids and bags safely. To date we have been denied permission for a dropped kerb, hence we are reliant on onstreet parking. We feel parking restrictions advantaging local residents would be beneficial for our area.</p>

134	<p>I'm writing to provide representations for the proposed changes to parking in the ward of st Leonard's.</p> <p>Largely I welcome the changes. For the past 8 years I have campaigned for change. I have written to the council several times and spoken at length with other residents in the community. I'm also a parent of primary aged children at a school within the proposed area.</p> <p>However I do have the following objections;</p> <p>EV parking bays Having recently purchased an electric vehicle LM21 VRD and now intending to buy another shortly for my business I am disappointed by the lack of infrastructure in this area. As there are zero parking bays in the area I have to run a long lead from the street every night. I'm not the only resident on the road who has to go to such lengths. There are other residents in a similar position. The proposal the ev charge points are some distance away, all outside the north area. Therefore I would respectfully request further charge points installed along drewstead road where there is plenty of space.</p> <p>Dropped Kerbs I also note several dropped kerbs in the area have not obtained planning consent. Therefore before the CPZ is installed there needs to be an audit to ensure there is adequate parking and those who haven't obtained the proper consents are held to account.</p> <p>Introduction of LTN The impact of the cpz will be that Drewstead Rd will be a much more desirable rat run.</p> <p>The CPZ will increase the speed of the passing traffic, as there are large cars from 6/7am that do the school run at the local public school. The school in question has to put up traffic management as the parents can't be trusted to pay and drop off properly. The CPZ should be part of a total traffic management scheme as well as a restrictions, and directional priority and speed management.</p>
134	<p>Drewstead road in particular is already unpleasant, with episodes of road rage, beeping, speed bumps (causing heavy breaking and acceleration along with heavy loads bouncing causing our house to shake, and cracking), all of which add to pollution. It is a "local road" but takes traffic avoiding the a23 and a24 and south circular interchanges, compiled with satellite navigation it has become a thoroughfare and often a complete breakdown of vehicle movement, leading to altercations and road rage incidents, all these are distractions to home office workers.</p> <p>Another change since COVID 19 changes, there are many more pedestrians and joggers heading towards the common, a welcome as they are an addition to the street. The introduction of an LTN will protect the health of users and reduce the daily traffic congestion, and be a much more pleasant place for pedestrians, cyclists and residents.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing more about the proposal in due course.</p>

135	<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>
136	<p>As a resident in St Leonard's North, Streatham Hill, I fully support the introduction of a new controlled parking zone.</p>
137	<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. 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>
138	<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>

139	<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>
140	<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>
141	<p>The proposal to introduce the above is really not needed in the above zone but if you still decide to implement then the residents of the each house should have the exemption to park at least one car without having to pay parking charges and this could easily be done by registering a car belonging to the residents. I hope that this proposal is acceptable.</p>
142	<p>As a resident in St Leonard's North zone I fully support the introduction of a controlled parking zone.</p>

143

I am writing to make representations AGAINST the controlled parking zone proposals for the Stanthorpe Road triangle on the following grounds:

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
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

143	<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
144	<p>I am writing in support of the proposed controlled parking zone in St Leonard's North (Zone 1). I have just moved to the area and have a new baby, and without parking restrictions on the road it has been very difficult to find parking. This has been hard to manage when taking the baby out in the car to run essential errands. I have frequently had to cruise for 10 minutes or more to find a parking space and even then, on many occasions have ended up parked a 5-10 minute walk from my house. The availability of parking spaces on the road is significantly increased in the evenings and at weekends, suggesting that many non-residents use the road for parking for work on weekdays. I am therefore strongly in favour of the proposed introduction of a controlled parking zone.</p>
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>

<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>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>
149	<p>I live at xx Norfolk House Rd, SW16 1xx</p> <p>I support the intro of CPZ – parking is a nightmare around here.</p> <p>But maybe there should be provision for shoppers so that the high road does not suffer too much – maybe you can park for 1 hour? Or, have some bays in the streets where you can park for 1 or 2 hours?</p>
150	<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>
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>

<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://modern.gov.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> <p>a) impose a CPZ at all b) set the control period for the longest possible period</p>
<p>152</p>	<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>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>

154	<p>With reference to the above controlled parking zone consultation.</p> <p>I have been a resident of Mortimer Close for over 30 years. There was never a problem with parking in the close until recently with the introduction of the CPZ on the north side of the railway line. It is now almost impossible to park in the close during the day due to dog walkers and commuters.</p> <p>Thus I am generally in favour of the proposed CPZ though I do have concerns that the specifics of the proposal will mean insufficient residents parking.</p> <p>I would like to propose some minor modifications:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Angled bays perpendicular to the pavement outside nos 1&2 Mortimer Close instead of the proposed 1 parallel bay. Currently approx 4 residents/visitors cars park there every night.2. Implementation of 3/4 parking spaces along the top of the inner grass 'roundabout' instead of the proposed single yellow line. Tradesmen and visitors use these spaces on a regular basis.3. The removal of single yellow lines along the edges of driveways to enable residents to park there if they choose. <p>These suggestions should give adequate parking for residents and not impede traffic flow or damage to the grass verges caused by large lorries (eg the bin lorries) who do not have enough space to make the turns with the current parking situation.</p> <p>I would be very grateful if you would take these points into consideration when finalising the CPZ plans.</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.</p> <p>Stop creating more problems for Streatham please!</p>

156

I'm writing with reference to the proposed parking controls.
I welcome this move in my area St. Leonard's North 'I'

Parking has been horrendous for years.
As a resident I would like to see controls in operation Mon - Fri 8.30am - 5.30pm and not just for two hours.
Businesses on the high road, especially estate agents and Westbury pharmacy have numerous vehicles for one business. I would like to see each business with cars limited to a minimum.

Streatham High Road must be the busiest bus route! I think it is fair to say that people can use public transport in and out of the area.

There are still plenty of people driving into Streatham Hill area, parking their cars and leaving them for the day to go to work. By maximising the CPZ you are putting a stop to that.
With only 2 hour controls for parking it could be possible for people to drive their cars in and park for half a day.

During lockdown this area proved that most of the cars used and parked in the area were local businesses and workers driving in to park for the day.
Our streets were quieter and the parking felt normal, there were good spaces available.

I think it's imperative you firstly help residents and also minimise the number of cars each business on the high road brings into the area. It's not acceptable that residents when arriving home with shopping to unload or children to unload we have to double park then drive to find a space, often a 10 min walk away.
Much tighter CPZ controls are needed.

157	<p>I am very disappointed at the proposals and strongly oppose the decision not to introduce a CPZ around Hambro, Ferrers, Ellora and Natal Roads.</p> <p>It seems clear from the previous consultation that residents in these roads identified that parking was an issue. These proposals ignore the real pressure the Tesco Extra store, leisure centre and flats have placed on these roads. In addition, the situation is made worse by commuter parking because of ease of access to Streatham Station.</p> <p>The issues of the hub development were recognised at the time of planning consent with officers talking then about a CPZ. The residents of Derry Court and Cromie House use these roads as parking as there is a charge for residents parking on the Tesco site. I had raised this in the past with former ward members.</p> <p>The disabled bays do not seem to be managed effectively when residents move.</p> <p>I would also be concerned that restrictions in other parts of St Leonard's will have the effect of displacing parking to areas with no restrictions or charges. This to an extent is already the case.</p> <p>It is also worth noting that there are already sections of double yellow lines, for instance on the corner of Hambro and Ellora Road. These are not enforced and vehicles often park there, often those making deliveries to Derry Court and Cromie House.</p> <p>I think this has been badly thought through and I can find no adequate explanation as to why this area has been excluded from the CPZ.</p> <p>I feel there is real lack of concern for the amenity of residents of the 'Ferrers Triangle'.</p> <p>I would hope our elected members, who I am copying in, might like to take the time to find how people really feel rather than this process being driven entirely by Officers</p>
158	<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>
159	<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>

160	<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>
161	<p>I'am a business owner at the premises mentioned below. My business will be impacted if CPZ is introduced in my area. Therefore I object to proposed introduction of Controlled Parking Zone in my area</p>
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>
163	<p>I write with regards to the above, to raise my objections to the proposed plans.</p> <p>I am a resident of Woodbourne Avenue and therefore directly impacted by any proposed change. I place great value on Streatham High Road and believe that the introduction of parking restrictions which will deter shoppers, will be detrimental to local business and the development of our high street.</p> <p>Furthermore, I do not welcome the prospect of having to pay for a resident parking permit which I assume will be the case.</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>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>

166	<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>
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>
168	<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>

168	<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>
169	<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>
170	<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>

171

Representation against proposed CPZ

We do not oppose the principle of the introduction of a CPZ in Hoadly Road because without it this residential area will continue to be used as a car park by people driving to work at Streatham and Clapham High School, commuters to local stations, and drivers living in nearby areas already covered by CPZs.

However, we are concerned that the proposed parking layout will not provide enough spaces for residents in Hoadly Road. This is important because one of the aims of the CPZ identified by the Council is to facilitate residents parking near their own homes (Delegated Report April 2021 para 1.11).

The Council's own 2017 parking survey has identified 64 unrestricted parking spaces (plus 2 disabled bays) in Hoadly Road.

[www.lambeth.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2018-07-](http://www.lambeth.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2018-07-18%20Streatham_Common_Parking_Report.pdf)

[18%20Streatham_Common_Parking_Report.pdf](http://www.lambeth.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2018-07-18%20Streatham_Common_Parking_Report.pdf)

The proposed CPZ substantially reduces the number of parking spaces in Hoadly Road. The Council has not provided any figures for either the whole proposed CPZ or just for Hoadly Road despite being asked to do so. However, Hoadly Road seems to be the worst affected in the St Leonard's North part of the proposed CPZ because the plot widths and arrangement of single rather than paired drives means that many kerb lengths between drives do not meet the Council's minimum requirement to install a marked parking bay.

We have calculated that there will be only 47 parking spaces ie a loss of 17 parking spaces. Most residents on the eastern side of the road will not be able to park outside their houses during the controlled hours because the kerbside is to be yellow lined.

There are 44 addresses in Hoadly Road. All houses have drives and at least one off street parking space. Responses to the CPZ survey question about car ownership confirm that in Hoadly Road average car ownership is almost 2 cars per household (13 respondents had 24 cars). On the face of it, 47 spaces on-street might seem reasonable, but these spaces are not exclusively for Resident permit holders. All would be available for Pay By Phone visitors and 21 out of 47 parking spaces would also be available for Business users.

There is currently substantial daytime parking demand due to the staff and Sixth Form pupils at Streatham and Clapham High School (SCHS, located opposite the southern end of Hoadly Road). This school is expanding, having been granted planning permission in 2019 to increase the number of pupils from 505 to 650.

Weekday daytime parking surveys in May 2021 recorded 67 cars parked on-street in Hoadly Road, which indicates a very high level of parking stress. This dropped to 49 in the evening. Thus there is substantial daytime demand, almost certainly due to SCHS. Whilst the CPZ controls may act as a deterrent and reduce car commuting (one of the aims of introducing it) there is also going to be a substantial reduction in spaces available and this could cancel it out.

<p>171</p>	<p>The SCHS annual travel survey (part of the school's Travel Plan, required by Planning Permission 14/01361) recorded that in September 2020 a total of 57 (47%) staff travelled to work by car, 6 (5%) of whom were car-sharing, amounting to about 54 cars. Only around 8-10 cars are parked in the SCHS car parks, and most staff park on-street in surrounding residential roads. Whilst not all staff necessarily attend SCHS at the same time, nevertheless there is a substantial influx of car parking when SCHS is open. It is hoped that the cost of parking in the CPZ will achieve a shift towards sustainable travel. However, apart from those SCHS teaching staff who may buy Teacher parking permits, and non-teaching staff who may buy Business parking permits, part-time staff may find that the 1 hour PBP parking facility is enough to allow them to drive to work for their morning or afternoon session and park on-street.</p> <p>In these particular circumstances ie loss of on-street spaces and strong demand from an adjacent non-residential use, there needs to be an emphasis on providing some Resident-Only parking bays in Hoadly Road. The bays where Business parking is allowed should be reduced and a proportion of the others should not be available to PBP users.</p> <p>If you are not willing to amend the proposals in favour of residents at this stage, we request a firm commitment from Lambeth to review the operation of the CPZ within 6 months of its introduction and again within 1 year and to adjust the scheme as required. Since each single parking bay or run of parking bays is to have its own sign, changing the purpose of bays is presumably simply a matter of changing the sign and would not be onerous.</p> <p>We have further concerns, mentioned to the Council previously, that the introduction of the CPZ will encourage more residents to fully pave their front gardens to avoid paying for multiple parking permits. Paving of Hoadly Road front gardens creates car parking space for 3 or more cars. This loss of greenery is harmful to the appearance of the road and to biodiversity, but we understand that provided permeable paving/SUDS is used it does not need planning permission. This unfortunate trend is likely to be exacerbated by the lack of on-street parking space for residents, caused by removal of spaces and having to compete with commuter parking.</p> <p>There is no easy answer to this. However, since this environmental damage is likely to be a direct consequence of introduction of the CPZ we request that the Council set aside some of the revenue obtained from permits and charges to mitigate that harm by paying for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the planting of more street trees and b. a campaign and funding for the planting of trees or hedges in residents' front gardens.
<p>172</p>	<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>
<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>174</p>	<p>I am writing in relation to the proposed CPZ areas around St Leonard's. I am a resident of Pathfield Road where currently no CPZ is intended. The road is hugely congested and parking is incredibly difficult. The proposals will only add further acute pressure for parking spaces on an even smaller locale.</p> <p>Ideally a CPZ should be introduced here if it is being done so in the other three areas. If this is not possible due to an historical vote (in which residents would not be cognisant of the impact of other areas having CPZ) then I am opposed to all three of the other CPZs being introduced.</p> <p>I am a single parent and I have grown to actually dread driving because I know I'll struggle to park anywhere close to my home upon return. I have become anxious because not only does it mean walking a considerable distance carrying my baby and anything else, such as shopping, i then worry about my car overnight as there have been multiple car break ins over the past 12 months.</p> <p>CPZs need to introduced in all areas mapped out or none.</p> <p>As an aside, the works that took place on the corner of Rotherhill and Pathfield removed 9 car parking places yet made no difference to easing congestion - a lot of people just drive through the no entry without consequence or now know to enter at the top of the road.</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. 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. 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>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 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</p>

	<p>very poor. The majority have not voiced their opinions and as such to impose these charges is undemocratic.</p>
179	<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. 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>
180	<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>

First, let me say that I am not against the proposed CPZ; however as a resident of Abbotswood Road for over 24 years, living in one of the only five houses on that road which does not have off street parking, I am very concerned about how its implementation will affect me. I would like to raise the following points:

1. I gather that the spaces have been drawn up on the basis of 5 metres being the necessary length for one car space. The kerbside space outside my house (no 54) is approximately 16.8 metres and I'd like an assurance that the markings will allow for three cars to be parked here, not two. It will still leave enough room to turn into the driveways at either end - we've had no problems to date with no parking restrictions and people using their own judgement about how much space to leave. Since the space is open at either end there is no manoeuvre room required and there is plenty of room for three cars.

2. Similarly, in the bays opposite my house, two cars park in each without obstructing the driveways at the moment. Please can these be allocated two car spaces when the markings are carried out - they are open ended so do not need the full 10m they would demand if hemmed in at either end. I'm very concerned that we will lose a lot of spaces overall in the road and would like to prevent this happening

181

3. Please could the bays outside nos 52 and 54 to be Residents only, not shared use? If all bays are to be shared use it gives no priority to residents who will be paying 365 days of the year to park during the restricted hours. We know that some 50 members of staff, and a number of sixth formers at Streatham and Clapham High School, as well as an undocumented number of staff working at Broomwood School in Garrad's Road, drive to work and park in Abbotswood and the surrounding roads and would much appreciate some protection from these daily visitors, as well as from commuters who park in our roads and take public transport on to their destination. At present, if I leave a parking space close to my home before 9am and return at about 9.30, which I do once a week when I collect and care for grandchildren, I often have to park in another road and struggle to my house with two small children and related equipment.

4. We are under considerable pressure from being sandwiched between two schools whose staff and pupils park in the road at the moment, putting huge pressure on spaces. Your document notes that the percentage of vehicles parked on the road all day is 3% weekdays and 2% weekends - I find this figure strange, especially since the corresponding figure for neighbouring Hoadly Road is 60% and 53%, but if it is accurate, surely this demonstrates how much the road is used for parking by incomers and traffic to and from the Schools?

181	<p>5. Is there a reason for the restricted hours being 12 noon to 2pm, Monday to Friday? Much of the Borough has controlled parking between 10am and 12 noon which would be a more effective deterrent in my opinion. Under these new rules, people can arrive at or before 9am and park until 1pm, the last hour being pay by phone but they do not have to be in the road to make that payment - they could be in Central London! This enables people to park here every morning for only a one-hour payment cost. Please would you reconsider and amend the controlled hours to 10-12 or even 11-1pm.</p> <p>6. Since this is a very experimental operation in an area which has many pressures, I think it would be appropriate to keep the situation under review. Could we have assurance from the Council please that the whole operation of this CPZ will be reviewed after 12 months, residents consulted and changes made if necessary and requested by a majority of residents?</p> <p>6. While writing I would like to point out that your initial survey seems to have been conducted in December 2016 and January 2017 at a time when the CPZ in Streatham Hill was not in operation and therefore the pressure on parking in Abbotswood and the surrounding roads was not nearly so great. We will never know whether the hockey pitch at the school was in use on the dates monitoring was carried out but this makes a huge difference to traffic and parking in my immediate area.</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> <p>-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</p> <p>-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.</p> <p>-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> <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>
185	<p>I write with regards to the above, to raise my objections to the proposed plans in Streatham.</p> <p>I am a resident of xx Woodbourne Avenue and therefore directly impacted by any proposed change. Streatham High Road struggles at the best of times and believe that the introduction of parking restrictions which could deter shoppers, will be detrimental to local business and could result in further shop closures.</p> <p>Parking is not a major problem in Streatham and this is simply another tax.</p> <p>Furthermore, I do not welcome the prospect of having to pay for a resident parking permit which I assume will be the case.</p> <p>CPZ Parking restrictions and LTN's are things that Streatham does not need in these struggling times.</p> <p>This is a very badly thought out proposal.</p>

<p>186</p>	<p>I live in The Spinney and want to make the following representations on the CPZ consultation.</p> <p>At present the location of The Spinney means that cars frequently park there from the school and also from part time workers locally, causing problems for residents wanting to park in their road and this has considerably worsened since the council undertook its parking study over two years ago www.lambeth.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2018-07-18%20Streatham_Common_Parking_Report.pdf . It is unclear from the plans how many parking spaces there are in The Spinney but one assumes that these spaces will not exclusively for Resident permit holders. However, it should be noted that one of the aims of the CPZ identified by the Council is to facilitate residents parking near their own homes (Delegated Report April 2021 para 1.11) but in The Spinney there are many elderly residents and one household with very young children who need to be able to park close to their homes.</p> <p>So for The Spinney there needs to be :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Five resident parking bays exclusively for Resident permit holders (equivalent to one per house) • A review of the operation of the CPZ within 6 months of its introduction and again within 1 year and to adjust the scheme as required
<p>187</p>	<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>
<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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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?</p>

	<p>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>
189	<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>
190	<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?</p> <p>I believe there should be a better and fairer way to impose such restrictions, which differ from some zones and are punitively expensive. 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>
191	<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. 3. Why is a 10 hour restriction being proposed for St Leonard's Central when the other areas are having 2 hours restrictions proposed? 4. We should we be financially penalised for our friends, family and tradesmen to park? 5. If this about making money, the Council should at least be honest enough to say so. We still object.

192	<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>
193	<p>I am Chair of The Spinney Residents Association and as a body representing residents in The Spinney want to make the following representations on the CPZ consultation.</p> <p>The Spinney suffers from problems of parking as cars frequently park there from the school and also from part time workers locally, causing problems for residents wanting to park in their road. This problem has become more acute and causes difficulties for the residents who are older people plus those families with young children. It's noteworthy that this has considerably worsened since the council undertook its parking study over two years ago www.lambeth.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2018-07-18%20Streatham_Common_Parking_Report.pdf .</p> <p>It is unclear from the plans how many parking spaces there are in The Spinney but we are assuming that these spaces will not be exclusively for Resident permit holders. We note that one of the aims of the CPZ identified by the Council is to facilitate residents parking near their own homes (Delegated Report April 2021 para 1.11).</p> <p>So for The Spinney there needs to be :</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Five resident parking bays exclusively for Resident permit holders (equivalent to one per house) • Ensuring that on the opposite side of The Spinney by the Common where cars with dog walkers park that there are two parking spaces at the end facing the school gate. • A review of the operation of the CPZ within 6 months of its introduction and again within 1 year and to adjust the scheme as required
194	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</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>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.</p>

<p>195</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>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.</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 Road, then these should be dealt with directly with targeted solutions, not by a CPZ.</p> <p>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>
<p>195</p>	<p>Further to my response yesterday, I did a quick reality check on Thursday 3 June at 12.30pm across Babington Road, Conyers Road/Potters Lane, Fairmile Avenue and Gleneagle Road. There were 57 unoccupied on-street parking spaces (not including an additional four reserved temporarily by builders) and 79 unoccupied driveway spaces. I did not include disabled, car club or red route spaces; and I gave away the benefit of the doubt (eg if a space looked like it might not be big enough, I assumed it was not). This confirms there is unused capacity and a CPZ is not needed.</p>

196	<p>In principle I am in favour of a CPZ but, in practice, I am unable to as I have some concerns and suggestions regarding specifically my immediate area, the western (Tooting Common, cul de-sac) end of Drewstead Road, which I outline below. Residents' parking will obviously help significantly with commuter parking during the day, but I am concerned that the specifics of the proposals outlined will mean there are insufficient residents' parking spaces for the bottom end of Drewstead Rd/ Mortimer Close.</p> <p>At the end of Drewstead Road (below Abbotswood) and on Mortimer Close, Lambeth are currently proposing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents' parking bays for a total of potentially 26 cars max (assuming considerate parking) • Double yellow lines at the western (Common) end of Drewstead Road • Double yellow lines around BOTH "roundabouts" in Mortimer Close • Single yellow lines outside all driveways (to extend 0.5-1.0m past end of dropped kerb) • A bay sized for only one car outside 1 & 2 Mortimer (where, overnight at present, there are often 4 cars parked perpendicular to the kerb) <p>I have undertaken a short survey of the number of cars parked overnight on the road in the Drewstead Rd/ Mortimer Close dead-end (101 and 86 Drewstead and below, 23 houses in total) on a selection of evenings, as an estimate of the number of residents' cars. This is summarised in the table below, together with the number of proposed Residents' spaces under the CPZ:</p> <p>You will see that on the nights surveyed, there would be between 5 and 10 more residents' cars parked on-road than is currently proposed under the details of the CPZ</p> <p>Note also that the proposed single yellow lines will mean that residents will no longer be able to park outside their own driveway whenever they wish. The situation is particularly acute for the main part of Mortimer Close which will be "short" of 6 or 7 spaces currently utilised. The proposals will make it impossible to park perpendicular to the kerb outside Nos 1 and 2 Mortimer Close as is currently the case and where there are often 4 cars (only one, parallel space, is proposed). Of course, Mortimer residents unable to park there will shunt the problem onto Drewstead Road.</p> <p>I would be happy to support the CPZ if Lambeth addressed the issue of a lack of residents' spaces and were able to slightly modify the proposals as per the suggestions detailed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Provide one additional resident's space on the southern apex of the Drewstead/ Mortimer "roundabout". Cars currently regularly park here and do not extend into Drewstead Road, nor would they block sight lines or prohibit easy access to Mortimer Close o The removal of the proposed single yellow lines to enable residents to park for the full 24 hours outside their own houses (for example often I park outside the driveway of 84 Drewstead, with the owner's permission) o the removal of the proposed double yellow lines on both sides of the road at the bottom of Drewstead Road, instead providing residents' bays (this space again is currently used, does not impede access to anywhere, does not affect sight lines) o the substitution of three residents' bays perpendicular to the pavement outside outside 1-2 Mortimer Close for the single, parallel bay currently proposed
-----	--

<p>196</p>	<p>Undertaking these modifications should provide an additional 5 residents' bays plus allow 24 hour parking outside one's own driveway. The suggestions are based on the existing situation post 6.30-7.00pm (when we don't currently have any problems) and would not impede traffic flow, access or sight lines.</p> <p>Furthermore, with an additional 5 resident's bays from what would otherwise be "wasted space", Lambeth could charge a total of over £1,500 per annum, to assist with enforcement for example</p> <p>Attached is a copy of Lambeth's existing plan of the detailed proposal, focussed on our immediate area, marked up to show the suggested additional residents' spaces</p>
<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>

198	<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>
199	<p>I am writing to express my concerns with the proposed controlled parking zones on Drewstead Road.</p> <p>I have lived at the address since 1987 and over this time many homes have been created and with that many vehicles have also arrived. I only started driving again in 2020 to enable me to travel safely to and from work.</p> <p>I depend on my car for commuting to work as a Supply teacher. With Remote teaching becoming more and more necessary, I have had to stay at home - thus parking all day on Drewstead Road. As a zero hour contract teacher, I do not earn the amount needed to pay for a garage space at £365 yearly on the Magdalen estate.</p> <p>I am very worried that I will have to get rid of my car just as lockdown has lifted for me to get secure work for the future. I will have to turn work down if I cannot travel to the site.</p> <p>It might help if I knew how much a permit to park on the road would cost, but even better if Drewstead Road could be left alone for the residents.</p>

200	<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>
201	<p>I am concerned with parking St Leonard's CPZ, as with other business along Streatham High Road. As an independent shop, I travel into streatham by car as this is the only way to come to work and to bring my stock in, that I need to carrie out services to my clients.</p> <p>For those of us, who have business in Streatham, to park in the surrounding these are the only parking space. With the area that are showed on map. This will an impact on business where there controlled parking zone, with controlled hours 12.00 noon-2.00pm. this will make it very difficult to leave work to remove a car, fine somewhere else to park then get back to work. As a business would there be a permit to park near to where work take place?</p>

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.

203	<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>
204	<p>My family live at 103 Drewstead Road, and we wish to make representation against the current proposed CPZ in our road and area. We had originally stated that we did not feel that parking was a problem and no CPZ was needed, and this is still our personal opinion.</p> <p>We see however that a statutory consultation has started so therefore wish to add our comments, should it go ahead.</p> <p>From your plans viewed online, the number of available parking spaces at the bottom of Drewstead Road and Mortimer Close are insufficient for residents, even without the added number of visitors e.g. dog walkers.</p> <p>This is borne out by a survey carried out by my neighbour at 101 Drewstead Road who focussed on parking by only neighbours over five days, finding that many additional spaces are required just for residents, based on his understanding of the plans.</p> <p>We can verify these results, as it is plain to see that the number of residents' cars outnumber the proposed number of available bays. This will cause instant problems between us all.</p> <p>In fact, the proposed implementation of 5 metre bay plus one metre each end by a dropped kerb (i.e.7 metres between dropped kerbs) will further reduce available parking, as evidenced by the plans for Hoadly Road which will have an impact on Drewstead Road and other surrounding roads.</p> <p>When visitor parking is added to this, the situation will be intolerable.</p> <p>It is very unfair for us to be left with these problems.</p> <p>Please reconsider the plans, and create more parking by using a more flexible approach, for instance, by designing more bays around Mortimer Close, even at 90</p>

	<p>degree angles to make use of available spaces (as previous seen on earlier plans received in an email from Leonardo Morris, Senior Parking Engineer, on 28/1/2020), and allowing parking at the very bottom of Drewstead Road, perhaps at a perpendicular angle too,</p> <p>This will help alleviate what otherwise could be an awful permanent situation.</p> <p>With your help this could be eased</p>
205	<p>I am a resident of The Spinney, SW!6 and am writing to register my comments on the porposed CPZ.</p> <p>The Spinney is a small cul-de-sac, whose residents include the elderly and infirm, those with caring obligatipns and also very young children. The Spinney alresdy has some parking issues as cars frequently park there from Streatham & Clapham High School and also from part time workers locally, causing problems for residents.</p> <p>It is unclear from the plans how many parking spaces there are in The Spinney but I assume that these spaces will not be exclusively for Resident permit holders.</p> <p>So for The Spinney there needs to be :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Five resident parking bays exclusively for Resident permit holders (equivalent to one per house) • Ensuring that on the opposite side of The Spinney by the Common where cars with dog walkers park that there are two parking spaces at the end facing the school gate. • A review of the operation of the CPZ within 6 months of its introduction and again within 1 year and to adjust the scheme as required
206	<p>I wish to oppose the proposed parking controls in my road Hoadly Road as the plans do not identify enough parking spaces for the users of this road, especially as a yellow line is proposed for almost one whole side of the road. Please reconsider these plans as this loss of current available parking will impact heavily on us and all roads in this area.</p>
207	<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>
208	<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>
209	<p>As a resident of Drewstead road I am really upset to hear that there will be new parking regulations put in place.</p> <p>As a single woman with a car that is required for travel to work I am being informed that I will be required to pay for a permit to park. This is unacceptable. Permits should be allocated to residents that require them at no cost. Any additional visitor permits can be purchased at a cost however it's not fair to make residents hand out their earnings just to park on their own road.</p> <p>I hope this proposal is considered, to be clear I'm not against the cpz.. I'm against the audacity of making residents pay to park near their homes.</p>
210	<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>
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>

212	<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>
213	<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>

214	<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>
215	<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>
217	<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>
218	<ol style="list-style-type: none">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.

<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 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>220</p>	<p>Ps I am hoping I am in time to make another point - whilst in some ways a few double yellow lines could assist us in preventing people parking in daft places in Mortimer Close (around the two turfed / roundabout areas) and causing lorries etc to have to cut across the turf in order to get past, I am also concerned that sensible yellow lines may proliferate unnecessarily so that we end up with much less parking space than currently. For example there is no need to have double yellow lines at the bottom of Drewstead road - dog walkers park there quite peaceably at present and if you stop them, it will simply displace them into Mortimer Close, causing increased problems for residents. Similarly if you decide to mark parking bays in Mortimer Close itself please do make good use of the space to maintain maximum parking spaces - for example the ones on the two south and north ends of the close should be nose/tail to kerb (rather than side of the car to the kerb) to enable at least 3 spaces on each of these two ends, in the same way that we all currently park. I think there is also room to maintain 3 or 4 spaces running east west along the south side of the turf where people routinely park at present. If these spaces are lost then you will make things worse rather than better for us.</p>

221	<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 since 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 found 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 railway 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>
222	<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>

223	<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>
224	<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>

<p>225</p>	<p>I am writing to make a representation about the proposed traffic orders which introduce “at any time” (double yellow line) waiting restrictions at locations in the “St Leonard’s South” zone, illustrated in Appendix B to the Proposed Controlled Parking Zones in St Leonard’s and Streatham Vale (Stage 1 Consultation results).</p> <p>Background</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am a resident of xxx Pathfield Road. • The Lambeth Parking Study – Streatham Commons/Vale Report 11/10/2017 (Reference number GB01T15C41) revealed that Pathfield Road was the most highly stressed long road in the area, with a parking stress of 96%/95% (weekday/weekend), considerably higher than, for example, neighbouring Barrow Road. • Pathfield Road has historically been in favour of parking restrictions as the figures for 2017 and 2021 show. • My experience is that I am only able to park on the road on which I live about 50% of the time, and usually have to park on nearby roads. Anecdotally, I know my neighbours have to do the same. <p>Objections</p> <p>I have two objections.</p> <p>One: I object to the proposed traffic orders, to introduce “at any time” (double yellow line) waiting restrictions at locations on and around Pathfield Road. These changes will have no impact on traffic flow.</p> <p>I specifically object to the double yellow lines proposed for outside my home, 127 Pathfield Road on three grounds.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) This corner is not a junction in which traffic flow is impeded. (I often work from home and look over the corner all day). (2) Parking is already hard enough at this end of the road (as your own survey shows) without losing two spaces. (3) There is already a drop curb on the corner. (4) Pathfield Road now has a filter system that has reduced traffic flow and means that nowhere on the road is there a point where traffic flow is impeded. <p>This parking restriction seems completely unnecessary and will only aggravate the parking stress (and mine!).</p> <p>I ask you reconsider these restrictions in general, and the double yellow lines outside 125 and 127 in particular.</p>
<p>225</p>	<p>Two</p> <p>The new CPZs in St Leonards will lead to considerable displacement of traffic, aggravated by the removal of many parking spaces though the proposed traffic orders. The consequence will be that the parking on and around Pathfield Road will get significantly worse. I request a new consultation, specifically pointing out these facts to the residents of St Leonard South.</p> <p>More, this reveals a significant failure in council processes: the Equality Analysis Proposed Controlled Parking Zones – St Leonards Area notes some displacement of vehicles to St Leonards Central but fails to discuss or account for the extensive displacement to St Leonard’ South. Any action ought to be suspended until this failure is addressed, and the impact to St Leonard’s South is addressed.</p> <p>Thank you for considering these views.</p>

226

I am writing in opposition to the proposed changes to the St Leonard's South and Streatham Vale West wards. These wards will be adversely impacted as a knock on effect of the proposed adjacent CPZs, and the proposed double yellow lines at key locations will not serve to improve or counter this.

Therefore I urge you to introduce a CPZ in these two wards too, or as a minimum at least on Pathfield Road where there is a huge consensus for a CPZ.

Specifically, I would like to highlight the unforeseen and unintended impact of the current proposed inconsistent approach. Without the addition of CPZs in the St Leonard's South and Streatham Vale wards, those driving into the area will simply be concentrated onto fewer roads. The parking situation will unfairly deteriorate for the minority of Streatham residents. I understand this has already played out at Streatham Hill (who now wish to reverse their decision and introduce a CPZ), and therefore we should learn from this to avoid it happening again.

I should add that whilst the "Quietway" on Estreham Road has improved the situation on Lewin Road and Barrow Road, and those residents are content with the current situation, this status quo will be disrupted if neighbouring CPZs are brought into force without any CPZ in our wards. The St Leonard's South ward is ideally located for commuters to access both Streatham and Streatham Common rail stations, hence the foreseen concentration of commuters under the current proposal.

For transparency, I am a resident on Pathfield Road. Having spoken to many Pathfield residents, there is strong preference for a CPZ in our ward as we are already struggling with parking on our road as it is.

Unlike Barrow and Lewin, we do not have many driveways and therefore curb side parking is already limited. This was made worse by the Estreham Quietway which directed commuters up our road rather than spreading out across Barrow and Lewin as well (noted the no entry barrier has helped). Not having a CPZ will make the situation intolerable for Pathfield residents again.

I hope this is clear and you will consider revising the proposal for the St Leonard's South and Streatham Vale wards accordingly. As a minimum there is a huge case for Pathfield Road to get its own CPZ - otherwise you will be creating an unfair situation in which Pathfield Road residents cannot park on their own street.

227

As a resident of Pathfield Road I am writing to stress my concern with the latest CPZ proposal.

Failing to introduce a CPZ in St Leonards South will create huge parking issues in our area given CPZs will be introduced in nearby areas, thus pushing more cars to our area.

Having spoken to our local councillor Scott (cc'd) I understand residents in Barrow Road and Lewin Road have opposed the CPZ and this is why it has not been proposed for our area.

However this once again hugely disadvantages Pathfield Road residents who already have huge parking issues and already suffered for the benefit of these other roads when QuietWays was introduced sending cars up our road - although the no entry barrier halfway up our road has been a huge help since being introduced so thank you to our councillors for this and for listening to our feedback - really appreciated and has made a huge difference.

We do not have as many driveways as these other roads and thus curbside parking is already in short supply. Pushing more commuters and other drivers onto our road by having CPZs in other areas will make this even worse.

The impact of having CPZs in one area and not another has been seen in Streatham Hill where residents who initially rejected a CPZ now want to reverse their decision given the impact neighbouring CPZs has had on them.

The double yellow line proposal will also impact parking on this road so is another thing that will make our situation worse

I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal - even if it means Pathfield Road gets a CPZ of its own and Barrow/Lewin choose not too...Although experience in SH suggests they should also want to have a CPZ to avoid future issues even if they do not feel it is currently needed...!

Either way there is a strong consensus on this street in favour of the CPZ so please do reconsider the proposal either in whole for St Leonards South or at least for our road - otherwise we will be in the awful situation of not being able to park on our own street!

Please feel free to contact me if you require clarification on any of the above.

228	<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 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.</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>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>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.</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 fair reflection of the residents' wishes.</p> <p>I am utterly shocked that the consultation is already 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>
229	<p>This will push commuter parking to other non regulated areas such as Pathfield Road, where we live.</p> <p>I would like resident friendly restrictions on Pathfield Road and other roads in the area to dissuade commuters from parking and leaving cars all day.</p> <p>I think this is now a matter of urgency as parking stress has become worse since recent traffic flow changes in the area.</p>

230	<p>I am writing to state my objection to the proposals related to above reference which as a resident of Pathfield Road affects me.</p> <p>Having lived at 44 Pathfield Road for 17 years i seen the affects the changes have had on our road and ensures these but this step will make being able to park my car on this road practically impossible. As a school teacher I find that as soon as I move my car in the morning someone waiting to park in my space to go to the station and when I return at the end of the day I find it is virtually impossible to park usually having to drive around several times waiting for a space or even parking on alternative roads. With your proposals this will make parking on alternative roads practically impossible too!</p> <p>The closing of estretham road meant that the volume of traffic increased on Pathfield road and also desire for parking spaces making it harder as Pathfield became the only road used for parking to station. To allay this the council proposed the blocking of Pathfield at the rotherhill interchange and putting in of lines for a turning point. This reduced the amount of parking on Pathfield road increasing the pressure for parking spaces.</p> <p>This new proposal will mean less spaces for parking (on a road with a high number of drop curbs and disabled parking spaces) when this double yellow lines go in. For what reason I can not see as it will not impact traffic flow in anyway only reduce spaces for parking.</p> <p>The introduction of cpz in roads surrounding Pathfield will push people for parking onto our road. So you are reducing the supply of parking and increasing the demand. This will cause chaos on an area that is already fraught when it comes to trying to park.</p> <p>The majority of Pathfield road residents have voted for cpz parking on the two occasions. Why are we not getting this when other roads are?</p> <p>During lockdown when no one was travelling and only residents were parked on this road i was still aware of some residents still being parked on surrounding roads thus showing that the parking capacity on this road at the present time is not enough formal it's residents as it is especially as we have four blocks of purpose built flats on this road alone without sufficient provided parking for its residents.</p> <p>I vehemently disagree with these proposals and am writing to put forward my objection to these changes going ahead. I also once again request that if his does go ahead Pathfield road should be included in the cpz zone.</p>
231	<p>We are writing as a resident of Woodbourne Avenue, which forms part of this new controlled parking zone, and is currently heavily used by outside visitors for daytime parking, as well as shopping on Streatham High Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We are concerned that sufficient on-street parking provision will be adequate for visitors, trades, district nurses etc. during the control period 2. Our preference would be a controlled period from 10.00 am to 12.00, if it is decided to implement this control zone. 3. We are comfortable with a control zone in our road. <p>With kind regards</p>

<p>232</p>	<p>I wish to make the following comments on the Proposal:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The response to the Survey of 2 September 2019 show that only 354 of those surveyed could bother to respond. Then less than 50% of that 354 thought that there were 'Parking Problems' in their road. This Result was like that of the 2018 Survey so why was over £100,000 spent on carrying out a similar Survey in 2019, when the Council's intentions were to introduce the Scheme regardless. 2. I am in agreement with the Scheme as it will reduce the amount of CO2 gas. But the people who will be affected most by this are the shop workers whom I am dependent upon to provide me with my food. The staff of Estate Agents will no doubt be reimbursed their parking charges, which will be recovered from Taxation, thus subsidised. If it was possible to levy parking charges on the same basis as Parking Permits i.e. Is CO2 outputs it may act as a disincentive for using larger cars 3. DeMonfort Road is in within a 20mph boundary but there are no Humps to help ensure the limit is adhered to. The addition to the 'Bus Lane ' in the High Road and Large Vehicles getting from Sreatham Station to Streatham Hill via Garrards Road. Cars frequently use DeMonfort Road in order to avoid the blockages, where valuable seconds are gained along DeMonfort. In addition to the children and elderly of the Road it is used by children attending Mortimer School. As work will be incurred in implementing the CPZ it would be greatly beneficial and practical if 3 Strategically Placed Humps were installed at the same time. Then hopefully we will not suffer the death of a child as the Residents of Dalebury Rd. Wandsworth did. 4. I have noticed in Blairderry Road that 'White lines' across drive entrances are backed by ' Yellow lines'. What is the objective if this?
<p>233</p>	<p>I am a resident of Pathfield Road and I am, like the majority of my neighbours, deeply concerned by the current parking situation on my street.</p> <p>We all regularly struggle to find a parking space and frequently have to park on other roads. Curb side parking is already limited and this was made worse by the Estreham Quietway directing commuters up our road rather than spreading them out across Barrow Road and Lewin Road as well. While the no entry barrier has helped (at the upper end of the road) this has led to increased double yellow line markings in the area of the barrier and a consequent reduction in parking spaces (I understand that we have lost 9 parking spaces as a result).</p> <p>Not having a CPZ will make the situation intolerable for Pathfield residents and there is a huge consensus for a CPZ.</p> <p>I am therefore writing in opposition to the proposed changes to the St Leonard's South and Streatham Vale West wards. These wards will be adversely impacted as a direct consequence of the proposed adjacent CPZs and the proposed double yellow lines at key locations will only make the situation worse.</p> <p>Therefore I urge you to introduce a CPZ in these two wards too, or as a minimum at least on Pathfield Road.</p> <p>I am particularly concerned by the inevitable impact of the current proposed approach. Without the addition of CPZs in the St Leonard's South and Streatham Vale wards, those driving into the area and seeking a parking space will simply be concentrated onto fewer roads where there is no CPZ. The parking situation will inevitably unfairly deteriorate for the minority of Streatham residents. I understand that this has already happened at Streatham Hill (where residents now want to reverse their decision and introduce a CPZ). We should learn from this and ensure that it doesn't happen again.</p>

The current proposal is therefore inconsistent and will create real injustice - aiming as it presumably does to alleviate parking difficulties in one area while at the same time inevitably creating much more difficulty in another area (where the situation is already bad).

The St Leonard's South ward is of course ideally located for commuters to access both Streatham and Streatham Common rail stations, hence the foreseen concentration of commuters under the current proposal.

I hope that you will consider revising the proposal for the St Leonard's South and Streatham Vale wards accordingly. As a minimum there is a huge case for Pathfield Road to get its own CPZ - otherwise you will be creating an unfair situation in which Pathfield Road residents cannot park on their own street.

234

I write as a resident of Abbotswood Road, where car parking pressure has grown significantly over recent years. Demand for parking is much greater than would be experienced on a traditional residential road, as the road, and others nearby, is a "parking destination" rather than simply a drive through road with parking predominantly only by local residents and their visitors.

The causes of that growth in demand for parking are the increasing activity from SCGHS and other local schools, from the introduction of CPZ in other parts of Lambeth which has resulted in "dumping" for days and weeks of cars from other areas, from the increasing activities at the Woodfield Pavillion and from the position of the road which is close to the common and within walkable distance to Balham's transport facilities. Many of the responses to recent planning applications by SCGHS and the Woodfield Pavillion drew the council's attention to the parking consequences of granting those applications, and requested the council's assistance in managing the impact on local residents.

My interest is therefore in the balance to be achieved between the residents and other users of parking in the road.

It would appear that the one-hour condition will limit the number of "dumped " cars, assuming that proper monitoring controls are implemented and maintained, and so is welcome. There should also be a beneficial effect on limiting daily parking by those who want to use Balham's transport facilities. The one-hour conditions could also at least achieve a limited rotation of cars of those using either SCGHS and Woodfield, limited only as it must be possible for users to informally arrange a simple "swap" with others.

There however appears to be no protection of residents by priority over or restriction of other users, as it appears that anyone can use any of the parking, subject to payment and within the time condition. As such, the "parking destination" character of the road is not being recognised.

The scheme should include resident-only zones, unavailable to others. If residents are unable to park reasonably close to their houses, so enabling access for children and those who are older and infirm, a predictable response might be for front gardens to be changed into driveways.

The hours of operation also need to be extended, with a second two hour (or all day) time band being introduced and consideration being given to extending the days to the weekend, as the road remains a parking "destination" on Saturdays and Sundays.

The proposal also allows for business users, so the issue arises of who may claim either "resident" or "business" status. Again, in my local area, this clearly addresses the issue of the position of SCGHS and other school staff and those carrying out activities in the Woodfield Pavillion. If there is no effective limit on business users, there will be very little protection for residents other than the cost to business users of their permits.

It could be that if no greater priority is offered to local residents, as opposed to business and other users, the only benefit to residents of the proposal overall would be the probable reduction in "dumped" cars from other areas with CPZs and in use by daily commuters, for which residents will have to pay if they wish to park on their street. That does not seem to be a fair and reasonable balance of interests.

Looking to the future, you will be aware of the planning application for the football facilities on the Triangle site. If granted, it surely is inevitable that demand for parking use will increase, as users of the facility, including schools, from the Lambeth side will seek to avoid the drive from the east to the Triangle area (for example by driving down Bedford Hill or Tooting Bec Road) by parking in Abbotswood Road and other nearby roads, from where there will only be a short walk to the Triangle. Much of that new demand for parking will be at later times than 2.00pm and will also be much used over the weekend.

It surely would be better to plan now for that additional probable parking demand on Abbotswood Road and nearby roads than allow friction to arise from uncontrolled further incremental parking on those roads.

234

I had written earlier this week to Mr Morris with questions, as in the email :

Mr Morris,

To assist me in making a representation for or against the proposals by 4 June, could I please ask the following questions:

- a) who qualifies as a resident in the CPZ I zone?
- b) will staff at all local schools in the I zone, including SCGHS and Northwood Senior both on or near Abbotswood Road, qualify as "residents" or be entitled to park in the bays as business users ? If so, will there be any limit on the number deemed "resident" or business users?
- c) will those who operate activities at the Woodfield pavillion, accessed largely from Abbotswood Road, qualify as "residents" or be entitled to park in the bays as business users ? If so, will there be any limit on the number deemed "resident" or business users?
- d) for clarity, is it correct that a qualifying resident with a permit may park all day in a bay, subject to the payment of the appropriate permit charge?
- e) for clarity, is it correct that there will be no "resident only " bays in Abbotswood Road?
- f) will it be possible to buy parking vouchers in addition to pay-by-phone?
- g) can you please quantify how many parking bays will be available in Abbotswood Road and how that number compares with the current number of cars parked in the

	<p>road? h) can you please clarify the difference between "residents and pay by phone" bays and "shared bays"?</p>
<p>235</p>	<p>We live in Pathfield Road (St Leonard's South) and I would like to register my objections to the proposed CPZ for St Leonards for the following reasons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If CPZ is introduced to the street nearest to us it will increase demand unfairly for the already limited parking spaces in Pathfield Road and the other roads that will not be subject to CPZ. • The parking bays in Pathfield Road has already been reduced due to the "Pathfield Road Traffic calming scheme" due to the construction of the island as well is the introduction of double yellow lines. This has also led to the bottom end of Pathfield Road being more congested as the top end of the street which now has restricted entry. • The "Estreham Road Calming Road Scheme" one way system has caused commuters driving to Streatham Common Station could no longer park along Estreham Road, next to the railway track and Lewin and Barrow Road etc. The "overflow" of cars now park in Pathfield Road. • There is currently already a shortage of parking bays in Pathfield Road and commuters are yet return to work due to the UK Government's work from home order. Once they return only a few roads will be left for them to park in. Again, causing and unfair demand on the parking in the roads not subject to CPZ. • There is a further proposal to introduce double yellow lines on the top of Pathfield Road that will yet again reduce already limited parking spaces. <p>I feel that residents in Pathfield Road will be impacted severely by this and will not be able to park in their own street. This defeats the object of introducing CPZ as we will not have more parking spaces but fewer! Pathfield Road should as a minimum also have CPZ.</p>

236	<p>As a resident of Pathfield Road, I want to request a rethink of the decision not to introduce CPZ here and to challenge the proposals for this road. I request a new, more informed consultation process.</p> <p>Pathfield Road has been strongly in favour of parking restrictions (2017 and 2021 consultations). Parking has become extremely difficult for residents, despite the new traffic flow arrangements of 2020 – which have otherwise successfully tackled the previous “rat-run”.</p> <p>I object to the proposed traffic orders, to introduce “at any time” (double yellow line) waiting restrictions at locations on and around Pathfield Road. These changes will have no impact on traffic flow but reduce parking options. These additional parking restrictions are unnecessary and will only aggravate the parking stress.</p> <p>The new CPZs in St Leonards will lead to considerable displacement of traffic, aggravated by the removal of many parking spaces though the proposed traffic orders. The consequence will be that the parking on and around Pathfield Road will become increasingly difficult for residents. I request a new consultation, specifically pointing out these facts to the residents of St Leonards South.</p> <p>The consultation process and outcome so far do not meet the standards that I’m sure you and Lambeth wish to. The Equality Analysis Proposed Controlled Parking Zones / St Leonards Area notes some displacement of vehicles to St Leonards Central but fails to discuss or account for the extensive displacement to St Leonards South. Please suspend further action until the process is made fairer and clearer, and the impact to St Leonard’s South is addressed.</p> <p>Thank you for your help with this.</p>
237	<p>I am a resident of Pathfield Road,</p> <p>We have suffered from increased parking issues since the erection of the barrier on Estreham Road. Adjacent Barrow and Lewin roads have benefited and their commuter traffic has shifted to Pathfield Road (though the barrier at Rotherhill has helped)</p> <p>Streatham Common station is at the bottom of the road and Streatham station is a short walk away. We have always had a significant problem with commuter parking. The current proposal for CPZs in Zones 1,O &U will undoubtedly push those hoping to avoid the charges onto Pathfield Road. I understand that this is what happened in Streatham Hill.</p> <p>In addition, the proposal to introduce further double yellow lines in Pathfield Road seems completely unnecessary as there are already double yellow lines at key locations. Any reduction in parking spaces will cause further stress to residents.</p> <p>Although I have strongly opposed a CPZ here in the past, I am now of the view that without it, there will be a marked increase in motorists seeking to avoid charges. A 2 hour parking restriction would deter commuters and only present a minor inconvenience for visitors. I believe my views are shared by many Pathfield residents.</p>

238	<p>I am writing in opposition to the proposed changes to the above areas, which will be impacted by the proposed adjacent CPZs.</p> <p>I urge you to introduce a CPZ in these two wards too, or as a minimum at least on Pathfield Road where there is a huge consensus for a CPZ.</p> <p>Specifically, I would like to highlight the unforeseen and unintended impact of the current proposed inconsistent approach. Without the addition of CPZs in the St Leonard's South and Streatham Vale wards, those driving into the area will simply be concentrated onto fewer roads. The parking situation will unfairly deteriorate for the minority of Streatham residents. I understand this has already played out at Streatham Hill (who now wish to reverse their decision and introduce a CPZ), and therefore we should learn from this to avoid it happening again.</p> <p>I should add that whilst the "Quietway" on Estreham Road has improved the situation on Lewin Road and Barrow Road, and those residents are content with the current situation, this will be disrupted if neighbouring CPZs are brought into force without any CPZ in our wards. The St Leonard's South ward is ideally located for commuters to access both Streatham and Streatham Common rail stations, hence the foreseen concentration of commuters under the current proposal.</p> <p>I am a resident on Pathfield Road where there is strong preference for a CPZ as we are already struggling with parking on our road as it is.</p> <p>Unlike Barrow and Lewin, our street is narrower and has few driveways, thus curb side parking is already limited. This was made worse by the Estreham Quietway which directed commuters up our road rather than spreading out across Barrow and Lewin as well (noted the no entry barrier has helped). Not having a CPZ will make the situation intolerable for Pathfield residents again.</p> <p>I hope you will consider revising the proposal for the St Leonard's South and Streatham Vale wards accordingly.</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>

240	<p>I am writing to oppose the suggested traffic orders which introduce “at any time” (double yellow line) waiting restrictions at locations in the “St Leonard’s South” zone, illustrated in Appendix B to the Proposed Controlled Parking Zones in St Leonard’s and Streatham Vale (Stage 1 Consultation results).</p> <p>As a relatively new resident to the road (Aug 2020) I can already see the stresses our road is under with limited parking for residents as is, further restrictions will only exacerbate this.</p> <p>Firstly to the proposed traffic orders, to introduce “at any time” (double yellow line) waiting restrictions at locations on and around Pathfield Road. These changes will have no impact on traffic flow, this corner is not a junction in which traffic flow is impeded and parking is difficult enough at this end of the road without further restrictions being introduced.</p> <p>Secondly, with new CPZs in St Leonards, this will only drive further traffic to our street. Neighboring roads under new restrictions who are looking for free parking availability will look to make use of our already over populated road. The consequence will be that the parking on and around Pathfield Road will get significantly worse.</p> <p>Anecdotally we are aware of this being the case in the Stratham Hill area where CPZ's measures were brought into place in only a handful of areas, those that weren't under CPZ restrictions were negatively impacted. I would highly suggest reviewing how this situation has unfolded before looking to replicate these same issues on Pathfield Road.</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>

242	<p>I am a resident of Pathfield Road. I wish to register my objection to the proposed introduction double yellow lines in the area near to Pathfield Road whilst at the same time not introducing CPZ in Pathfield Road.</p> <p>Parking is already very difficult on Pathfield Road. Making Pathfield Road one of the few 'free' parking areas in the neighbourhood is virtually guaranteed to make parking in the road much more difficult. My wife is an emergency worker. The occasions when she manages to park anywhere near our house are now so rare that they are major conversation points.</p> <p>The proposed changes will have no (positive) effect on traffic flow. They are likely to have the exact opposite effect with more cars cruising on the lookout for spaces and some waiting, in a street where there is no room to pass a stationary car, on the off chance that somebody who has opened the door to a car is going to get in it and drive it away.</p> <p>Please can you reconsider your plans, and factor in the knock-on effects on parking, traffic flow and air quality in neighbouring areas.</p>
243	<p>Dear Sirs</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>
<p>245</p>	<p>I would like to make the following comments in a personal capacity as a resident at number x The Spinney.</p> <p>For a tiny cul-de-sac, The Spinney has more than its fair share of parking as we have teachers at the school, various local workers and users of the common, including dog walking businesses leaving their cars here for various periods. We have elderly residents in our road and also young children meaning that it is essential that we are able to park close to our house. I have also noted that the parking study was undertaken over two years ago - ago www.lambeth.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2018-07-18%20Streatham_Common_Parking_Report.pdf .</p> <p>I can't see from the plan but it is important that the current parking spaces are replicated. This needs to include on the opposite side of The Spinney nearest to the school gate. It is not appropriate to leave that end clear as a "turning circle" as it is perfectly possible to turn when you have legitimately accessed The Spinney and it is essential that traffic is not encouraged to use The Spinney as a turning circle. This already happens with a number of mini cab drivers and creates worrying pollution at our end of the road.</p> <p>In addition, I would request that –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are five resident parking bays exclusively for Resident permit holders (equivalent to one per house) • There is a review of the operation of the CPZ within 6 months of its introduction and again within 1 year and to adjust the scheme as required

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>
247	<p>I wholeheartedly support the proposal.</p> <p>As a resident of Abbotswood Road we are plagued with displaced parking from adjacent CPZ's.</p> <p>I would, however, question the number of spaces that we will lose. I appreciate that space must be left either side of crossovers but we can comfortably fit three cars into the space that will be designated as only large enough for two.</p> <p>Why do we need so much parking made available for business users? There are no businesses in this area other than the Streatham and Clapham High School.</p> <p>Could we also have enforcement at the weekends. If the proposal by Wandsworth to build commercially run football pitches on the common immediately behind our houses gets the go ahead we will no doubt suffer from an influx of traffic.</p>

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>
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>
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>

251

We are writing to make a representation about the proposed traffic orders which introduce "at any time" (double yellow line) waiting restrictions at locations in the "St Leonard's South" zone, illustrated in Appendix B to the Proposed Controlled Parking Zones in St Leonard's and Streatham Vale (Stage 1 Consultation results).

We are residents of xx Pathfield Road, and we have two objections to the proposed order, further detailed below.

Our experience is that we are only able to park on the road on which we live about 60% of the time, and usually have to park on nearby roads. We know from our neighbours that the same applies to them. We were surprised to see the proposed traffic orders, as the Lambeth Parking Study Streatham Commons/Vale Report 11/10/2017 (Reference number GB01T15C41) revealed that Pathfield Road was the most highly stressed long road in the area, with a parking stress of 96%/95% (weekday/weekend), considerably higher than, for example, neighbouring Barrow Road. Moreover, Pathfield Road has historically been in favour of parking restrictions, as the figures for 2017 and 2021 show.

We object to the proposed traffic orders to introduce "at any time" (double yellow line) waiting restrictions at locations on and around Pathfield Road. These changes will have no impact on traffic flow (which has already been reduced thanks to the filter system introduced).

The new CPZs in St Leonard's will lead to considerable displacement of traffic, aggravated by the removal of many parking spaces by the introduction of double yellow lines. The consequence will be that the parking on and around Pathfield Road will get significantly worse.

We therefore request a new consultation, specifically pointing out these facts to the residents of St Leonard South. The Equality Analysis Proposed Controlled Parking Zones – St Leonards Area notes some displacement of vehicles to St Leonard's Central but fails to discuss or account for the extensive displacement to St Leonard's South. We believe that introducing a CPZ only in St Leonard's North & Central will encourage drivers to come and park in the "St Leonard's South" and "Streatham Vale West" areas, making it even harder for the residents to find a parking spot. We think this will especially impact our side of the road, since we are just in front of the station: as residents we may end up with no spaces available as they will be taken up by all those looking for parking to use the station (since the neighbouring roads will have restrictions in place!). We would like to request for any action to be suspended until this failure and the impact to St Leonard's South is addressed.

As a resident of Pathfield Road, I am compelled to write and strongly protest against the proposals for the road made by Lambeth Council.

The road is heavily under pressure pertaining to parking space generally for a number of reasons:

- the only road in the vicinity that is still easily accessible from the station and its commuters
- over development by houses into flats
- the nursery staff use the street for parking
- close to local shops on greyhound lane and streatham high road
- used by residents of greyhound lane
- small front gardens resulting in few converted for parking
- one way system reduced parking spaces

252 Thus the suggestion that even more parking spaces are removed is unworkable and unacceptable.

The above has been clearly shown during lockdown and the recent road closure as a result of the stabbing freeing up significant numbers of parking spaces on the street.

As the father of a young family I am rarely able to park within 50m of my front door because of the number of non-locals parking as well as a large number of my neighbors that have 3-4 vehicles per household (many families have a number of cars and a van).

This combined with the large number of unused disabled bays on the street results in young families being discriminated against.

The adjoining streets are less concerned as they have more off street parking and are protected by the one way system hence their lack of support for the area's CPZ.

Regards

Michael Matthews
63 Pathfield Road, SW16

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>253</p>	<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>254</p>	<p>I have had a look at the proposed controlled parking zones in Streatham, in which I am residing in the "St Leonard's North 'I' Zone". I personally do not agree with this idea. Reasons stated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I moved here in 1983, since then I have been parking 3 to 4 houses away from my own house and till this day I've been parking up to 5 to 6 houses away from my house. Nothing has changed since. • The only people who will benefit from this scheme is the businesses and the council, not the residents. • We the residents will have to pay for the parking on top of road tax, car insurance, and a very high council tax (which is over £2000). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are already paying a ridiculous amount of money for council tax (£2000+), whereas residents half mile down the road in Wandsworth pay less than £1000. And your solution is to make us pay even more for parking which is unfair. • I believe this is simply just another money-making scheme by the council to benefit from by gaining extra revenue. <p>Quote Reference: ST LEONARDS CPZ</p> <p>I hope you take this into consideration before implementing this CPZ.</p>

255

As a resident of Mortimer Close SW16 1xx, I personally have serious concerns regarding your proposed implementation of Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ) and would like to provide further clarity regarding my concerns.

Being a full-time carer for a family member I heavily have to rely on assistance from various sources as well as being able to conveniently transport an immobile person to and from the car to the house as well as various forms of caring and medical support. Your intention would therefore create huge concerns and no doubt cause a massive inconvenience. To date I have not required the need to request a disabled parking bay as all residents have always been respectful to each other neighbours' direct parking spaces.

Whilst we have noticed a recent increase to the amount of additional parking (due to making Sternhold Avenue a CPZ), the residents of Mortimer Close are still able to conveniently park directly outside their homes without interference from others who use the additional parking spaces outside of those areas in order to access the nearby common (Business Dog Walkers) or local tube or train stations (Commuters).

There are however, a certain element of inconsiderate parking close to the edges of the two oval greens and consider it wise to implement yellow lines to these four edges so that it will permanently enable vehicles to adequately navigate themselves around without causing damage to the kerbs. There is also convenient parking spaces for cars to the long length of the inner oval green area (long stretch between the two ovals) and the two long stretches (on both access and exit sides of the close) which, would not prove detrimental to parking.

In front of numbers 1 & 2 and also 11 & 12 Mortimer Close, there is adequate space to provide 3 or 4 parking spaces (if parked diagonally facing the kerb) without causing disruption to others.

Residents of Mortimer Close have lived peacefully for countless years without issue and the only one that could improve the situation is the attention to inconsiderate parking close to the edges of corners.

The intention to implement Mortimer Close as a CPZ is therefore unnecessary and would only but add additional expense to the residents within the close which is considered hugely unfair unless you are proposing to issue free parking permits to residents and their visiting guests? Is this a ploy to reduce the number of cars per household in addition to implementing LTN's which has caused nothing but chaos to the nearby Streatham High Road as a direct result.

Unfortunately the mere suggestion of implementing a CPZ gives the impression of purely creating an additional money-making exercise in order to offset cuts incurred in other areas.

I am aware that most residents of Mortimer Close have already provided similar views (some slightly differ in the extent of Yellow Lines).

256

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).

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.

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?

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.

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>257</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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:</p> <p>A similar situation pertains in nearby Hoadly Road, for example, where there is to be a serious loss of parking capacity.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
<p>257</p>	<p>Incorrect and out of date plans The plan on which this statutory consultation is based is inaccurate and out of date. It is showing, for example, the previous arrangement at the Junction of Woodfield Avenue and Abbotswood before the landscaped scheme was built two years ago, resulting in the loss of parking spaces.</p>

258	<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>
259	<p>I live in Pathfield Rd SW16 where parking is already difficult for residents with the station at the bottom . I feel that parking restriction for a few hours ie 10 - 12 would help or resident parking .</p> <p>It will lead to more people trying to park on our Rd when other Rds have controlled parking , then residents and several have small children will have difficulty parking in the Rd where they live .</p>
260	<p>Torally agree with cpz in St leoards</p>
261	<p>Totally agree with cpz in this area</p>
262	<p>I am a resident of Fairmile avenue. I write in support of the proposed CPZ for st Leonard's</p>

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”.

<p>263</p>	<p>Why your current design needs changing</p> <p>Overall, the way you have designed your scheme seems to be excessively punitive against local residents: now charging them to park “near their own homes”, in a reduced number of spaces, where they will have to fight against staff from a rich commercial organisation, who live far away and choose to drive to our once tranquil, leafy, residential community. Is that what Lambeth residents really deserve from Lambeth council?</p> <p>And environmentally, taking on-street parking away from local residents may well force many to pave over their front gardens simply to be able to park and save money. This will accelerate the destruction of the distinctive look of the front gardens of this residential community, taking away rain drain off and destroying habitat for bio-diversity.</p> <p>A simple suggestion</p> <p>I believe to truly live up to the aim of “facilitate residents parking near their own homes” and to protect the environment and distinctive design nature of Hoadly Road, we need a scheme that replaces many of the Business User and Pay By Phone bays by Resident-Only parking bays. Other boroughs protect their residents by doing this, why is Lambeth not? Lambeth will still get its money from the residents that pay their annual fees. It seems Lambeth is now making Lambeth residents pay to subsidise visitors from other boroughs to park outside our homes.</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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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>
<p>265</p>	<p>We are in the proposed St Leonards North I (Mo-Fr) 12noon -2pm) proposed CPZ zone. We are happy with the proposed CPZ proposal. My question is, will there be a survey / proposal where the actual parking bay lines will start and finish? I am asking, as we live at 1 Hoadly Road, London, SW16 1AE and we get a lot of cars at our end of the road, as it is a long stretch without any driveways. We frequently get cars even parking half way across in front of our driveway, which makes it very difficult for us to get in and out of our drive. I would like to make sure that the new parking bays when they are marked up, we will have a suitable distance from the edge of the bays.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from you,</p>

266	<p>Firstly, please accept our apologies for missing the deadline for sharing our views. I do hope these can still be taken into consideration despite being 2 working days beyond the deadline.</p> <p>We are residents of the lower end of Drewstead Road (close to the access to Tooting Common) so would be directly impacted by the proposed St Leonard's North controlled parking zone. Whilst we do not disagree wholly in principle with the introduction of a controlled parking zone (particularly to reduce the number of vehicles that are parked in non-permit areas for a significant amount of time), we do have a number of specific issues with the recommendations to how the zone will be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed plan for the lower end of Drewstead Road (nearest the common) and Mortimer Close does not allow for sufficient parking for the residents of these areas. The plan shows approximately 6 spaces for 9 houses on the lower section of Drewstead road and a notable reduction from current usable space on Mortimer close - With the regular use of the common at all times of the day and evening by leisure users, dog walkers, sports players etc as well as visiting trades people, providing only this number of bays will make parking for residents very difficult at certain times of the day - The introduction of single yellow lines across driveways is a ridiculous proposal as surely this is up to the individual residents if they wish to block their own drive and leaving as-is (with no yellow line) will help to alleviate the pressure on spaces at busy times if residents cannot find a space close to their own home - Double yellow lines at the very end of Drewstead Road, we feel, is also another unnecessary proposal. This is helpful additional parking and is often used by visitors to residences or to the common. It seems wasteful to make this area unusable and we would welcome the consideration of further marked pay bays in this area - The recent approval of plans on the triangle area of the common to allow the upgrade of the football pitch and the introduction of a private leisure facility will undoubtedly add pressure to the parking in Drewstead Road, Mortimer Close and Abbotswood Road. Reducing the number of bays will make this situation much worse - In addition to the above points which I'm sure affect all residents of the street, we have a disabled daughter and require close access to our wheelchair accessible car for her needs. Whilst this is rarely an issue with the current parking situation (particularly as we can park across our drive when there is no other space) I fear the proposed solution would force us to request a disabled bay, which would further reduce the number of spaces for our fellow residents. <p>I sincerely hope you can take these points into consideration and would be grateful if proposals could be modified accordingly.</p>
267	<p>Really disgusted by the way we and all on drewstead road have only found out about parking restrictions due to take place soon on our road . And apparently yellow and double yellow lines being painted all over our driveway/front . No letter no nothing to inform us at all !!! As a resident and have been for some time . Really is appalling to be left in the dark and fir yous to just do as you please regarding the matter . We have two vehicles which we can park every day out side our home ,</p>

	<p>your suggestions as to what we must do now , ??? I'd gladly like to hear what your solution is !?</p>
268	<p>I have only just found out about new parking restrictions that are due to be implemented on Drewstead road. I live on Drewstead road and have lived here for many many years and did not receive any letter or warning or consultation on this matter . Of course I object to this for many reasons and as a female for safety reasons like to park my very green small city car near to my house for safety reasons if coming home late. And many more reasons besides... Also would have appreciated being asked or informed or sent a letter or consulted on this matter and not just found out through my neighbour. Please take this email as ' I object ' to these new parking restrictions And please send me the information about them to my address</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>
270	<p>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.</p> <p>I see that representations had to be sent by June the 4th but given the circumstances I sincerely hope you will read and respond.</p>

<p>271</p>	<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://modern.gov.lambeth.gov.uk/documents/s127311/Appendix%20A%20-%20Revised%20Detailed%20CPZ%20Proposal.pdf</p>
<p>272</p>	<p>Letter dated 26/05/2021 and also email of 11/06/2021</p> <p>I have analysed this data and wanted to point out a few points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Less than 20% of people surveyed, responded 2. Where the most responses were for 10 hours a day was around the roads that have quick train station access, i.e Gleneagle Road SW16. Streatham Station is a quick access to Farringdon etc. 3. The data compiled states that 10 hours was the most following 2 hours but extensive research by Leonardo shows that 2 hours would resolve the issue. So why was 2 hours not shown rather than 10. 4. The trend for Abbotswood Road, Hoadly Road, Drewstead Road has started because you have just diverted traffic from one area of Streatham to another and those cars are moving. <p>I am sure you will not deny that CPZ is a revenue making scheme for Lambeth. It is also important to mitigate non-residents from parking within the area, there needs to be things done in the right way and the focus needs to be long-term on not just residents but our high street too!</p> <p>We are in challenging times, especially for businesses and when you see such poor measures that Sadiq Khan has taken over the past 2 years, we do not want them taken in Streatham. Our High Street is dying & you must be aware that the A23 Streatham High Road was rated the worst high road in the country.</p> <p>The regeneration plan is fantastic but when you put measures to stop businesses, residents and people to our area it will have a long term effect. A mere example TFL lied to us for a bus lane that was needed 7am to 7pm along the A23. It caused</p>

an upheaval in traffic, a year later it went to 24 hours. If the need was 24 hours why was this not done one year ago when the reports were compiled

As you are a senior parking engineer it would be good to discuss over a detailed call. I am here to help promote local businesses, local communities and our residents. I want to make sure that we do the right thing the first time around. I know each road in this area as a resident for 40 years and can tell you what the issues would be for each road and how to mitigate them.