

# Our Healthy Streets Dulwich: Phase 3 Report

May 2021

# Executive Summary

The consultation for Phase 3 of Our Healthy Streets – Dulwich was carried out between 28<sup>th</sup> January and 29<sup>th</sup> March 2020. As well as an online consultation form, with paper versions available at local hubs, we held three very well attended community meetings, and participated in numerous additional meetings with schools, residents associations and other stakeholders.

With 2007 confirmed individual responses, this was, excluding a small number of borough-wide consultations, the largest consultation carried out in Southwark, with engagement at over 50% in some parts of the area under consultation.

Phase 3 followed on from an initial scoping exercise in Spring 2019, and a workshop-based Phase 2 survey in autumn 2019. It was intended to set out and establish levels of approval for some broad proposals to tackle high traffic levels, air quality and road safety in Dulwich Village and surrounding areas. Under the original plans, there would have been a further consultation in late summer-autumn 2020, looking at revised proposals in more detail.

In the event, the Covid-19 pandemic intervened, and this process could not be carried through. Elements of the proposals were reflected in the emergency traffic measures implemented from June 2020, but there were significant differences from the implemented scheme.

For the purposes of the consultation, the Dulwich area was broken down into 3 'zones' (A, B and C) – 'Zone B' had been the focus of phases 1 and 2 of the Our Healthy Streets process, as well as long previous debate about the working of the Dulwich Village junction. 'Zone A' – to the north east of Townley Road, and 'Zone C' – to the south west of Dulwich Village, were areas with significant existing traffic concerns which could be exacerbated by the proposals for 'Zone B', but which had not been explicitly included in the earlier phases of discussion. This meant that the options for these zones were deliberately kept a little more open where possible, and local stakeholders (especially residents associations) were targeted for contact, including local meetings held closer to the centre of each zone. Nonetheless, the overall proposals were always presented as a holistic plan, in which all sections needed to be considered together.

The tables below show the breakdown of responses by zone to all the key questions. As well as quantitative responses (yes/no answers or answers in a range from strongly agree to strongly disagree), we have included a basic analysis of the text answers (of which there were thousands, some quite substantial), with the main themes highlighted along with sample quotes reflecting the diversity and complexity of the responses received.

Top level summary of responses to the key consultation questions:

Question	Overall		In consultation zone	
	% in favour	% against	% in favour	% against
Do you agree with our overall objective?	76%	17%	81%	13%
Do you agree that measures described will achieve the objective?	46%	40%	44%	40%
Do support proposed measures at Dulwich Village junction?	55%	37%	55%	36%
Do you support proposed measures at Townley Road?	52%	32%	53%	29%
Do you support proposed measures at Eynella Road?	48%	35%	45%	35%
Do you support proposed measures on Melbourne Grove?	39% permeable closure 11% one way no entry	42%	37% permeable closure 12% one way no entry	41%
Do you support proposed measures to restrict traffic on Dulwich Village?	56%	39%	59%	34%
Do you support proposed measures on Burbage Road?	37% permeable closure 10% one way no entry	46%	34% permeable closure 12% one way no entry	47%
Do you support proposed measures on Turney Road?	42%	50%	39%	52%
Do support parking controls to complement these measures?	57%	29%	59%	26%

Appendix A includes a more detailed breakdown of all responses, including by street, age and gender.

# Question One

This scheme has been developed as an area-wide approach to create a safer, healthier environment to support active travel. Do you agree with this objective?

## Overall response

Response	Number	% of total
Strongly agree	1045	52.1%
Agree	478	23.8%
Not sure	142	7.1%
Disagree	112	5.6%
Strongly disagree	230	11.5%
	2007	

## Summary of responses by zone

	Responses	% agreeing	% disagreeing
Zone A	142	87.3%	9.2%
Zone B	537	76%	16%
Zone C	597	81.9%	11.4%
Borders	50	70%	28%
Other	681	68.6%	23.6%
Total	2007	75.9%	17%

There was very strong support for the overall scheme objective, especially from residents of the affected zones. Respondents from outside Dulwich, or who did not provide address details, were less likely to support the objective, though a large majority still did.

# Question Two

Generally, do you agree that the measures described will achieve the objective?

## Overall response

Response	Number	% of total
Strongly agree	602	30.1%
Agree	323	16.1%
Not sure	278	13.9%
Disagree	318	15.9%
Strongly disagree	482	24.1%
	2003	

## Summary of responses by zone

	Responses	% agreeing	% disagreeing
Zone A	142	68.3%	21.1%
Zone B	537	43%	44%
Zone C	593	40%	41.5%
Borders	50	44%	40%
Other	681	49.6%	39.5%
Total	2003	46.2%	39.9%

There was a very mixed picture when people were asked to assess the overall likely success of the proposals in achieving the objectives – as suggested by response patterns later, this is probably because people who disliked the scheme had a clear way to respond to this question, whereas people who favoured low traffic schemes but did not think the proposal went far enough, or who liked it in principle but worried about the impacts on a specific street, would have been mixed in how they responded.

Notably residents in 'Zone A' were much more positive about the overall success of the scheme than those in 'Zone B' or 'Zone C' – reflecting the strong engagement from residents of Melbourne Grove.

# Question Three

What do you think of the proposals for:

**A: Dulwich Village junction**

## Overall response

Response	Number	% of total
Strongly agree	842	42.5%
Agree	260	13.1%
Not sure	132	6.7%
Disagree	170	8.6%
Strongly disagree	575	29.1%
	1979	

## Summary of responses by zone

	Responses	% agreeing	% disagreeing
Zone A	140	67.9%	19.3%
Zone B	533	48.6%	47.3%
Zone C	584	60.1%	30.1%
Borders	50	52%	40%
Other	672	55.2%	40.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1979</b>	<b>55.7%</b>	<b>37.6%</b>

There was clear overall support for the permeable closure of the junction of Dulwich Village with Calton Avenue and Court Lane, with more agreeing than disagreeing in all zones.

'Zone B' was the only zone in which there was not an absolute majority in favour of this measure – probably reflecting concerns (some realistic, some based on misunderstanding of the proposals) about reduced access by motorcar and longer car journeys.

## B: Townley Road

### Overall response

Response	Number	% of total
Strongly agree	684	34.7%
Agree	369	18.7%
Not sure	273	13.9%
Disagree	179	9.1%
Strongly disagree	464	23.6%
	1969	

### Summary of responses by zone

	Responses	% agreeing	% disagreeing
Zone A	141	63.1%	25.5%
Zone B	532	49.2%	40%
Zone C	578	52.2%	20.4%
Borders	50	54%	40%
Other	668	52.7%	38.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1969</b>	<b>53.5%</b>	<b>32.7%</b>

There was very clear overall support for the proposal to apply a timed permit-only camera restriction, with no peak time eastbound access, on Townley Road. This was supported across all zones, though again the margin was narrowest in 'Zone B', with no absolute majority.

## C: Eynella Road

### Overall response

Response	Number	% of total
Strongly agree	669	34%
Agree	285	14.5%
Not sure	309	15.7%
Disagree	168	8.5%
Strongly disagree	534	27.2%
	1965	

### Summary of responses by zone

	Responses	% agreeing	% disagreeing
Zone A	134	60.4%	22.4%
Zone B	531	41.6%	48.8%
Zone C	579	47.8%	36.6%
Borders	50	50%	36%
Other	671	52.2%	35.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1965</b>	<b>48.5%</b>	<b>35.7%</b>

The proposal for a permeable closure at Eynella Road was the only one of the 'Zone B' proposals that did not achieve majority support – with in fact significantly more 'Zone B' residents disagreeing than agreeing with this proposal. Residents of Eynella Road itself mostly opposed this option. From the text answers it appears most people did not appreciate the need for this measure.

## Please explain your answer if you wish

Comment type	No.	As % of all respondents	Example quotes
Doesn't agree with proposals (general reasons)	333	16.05%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The roads are accessible. Workable. Illogical to close</li> <li>- This type of traffic management is completely unprecedented. This has clearly only got as far as it has with the local authority due to connections between Dulwich residents and the local council. This type of traffic management is detrimental to almost all of the Dulwich Village residents apart from a small minority.</li> <li>- Ill thought out with serious consequences for the whole of dulwich congestion, parking, safety.</li> <li>- Way too complex</li> <li>- Closing roads for cars is not a solution. I look at other schemes where roads have been closed and every single one has become worse.</li> <li>- Please don't carry out any of the proposals in this consultation</li> <li>- These proposals will drastically affect people's day to day lives, and using the phrase 'to encourage active travel' as a blanket reason to do so exceeds the councils' powers.</li> <li>- Please stop the road closures. You will make the areas we live worse, not better. If you want to decrease pollution, increase mobility and to flow of traffic. Dont decrease it.</li> </ul>
Concern about displacement of traffic	240	11.57%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- These measures will just mean moving traffic to other roads in the area, creating more back up of traffic.</li> <li>- I agree with your changes- but I am deeply concerned that you will divert considerable amount of traffic on to my road Dovercourt and Beauval Rd- cutting through from the top access on court lane (at lordship lane) going to townley road. This is probably the most extensive cut through (and in reverse at the other end of the day) on Dovercourt.</li> <li>- This will result in huge displacement of traffic from Dulwich Village to the surrounding areas, which also have heavy pedestrian use.</li> <li>- i'm concerned the traffic will all be diverted to lordship lane and other road sin east dulwich which is where i live. my children go to school on lordship lane i worry they the private schools will all have better air quality but the cars will pollute the area on lordship lane more.</li> <li>- No point closing roads and junctions only to have traffic displaced a half mile down the road. The traffic won't disappear, but by not closing roads it will be dispersed over a wider area.</li> <li>- You will simply displace traffic onto other roads - look what happened when Lambeth tried to change the traffic flow through Loughborough Junction. It didn't work - it just made adjoining streets busier and in some place more dangerous.</li> <li>- These plans will shove traffic down the top end of Court Lane, cars will drive past all our houses, then spend ages on side roads like Dovercourt Road etc trying to get out.</li> <li>- The current Calton Rd / Court Rd junction is a nightmare, but this will just channel traffic up the main Dulwich Village Road instead and not actually reduce it.</li> </ul>



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- These changes will serve to funnel much of the traffic into East Dulwich Grove and onto Lordship lane, where the junction is incredibly pedestrian-unfriendly.</li> <li>- I live on Lordship Lane itself...while these proposals might benefit those living in Area B....Traffic will inevitably be displaced into the main roads with idling engines at the Plough Junction causing even more pollution.</li> <li>- I am concerned traffic trying to get to West Dulwich side will be forced up East Dulwich Grove and through the village making traffic through the village worse</li> </ul>
Agrees with proposals (general reasons)	171	8.24%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Something drastic has to be done. If it makes traffic worse elsewhere, more measures have to happen to stop people thinking driving everywhere is ok.</li> <li>- Agree but strong concerns about impact on other areas.</li> <li>- Closing access to motor traffic is a good idea, as is having a dedicated cycle track to allow cyclists to continue to pass through the area without being in conflict with pedestrians. These are good plans.</li> <li>- I fully support these proposals. I wish they would be extended to include Dulwich Village southbound. I would also like to see a 24 hour low traffic neighbourhood.</li> <li>- Excellent, all excellent. Please roll out asap, and get more people walking and on bikes!</li> <li>- Needed to stop the rat run traffic, speeding at will, rear axles wheels often off the ground. #getitdone</li> <li>- Delighted that these proposals have listened to the community and are as bold and radical as they need to be to address the issues identified in Phase 1. This is such a great opportunity to put the village feel back into Dulwich Village.</li> <li>- I strongly support the need to reduce traffic and pollution, but am only in favour of these proposals provided that the measures are area-wide (ie including Area C) and do not simply displace traffic onto adjoining roads.</li> </ul>
Concern that local residents will face longer journeys	84	4.05%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The permanent closures of Eynella Road and Court Lane and Carlton Road to vehicle traffic will be a massive disruption and inconvenience to residents who live in Woodwarde Road, causing significantly longer road journeys to access our properties.</li> <li>- In doing this people will have to drive further to get where they want meaning there will be even more traffic in places like the south circular and there will be even more pollution.</li> <li>- Looking at these plans it is not clear how I can drive anywhere except up court lane to Lordship Lane to start any journey. So most of my journeys will be a mile longer, 10 minutes more of car pollution.</li> <li>- I need to drive to Goodrich Rd E Dulwich from Dulwich Village to take small children to school and back. These closures will make the time to drive twice to three times as long time and distance wise.</li> <li>- These proposals will only put pressure on surrounding areas &amp; make it inconvenient for residents too to take their children to school &amp; to commute to work themselves.</li> <li>- As a resident of the area on lower Court Lane .....it is not obvious to see how I leave the area other than by the end of Court Lane onto lordship Lane....if I am am going to the West this forces me onto the already congested south circular probably add 20 minutes to my journey time.</li> <li>- Most if not all my car journeys to work go out through Dulwich village. Your proposals again are going to add</li> </ul>

			another 10, 15,20 mins to my journey times with concomittant pollution.
Proposals will improve air quality	73	3.52%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I walk through the Village Junction, along Townley Road and along Eynella Road almost daily. The volume of vehicle traffic in all three areas has increased markedly over the past twenty years. It is a danger to pedestrians and a respiratory health challenge to all who use these roads, including hundreds of young students.</li> <li>The proposed measures are long overdue.</li> <li>- Health and safety has to take precedence over commuter accessibility</li> <li>- Will cut down on pollution from queuing traffic, encouraging us all to use alternative, more environmentally friendly mode of transport.</li> <li>- These measures are essential to end the senseless tragedy of our toxic air and road danger.</li> <li>- This is the only way to get rid of the toxic fumes from queuing traffic choking the pavements at school run time</li> <li>- So glad to see that Dulwich is willing to be bold - I now cycle in this area on my commute and compared to the rest of the quiet way, it is so busy, polluted, and car-dominated.</li> <li>- The volume of traffic at peak times on Court Lane/Townley Road is phenomenal. Consequently we have to suffer hours of stationary cars polluting the roads at the exact time that children are going to and from school. These measures will significantly reduce pollution.</li> </ul>
Proposals will lead to more congestion	58	2.8%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the road restrictions seem to be focused on the eastern access into Dulwich and there is no consideration that this may push traffic around to the north and west - a particular problem with the 2 village schools.</li> <li>- This will just congest traffic other areas in Dulwich and will worsen issues in other places</li> <li>- It will create total chaos. Heavy traffic? This is London!</li> <li>- If the Townley Road proposals go through in their current form there will be more congestion on Melbourne Grove and more dangerous driving by the (often aggressive) school traffic on Colwell Road, by those who will be coming around to reach Townley Road in the direction that remains open.</li> <li>- It makes total sense to close off Dulwich village/Calton Avenue- however- where does thus traffic go? East Dulwich Grove and the rest of Dulwich is going to be so busy from a traffic perspective. I fear there may be lots of congestion on Village way etc..</li> <li>- You will cause havoc to the whole area with the hair brained scheme and push traffic into already more congested areas.</li> </ul>
Proposals will stop through traffic	57	2.75%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- shutting off access to these 'pinch points' for motorised vehicles would require people to rethink their school journeys and commuting routes in the area and stop driving. ( a good thing) thought needs to be given to areas close to Area B to make sure people didn't park their vehicles there and then return later in the day to pick them up.</li> <li>- Long overdue - get rid of the rat running and return the area to local people</li> <li>- restricting traffic that passed through the village and Calton Avenue is a good idea. Permeable closure also means that there is lesser chance anyone will try to break the rule because of the physical barrier.</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- These are bold proposals that make vehicle travel through Dulwich more difficult and will reduce peak time congestion and pollution. All other proposals are unlikely to reduce traffic</li> <li>- The sheer volume of traffic coming into the village is not reflective of the residential status of the area.</li> <li>- No more dangerous rat runs</li> <li>- We need to take all possible steps to reduce traffic through the residential streets of Dulwich Village, and where possible along the main street as well.</li> </ul>
Proposals will lead to more air pollution	56	2.7%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The plan will merely shift traffic to adjacent roads creating traffic jams and pollution in these.</li> <li>- Removing these avenues will just push the problem elsewhere. In fact, it will make it worse because there will be more jams and therefore exhaust from idling vehicles than there currently is.</li> <li>- Drivers will be forced to travel greater distances to get where they want to, meaning extra emissions, more overall pollution, longer queues at exit points, and more cars idling.</li> <li>- Slowing down traffic and creating other pockets of high traffic will only deteriorate air pollution. Evidence has shown already the cycle lanes in itself are increasing air pollution, but forcing cars to drive slower, stop and start, and stay longer in certain areas (and they could pass through quicker). I have a child that goes to school in Dulwich and I strongly oppose creating further issues with traffic locally. Let the central government sort this problem with the guidance and legislation they already have regarding cleaner vehicles.</li> <li>- This is going to make the area more polluted than ever a total nightmare for everybody (except cyclists) I'm going to have to move now!!!</li> </ul>
You should deal with the school traffic instead	45	2.17%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Local schools should also be held to account and take action as they cause the most of the resulting traffic / parking concerns. Schools should have to review where students are travelling from and monitoring and report this to the council to ensure that they are enforcing similar practices to all families doing the school run.</li> <li>- Area B appears to be driven by the requirements of Alleyns' school, whose coaches and parental drop-offs are significant contributors to traffic. Coaches are environmentally better than cars, but to what degree can the school oblige its pupils to walk/ride or take public transport? That is a tricky one, but can the school contribute data and take some responsibility?</li> <li>- One of the main issues is cars that drive kids to the three private schools. In holiday time, I notice a huge reduction in traffic during these times. What are the schools doing about this? The schools have increased their junior school capacities, so now there are more cars. These cars will simply use other small roads. The rich people who can afford these schools and their big cars will not simply disappear.</li> <li>- The issue of through traffic in the village is STRONGLY associated with school traffic dropping children to the nearby schools. The parent traffic to Alleyns school causes the most disruption to Townley Rd. The council should work closely with these schools to encourage less traffic and to give over some of their land to accommodate their traffic causing polluting inducing coaches.</li> <li>- The problem in Townley Road is almost entirely due to coaches and private cars delivering and collecting children from Alleyns school. I don't think local authority money should be spent and locals inconvenienced for a private school. Other</li> </ul>

			measures could simply discourage pupils using cars to get to school and the school could easily provide off street parking for coaches in their extensive grounds.
Proposals will improve safety	42	2.02%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Live in area, children walk to school through this pollution. Dulwich village junction is dangerous for pedestrians when lollipop lady not there.</li> <li>- The Dulwich Village junction is confusing to drivers and dangerous to pedestrians as a result. Closing access to Calton Ave / Court Lane will resolve this.</li> <li>- The roads come to a complete stop and it is not safe, especially for young cyclists. Large school busses cut through cut through which caused traffic chaos on a daily basis. All these proposals would make it better for residents and for the large number of children going to school.</li> <li>- The village junction is a fatal accident waiting to happen, as well as a pollution hotspot. The sooner this can be closed the better.</li> <li>- Cars that use these junctions currently are often reckless or confused leading to great danger for pedestrians and cyclists.</li> <li>- The Calton Ave/Court Lane junction remains incredibly dangerous for our children crossing the road, even after the recent redesign. Many cars remain unsure as to who has priority and others seem oblivious to the fact that it is a 5-way junction. Any measure that reduced the 'through traffic' has to be welcomed at this stage</li> </ul>
Concern that residents won't have access to their homes	39	1.88%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Both road closures appear to be very drastic measures to calm traffic and reduce pollution and I am quite concerned that it will make driving to and from my home on Calton Avenue very difficult.</li> <li>- As a resident of Calton Avenue, I don't understand how I will get home during peak times from, for example, Streatham if the Village end of the road is blocked to cars, and I cannot turn into Townley Road/Calton Avenue from East Dulwich Grove. How far round will I have to drive?</li> <li>- As a woodwarde road resident living near the Calton road junction, i am concerned about not being able to access or leave my house by car, and additional through and displaced traffic down the street.</li> <li>- Closure to vehicles of DV and Eynella junctions will severely penalise Area B residents, particularly the elderly for whom walking may be less practical. Access to the Village, the Picture Gallery, Lordship Lane shops etc will involve lengthy detours, increasing traffic and pollution - contrary to your objectives.</li> <li>- I live on Court Lane. Your proposals are a ridiculous restriction on my freedom of movement.</li> <li>- The adjustment and closure of these roads are going to make it very difficult for people who drive into these areas for social activities, for example members of tennis clubs such as Old Dulwich Tennis Club, and other clubs in the area, where I happen to be a member. It's wrong that you are basically penalising people with cars who need free parking when attending social activities!</li> <li>- Not sure how residents and visitors will be able to get to our homes. Difficult to get out of the top of Court Lane, which seems to be to only exit from the area.</li> </ul>
Proposals encourage walking	37	1.78%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I love these as I can imagine more local residents (myself included!) feeling safe enough cycle and walk with the segregated cycle paths and larger walks at Calton and Eynella</li> </ul>

and cycling			<p>and I believe all these changes will help to stop commuters short-cutting through the village to get off the South Circular/Lordship Lane.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Promoting Walking and Cycling is the fundamental to the area. Reducing car use is key</li> <li>- I love the boldness of the solution. It will be a radical change but really encourages cycling, walking and cleaner air for the area. I love the vision for it.</li> <li>- we would all be happier and healthier with less driving and more bike riding and walking leading to a better environment and healthier lives.</li> <li>- These proposals will be encourage walking and cycling. Please be as ambitious as possible.</li> <li>- We need to make space for bicycles and pedestrians</li> <li>- Anything that stops cars coming into the village and encourages alternative transport is good. People can use public transport, walk, cycle, scoot, or travel in convoys. I believe some schools will be operating walking buses.</li> </ul>
Proposals are unfair as they benefit wealthy people over less advantaged communities	35	1.69%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This is a plan designed entirely for the rich people of North Dulwich. It will push traffic into East Dulwich making ED streets more polluted. It will also cut off access to ED residents travelling to Brixton, the only Tube station in the area. These proposals are therefore discriminatory.</li> <li>- This project in part feels like protecting the sanctity of the most affluent neighbourhood and in turn creating problems for the less well off, and even less well maintained, residential streets. First address how to better the area's public transport etc, and then we can talk about creating an idyllic little haven for Dulwich Village.</li> <li>- My first objection is that the definition of 'area-wide' is essentially drawing a line around the most prestigious area of Dulwich, namely 'Dulwich Village', and cuts it off from the rest of Dulwich (North and East Dulwich) in a way which will surely be seriously detrimental to N &amp; E Dulwich.</li> <li>- I understand that Dulwich Village is a particularly characterful place, and aren't the people who live there lucky? But these proposals seem to me to be aiming to create an atmosphere of being in a sleepy Hampshire village for those in Dulwich Village, while East Dulwich is going to be turned into Camberwell Green in comparison.</li> <li>- You are responding to pressure from wealthy local residents in order to move traffic volume away to areas where people who are less able to mobilise live - you are moving pollution to the poorer areas of the borough</li> <li>- I think this is a hare-brained idea. The whole thing has the feel of a plan to create a gated enclave for the wealthiest part of Southwark so that the rich residents there and the students at the private schools can enjoy a nice environment while the rest of the borough residents who live close by but outside this exclusive and expensive area are shut out and left to lump it.</li> <li>- It seems to me when rich people living in their big house in Dulwich Village whinge about poor air quality and safer roads Southwark Council is happy to disregard the amount of money already spent on that junction in the village and give these people private roads which will only increase the value of their homes. How is that helping the environment? The traffic will only move to someone else's road maybe a less desirable road with less well off occupants who will not have the clout to be heard.</li> </ul>

Council made a mess of the Dulwich Village junction	28	1.35%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The road closures make a lot of sense, but wish this could have been thought about before all the time and money was spent making the ineffectual changes at the Dulwich Village junction.</li> <li>- The increased congestion at Dulwich Village / Calton Avenue / Townley Road junction has been primarily driven by the reconfiguration of the junction and the introduction of the cycle lane and lights. If the objective is to reduce pollution and reduce accidents, improving the flow of vehicles by returning to the previous configuration would be a more sensible solution.</li> <li>- this is going to be a disaster. You thoroughly mucked up the main junction in dulwich village and this is going to create massive rat runs and increasing traffic pollution generally</li> <li>- The junction at Dulwich Village has been extremely badly designed. It is not safe for pedestrians, cyclists or cars. Arguably, traffic is worse in the surrounding areas because of the "road improvements". Stop wasting money.</li> <li>- The junction Southwark redesigned and imposed at Calton/court/ village is a disaster and made things worse. I have zero confidence that Southwark can be trusted to get this right.</li> <li>- Southwark have very recently spent hundreds of thousands of pounds on the Dulwich Village junction and caused months of disruption for residents. I find it extraordinary that you are proposing further expensive works.</li> <li>- I don't understand how this will achieve the results you suggest when the changes to the junction in DV simply caused this problem in the first place.</li> </ul>
Proposals unfairly impact disabled people	25	1.2%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I rely on licensed London taxis to get around as I am a wheelchair user. These road closures will affect my ability to get around. Please let licensed taxis have access.</li> <li>- I drive my disabled daughter to Dulwich Park using Eynella road and this proposal cuts that off for no particular reason.</li> <li>- This ridiculous idea that EVERYONE should cycle or walk, does not take into account those with disabilities nor the elderly.</li> <li>- This will make access to and from the Calton Avenue/Woodwarde Road area very difficult for residents with disabilities. There is no sign that any exception will be made for disabled residents especially where roads are to be blocked off.</li> <li>- The proposal by exclusively focusing on cyclists and pedestrian, ignores the needs of the elderly and disabled who rely of cars or people with cars to pick them up. As a volunteer with Southwark Linkage, I know that this will become a big problem which will only worsen as the population ages.</li> <li>- The enthusiasm for encouraging residents to walk and cycle does not take account of those elderly/disabled residents who are not housebound, wish to live as active a life as possible and need transport, in addition to public transport, to be able to do so. This same group of residents also often needs additional help from others with housework, gardening etc which requires access for cleaners, gardeners at a range of times of day. These proposals will make all these needs much more difficult to address.</li> <li>- These plans discriminate against the disabled. Not everyone has the option to cycle or walk. My wife's quality of life will suffer.</li> </ul>

			<p>- I would need there to be disabled access to the residents parking area so that my wife and I can visit our grandchildren. We tend to come to visit for 7-14 days at a time as we live 4 hours away. My wife is disabled and is unable to use public transport for the journey to London, but we use the bus around the area.</p>
Proposals mean there is no access for school drop-off	25	1.2%	<p>- It will make it almost impossible for me to take my children to school</p> <p>- Your timed closure proposals are also very unfair on parents who drop kids between different schools and home and then various clubs back at schools during your restricted times.</p> <p>- As a resident of Woodwarde Road with young children, I'm concerned about the ability to get my children to school consistently and punctually under the proposals. While I would be happy to contribute to the objectives with active travel when appropriate, I am concerned that the proposals will lengthen the school run journey when a car is necessary and increase pollution.</p> <p>- Bearing in mind the paucity of public bus links to JAGS/JAPS and Alleyn's, I wonder how so many children will be served by public transport, and how many will feel safe cycling from home to the point where they will enter the protected Dulwich area, not to mention how young primary-aged children will get to school by the time all access to these schools has been shut off.</p> <p>- I have no idea how you think the hundreds of parents dropping/picking up children at the 3 independent schools plus other state schools will get to those schools. Plus where will the numerous coaches for the independent schools get to the schools/park?</p> <p>- Many of the journeys you have described are journeys to and from schools in the area, where parents and carers do not have a choice but to drive, due to large amounts of bags the children have to have with them.</p> <p>- This is absolute ridiculous with no consideration given to busy parents who are already struggling get children to different schools and then make their way to work. The impact on this for us are catastrophic as our children are too young to walk or use bicycles.</p>
Proposals unfairly impact elderly people	24	1.16%	<p>- You have forgotten elderly people who need to get to the church in Calton Avenue, either for Sunday services, for marriages or funerals or other activities for elderly held there. Also elderly people with walking difficulties and living in these confines needing to go about their lives for shopping, getting to medical services, etc. and can only go by car or taxi or NHS ambulance services.</p> <p>- Closure to vehicles of DV and Eynella junctions will severely penalise Area B residents, particularly the elderly for whom walking may be less practical.</p> <p>- As usual Southwark Council discriminate against older people in favour of the young. Far better to ban cars on school runs which cause most of the problems with traffic.</p> <p>- Many residents like myself are elderly and cannot cycle or walk very far.</p> <p>- Older residents from Area B will be greatly effected trying to get to Dulwich Village which will be cut off to them.</p>
You should improve	23	1.11%	<p>- engagement with TFL and the train companies to increase public transport alternatives should also be considered.</p>

public transport options			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The lack of public transportation going through Dulwich Village is another serious problem. For those who have mobility issues (or are carrying heavy items (children's cricket bags, instruments, groceries), there are not buses going east and west and only one small bus going north and south through the village. You can't introduce these measures without enhanced public transportation available. How about offering small buses that go down through Burbage Road and onto East Dulwich (perhaps up Calton Avenue (not allowing car traffic on it, but allowing public transport)?</li> <li>- Any traffic reduction needs to be lead by an improved bus service. Dulwich is poorly served from surrounding areas.</li> <li>- The public transport is not good enough to cater for the large number of school children trying to get to schools in a very small area.</li> <li>- These new restrictions can't work without public transport linking area's such as West Norwood and West Dulwich to Dulwich village. It can't be presumed that everyone is able to get on a bike. Working mothers, OAP's and under 5's can't get around like this easily and safely. Without better London transport BEFORE any of these restrictions: other than local residents being happy, all local business will suffer and teachers/employees unable to get into work/school.</li> </ul>
Proposals improve safety for cyclists	21	1.01%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I am particularly pleased with the proposal for Dulwich Village junction. I cycle this way regularly and cyclists coming down Calton Avenue towards the junction are squeezed out by cars and also have to run the gauntlet of cars swinging right into Court Lane from the main Dulwich Village junction. Even though cars are supposed to give way when turning right here, the relatively recent change in road priorities mean drivers are often confused and don't realise that cyclists have right of way. Closing off access to cars will greatly enhance safety for pedestrians and cyclists.</li> <li>- Great to create a safe through route for cycling from Dulwich Park to Peckham rye. Safer routes for on road cycle training.</li> <li>- I am particularly in favour of the Eynella closure. I cycle through here with a disabled person and the fast through traffic is very intimidating. Crossing from either side we have been raced by cars and (going towards Peckham Rye park) overtaken on the blind bend while trying to turn right into Etherow Road.</li> <li>- I do not cycle through the Townley Road and Dulwich Village junctions because they are too dangerous. Cyclists using these junctions are overwhelmingly fit young men. If the cycling demographic is to widen, junctions like these need the sort of management you propose.</li> <li>- We cycle daily with our children in these areas and these measures will make our journey safer and healthier. Be brave!</li> </ul>
Concern about impact on roads such as Dovercourt and Beauval	21	1.01%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I agree with your changes- but I am deeply concerned that you will divert considerable amount of traffic on to my road Dovercourt and Beauval Rd- cutting through from the top access on court lane (at lordship lane) going to townley road. This is probably the most extensive cut through (and in reverse at the other end of the day) on Dovercourt.</li> </ul> <p>These streets are already dangerous- if you do the above proposals I think that you will need to close Dovercourt and Beauval roads at one end each to traffic- otherwise we will have 5 further years of traffic carnage until you realize the mistake.</p>



			<p>- As a resident I notice the increase in traffic during school term time. I agree with the plan to reduce traffic in the area but believe that parents will turn from Lordship Lane into Court lane, into Beauval and Dovercourt Roads to complete the school drop off and collection. I am therefore concerned about the effect on these roads in the morning and evening during term times.</p> <p>- I am concerned that a closure of Townley Road will cause a nightmare scenario on Dovercourt Road. Parents dropping off children at Alleyns might drive up to the north end of Dovercourt Road, let their children out of the car, then attempt a three point turn and drive south down Dovercourt Road. That could cause gridlock with a high impact on the residents of that road.</p> <p>- I am concerned about the impact of these proposals on Dovercourt Road, where I live. I am concerned that traffic will be displaced on to this road leading to a deterioration in the environment, Dovercourt Road is too narrow for lots of traffic. There are already jams when lorries try to use this road.</p>
--	--	--	---

As with subsequent text questions, respondents who disagreed with the proposals were more likely to post substantive comments here, hence the high showing for critical comments here despite the overall popularity of the proposals.

Chief among critical comments were concerns about possible traffic displacement, as well as worries about longer car journeys for residents and difficulties for those needing to drop off or pick up schoolchildren. The needs of elderly and disabled residents were also highlighted – though in some cases these were based on a notion that there would be no car access, or that the scheme expected elderly people to be able to cycle.

Supportive comments identified potential benefits for walking and cycling, especially for schoolchildren, and improvements in air quality and safety.

# Question Four

The area-wide approach includes proposals for timed restricted access (residents and registered users only) on certain streets, in particular Townley Road. If we proceed with timed restrictions, what hours would you prefer these to apply?

## Overall response

Response	Number	% of total
7-9.30 and 3-7.30	642	34.1%
7-10 and 3-8	539	28.6%
7.30-10 and 3.30-8	125	6.6%
Not sure	578	30.7%
	1884	

The preferred time of operation for the timed restrictions (which would apply to Townley Road as well as the other potential permit closures) was 7-9.30 and 3-7.30, though a significant number of respondents supported the maximum closure of 7-10 and 3-8, which would cover the whole period of increased peak travel.

However, a large number of people abstained from this question or gave a 'not sure' response. Many people who were opposed to the principle of timed closure objected to being required to choose a time.

It is important to note that the scheme under consideration here is different to that implemented in practice in summer 2020, which did not include permit access for residents – these results therefore cannot be used to indicate agreement or disagreement with the implemented measure.

# Question Five

Please select your preferred option for each of the following:

## A: Melbourne Grove

Response	Number	% of total
Permeable closure	788	39.3%
No entry northbound	218	10.9%
No change	837	41.8%
Not answered	160	8%
	2003	

	Responses	Permeable closure	No entry	No change
Zone A	142	69.7%	7.7%	21.1%
Zone B	537	30.4%	12.7%	47.3%
Zone C	593	35.2%	13.5%	39.8%
Borders	50	38%	14%	48%
Other	681	43.8%	7.6%	43%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>39.3%</b>	<b>10.9%</b>	<b>41.8%</b>

Two possible options were offered for Melbourne Grove, and responses were accordingly split, with a narrow overall majority for some kind of change. Residents in 'Zone A', which includes Melbourne Grove itself, strongly supported the permeable closure option.

## B: Dulwich Village/College Road/Burbage Road junction

Response	Number	% of total
Timed access closure	1116	55.7%
No change	774	38.6%
Not answered	114	5.7%
	2004	

	Responses	Timed access closure	No change
Zone A	142	59.9%	31%
Zone B	537	45.6%	46.2%
Zone C	593	71.3%	24.5%
Borders	50	46%	54%
Other	682	49.9%	45.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>55.7%</b>	<b>38.6%</b>

There was a clear overall majority in support of the proposed timed camera-controlled permit access at the junction of Dulwich Village with College Road and Burbage Road. However, this is skewed somewhat by strong support from 'Zone C' residents, whereas 'Zone B' residents were much more divided. This reflects the clear aspirations of many Burbage Road residents for a quieter road, and the perception that this was at least a step towards a 'school street' for Dulwich Village.

As above, it is important to note that this proposal is different to the scheme implemented in 2020 as part of the Covid-19 emergency measures, which does not include permit access.

## C: Burbage Road

Response	Number	% of total
Permeable closure	736	36.7%
Southbound only	210	10.5%
No change	932	46.5%
Not answered	125	6.2%
	2003	

	Responses	Permeable	Southbound only	No change
Zone A	143	46.9%	8.4%	34.3%
Zone B	537	25.9%	14.7%	50.7%
Zone C	592	39%	9.6%	46.6%
Borders	50	38%	10%	36%
Other	681	41.1%	8.4%	46.5%
Total	2003	36.7%	10.5%	46.5%

The response on this question was very divided, notably even for residents in 'Zone C' – as indicated in the text responses, many residents of Turney Road and adjacent streets were concerned that a permeable closure on Burbage Road, without something similar on Turney Road, would lead to more traffic on their street.

During the consultation period, there was considerable engagement with the Residents Associations in this area, with the recognition that the proposals put forward did not meet the needs of residents and further options should be explored – many 'Zone C' residents who responded with 'no change' to this and the subsequent question in practice would have favoured a more radical change, such as a permeable closure on Turney Road, and so did not feel able to support the existing proposals.

## D: Turney Road

Response	Number	% of total
No entry north east	850	42.4%
No change	1007	50.3%
Not answered	146	7.3%
	2003	

	Responses	No entry NE	No change
Zone A	142	50%	37.3%
Zone B	537	35.9%	54%
Zone C	593	39.8%	53.1%
Borders	50	42%	54%
Other	681	48.3%	47.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>42.4%</b>	<b>50.3%</b>

There was a clear majority, notably including 'Zone C' itself, against the proposal for a one way access on Turney Road (east of the junction with Burbage Road). As above, however many of those against this proposal instead favoured an alternative proposal for a permeable closure on Turney Road, by the junction with Croxted Road.

## Comments:

Comment type	No.	As % of all respondents	Example quotes
Don't make the changes (generally against)	373	17.98%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- don't change there is not a problem. don't create a problem.</li> <li>- This combination of proposals would make movement around Dulwich Village extremely restricted for residents</li> <li>- Please don't carry out any of the proposals in this consultation</li> <li>- I disagree with all these changes. Not only are you trying to prevent free movement between different parts of London but if all parts of London started clamping down on where we could travel to we would all feel like prisoners. We all have friends, family, work and other interests that make us want to move around freely and let other people come to us . The proposals will completely mess that up.</li> <li>-</li> </ul>
Support for the timed access closure at Dulwich Village	220	10.6%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Timed closure for as long as possible essential to promote healthy travel and reduce air pollution</li> <li>- Dulwich Village is heavily congested in the mornings and I support any measures to reduce traffic in the area.</li> <li>- It is vital that restrictions are put in place on Dulwich Village during school hours i.e. school streets we have four school locations on Dulwich Village alone and with time restrictions are not in place potentially we have even more traffic than before due to the other measures being put in place.</li> <li>- Preventing an increase of traffic (ideally reducing) on Dulwich Village is critical. With the schools and large numbers of children near the road and air quality that is already poor this is an urgent issue that needs to be addressed for the health of children</li> <li>- Although Dulwich Village is a more major road, it is still carrying more traffic than it can really cope with. At times the queues back up for hundreds of metres. So at peak times traffic needs to be discouraged from using this route.</li> <li>- Rather than only being a timed restriction i would prefer for there to be a 24 hour bus gate on college road to prevent through traffic and a permeable filter on Burbage</li> </ul>

			<p>Rd to make it a full time access restriction in both direction. This would provide greater safety for cyclists going to the velodrome - it is ridiculous that access to such a historic cycling site is so poor for cyclists currently.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Dulwich Village could be a really good route for people to get to the various schools by bus, bike or on foot- but currently the high levels of traffic prevent this. It is also ideal for an 'urban island' of calm given the wide streets and visitor numbers. There should definitely be traffic reduction on this street.</li> <li>- This is very important. Without it, there is a serious risk of traffic backing up from the East Dulwich Grove/Red Post Hill junction, which would be idling outside of the primary schools there (JAPS, Village Infants and Dulwich Hamlet).</li> <li>- There are very high levels of through traffic vehicles travelling north on Dulwich Village and Burbage Road already, which need to be addressed in order to create healthy streets for all. These traffic levels will increase even further without mitigation.</li> </ul>
Support for permeable closure on Burbage Road	193	9.3%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Permeable closure essential to promote healthy travel and reduce air pollution.</li> <li>- I'm open to either option here, but have a slight preference for the permeable road closure so that Burbage essentially becomes a cycle/pedestrian path during school hours--this would encourage us and many others with wheels and cycles to travel to school via Burbage--reducing congestion on the pavements along Village Way and Half Moon Lane.</li> <li>- Permeable closure preferred, as it provides a physical barrier to rat running motor traffic, whereas no entry signs can be ignored. Additionally, permeable closures provide more space for pedestrians, planting, and spaces for children to play</li> <li>- removing cars completely from this road will have the greatest effect on improving the health and safety of residents.</li> <li>- A one way closure will still allow cut through traffic, and due to it being one way, traffic speeds will likely increase.</li> <li>- One way streets allow rat running and increase speed. If you are trying to reduce traffic and facilitate safe walking and cycling, then please make sure you do so. A partial scheme could potentially fail.</li> <li>- You consulted on this in the 1980's. It wasn't accepted then. I hope it will be now. There is far too much through traffic on Burbage road. The proposal will result in quieter and healthier streets. The first option will result in extra traffic in Winterbrook and Stradella Roads, and be worse than no change for the residents of those roads.</li> <li>- A permeable closure would have greatest impact on overall traffic reduction in Dulwich Village.</li> </ul>
Support for permeable closure on Melbourne Grove	172	8.29%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Permeable closure essential to promote healthy travel and reduce air pollution.</li> <li>- i think with the changes to townley rd and court lane, a no entry northbound would still result in way too much southbound traffic</li> <li>- Removing cars completely from this road will have the greatest effect on air quality, noise pollution and road</li> </ul>

			<p>safety (especially for children) encouraging active transport and thus improving the health of residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- one way systems (which is what a no-entry would be) can speed up commuter traffic albeit only in one direction.</li> <li>- Much as this would irritate me personally (I live on Melbourne Grove - why should my few car journeys become longer because other people insist on using their cars all the time), I think this is the only way to reduce the use of this road.</li> <li>- It has to be permeable closure as one way will still allow cut through traffic.</li> <li>- The permeable is the best option as one way won't improve traffic and will take away from the intent of the initiative and proposal.</li> <li>- An effective one-way system by introducing only a no-entry in one direction could encourage drivers travelling in the allowed direction to speed.</li> </ul>
Support for North-East closure on Turney Road	121	5.83%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This proposal would be much improved if it applied to the whole of Turney Road, not just one section - so No entry northeast bound between Croxed Road and Dulwich Village would be better.</li> <li>- I think the presence of the schools makes this a reasonable option</li> <li>- I support no entry northeast so as to reduce traffic, but I think that a permeable road closure would have more of an impact.</li> <li>- Again, this will a) influence people's behaviour by making car usage less desirable and b) will immediately traffic flow. Both are needed. Very keen on this.</li> <li>- This will significantly help reduce the air pollution and traffic close to the schools at the top of Turney Rd.</li> <li>- Would value less traffic around the school and village but not sure best way to achieve this</li> <li>- This stretch of road is busy with school children heading to Dulwich Village and so a reduction of motor traffic is important.</li> <li>- This is needed to reduce northbound through traffic on Dulwich Village. However, given that there are no southbound restrictions proposed for Dulwich Village, additional mitigating measures are required on Turney Road to deal with the high levels of traffic in both directions am and pm.</li> <li>- As a resident I'm very keen to include Turney Rd in these proposals. Road use and pollution is increasing.</li> </ul>
Proposal for permeable closure on Turney Road	105	5.06%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Traffic should be restricted in BOTH directions on Turney Road. The traffic during peak hours is already too high for the road. It is supposed to be a cycle quietway</li> <li>- A permeable closure here. This change will stop northbound traffic, but still allow southbound. This is part of the Quietway 7 route and filtering would greatly improve this bit.</li> <li>- As a Turney road resident, I would be concerned that the west end of Turney would become very congested, however, and basically a parking lot for those who can't drive all the way to the village. I would be in favour of restrictions along whole of Turney rd.</li> <li>- I do feel that residents would also want to consider restrictions on entry into Turney nearer to Croxed Road</li> </ul>

			<p>and would support this, if it were supported by residents of Turney.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- But i would prefer our end of Turney to be closed to stop us getting all the traffic. I walk to school every day and the traffic is already bad, and it will get worse if we don't take action.</li> <li>- I would like Turney Road to be closed like Burbage, otherwise we will get worse traffic.</li> <li>- I do not understand why you give only one feeble change option for Turney Road. This makes a mockery of your claim to an "Area-Wide" approach, since even with this option, Turney Road will be blighted even further by traffic displaced by the other, welcome changes suggested, especially those for Dulwich Village and Burbage Road. I think you should consult on a permeable closure of Turney Road under the bridge near Croxted Road- a measure I would definitely support.</li> <li>- Close Turney Road in both directions during peak hours. It is a cycle quietway and very dangerous as it is. Your proposals will only make it worse if you do not include Turney Road in your proposals. It it an accident waiting to happen.</li> <li>- A closure of Turney Road at the railway bridge is a much better option.</li> </ul>
Support for North-East closure on Melbourne Grove	58	2.8%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Two way traffic in this road is currently an issue with incident of road rage. The No Entry restriction would improve this.</li> <li>- This is a narrow road needing one way traffic if parking on both sides to continue</li> <li>- The road has become narrower since the parking on the pavement was stopped some years ago. One direction would work well</li> <li>- I think if you have a permeable closure of Melbourne Grove, the same traffic will simply move onto either/both of the adjoining roads - Derwent Grove and/or Elsie Road. They will experience the same traffic problems and therefore in my opinion having Melbourne Road one way makes more sense and therefore reduce traffic on Melbourne and not create the same situation on the adjoining roads.</li> <li>- I would have timed access no entry consistent with commuter and school hours. Its the residents we are trying to protect without massively inconveniencing.</li> </ul>
Support for Southbound only on Burbage Road	54	2.6%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The biggest problem with Burbage Road appears to be commuters using it to travel into town in the morning, so closing it northbound would definitely help.</li> <li>- I think that this one way system is a better solution. Effectively halving the traffic, so the amount of traffic finding an alternative route is less than with road closures.</li> <li>- Agreed need to cut down through traffic so one way is acceptable solution.</li> <li>- I would not have any barriers on Burbage Road but have timed access restrictions for commuters north and south. On this basis residents and support services, including elderly services Southwark, ambulances are not cut off.</li> <li>- Permeable closure south of Stradella does not work as it sends all of the Premier Plant lorries and all traffic for the sports club past the majority of the houses. There has</li> </ul>



			to be a solution for the North section of Burbage Road per ny comments above so my preference is fr the Southbound only.
Support Melbourne closure because it eliminates through traffic	52	2.51%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Melbourne Grove has long suffered from being used as a short-cut by vehicles that want to avoid the stop lights and slower traffic of Lordship Lane.</li> <li>- Anything to reduce the rat-run traffic which blights these streets is most welcome</li> <li>- I live on Melbourne Grove and am concerned about the speed at which vehicles drive along the road. it is also very busy so I would definitely support measures to reduce use of my street as a cut through.</li> <li>- We live on Melbourne Grove, this road is already used as a cut-through by too much traffic and the situation will deteriorate when the other proposed measures are implemented.</li> <li>- Melbourne Grove is currently used as a cut through by both cars and larger vehicles. This often leads to gridlock as lorries and cars struggle to get through the narrow parts of the road. This also negatively impacts the air quality on the road, with vehicles often static with engines running. Permeable closure would address this issue and there are more suitable routes available for the traffic to use instead.</li> <li>- We have lived here for 40 years and long wanted this to happen. The traffic has always been a problem but it is much much worse now.</li> </ul>
Concern Burbage closure will lead to displaced traffic	48	2.31%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Currently there are 3 ways that traffic can reach half moon lane going north, ie Burbage Rd, Winterbrook and Stradella Rd, Burbage Rd being the widest and having a pedestrian crossing. Closing Burbage rd Northbound will displace the traffic into Stradella and Winterbrook Rd.</li> <li>- Closing Burbage road to through traffic will increase overall congestion in the area.</li> <li>- You will merely relocate traffic to the few available other streets, thus causing more traffic jams, longer journey times and more pollution for others.</li> <li>- Northbound traffic will be displaced along Turney/Corxted, creating greater traffic at the junction of Norwood Road and Croxted Road.</li> <li>- I have never found Burbage Road noticeably busy - closing part of the road off to vehicles seems bound to increase traffic on Half Moon Lane and lead to greater congestion both at the junction with Herne Hill and on entry to Dulwich Village from Half Moon Lane</li> <li>- A closure on Burbage will increase traffic on Turney in the afternoon as it will come down Dulwich Village and right into Turney at the lights and come along Turney to Croxted Road.</li> </ul>
Concern Melbourne Grove closure will lead to displaced traffic	44	2.12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This will lead to traffic displacement. I fear it will be a zer-sum game. Our public transport is not reliable.</li> <li>- When you push all motorized traffic on to main roads only you create unnecessary congestion and air quality issues. These are public roads and should be available for use.</li> <li>- as someone who regularly cannot get my children to school on to the buses up Lordship Lane due to overcrowding already, forcing additional traffic onto Lordship Lane instead of Melbourne Grove is going to be</li> </ul>

			<p>an absolute disaster in terms of further overcrowding of buses, traffic jams and therefore longer journeys, to say nothing of the pollution for Lordship Lane, which has high footfall and is surrounded by schools (Goose Green, Heber, Harris etc).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Whilst the measures will help the designated areas they will only displace all the problems to areas immediately surrounding. This will cause overloading of those areas which will get a sudden increase and a worsening of pollution/traffic delays.</li> <li>- Cutting off access to East Dulwich Grove via Melbourne Grove will simply drive ALL traffic through Lordship Lane (already heavily congested) and its junction with East Dulwich Grove (already a nightmare).</li> <li>- If traffic restrictions are introduced in Melbourne Grove there will be overflow traffic into adjacent streets Derwent Grove and Elsie Rd. These streets have very high traffic levels also and any extra traffic will make them even more dangerous and with higher levels of pollution. If traffic is restricted in Melbourne Grove it also needs to be restricted in Derwent Grove and Elsie Rd so that these streets don't suffer even higher traffic volume.</li> </ul>
Concern Dulwich Village timed access will lead to displaced traffic	38	1.83	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It would significantly impact traffic in other areas. Parking restrictions within Dulwich Village have already caused additional problems, as has the new traffic light system in Dulwich Village at the junction with Turney Road.</li> <li>- Any restrictions will just make the traffic so much worse on neighbouring roads. Burbage Road is not a problem area as it is.</li> <li>- By tampering with everything you will create rat runs down tiny residential roads. Traffic is like water - it will find a way</li> <li>- Where will the traffic go if not through this area? It will again mean either using the south circular, which is already far too busy (it can take upward of 20mins to get from the college road intersection to London road on the s circular as it is) or having to go around to crized road, down to brockwell park and through herne hill and into east dulwich grove, also already far too busy. These measures will not stop people and families using their cars!! They will only mean being more creative and taking longer routes to where we need to go. These measures will only punish dulwich residents, not make life easier for just a few of them.</li> <li>- Timed restrictions would be a significant inconvenience for both local and through traffic, with the knock on effect of creating "rat runs" elsewhere</li> </ul>
Concern Turney Road measures will lead to displaced traffic	37	1.78%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Potentially worth looking at but I think you may end up forcing traffic along Pickwick, Aysgarth and Boxall Roads instead if they need to access Turney Road from Dulwich Village. Resident Only permeability would work</li> <li>- I think that would add volume of traffic in the village, with knock on effects at S Circular junctions (college rd/ gallery road).</li> <li>- All these changes will make the lives of local residents so much harder; and affect the shops. It will drive traffic onto Croxted Road, my road, and made the health of the residents here worse.</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I am concerned about more traffic on half moon lane which might result from this. Please could we close half moon lane to traffic, or at least add a cycle lane on the north side and any other car and bus reducing measures.</li> <li>- Traffic using Turney Road to get towards Lordship Lane will go where? It will NOT disappear.</li> <li>- Again, this will just redirect traffic down alternative roads including East Dulwich Grove and the South Circular, as well as small roads which are not designed for large amounts of traffic. I do not see any problem with this road in its current state.</li> </ul>
Proposal to close access to Dulwich Village both ways	30	1.45%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I support a 24-hr bus gate at College Rd and a permeable filter at Burbage Road junction to make this a full-time restriction. It should be in both directions also to prevent southbound traffic in the area. Important to protect the children at schools on Dulwich Village.</li> <li>- Ideally Dulwich Village should be cyclists and pedestrians only with exception of public transport (P4)</li> <li>- Dulwich Village should become a pedestrian area completely to provide safety for school children, visitors and residents.</li> <li>- Need an option for full closure at all times!</li> <li>- I would prefer a school street outside Dulwich Village Infants School because I would prefer fewer cars and less pollution as I get to school.</li> </ul>
Proposal to make the camera-controlled closure on Dulwich Village 24/7	21	1.01%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Please make this 24/7.</li> <li>- Would like to see consideration of 24 hours or some other way to reduce traffic for 24 hours.</li> <li>- Again...for these changes to start to allow significant mode share change they should be 24/7 rather than timed.</li> <li>- Should go further not just timed access restriction but permanent ban to through traffic</li> </ul>
Opposed to Melbourne Grove measures (no detailed explanation)	21	1.01%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The council have already squandered tens of thousands of pounds trying to implement a barrier on Melbourne Grove, and time and again residents have rejected these proposals.</li> <li>- Don't change anything. Try to come up with something a bit more inventive than closing a huge part of the borough to traffic.</li> <li>- This is not likely to affect me much, but in general my view is that closing roads is likely to make it harder for deliveries and removals to occur, disrupts existing social networks (thereby frustrating the aim of promoting a safer and healthier environment if healthier is deemed to include mental health) and inconveniences local residents or those coming to visit them. Such closures should therefore be avoided unless there is clear logic to the contrary.</li> <li>- The residents of East Dulwich have already roundly rejected a CPZ in the most popular consultation in Southwark's history. To impose restrictions on Melbourne Grove - an area of dense housing, social housing with little or no off street parking - would be really unfair as it would be as a consequence of improving a less dense and already more privileged area.</li> <li>- You have to allow some sort of route west for East Dulwich residents!</li> <li>- Melbourne Grove is fine as it is.</li> </ul>

Support Burbage Road closure because it will improve air quality	20	0.96%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- As a resident of Burbage Road, with three small children who walk to school, nursery and nearby amenities I am acutely aware of the pollution on the road and the inability of my children to cycle safely on their own street because the road has become a congested commuter run. Frankly, these measures are the minimum required for their safety, and residents' health.</li> <li>- I live on Burbage Road and regularly witness dangerous driving (excessive speed, overtaking). The smell of exhaust fumes during peak hours is constant. Not safe and not healthy.</li> <li>- This is essential for Burbage road traffic / pollution to not dramatically increase and exceed all pollution levels.</li> <li>- Living on Burbage Road (close to the site of the permeable road closure) I'd appreciate the difference this would make for air quality and levels of traffic on the street.</li> <li>- I am worried my road is getting too busy and noisy with traffic. My brother has asthma and I don't want it to get worse with the pollution.</li> </ul>
Support Melbourne Grove closure because it promotes walking and cycling	18	0.87%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In the absence of road pricing the only way to encourage people to walk, cycle and use public transport rather than drive is to reduce the space motor vehicles can park &amp; drive. A permeable closure reduces the space for motor vehicles more than one way working.</li> <li>- Access for cyclists is crucial to reduce road traffic. Making local cycling safer will encourage people to cycle rather than drive for short trips.</li> <li>- This would encourage walking pedestrian and cyclists. Safe cycling storage will also help.</li> <li>- The permeable closure should encourage cyclists and pedestrians to use Melbourne Grove as an alternative to Lordship Lane, when heading northwards (e.g. to ED Charter School).</li> </ul>
Opposed to Burbage Road measures	17	0.82%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This is insane. Burbage Road isn't even a problem compared to Dulwich Village.</li> <li>- not much traffic on Burbage Road and it's a wide road</li> <li>- I do not think that the traffic in Burbage Road is excessive</li> <li>- It is not clear that there is a material issue that needs addressing with further restrictions.</li> <li>- This road is wide and always passable, even when double parked. Inconsiderate cyclists riding 2 and 3 abreast are a bigger problem.</li> </ul>
Opposed to Turney Road measures	17	0.82%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This proposal would prohibit attendance at the sports clubs for many members and make them financially unviable.</li> <li>- With two children, at different childcare places within the Turney Road and Dulwich Village area, this specific closure would result in a considerably slower and more difficult drop off/pick up. We do not have the luxury of spending hours each day collecting and dropping off our kids.</li> <li>- Are you people crazy, this will make every thing worse.</li> <li>- One way traffic is likely to result in speed increases creating increased danger for children and other vulnerable road users.</li> <li>- Closing roads because they are busy is not a solution.</li> </ul>

			- I am dependent on being able to access Turney Road for my local nursery. These changes will likely put them out of business - This would only make Turney Road traffic even worse with continuous traffic westwards
--	--	--	--

Responses to this text question mostly reflected local concerns from particular streets – notably a strong desire from many Melbourne Grove residents to see measures to cut out through traffic, and a similar aspiration from residents on and around Turney Road.

Although a significant minority argued against any change, or did not see the need for change, most comments were about the degree of change, and how to avoid changes in one location having a negative impact elsewhere.

## Question 6

Do you regularly experience difficulty parking on your road?

Response	Number	% of total
Yes	624	32%
No	966	49.6%
Not sure	61	3.1%
Not applicable (i.e. no car)	296	15.2%
	1947	

Question 6 & 7 were exploratory questions ahead of a future potential consultation on parking controls, and were not intended to demonstrate assent to any such proposal. Notably, most car owners did not experience significant difficulties parking.

## Question 7

Would you support parking controls that complement the proposed traffic reduction measures?

	Responses	Yes	No
Zone A	138	69.6%	21%
Zone B	532	51.7%	35.3%
Zone C	588	65.3%	20.1%
Borders	49	59.2%	34.7%
Other	659	53.4%	36.1%
Total	1966	57.8%	30%

Perhaps surprisingly, despite the response to question 6, a significant majority of responses to question 7 indicated support for controlled parking – though it is to be noted that this was proposed in the context of the discussed permit access scheme.

Comment type	No.	As % of all respondents	Example quotes
Support controlled parking	338	16.29%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I would support parking controls over any road closures. These alone will reduce traffic (and therefore improve safety and pollution) while still allowing local residents to move freely.</li> <li>- I have particular issues with motorists who park in front of my entrance in Dulwich Village to buy coffees at the shops or, worse still, meals at the restaurants. Controlled parking and white lines in front of residents' entrances would remedy this.</li> <li>- I think to prevent destination parking in peak hours this makes sense but as a family area with lots of family visitors it would be nice to be able to accommodate that off peak</li> <li>- Living on Townley Road I find it increasingly difficult to park especially during term times!! Restrictions should be imposed.</li> <li>- I absolutely support parking restrictions, paid-for parking (as introduced in Southwark Parks recently), CPZ and a gradual reduction in parking places in favour of bicycle parking, extra public space (seating, planters etc).</li> <li>- very much so and CPZ is LONG over due. especially now Southwark are introducing charges to parking in the Parks and cars will park in Burbage road now making it even more congested.</li> <li>- I do not live in the area, but travel there for school and properly enforced parking controls would stop people driving to school and parking there all day, plus hopefully unnecessary pick up and drop offs.</li> <li>- If parking controls will deter commuters from parking and walking to stations, and deter parents from parking to drop off children, then they are a necessary measure.</li> </ul>
Controlled parking not needed	196	9.45%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- As someone who used to live on Trossachs Road, I never had any difficulty parking my car within a two minute walk of my house at any time. Nor did any of my neighbours.</li> <li>- I don't believe in privatising public space in this way. I believe it encourages car ownership. I would rather see general measures to reduce vehicle numbers in the area.</li> <li>- Again, residents in this area have rejected Tooley Street's relentless campaign to impose controlled parking zones on its residents. Give it up. We don't want it.</li> <li>- Why should residents have to pay for permits to be able to park on the road they live on?</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There are plenty of spaces to park on Townley Road as most of it is alongside the playing fields. There are very few houses along Townley Road.</li> <li>- It's absolutely fine the way it is!</li> <li>- The implementation of these proposals will CAUSE the parking problems. Currently parking is NOT difficult in most roads.</li> <li>- the ONLY time it is difficult to park on our road is when there is an 'open day' / school event on at Jags or Alleyns OR a fair in Dulwich Park.</li> <li>- Parking restrictions would only cause issues in other areas. The current parking works well for local businesses and school users.</li> </ul>
Not sure about controlled parking	61	2.94%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I do not want parking restrictions. However with all your proposed changes, it may become impossible to park, and therefore we would need them.</li> <li>- It depends on the traffic reduction measures. It is these that are important.</li> <li>- I am neutral about parking controls</li> <li>- I would like to see how the introduction of charges in Dulwich Park impacts our street and review in 6-12 months.</li> <li>- Everything would depend on changes in traffic patterns. It may be that some controls will be needed, but this question cannot be easily answered just yet.</li> <li>- In favour potentially but subject to more clarity on what is envisaged, e.g. number of cars allowed per household (should be restricted), arrangements for visitors (a non-bureaucratic and effective system is needed, e.g. electronic register), strict rules on any non-resident exceptions - for example a big problem in Beauval Road (Townley end) is due to Alleyns school and especially the health clinic on Townley where people (and nurses) drive rather than use public transport. A restriction of say 12-2pm would be of limited value for example. Whether a CPZ is acceptable also depends on cost, which should be kept to a minimum for permanent residents and cost</li> <li>- Maybe if it becomes a problem for people after we have seen it work</li> </ul>
Support controlled parking because it prevents commuter parking	48	2.31%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Calton avenue has become increasingly the destination for non-resident to park, due to its close vicinity to shops, restaurants and school. The street was designed to have on street parking sufficient for resident who do not have a parking garage. Parking controls ensure the parking is for people who reside on the street, and reduce traffic who comes here to look for a parking space. If they know there is no parking space for them, they will naturally find another way to make their journey.</li> <li>- People driving and parking near the station adds to traffic. Limited lunchtime restrictions would reduce these "commuter parkers" whilst still allowing people to be able to access local businesses</li> <li>- Commuters from outside the area use Dulwich as a free car park. Parking controls would reduce this commuter traffic, and free up spaces for residents and local shoppers.</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I agree that people park in the area to then take the train into the city and support parking restrictions. They are already in place in some areas in herne hill and I think they do work</li> <li>- A CPZ is critical. The area is blighted by commuter parking which is also the cause of much of the traffic. This traffic would not register as through traffic on your survey because it stays longer than 15 minutes but it is nonetheless outside traffic using Dulwich as a car park. The heavy parking also makes walking and cycling more dangerous.</li> </ul>
Don't charge for parking	33	1.59%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Yes I would but I don't think it should be chargeable. Control the traffic but don't make it an excuse for revenue raising</li> <li>- Absolutely do not support the action that local residents have to pay for parking permits because of non residents coming into the area for one of the many schools</li> <li>- I am utterly furious at this prospect of permits. Living in Pickwick Rd. it is just a way of making more money from residents. If you paid more attention to keeping the streets clean instead of this war on the cars it would be a blessing</li> <li>- I don't support them but if they go ahead anyway I would want the resident parking to be free. This plan should not cost residents money!</li> <li>- My one concern with parking restrictions concerns the fees that the Council would charge for resident parking permits. I have lived in other areas where permit requirements were introduced. The fees were over £100 p.a., essentially a tax on residents out of proportion to the costs of administering the scheme.</li> <li>- The trouble with parking permits of course is that they generate income for Southwark council, rather than just looking at the parking interest of residents. Why not offer VERY low cost parking for residents. It seems the only way the council want to help is by charging residents more!</li> <li>- Any proposal to charge households in Dekker, Desenfans, Druce and Dovercourt roads £125 per annum for a permit to park their vehicles in their own streets would amount to a punitive tax in addition to council tax and parking charges in Dulwich and Belair parks. I repeat - I AM OPPOSED TO THE INTRODUCTION OF SUCH PERMIT CHARGES.</li> </ul>
Controlled parking is bad for businesses	31	1.49%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bad for local businesses</li> <li>- Residents rejected Controlled Parking zones. Why are you trying to bring this in through the backdoor. Having free parking does mean more non-residents parking in the area. But the upside of this is that they support local shops, cafes, cinema which are then on our doorstep!</li> <li>- Parking controls are promoted as a method of making streets greener but are of course a method of raising money for the council. They will also severely damage the local businesses in East Dulwich, especially small independent ones already crippled by business rents.</li> <li>- Parking controls will make life more difficult for the shops and restaurants in Dulwich Village.</li> </ul>



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I've lived here for 12 years and managed up till now! It would affect business on a Lordship Lane if parking restrictions are introduced in nearby roads.</li> <li>- A CPZ will have a detrimental effect on local businesses. Maybe that is the Council's long term objective, drive out the small businesses and let the multi-nationals move in - perhaps with a financial incentive for planning permission; certainly with higher business rates which can then be used for council employees benefits and pensions.</li> <li>- It was clear from the previous CPZ proposals that we are not in favour of increased parking controls in East Dulwich. I strongly believe that a CPV would adversely affect local shops and restaurants and have a negative impact on the local area.</li> </ul>
Controlled parking just displaces parking	27	1.30%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Townley road is already totally parked up and without the schools making provision for their staff's parking plus the canyons of coaches that bus children in. So parking controls will simply displace that parking.</li> <li>- The alternative is people parking in another residential area slightly further away. They won't leave their cars at home, they will just park somewhere else.</li> <li>- Putting in parking restrictions again does not solve the parking issue just moves it on to the next area where there are no parking restrictions.</li> <li>- Any restriction on parking will just move the problem to surrounding roads, which will cause increased congestion and pollution.</li> <li>- all you do with parking controls is displace the problem and create a problem elsewhere.</li> <li>- Such controls will simply divert parking onto other roads.</li> </ul>
Controlled parking improves access for residents	25	1.2%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Already car users park on the road very inconsiderately, often partially blocking my driveway. I can foresee parents cars trying to do lots of U turns in the road which will be dangerous.</li> <li>- We need resident parking in Court Lane and through the rest of Dulwich Village. These streets are often taken over by commuters who are not residents here, but dropping off children, bringing more traffic into this area. We also have a very high level of street crime and introducing parking controls will reduce crime significantly because it will be harder for outsiders to come here to commit their offenses.</li> <li>- Commuters from outside the area use Dulwich as a free car park. Parking controls would reduce this commuter traffic, and free up spaces for residents and local shoppers.</li> <li>- It is ridiculous that our road is always jam packed to bursting with cars, as are streets around. As you say, this will get worse with other measures being introduced. I feel strongly that we need parking permits for residents.</li> <li>- My Mum and Dad have more and more trouble parking near our house as so many people come to park in our street. I see them parking and then walking to East Dulwich station each morning when I</li> </ul>

			<p>go to school. It would be better if these commuters didn't park in our streets and I was disappointed that the CPZ didn't come to our area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It will hopefully mean that we can park near my house.</li> <li>- There should be parking controls to reduce streets becoming a destination for parking (especially next to new permeable closures/restrictions) and so that local residents who need to park can park</li> </ul>
Controlled parking promotes healthy travel	23	1.11%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I currently have car which I use for the odd trip. More preventative measures might make me reconsider owning a car: especially if one could be rented nearby easily.</li> <li>- Anything that discourages people from driving is good.</li> <li>- Reducing the space people can park in discourages car use and encourages people to walk, cycle and use public transport.</li> <li>- Also, the availability of parking spaces encourages car use and ownership: removing parking encourages more sustainable shared car and car hire schemes and reduces unnecessary car ownership, and encourages active travel.</li> <li>- Discouraging car use is essential to achieving the aims of the project and I support it even it if results in some personal inconvenience to my family.</li> <li>- Parked cars make things difficult for cyclists and harder for pedestrians.</li> </ul>
Controlled parking helps reduce congestion	21	1.01%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Parking controls are essential along Calton Avenue. Not only is the road clogged up but entry to residents off street parking is often blocked as well causing chaos.</li> <li>- People drive short distances in Dulwich Village, and often park badly and dangerously. All measures possible need to be used, together and in a concerted manner, to limit motor traffic in Dulwich Village.</li> <li>- Yes I support the proposals to reduce the terrible pollution and traffic build up on court lane but equally I don't want this beautiful road to be a car park for those who won't be able to drive further into the village.</li> <li>- Parking controls are a great way to reduce overall traffic. I whole heartedly support parking restrictions as a way to reduce overall traffic.</li> <li>- Yes Dulwich has become a car park and I fully support the implementation of CPZ in the area. It will help reduce congestion in the area</li> </ul>
Suggestion to bring in parking controls to cover the whole area	19	0.92%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Parking controls would have to cover the whole area to ensure parking is not just pushed to other roads. Burbage and Turney Road need parking restrictions too</li> <li>- I would support parking controls if they were bought in ALL the areas around JAGS and Alleyns (ie. at least 250m in all directions) in order to prevent teachers and sixth formers driving to school and parking in the streets during term time.</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- As long as it is done in a holistic fashion. There is no point displacing traffic to other roads within the village. It needs to include all roads.</li> <li>- Parking controls should be implemented on all streets in the discussion area if at all ; there is no point addressing a problem that then just moves slightly.</li> </ul>
Suggestion that permits should be for residents and businesses only	19	0.92%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Yes support parking controls and permits should be restricted to local residents and businesses only. Otherwise permits will be purchased and congestion will remain the same.</li> <li>- Residents and visitors should be allowed to park on the street at Turney Road without restriction. Permits should be issued. Parking commuters should be prevented</li> <li>- parking should only be for residents and for those visiting local shops (short term) and there should be parking restrictions to stop commuters using the streets as storage for their vehicles</li> <li>- Residents' parking only in the area</li> <li>- Any parking control scheme has to include resident parking priority.</li> </ul>
Need controlled parking in 'Area A'	17	0.82%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Yes - particularly around the area towards the South of Melbourne Grove &amp; Townley Road.</li> <li>- We live on Melbourne Grove south and regularly experience difficulty parking due to commuters parking on the street to use the station as well as Lordship Lane shoppers. This will only be exacerbated when the Melbourne Grove north parking is restricted.</li> <li>- Yes, parking is a huge problem on our street as it is used by commuters and shoppers. This will only increase when the restrictions on North Melbourne Grove are implemented later this year. It increases pollution and reduces safety on the street.</li> <li>- We were all really disappointed that Melbourne Grove South was not included in the recent parking controls. My family can never park near our house - we see people parking and walking down to the station every day. I am worried that if only the plans for area B are implemented, the parking will get even worse</li> </ul>
Controlled parking helps deter school drop off and pick up	13	0.63%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Parking controls might be preferable to road restrictions as this will cut down local commuters and school run traffic. - especially coaches!</li> <li>- Parking controls yes. Traffic restrictions no. Get the schools drivers dropping kids off to walk or public transport. I'd be interested to know the volume of traffic the private schools generate. As I'm sure people travel from far.</li> <li>- I do not support the traffic reduction measures. But I think introducing a CPZ into the area would be a good idea and would avert the need for these more drastic proposals as it would discourage all the private school parents from driving their children to school</li> <li>- If there is a permeable road closure in Burbage Road, it is important that no part of Burbage Road becomes a parking lot for school drop offs. The</li> </ul>

			intention is to reduce traffic bringing children to school (which requires improving alternative ways for children to get to school). That means making it impractical to park for drop off as well as reducing road access.
Need controlled parking on Turney Road	12	0.58%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Also it is really important to consider parking controls on the whole extent of Turney Road up to Croxted Road, not just that part between Dulwich Village and Burbage Road. I live on Turney Road in the section between Burbage Road and Croxted Road. It is extremely busy already and the Phase 3 proposals will make it busier with parents trying to use our section of the road as a drop off. This would make it less safe for pedestrians and cyclists and life harder for the residents. Already car users park on the road very inconsiderately, often partially blocking my driveway. I can foresee parents cars trying to do lots of U turns in the road which will be dangerous. Parking controls here (or extension of Phase 3 controls) should be considered essential and then properly enforced.</li> <li>- Restricting parking on Turney Road would make it safer for cyclists and pedestrians - especially school children.</li> <li>- During the working week many vehicles (cars, taxis, vans) are left parked on Turney Road all day to be replaced by those parked all night while their drivers commute from/to North Dulwich and Herne Hill stations.</li> <li>- We would support resident permit holders on Turney Road and/or restrictions between 12 and 2pm as is in place in surrounding road. This measure would discourage commuter parking and non-residents dumping cars in the road for extended periods.</li> </ul>
Make controlled parking lunchtimes only to deter commuter parking	12	0.58%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A simple two hour restriction, as on Burbage, Village Way, etc. is all that is needed</li> <li>- if you wish to control parking by commuters do it only for one hour in the middle of the day.</li> <li>- Sensible parking controls (such as 12-2pm similar to Herne Hill) can prevent commuter parking but still allow community parking for shopping in the middle of the day.</li> <li>- Preference would be controlled parking between 12 and 2pm. Only can be paid by coins and not by phone or apps .Free parking at the weekend.</li> <li>- I do not because Southwark will put in 'all day' parking restrictions. If it's 12-2pm I would agree.</li> <li>- Possibly between the hours of 12 noon and 2 pm as neighbouring streets, to stop commuters parking all day and non residents leaving their cars for long periods at a time.</li> </ul>
Work with schools on parking issues	12	0.58%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The issue has to be dealt with in partnership with local schools as the school related traffic/parking will need to be redirected to other roads unless schools are held accountable for influencing the behaviours of the families that enter these roads for access to local schools.</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Alleyns school should be made/encouraged to provide additional parking for teachers' (and pupils') cars.</li> <li>- It has improved in terms of private school's coaches sitting their with their engines on, but it still happens - why isn't this policed and fines given out. Also what plans are in place to encourage the parents of private school children to use their cars less, as this is a major source of congestion during term times?</li> <li>- Also need some "carrot" scheme to encourage the private school kids not to drive or be driven.</li> </ul>
Support controlled parking because it improves air quality	9	0.43%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I don't have a car and walk everywhere so I would like to see measures to persuade others to do this and improve air quality</li> <li>- We would like residential parking. These kind of parking controls also reduce the number of cars coming into our street. parking controls are another way of reducing pollution,</li> <li>- I live on Calton Ave. I am tired of people parking over my drive or obstructing entry to my house. I'm tired of people stalling whilst waiting for school children. I'm tired of all the through-traffic. Air quality in our area falls far short of WHO guidelines/measures. We need to address this now, it's affecting all of us - but especially the younger people in our society. Their lung development is disproportionately affected and the damage is irreparable</li> </ul>
Concern about issues for older people receiving visitors	7	0.34%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It also makes it difficult for people to visit. I'm an older person and visitors will be become increasingly important as I grow older.</li> <li>- Parking restrictions disincentivise individuals from visiting and interacting with local residents. This seems undesirable to me in the context of an ageing population from a social cohesion (and social care) perspective.</li> <li>- For those who wish to access the shops park and gallery - a large percent of visitors are of pension age - this activity would be more curtailed as many are unable to walk long distances and public transport may not be easy from where they live.</li> </ul>
Issues for tradespeople and deliveries	7	0.34%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strongly support CPZ across the whole area, but provision must be made for short-term parking to help traders.</li> <li>- I don't understand how non-car owners without permits would be able to have visitors (including blue badge holders) who come by car or how a builder or plumber would be able to park outside while they did work.</li> <li>- We have a lot of deliveries and workmen working on houses in the area. These trades will still come into the area, but will park in more inconvenient places if parking controls are put in place.</li> <li>- The main sufferers from parking controls will be local residents with visitors, deliveries, workmen etc.</li> </ul>

Perceptions of the value of and need for controlled parking varied from street to street – some streets experience high volumes of commuter parking, or school drop-off and pick-up parking, whereas others are typically quiet. The arguments expressed here are typical of those raised whenever controlled parking is debated in areas across Southwark – notably most of the discussion is focused on the parking control itself, and not on the potential linkage with a permit scheme for resident access to the roads.

## Question 8

What difficulties do you think there will be if the proposed measures are implemented?

Comment type	No.	As % of all respondents	Example quotes
Displacement of traffic	391	18.84%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The traffic will just be pushed back to other areas who will then suffer exactly the same issues.</li> <li>- Increased volume of traffic and congestion on Dulwich Village, College Road, Lordship Lane, East Dulwich Grove and Half Moon Lane.</li> <li>- risk of displaced traffic creating problems elsewhere. so restrict motor vehicles in these areas too</li> <li>- All traffic would be pushed to surrounding roads leading to gridlock. At the moment, at least the traffic is spread out because there are multiple routes.</li> <li>- Traffic displacement to other areas, Dulwich village might be quieter and more pleasant, but residents in surrounding areas will be disproportionately negatively affected for no overall benefit.</li> <li>- While the goal may be to increase walking and cycling, some of the traffic will be forced to go elsewhere so roads like Lordship Lane, the A205 and East Dulwich Grove / Half Moon Lane will probably get busier. But maybe that will deter people from driving unnecessarily!</li> <li>- Traffic will increase on the south circular</li> <li>- I live on Tintagel Crescent and although I am in favour of any measure to reduce car use and pollution I would be concerned about any increase in car journeys made in the roads further north between East Dulwich Grove / Grove Vale / Lordship Lane. I strongly favour extending the traffic reducing measures to this area as well.</li> <li>- The roads where the traffic will be forced onto will become increasingly congested and dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists.</li> <li>- Probably more motor vehicle traffic on Croxted Road &amp; through Dulwich Village.</li> <li>- Traffic would be displaced into the main Roads. I live on Lordship Lane near the Eyenella junction. I fear we would suffer much more traffic and worse pollution.</li> </ul>

General negative (no specific reason given)	215	10.36%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Massively negative at All locations.</li> <li>- Chaos! complete waste of time and money.</li> <li>- These proposals will make living here a nightmare for parents and business. Do not do this.</li> <li>- You will blight the lives of ALL Dulwich residents simply to deter commuters form driving through - how is that fair.</li> <li>- Ludicrous thinking behind these restrictions. This will not benefit residents in any way!</li> <li>- Diverting traffic and parking to other roads. It's frankly an extremely daft plan that has not been thought out very well</li> <li>- The roads you are trying to change with restrictions are just fine.....leave them alone please!</li> <li>- I feel it will adversely affect the local residents and the local area.</li> <li>- Will make life problematic for residents and guests</li> </ul>
Longer journeys for residents	156	7.52%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Road rage and incredibly convoluted journeys for us that live here.</li> <li>- difficult of driving out of area b without long and time wasting detours</li> <li>- Local people will be forced to make longer journeys meaning more air pollution.</li> <li>- These measures would double the length of all necessary car journeys for residents, increasing pollution and traffic. Not all car journeys are easily avoidable. People are not going to abandon their cars entirely just because of deliberately frustrating measures.</li> <li>- The difficulty will be for residents in Area B. Anyway trying to get to Area B either to see relatives/friends or attend local clubs would need to add 20-30minutes to their journey. With Carlton road/Dulwich village blocked and no access to Townley road in peak time, they would either need to drive on the south circular or down Lordship Lane.</li> <li>- Residents in Court Lane and the adjoining streets will have to do a large detour to visit Dulwich Village and areas to the west</li> <li>- residents of Area B , including us off Court Lane, will be "boxed in", leading to tortuous detours and delays getting away from, and returning to, our homes.</li> <li>- Residents of Dulwich Village will find it very difficult to make middle-distance journeys without significant detours.</li> </ul>
More traffic in general	141	6.8%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Most traffic will just divert around the area instead. There will be the same amount of traffic in a smaller number of roads.</li> <li>- You are going to make other roads more congested . Cars will sit in traffic and pollution will be worse .journey time will be longer</li> <li>- It would create traffic Armageddon to the south circular and residential roads where the average house price isn't £4m.</li> <li>- Back up traffic on Lordship lanev/London Rd especially when Lorries park to deliver</li> <li>- Increased traffic pressures on the main trunk roads through the zone, A205, Lordship Lane, ED grove etc.</li> </ul>

			<p>how do you keep traffic flowing on these roads, especially buses and pollution down.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I feel that many of the people using cars in Dulwich will still use cars and so the changes will lead to more traffic jams and more disgruntled drivers (and pedestrians).</li> <li>- Already congested roads will become even more congested. For example, westbound Turney Road, eastbound East Dulwich Grove, eastbound South Circular and Lordship Lane from the junction of East Dulwich Grove to the South Circular.</li> <li>- Greatly increased traffic in a reduced area causing severe delays.</li> </ul>
More traffic on Turney Road	135	6.51%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I live on Turney Road in the section between Burbage Road and Croxted Road. It is extremely busy already and the Phase 3 proposals will make it busier with parents trying to use our section of the road as a drop off. This would make it less safe for pedestrians and cyclists and life harder for the residents.</li> <li>- The proposals, as they are, will push traffic onto Turney Road (from Burbage up to Croxted) and onto Burbage Road (from Dulwich Village to Turney Road). This is unfair and the proposals needs to be amended to stop this from happening.</li> <li>- Turney Road (western end) is already a rat run. This will get much worse under these proposals as all traffic that enters Burbage Road from the village end will have to go along the western end of Turney Road</li> <li>- Turney Road (east) and Burbage Road (west) obviously become rat runs – Turney Road (east) is already a rat run, but these proposals make the problems on this road far worse. These roads become mains routes for drivers wanting to access Herne Hill and beyond and Turney Road (east) is effectively turned into an A road.</li> <li>- Turney and Burbage will become a rat run unless change is also made on these roads.</li> <li>- Traffic will surge down Turney Road, from Dulwich Village through to Croxted Road. This will occur all day: making an existing all day/all week traffic problem much worse.</li> <li>- Traffic will tailback on Turney Road and during peak hours this will pump out pollution on children leaving the schools/nurseries and those walking home from school who use the road to walk home.</li> <li>- Turney Road will be blighted even further by traffic displaced by the other, welcome changes suggested, especially those for Dulwich Village and Burbage Road.</li> <li>- The scale of traffic on Turney Road makes a mockery of its designation as a Quietway and cycle route. I believe the scheme as proposed will increase traffic on Turney Road and add significantly to pollution and standing traffic on a rat run route that includes two schools and urgently needs to be made safer for cyclists and those walking to the village schools.</li> </ul>
More air pollution	89	4.29%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- More traffic. More pollution.</li> <li>- Gridlocked, stop start slow moving traffic is worse for air quality</li> </ul>



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Those roads are used for a reason, if you close you simply move the traffic elsewhere. as we all move to electric cars in the next 3-8 years the air pollution problem will improve anyway.</li> <li>- I am concerned that unless through flow traffic from non residents is reduced, the changes will increase pollution through increasing our and others journeys (especially at peak hours) and increase stationary traffic as the roadways narrow.</li> <li>- Bearing in mind the constant roadworks and heavy congestion on the surrounding major roads, I can only imagine that journey times, idling traffic and air pollution will become appalling for those roads</li> <li>- Closing roads and restricting access will move the problems to other roads, and actually increase air pollution as people will be forced to use a smaller number of routes meaning cars sat polluting the air for longer.</li> <li>- The carbon footprint of vehicles being driven 'home' Will be greater as congestion will be dislocated and journey distances increased.</li> <li>- The drastic changes do not take into account that the pollution will be reduced when the Ulez area is extended to the South Circular. More pollution is caused by queuing traffic than anything else...</li> <li>- This hairbrained idea will do nothing but worsen the air quality and quality of life of all around the zones.</li> <li>- Also risk that those who still try to drive will increase pollution by driving around for much longer looking for somewhere to park.</li> </ul>
More traffic on East Dulwich Grove	77	3.71%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- East Dulwich Grove is going to be a nightmare. I am a cyclist and this road is dangerous as is with car speeds, parking, excessive traffic and pollution....</li> <li>- Too much traffic on East Dulwich Grove and will only get worse when health centre opens.</li> <li>- As mentioned east dulwich grove will take an enormous hit, it already has higher then who recommended levels of pollution.</li> <li>- East Dulwich Grove is already an incredibly busy road that our family walk along a number of times every day - how will the council ensure traffic and air quality here doesn't become even worse?</li> <li>- Even longer queues on East Dulwich Grove towards Herne Hill</li> <li>- I am concerned about an increase in traffic along East Dulwich Grove and Village Way and Half Moon Lane.</li> <li>- Massive tailbacks in East Dulwich Grove/Lordship Lane.</li> <li>- East dulwich grove will probably become busier, and this area, particularly the crossing with dulwich village is already extremely dangerous at peak times, with stupidly narrow pavements, quick lights and huge amount of pedestrian traffic, mostly children!</li> <li>- Half moon lane and East dulwich grove would become extremely congested and cause increased pollution for the whole area and in particular the local schools rather than allowing for access being spread out across the area as a whole.</li> </ul>

			- Increased traffic load on East Dulwich grove. Safety concerns for cycling on East dulwich Grove.
More traffic on Half Moon Lane	64	3.08%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- will make half moon busier.</li> <li>- From our perspective, the proposals don't address heavy traffic on Half Moon Lane, Village Way and the junction with Red Post Hill/East Dulwich Grove/Dulwich Village, the majority of our walking route to school. This may become heavier with all of the restrictions.</li> <li>- Half Moon Lane will get more traffic and pollution.</li> <li>- I am concerned there may be more traffic on half moon lane. Please could half moon lane be pedestrianised too? At the very least let's have a cycle lane, wider pavements, a 10 mile an hour speed limit, anything to discourage cars and buses.</li> <li>- knock on effects will make traffic busier on streets that also have schools including Half Moon Lane and Red Post Hill</li> <li>- Half Moon lane already has a high number of speeding vehicles/dangerous overtaking. If all cars are forced to drive the length of the road to get to Village way as can't use Burbage road this will worsen.</li> <li>- You do not appear to have considered what the impact might be on Half Moon Lane and Herne Hill and the North Dulwich triangle.</li> <li>- The proposals are too vague and not properly explained especially in Herne Hill. I am concerned that all the traffic will be displaced to Herne Hill. Streets off Half Moon Lane will be adversely affected with an increase in pollution.</li> <li>- Halfmoon lane in particular already has too much fast moving traffic and drivers are likely to get even more impatient with these changes.</li> </ul>
More traffic on Dulwich Village	63	3.04%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Potentially there will be increased traffic on Dulwich Village this will be detrimental to the health of children at the four school sites</li> <li>- By restricting traffic flowing into townley road there is a real risk this forces more traffic into dulwich village which would be a terrible outcome</li> <li>- i am concerned it will make traffic through dulwich village worse, ie on the main Dulwich Village road, if restrictions are in place in the surrounding side streets. Dulwich Village also has many residential buildings, including our house, and I am keen for the plans to consider any impact on the area between the college rd roundabout down to the junction with east dulwich grove</li> <li>- Dulwich Village's beauty will be ruined as it will become a traffic congested cut through road.</li> <li>- Traffic southbound on Dulwich Village will still be a problem and discourage people from riding a bike.</li> <li>- The cars have to go somewhere. There will be more going up and down college road and The village</li> <li>- I am worried there might be more traffic on Dulwich Village.</li> </ul>
Makes the school run more difficult	56	2.7%	- There are lots of schools in the area and whatever you do the pupils need to get there and some cannot walk or come by public transport.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- children stuck in cars for hours trying to travel moderate distances (1-2 miles) which are too far for them (5, 8) to walk</li> <li>- Those who bring their children to Dulwich schools by cars will likely to experience difficulties, but it is unavoidable if our society start caring for the environment and reduce traffic to and from schools.</li> <li>- Many are also busy parents who are not serviced by busses or rail links. It is simply not possible to put two small children and all their bags and equipment and cycle west to east to north to south in the tiny time allowed by the schools to collect them. These proposals will make living here a nightmare for parents and business. Do not do this.</li> <li>- Access to schools however with the right support these can be overcome</li> <li>- Taking my children to school on time will become almost impossible as we need to use the car for multiple drop offs.</li> <li>- Children will have difficulties getting to schools. School bus schemes are extremely expensive and people have to have the basic right to drive their children to school.</li> <li>- Schools Traffic might be displaced on to roads such as Dovercourt Road or Druce Road. It would be good if the schools could consult parents on how best to help the pupils arrive at school without bringing parents' cars close to the school gates.</li> </ul>
The problem is caused by schools, deal with that instead	56	2.7%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Because you have allowed James Allens and Alleyns School to expand over the years, you have brought these problems on the area yourselves and there is no solution except to restrict the numbers of people using the schools.</li> <li>- The real issue with Dulwich is finding a better way to get the students into the private schools (and at some point stopping the buses parking all day on Gallery Road and restricting that) that doesn't involve cars. Parents cross from the College to Alleyns to Jags and back and forth - nursery to sixth form.</li> <li>- Start with the school traffic. That will help most.</li> <li>- Local schools should be held accountable for this as they can monitor where families are commuting from and forms of transport used.</li> <li>- A good percentage of the congestion is caused by cars and busses at Alleyns school. You have to take action to reduce car journeys to their school</li> <li>- This problem is generally school-related, because there really is no problem in school holiday time. Dulwich is peaceful when schools are out, and it's noticeable that when the private schools are off (and state schools still in ), it's substantially quieter.</li> <li>- Perhaps the schools should have a free shuttle bus for their students (as the kids often carry so much kit with them, making walking or cycling impossible on some days).</li> <li>- The schools just have to do more (that includes all the Dulwich Hamlet, Village Infants and Charter School parents who are supposed to be living in walking distance. Although, we must have compassion for young parents, more now than ever cannot afford</li> </ul>

			to live in this area without their both working. Work pressures often call on parents to find ways of saving time and one of these is driving their kids to school. Perhaps a network of school buses is a cheaper and easier way to solve these problems.
Negative impact on businesses	55	2.65%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- If parking measures and the park fees are brought in I think it will be of detriment to local businesses.</li> <li>- Bussiness will be ruined and the life style in this area will be unsustainable.</li> <li>- Having so many local amenities in the area is a positive thing and should be supported given how many high streets have been damaged by the internet. These proposals would damage our local amenities and that would be a bad thing</li> <li>- Probably the local traders will complain, as they did before. But I think this huge step forward is needed to make the area liveable and safe again. The health of our local residents is more important.</li> <li>- Will also add challenge to local shops with limited parking in Dulwich on main roads and limited car parks.</li> <li>- Total devastation to the shops of the area.</li> <li>- Shops in Dulwich Village, much valued, would lose custom significantly and some, if not all, would close.</li> <li>- Places like the tennis club one college road would suffer immensely and it would be so damaging for their business and the community.</li> <li>- I have to carry large amounts of equipment with me, meaning I cannot walk or cycle. These measures would adversely affect my business, making journey times longer and more expensive.</li> <li>- Local shops will suffer. It will kill the life of the village which takes in a wider area of customers that actually need to drive and park to be able to enjoy village life</li> </ul>
Will lead to new rat runs in Zone B	51	2.46%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I have some concern that sat navs may direct through through rat runners via Dovercourt/Woodwarde, Townley/East Dulwich Grove so the timed closure for the maximum possible period is an essential part of the proposal.</li> <li>- I would be concerned that some of the roads in Area B may become short cuts for vehicles trying to avoid Lordship Lane, particularly in the busier hours and wonder whether for example Woodwarde Road junction with Calton Avenue should also be closed off or made no access during the times that Townley Road is no vehicle access?</li> <li>- Area B roads become rat race / cut through / drop off zone for non residents</li> <li>- It looks to me as though cars will be able to drive down court lane to Carlton Avenue via Woodwarde Road to exit onto East Dulwich Grove. This might turn out to be a rat run and increase traffic.</li> <li>- Possible Creation of new rat runs but I think the area-wide approach makes this much less likely.</li> <li>- Some Area B roads(Dovercourt Lane, Beaval Road and Calrton Avenue) are still accessible at peak times via Court Lane and will be come dangerous. School drop-offs will still be allowed on those roads and the drivers will then be forced to do U-turns as they cannot enter Townley Road</li> </ul>

			<p>- Increase of through traffic on Dovercourt, Beauval, Woodward, Druce, Desenfans, Dekker Roads as drivers will find a wriggle though the restrictions. These are already really difficult fairly narrow roads.</p>
Will lead to worse air quality for other schools	45	2.17%	<p>- As a mum to two at the Infants and Hamlet Junior school--one of whom has suffered asthma ever since starting at the Infant's school age 4--I am concerned that if bits of the plan are adopted (ex. timed closure of Townley) without adoption of the plan overall (ex. if the Court lane/calton/Burbage closure/restricted access doesn't go ahead), that the air quality and safety of the children at DVIS and DHJS will be impacted.</p> <p>- This plan needs measures to limit air pollution exposure for the children at the ED Charter School.</p> <p>- I would predict a huge increase in traffic, pollution and accidents at the junction of both Dulwich Village and Townley Road with East Dulwich Grove as traffic is displaced. Both of these junctions are locations for schools and therefore students will be adversely affected rather than protected.</p> <p>- And has anyone produced a plan for JAGS which will have enhanced pollution from East Dulwich Grove - or the new Academy school on the old hospital site from these plans? Southwark needs to have a wider view and look at traffic patterns across the whole of London and integrate those to provide a coherent plan. There are schools everywhere and providing healthier streets for all of them will be nigh on impossible unless we ban all traffic.</p> <p>- My worry is that more traffic will be funnelled southbound along Dulwich Village directly outside my children's primary school (there are three primary schools on that stretch). There were proposals for this stretch to be a school street originally and there have been campaigns. It would be amazing and beneficial to those most at risk from pollution (younger children) to have this road blocked to traffic at least while they get in and out of school.</p>
Problem caused by poor public transport options	42	2.02%	<p>- None of this looks at the public transport solutions. The one reason why Dulwich Village is so congested is that we have an entirely inadequate bus service. If you could increase the P4 to every 5 minutes during peak school and business hours (7-10am and 3-7pm) that would make a huge difference, and possibly also find a north south bus route that would link Dulwich Village itself (not just North Dulwich) to Camberwell and Peckham, than people would not have to use their cars. Also add more school buses and insist that children travel by public transport or school buses and ban parents bringing kids to school by car.</p> <p>- Need buses running east-west. For example at present there aren't routes from the area around the Plough junction that go towards either west Dulwich or Herne Hill, or Between Forest Hill and Herne Hill. These are too far to walk (for most) but take even longer by public transport as you have to change bus.</p> <p>- Your proposals do nothing to to address the paucity of public transport in the area!</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There's a risk that taxis will fill the gaps of private cars if other transport (e.g. Boris bikes &amp; more frequent buses to e.g. Brixton station) aren't put in place.</li> <li>- There is a lack of public transport (buses) across Dulwich, esp in South Dulwich, and therefore people rely on their car to transport them around Dulwich. from East Dulwich Grove junction up to the South Circular there is only the P4 bus.</li> <li>- I am really very concerned that you have not begun to coordinate this proposal with TfL. If there was a proper bus service through Dulwich Village you might not be experiencing the huge traffic flows which blight our lives. There is NO bus route to West Dulwich/Crystal Palace from Dulwich Village!!! The P4 is extremely unreliable as is the 37. The P4 is often overcrowded already; how will it cope with your proposals of getting us all using 'Active transport'?? It will not.</li> </ul>
People will adapt to changes	41	1.98%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I think people will actually manage and adapt around these.</li> <li>- I think that any difficulties resulting from the measures you propose will be only temporary - drivers will soon adjust to the changes, and residents will quickly come to appreciate the benefits of reduced noise and pollution. Some years ago Turney Road was entirely closed as the western end for several weeks for repairs to the bridge - the improvement in life quality was quickly noticed, not just with reduced traffic, but with an improved sense of community as the road was no longer divided by a continuous stream of vehicles. These changes can't come soon enough.</li> <li>- It might be inconvenient for those people who don't care about healthy streets, and prefer to drive. They will get used to the new layout very quickly.</li> <li>- Journeys may take longer by car but people will behaviourally learn to adapt their day to day practices. This is good!</li> <li>- Possible short term inconveniences to local journeys as people learn the restrictions. This is about making short journeys less attractive by car as society learns to change its 'convenience' behaviours and (those that can) opt to take more healthy transport methods which then helps to improve their short term and longer term health as air quality improves. Thank you Southwark for taking on Our Healthy Streets and I encourage you to make these changes for bettering our community environment.</li> <li>- I don't foresee any difficulties beyond a minority of frustrated drivers who will either stick to bigger roads or stop making the journey. Both are desirable outcomes.</li> <li>- Short term pain will subside to result in more sustainable transport choices. Lower pollution and fewer road traffic deaths.</li> </ul>
Restrictions on movements of the elderly	41	1.98%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It is difficult for older residents to visit each others' properties to socialise on evenings with bad weather - let alone the risk of late night muggings - if they always have to do so on foot. It is therefore worth</li> </ul>

			<p>consideration allowing local residents the ability to drive through any of the permeably closed junctions between say 7.30pm and 2am. This could be implemented through creating barriers which can be opened by residents (at specified times) in the same way that mobility impaired people can open traffic barriers in Dulwich Park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- no thought given to the needs of the elderly and the disabled</li> <li>- Concerned about ability of elderly and infirm to access surgeries etc</li> <li>- These proposals suits able-bodied adults who can cycle. This does not suit the elderly, those with permanent disabilities, those with short term illnesses and injuries, those with mental health problems, those pregnant, those nursing infants (who cannot be transported by bike), or those with children under 5 years old who cannot walk or cycle distances above a mile.</li> <li>- No thought has been given to people who are going to be disproportionately affected in particular women in the area who are likely to be family carers of either very young or very old people and who may use a car to help ferry around vulnerable people to activities and medical appointments and deliver meals and help with food shopping etc</li> <li>- Elderly and less mobile people will be isolated - unable to get out of area.</li> <li>- Many of my neighbours are elderly and their cars provide them with an incredibly important lifeline. The current scheme will seriously inconvenience them and reduce their quality of life.</li> </ul>
Will cause congestion at the Court Lane/Lordship Lane junction	39	1.88%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Accidents through frustrated drivers trying to get on to Lordship Lane from Court Lane.</li> <li>- congestion at the junction of lordship lane and court lne once this becomes the sole unobstructed way in and out of area B.</li> <li>- If I am returning to my home during the school rush hour I can't see how I can get to my home except through one route via the junction of Court Lane and Lordship Lane. This junction is a difficult junction already and would become the only way in to the north side of Dulwich.</li> <li>- The only access/egress for much of the day will be through the top end of Court Lane. This means that ALL THE TRAFFIC from all the roads in the triangle deliniated by Lordship lane, the park and East Dulwich Grove will come straight past my front door on the way to the top of Court Lane.</li> <li>- All residents in area B will have only one route to and from their homes, being the south end of Court lane. Very inconvenient.</li> <li>- Issues turning right out of the top of Court Lane. It may require traffic lights as presumably Lordship Lane will now have much more traffic.</li> </ul>
Changes are unfair because they prioritise a wealthy area	38	1.83%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Seems like the closing of the streets is to benefit the wealthy people on those roads</li> <li>- Cutting off ED residents' access to Brixton, the only major transport hub in the area, all this for the benefit of the wealthy people of North Dulwich.</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Another implication of these proposals is to improve the air quality in the wealthy streets of Dulwich Village and North Village while adding to the poor air quality in East Dulwich, especially on East Dulwich Grove, the walking route for a new and growing school.</li> <li>- The overall impression of these proposals is that they are designed to benefit the wealthy residents while harming those in less well-off parts of Dulwich.</li> <li>- Posh people on posh roads like court lane will have car free unpolluted streets and everyone else will have an increase in traffic and pollution.</li> <li>- I object to social engineering of traffic away from wealthy middle class areas</li> <li>- This truly only benefits the few privileged residents of dulwich village and makes life harder for all other local dulwich residents!</li> </ul>
More traffic on Dovercourt and Beauval	36	1.73%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I am deeply concerned that you will divert considerable amount of traffic on to my road Dovercourt and Beauval Rd- cutting through from the top access on court lane (at lordship lane) going to townley road. This is probably the most extensive cut through (and in reverse at the other end of the day) on Dovercourt.</li> <li>- Dovercourt Road is at the heart of the residential neighbourhood identified as 'Area B' on they OHS map and is a narrow residential street that already struggles with congestion and parking. Priority should be given to alleviate traffic from Dovercourt Road (as well as Beauval) due to their narrow width, above and beyond Woodward Road and Calton Avenue which are better able to facilitate two-way traffic, which in turn should be prioritised over the wider peripheral roads of Court a Lane, Lordship Lane and East Dulwich Grove. It seems utterly perverse to actually try to divert traffic into Dovercourt a Road and simply shift a problem onto a smaller street that is less able to cope with vehicles and less able to disperse pollution.</li> <li>- The proposals will also have a terrible effect on the smaller roads of Dovercourt and Beauval which are already very difficult roads for cars to pass in.</li> <li>- Some Area B roads(Dovercourt Lane, Beauval Road and Calrton Avenue) are still accessible at peak times via Court Lane and will be come dangerous.</li> <li>- Dovercourt Road (between Woodward and Townley) has cars parked on both sides and it can result in people reversing to allow others to pass. I'm concerned that there may be an increase in Traffic along this road for which it is unsuitable.</li> <li>- My concern is that a much higher volume of traffic will pass through Beauval and Dovercourt Rd and that is unacceptable.</li> </ul>

This question was an open invitation to identify potential problems with the proposed scheme – so that even people who overall favoured the project could tell us about potential snags. The critical responses largely tracked those in question 3, identifying potential traffic displacement, and longer journeys for residents as the largest concerns. Other key themes were concerns for traffic levels on specific roads, a feeling that congestion and air quality



might worsen overall, and a concern that the proposals did not do enough to address the responsibility of local schools for high traffic levels.

## Question 9

Are there additional changes that we could make to mitigate these difficulties?

Comment type	No.	As % of all respondents	Example quotes
Don't change anything	303	14.6%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Scrap the whole scheme</li> <li>- yes - do nothing please. It is as if you want to create chaos</li> <li>- Find an alternative solution or divert through traffic else where and very shortly the multiple cars will be electric and this will not be an issue, but if you create this now you will destroy the village the amazing schools and any business n the area.</li> <li>- Encourage the community to work together, don't shut roads you are just making it vile for the surrounding roads. People won't leave their car they will find another way</li> <li>- Do not proceed with your ill-thought out, disruptive and expensive schemes. In any case, please control the speeds on Dulwich Village</li> <li>- Closing junctions like Court Lane and Eynella Road is a drastic change to the whole area, and will blight all those who happily live there. You should go back to the drawing board and listen rather than impose.</li> <li>- Just leave things as they are. Dulwich Village is in London, not the wilds of Kent.</li> <li>- Yes. Scrap the whole idea which is predicated on traffic levels during the 'school-run' period, and the belief that introducing these measures will get people out of their cars and on a bicycle.</li> </ul>
Include a permeable closure on Turney Road	147	7.08%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Please offer traffic reduction measures that will benefit the entire length of Turney Road up the the western end (junction with Croxted Road). I would warmly support restricted access at this end of the road - the front rooms in our house are badly affected by heavy traffic flows, including the impact of speeding vehicles passing over the humps (which causes regular ceiling collapses).</li> <li>- Turney Road - either close Turney at the junction of Turney Road and Croxted Road, or make Turney Road a one way from Croxted Road down to Dulwich Village.</li> <li>- Would a filtered/cyclist friendly junction between Turney road and Croxted road contribute to consistent, safe and pleasant route?</li> <li>- Close Turney Road at the junction with Croxted Road.</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I think you should consult on a permeable closure of Turney Road under the bridge near Croxted Road- a measure I would definitely support. This will also make some sense of the cycling "Quietway" status of the road- at present meaningless.</li> <li>- The scale of traffic on Turney Road makes a mockery of its designation as a Quietway and cycle route. I believe the scheme as proposed will increase traffic on Turney Road and add significantly to pollution and standing traffic on a rat run route that includes two schools and urgently needs to be made safer for cyclists and those walking to the village schools. I therefore wholeheartedly support the idea of a village bound "No Entry" at the crossway with Burbage Road (to cut pollution around the schools and standing traffic at the village junction) and a permeable closure of Turney Road at the bridge. This will at a stroke reduce traffic along the whole road, in both directions, all day.</li> <li>- To protect Turney Road in addition to the other residential roads outlined, I would support the proposal for a permeable closure of Turney Road at the railway bridge between controlled times (allowing access to residents and electric vehicles)</li> <li>- Closure of Turney at the Railway Bridge which will stop through traffic along Turney will reduce through traffic on Turney Road in both directions, will reduce traffic on the second highest residential road in Dulwich and reduce traffic outside the Hamlet and Infant schools. This should be a priority.</li> </ul>
Improve public transport in the area	126	6.07%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Improve the public transport so we want to get out of our cars....put a tramline back on Lordship Lane, put a tram line to Herne Hill... tinkering with cars when we are all going to go electric anyway is short-termist.</li> <li>- Transport! Regular buses from ED to Honor Oak for example. Fast buses to Brixton.</li> <li>- Better local public transport (buses) through Dulwich and not just around it would make it easier to leave the car at home.</li> <li>- Provide better buses please including a route that goes to central London without having to change in Brixton.</li> <li>- There need to be Boris bike stations in the area to enable people to get around without cars.</li> <li>- Improve public transport in the area. As a regular user I can assure you it leaves much to be desired.</li> <li>- I would suggest better public transport options (the 37 and P4 buses are not exactly regular or reliable), however since those both rely on the routes that are going to become even more congested if your proposals go ahead, I'm not sure that would help either.</li> <li>- School buses. Maybe look at public transport for people travelling to different stations.</li> <li>- Possible addition of a bus route between East Dulwich and West Dulwich/west Norwood via Dulwich village for pupils to use to get to schools, and community to get to/from the new medical centre.</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sort the public transport first! That should be your main objective. Lobby TFL and get it dramatically improved!!! That would be a major achievement.</li> </ul>
Extra cycling infrastructure – cycle lanes (especially on Half Moon Lane)	112	5.4%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Put a cycle lane on half moon Lane and east dulwich Grove to prevent any displacement.</li> <li>- Put a segregated cycle lane down Half Moon Lane. You should also do this on East Dulwich Grove and Dulwich Village.</li> <li>- Expand/ seperate from pedestrian area) cycle path from Dulwich park (south circular exit) to Dulwich college. Extend cycle path up college road to Huntslip road for Dulwich Prep and Kingsdale.</li> <li>- I would build dedicated cycle paths on the main roads: East Dulwich Grove, Halfmoon Lane and Dulwich Village. Once built they will fill up with cyclists of all ages and car use will go down.</li> <li>- Please pedestrianise also Half Moon Lane or at least a protected cycle route along Half Moon Lane, Village Way, and East Dulwich Grove as shown in Southwark’s 2015 Cycling Strategy, will unlock greater active travel potential in this area.</li> <li>Furthermore, if partial traffic restrictions are put in place in Area B, cycling provisions should be put in place on Turney Road, Dulwich Village, and College Road.</li> <li>- More bicycle parking provision around the area.</li> <li>- A protected cycle route on the main roads: East Dulwich Grove, Village Way, Halfmoon Lane and Lordship Lane will greatly assure cyclists of all ages and confidence. Build the cycle path and the cyclist will follow in droves.</li> <li>- Try one way systems with bike lanes instead of closing off roads</li> <li>- Southwark council is now working with Peddle Me Wheels - an excellent step forward. However, most people are unaware and much more could be done to actively promote cycling - e.g. set up displays in the parks in the summer so people can try out different types of bikes - such as e-bikes and cargo bikes. People are so used to their cars that they are utterly unaware of the alternatives.</li> <li>- Please make my cycle ride to school nicer</li> <li>- More segregated cycle ways. Change the law to allow electric Scooters / ebikes / etc</li> </ul>
Just do it (no detailed explanation)	80	3.86%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I love that the plan prioritises cyclists and pedestrians over drivers. yes, please!</li> <li>- The proposals are good and it is excellent to see real, serious measures being planned for this problem.</li> <li>- It’s a great first step. Needs to expand otherwise the problem just shifts else where.</li> <li>There will be resistance, but the evidence of climate change and effects upon health are overwhelming</li> <li>Thank you</li> <li>- Keep expanding! Make it as hard as possible for people to drive. They dont need to!</li> <li>- No. I would like to say this will make the street healthier for all the schoolchildren who are heading to the new secondary school.</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I don't see any problems with closing our street. In fact, it is going to make our street much more pleasant to live in. It will even make it easier to sleep and easier to breath when we're walking along our street.</li> <li>- Face down the opposition to clean healthy streets and go for it! Good luck</li> </ul>
Schools should discourage driving	72	3.47%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Surely the school should have a policy re driving to school.? I'd like to think the school are educating pupils about responsibilities to children's health, the wider community and the environment.</li> <li>- Look for ways to deter parents driving children to schools in the area.</li> <li>- There should be a borough-wide initiative as soon as possible to encourage/incentivise parents to car-share. This would significantly reduce the amount of traffic on the roads during term time.</li> <li>- Also encourage the schools to stop parents driving their kids to school.</li> <li>- Work with local schools on drop off and pick ups. work with them to devise park and stride routes. Staff picking up children from central drop offs such as the park in the centre.</li> <li>- A rewards scheme for those who travel to school through non-motorised or public transport?</li> <li>- Have the schools produced (or been asked to produce) transport/travel plans or strategies or asked to show how they can reduce their reliance on local streets and reduce their impact on local congestion and air quality? Have the schools been challenged about the method by which the students are connected to and the means by which they get to and from the school sites? The schools could, for example, look at opportunities within their own sites to accommodate coaches and drop-offs, they already park their own vehicles and minibuses on site or examine alternative drop-off and pick up points.</li> <li>- Why are the schools not taking responsibility and a leadership role in making is socially unacceptable to drive and providing imaginative alternatives, not just outsourcing to clunky polluting expensive coaches?</li> </ul>
Use permit access, not full closures	47	2.27%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- People living in area B need to be able to access their properties by car 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. They should also have access to all the other local areas mentioned in this proposal at any time. They could have a single permit for free for access and for parking anywhere is the area. The system could be administered using cameras.</li> <li>- I don't know if it would be possible for residents to be able to pass through some junctions, while non-residents cannot?</li> <li>- I agree that there is too much traffic. You have pointed out that many vehicles are only doing 'through' journeys, that they are not dulwich residents but are using dulwich to get where they need to go. It is these drivers who need to be penalised, not dulwich residents.</li> <li>- Perhaps a congestion charge of some kind, aimed only at those travelling through the area (residents</li> </ul>

			<p>would be exempt and it could be controlled through ANR cameras) would deter them?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Instead of what is suggested, please look into reserving streets or groups of streets for local residents (or their visitors) with ANPR camera enforcement. This is successfully done by a number of local authorities across the continent. Belgian examples state that the investment in cameras repays itself in within a couple of years and successfully reduces traffic.</li> <li>- Allow local traffic only - maybe with a permit for anyone living in Dulwich</li> </ul>
Use timed access, not full closures	45	2.17%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ditch the closure of Court Lane and implement time controlled temporary closure for all those roads.</li> <li>- If you have to restrict traffic i would have a much stronger preference for timed access rather than permeable closures.</li> <li>- Consider timed access in on Eynella not total closure,</li> <li>- Families with preschool kids need to be on the move early in the day. Blocking the roads will severely affect them. If you have to make a restriction, timed as opposed to permeable closers would be Better.</li> <li>- I'd propose that the closure of the Court Lane junction at Dulwich Village is restricted to the morning and evening peaks only. This would allow for traffic to use that junction off-peak, which would give residents and users of the shops in East Dulwich respite from extra traffic during the off-peak.</li> <li>- I think the council should look at extending the use of timed restrictions to operate at peak hours only.</li> <li>- Give all residents a permit and prevent all non-resident/business traffic from entering Dulwich village from 7.30-9 and 3-4.30 - then there would be no traffic problems and no parking problems.</li> <li>- use camera limited time closures through out areas B and C certainly- 8 in all</li> <li>- What about a peak hour toll ?</li> <li>- timed access restrictions for the whole of Zone B so that unauthorised vehicles cannot enter the whole area at peak times.</li> </ul>
Make the private schools take responsibility for reducing traffic	44	2.12%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Some responsibility's need to be with the schools in providing transport or car free zones around the schools and the drop-offs which slow the traffic down considerably.</li> <li>- Yes make Alleyns coaches turn their engines off. Send parking wardens along to check the coaches and car parking.</li> <li>- Perhaps Alleyns school, which must bear some responsibility for the traffic congestion in the area, could look at using some of its extensive land as a car park or dedicated drop-off for its huge number of coaches and for the many, many parents who insist of driving their children to the school.</li> <li>- Alleyn's owns a great deal of land surrounding the school buildings. Is it beyond possibility that they might be required to build a drop-off zone in Townley Road such that parents could drive in, turn around and leave? The sacrifice of a small part of the</li> </ul>

			<p>playing fields on the south side of Townley Road would make this possible. The school (and JAGS) would have then to pursue an active policy of encouraging parents not to drive their children; and suitable adjustments would need to be made to the currently proposed restrictions to ensure that it was the only feasible drop-off and pick-up point for both Alleyn's and JAGS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Make school coaches park somewhere well away from the area, or make them wait in designated parking bays (which already exist) until 9.30.</li> <li>- Please can the Council urge Alleyns and Jags that are the root cause of through traffic to take some bold community based measures.</li> <li>- Also the schools need to be incentivised to admit kids from the local area rather than kids who will have to drive to get to school.</li> </ul>
Use a permit scheme for residents only	41	1.98%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Restrict access to permits for parking to discourage (non local residents) people from purchasing permits for their personal use</li> <li>- In order to facilitate this restricted access to Dulwich Village from the South Circular, cars coming through the Village area would have to apply for access with a smart card, and pay for the right to pass through, as with any toll road/bridge/tunnel crossing.</li> <li>- YES, allow RESIDENTS ONLY access from Dulwich Village to Calton through Gilkes!</li> <li>- All local residents could have a 'pass', with cameras identifying non residents at school drop off / pick up times.... a local congestion zone. This should apply to school buses also.</li> <li>- I would allow residents permits to enter townley road during peak hours from both ends.</li> <li>- I would allow residents to enter the village from Area B and the carlton avenue junction.</li> <li>- Please consider wider use of cameras to access the area for residents only</li> </ul>
Proper enforcement of speed limits and idling	36	1.73%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proper enforcement. e.g. on Alleyn Park many cars ignore the 'double yellow' lines and drop off / pick up as there is no enforcement.</li> <li>- Fine all with parked idling engines. A random weekly police/ CSO check.</li> <li>- Introduce traffic police to catch dangerous drivers. If drivers know that you can't speed through Dulwich or overtake cyclists or slower drivers recklessly, they will avoid the area or at least slow down!</li> <li>- I would be delighted if the whole area could be monitored and traffic charged accordingly if they move around the area at peak times.</li> <li>- Better policing of parking and speeding might help.</li> <li>- Enforcement fines issued to drivers sitting in vehicles with the engine running</li> <li>- The 20 mph speed limit on Half Moon Lane is never adhered to and no one ever checks whether motorists stay within the limit. I propose putting speed bumps all the way down Half Moon Lane and a speed camera half way down.</li> </ul>

Review the traffic levels at Herne Hill and down Half Moon Lane	34	1.64%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There should be a protected cycle way along Half Moon Lane. The cycle lane should not be at the expense of cutting down the trees lining the lane to create the necessary width. As a minimum, the cycle lane should cover the section from Stradella Road to the Herne Hill junction. The traffic lights' phasing at the Herne Hill junction should be amended to accommodate increased traffic on Half Moon Lane to limit idling pollution from queueing traffic. There should be a speed camera on Half Moon Lane somewhere between the Herne Hill junction and Village Way to deter speeding traffic.</li> <li>- Consider measures to also reduce traffic on Half Moon Lane and Village Way.</li> <li>- Yes, on Half Moon Lane we need a designated cycle lane from Winterbrook Road down to the Herne Hill Junction if possible or at least from Stradella Road to the busy and dangerous Herne Hill Lane Junction. We would like speed cameras on Half Moon Lane too.</li> <li>- Please stop cars on Half Moon Lane, at least put in a cycle lane.</li> </ul>
Extend similar measures to neighbouring areas	32	1.54%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Extending the traffic reducing measures into the area around East Dulwich Station - between East Dulwich Grove / Grove Vale / Lordship Lane.</li> <li>- We have to address the rat-running down the north side of Melbourne Grove from Grove Vale to East Dulwich Grove. In the 23 years we have lived on this street, we have experienced almost daily road rage, damage to vehicles and an ever increasing amount of pollution. That this is not part of the area map is deeply concerning.</li> <li>- Extend the scheme to cover the area south of the South Circular. Make through routes through the centre of Dulwich Village by car impossible.</li> <li>- Yes! Include all areas, not just Dulwich Village. There are approx 18 schools in about a square mile, which is unusual for London. Everyone needs to benefit, not just the residents of Dulwich Village.</li> <li>- I'd like to see this style of area-wide approach rolled out further. There are massive opportunities to improve walking and cycling, cut air pollution and climate wrecking emissions and improve community interaction by proving more space for people to stop, relax and chat.</li> <li>- There is also huge opportunity to link up with the work Lambeth are doing around the Low Traffic Neighbourhoods in Herne Hill, especially along Half Moon Lane.</li> <li>- Apply changes to the whole of Dulwich, displacing traffic onto the South Circular and Lordship Lane etc.</li> </ul>
Set up electric shuttle buses for schoolchildren	28	1.35%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- electric Shuttle busses from drop off points further way from the school</li> <li>- Prioritise a recent local proposal to create a school 'park-and-ride' that uses hybrid, electric or hydrogen vehicles (perhaps smaller than the coaches that struggle to navigate the local streets) to move children from locations on the A205 South Circular (Belair Park Car Park), A2219 and A2216 Dog</li> </ul>

			<p>Kennel Hill (Sainsbury's Car Park) or elsewhere to Alleyn's and JAGS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Has anyone asked the local schools to run minibuses through Dulwich?</li> <li>- Could suggest to local private schools that they offer additional mini bus services from east to west Dulwich as alternative to parents driving.</li> <li>- It will be a great improvement if coaches and buses are going through Dulwich are electrics.</li> <li>- Put shuttle buses on between schools in West D (dulwich college, Dulwich Prep) and schools at the other side of the village (Jags, Alleyns). That way families with kids at both schools do not need to drive across dulwich, they can drop at their nearest one, or kids can walk or cycle to nearest one.</li> </ul>
Wait for/bring forward the ULEZ extension	27	1.3%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bring forward the date for expansion of the ULEZ to stop so many diesel/polluting vehicles travelling through the area</li> <li>- Accelerate the roll-out of the ULEZ to the area. Or wait until it is in place and reassess emissions before making further changes.</li> <li>- Introduce a micro ULEZ so coaches and SUVs are not allowed in the area ever. This would discourage all the commuting in of school children from far afield by coach and SUV that causes the problems in the first place.</li> <li>- The ULEZ comes into play soon - that should make the air cleaner anyway as a lot of the dirtier vehicles will not wish to cross the South Circular road (northbound) so perhaps wait to see the impact of that before going too far along this route. It should stop quite a bit of 'rat-running" by the bigger and dirtier vehicles</li> <li>- What about a charging mechanism such as the ULEZ. Those that live within Dulwich Village or have full electric vehicles do not pay. Those driving in or through pay. So if congestion is very bad they drive through, but it would be too expensive to do this regularly and will encourage drivers to find alternative methods of transport or use electric cars.</li> <li>- Start advertising the fact that ULEZ will be covering the Dulwich village area next year to encourage people to find an alternative route to Dulwich Village or to ditch their polluting cars.</li> <li>- Furthermore it would be sensible to wait for the implementation of the ULEZ in Dulwich. In the city this has lead to a 20% reduction in pollution and driving. The same would be true in this neighbourhood once that is implemented</li> </ul>
Restrict access for larger vehicles	27	1.3%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Restrict heavy traffic through the Village.</li> <li>- Whoever allowed massive 4x4 cars onto London's streets?? We should just have small cars in our city. Can we ban these from Dulwich?</li> <li>- Restrict lorries on side roads</li> <li>- Restrict vans and lorries completely from the area except for delivery before ?7am after 7pm?</li> <li>- How about banning lorries, bigger polluting cars etc.</li> <li>- Consider more height/weight restrictions for vehicles on the residential roads</li> </ul>



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Something needs to be done to mitigate the effects of the large coaches being used to take students to and from the private schools near Dulwich village. These often block junctions. The high volume of large vehicles with only two occupants at school opening and closing times also needs to be reduced.</li> <li>- A lot of the heavy traffic on Townley rd and the surrounding area is caused by coaches using a it for the school, perhaps we could have 6 ft width restrictors instead. This would also stop Lorries and large vans.</li> </ul>
Put speed cameras on the main roads	26	1.25%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I would urge the placement and effective monitoring of speed cameras along East Dulwich Grove, Half Moon Lane, College Road and Gallery Road. The incidence of speeding vehicles along these roads is very high. I advocate this both as a pedestrian and as a cyclist, resident in the area for almost twenty years.</li> <li>- Speed cameras on half moon lane, often cars speeding down road</li> <li>- Average speed cameras to add extra deterrence to non Southwark origin storing traffic to pass through somewhere else.</li> <li>- There should be a speed camera on Half Moon Lane somewhere between the Herne Hill junction and Village Way to deter speeding traffic.</li> </ul>
The consultation process was flawed	25	1.2%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Question 4 is biased and slanted towards the response you want to hear, this is exactly the strategy you took in the East Dulwich CPZ survey. You need to give respondents the option to say no!</li> <li>- The consultation assumes that the proposals are acceptable and do not offer alternative less draconian measures. There is no detail on how displaced traffic will be managed.</li> <li>- THIS CONSULTATION HAS NOT BEEN ADEQUATELY PUBLICISED.</li> <li>Have there been mailings to all affected residents? I think not. This is absurd in light of the radical changes which are proposed.</li> <li>- You need to do an equalities impact assessment which looks at the wider impact on society and is not solely focused on the local rich white residents.</li> <li>- Design schemes from the starting point of common sense and proper community engagement rather than ideology and biased engagement that prioritises unrepresentative lobby groups.</li> <li>- Your consultation questions are misleading.</li> </ul>
Increase electric vehicle charging facilities	23	1.11%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Alongside these changes I would like to see and increase in cycle parking spaces and further introduction of electric vehicle charging stations.</li> <li>- Better EV charging infrastructure. In time the pollution component will reduce as more and more EVs are adopted. This is an affluent area with people having the money to elect to purchase EVs and with social conscience to do so. Enable that spend.</li> <li>- Put in more electric vehicle charging points in East Dulwich.</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- forget this scheme and promote hybrid and electric cars by investing in infrastructure and suggest, permit free for hybrid and electric cars.</li> <li>- A more effective way to deal with pollution longer term is to use the proposed funds to support and sponsor clean energy technology for vehicles.</li> </ul>
Reduce the number of parking spaces	22	1.06%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bus priority, cycle tracks &amp; reducing car parking spaces would reduce still further the space for motor vehicle traffic</li> <li>- And I would also limit the on street parking. Just keep it to one side of the road. Far safer for cyclists (which includes me when I am not waiting to have a new hip), and pedestrians.</li> <li>- If there were zones on either side of College Road where cars were not allowed to park it would help the safe flow of vehicles and cyclists and reduce the number of vehicles queueing with idling engines until a vehicle in the opposite finally gives way.</li> <li>- Remove all parking on Half Moon Lane and other roads where traffic will be heavier.</li> <li>- More double yellow lines at the Village end of Court Lane and Calton Avenue</li> <li>- Stop parking on both sides of the street on Calton Avenue. Introduce residential or paid parking (12-2) throughout the area to stop people parking and walking to North Dulwich station, leaving their cars for the day.</li> <li>- Additional double yellow lines in East Dulwich Grove</li> <li>- Reduce parking along Dulwich Village to minimise traffic slow down and congestion.</li> </ul>

Notable responses here included a desire for ‘carrot’ measures to complement or even replace the perceived ‘stick’ measures of road closures – so people wanted to see improved public transport in the area, especially more reliable east-west bus routes, and safe cycle lanes on some of the main roads, especially Half Moon Lane. The desire of residents for a permeable closure on Turney Road was also strongly reiterated here. Significant numbers also called for direct action to make schools reduce car use, whilst others expressed a wish that the proposed permeable closures be replaced with permit-controlled timed access.

# Corporate responses

Responses were received from many community organisations, businesses and other representative bodies. In all cases, these were asked to encourage their members to respond individually. Nonetheless, organisations who supplied a corporate response are listed below:

## **Online responses (titles as given):**

Lambeth Cyclists  
 Mayflower Gardens  
 Herne Hill Velodrome Trust (Charity based on Burbage Rd)  
 Hanbury Hill  
 Croydon Living Streets Group  
 Old College Tennis Club  
 Dulwich Podiatry Ltd  
 Harold George hairdressing and beauty  
 Camberwell Plant Hire Ltd. t/a Premier Plant Hire  
 United Cabbies Group  
 Southwark Community Sports Trust  
 Langley Dog walking  
 Stradella and Springfield Residents' Association  
 Dulwich College  
 Crystal Palace Transition Town Transport Group  
 Turney Residents Assoc  
 Cypress Cyclists  
 Dulwich tennis club on Gallery Rd  
 Dulwich Village Church of England Infants School

## **Email and other responses provided by:**

Turney Road Residents Association (survey)  
 London Cycling Campaign  
 Dulwich & District U3A  
 Dulwich Society  
 Dovercourt Road North Residents Association (survey)  
 Dulwich Village Residents association (survey)  
 Stradella and Springfield Residents Association  
 Dulwich Village, College Road and Woodyard Lane Residents Association (survey)  
 Dulwich Estate  
 Burbage Road Residents Association (survey)  
 Dulwich & Herne Hill Safe Routes to School Group  
 Clean Air For Dulwich  
 Lambeth Cyclists  
 Eynella Road residents (survey)

Mums for Lungs  
Propensity to Cycle Tool (PCT) authors  
Southwark Cyclists  
Metropolitan Police (Road Safety)

# About you

## Sex

<b>Female</b>	<b>948</b>	<b>47%</b>
<b>Male</b>	<b>990</b>	<b>49%</b>
<b>None given</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>3%</b>

## Age

<b>Unknown</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>2.3%</b>
<b>Under 16</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>3.7%</b>
<b>16-17</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>0.6%</b>
<b>18-24</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>2.6%</b>
<b>25-34</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>6.0%</b>
<b>35-44</b>	<b>463</b>	<b>23.1%</b>
<b>45-54</b>	<b>528</b>	<b>26.3%</b>
<b>55-64</b>	<b>380</b>	<b>18.9%</b>
<b>65-74</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>11.3%</b>
<b>75-84</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>4.4%</b>
<b>85-94</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0.5%</b>
<b>95+</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0.1%</b>

The age range of respondents roughly reflects that of the area, though the under-34 groups are underrepresented. The under-16s are relatively well represented (by comparison with most other public consultations), reflecting outreach work in several of the local schools.