

## Appendix B – RBG Consultation Comments & Objections

Comments / Objections	RBG Response
<p>I note the communication is the day after the publication of the formal notice so does not conform to the requirements of the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 which requires notification</p> <p>7(2) Not later than the date on which paragraph (1) has been complied with, the order making authority shall send a copy of the notice of proposals to each body or person whom it is required to consult under regulation 6(1) or under any of the provisions referred to in regulation 6(2).</p> <p><b>I confirm the London Borough of Bexley raise objection on the above procedural requirement not being met.</b></p>	<p>At this stage, the Draft TMO is the required notice and consultation on the proposed making of the order. Therefore, Royal Greenwich have consulted those affected and the consultation period was also extended for an additional 7 days.</p> <p>Nevertheless, given that LB Bexley has responded to the consultation, it is impossible to see what prejudice LB Bexley or any other of the consultation bodies could have suffered.</p> <p>The Reg 7(2) notice to the consultation bodies only entitles LB Bexley to make a consultation response and they in fact have responded substantively with sufficient time to do so.</p> <p>Consequently, all such comments received by LB Bexley and others, will be taken into consideration before a decision is made on the scheme.</p> <p><b>LB Bexley were updated and informed on 4.10.22 that RBG have considered this objection, but as LB Bexley have provided their comments, they will all be taken into consideration before a decision is made.</b></p>
<p>With regard to the proposed changes to parking controls the London Borough of Bexley object on the grounds that the proposals are likely to cause significant parking migration that will affect parking on a number of roads within our borough. The following plan illustrates our concern, two circles have been drawn on a scale plan, the outer circle indicates the limits of new parking controls within RBG (the limits to which RBG estimate they need to control parking). The inner circle indicates the general extents of the existing controlled parking zone in our borough. The roads in our borough inside the larger circle and not in a CPZ would be vulnerable to parking migrating from the locations at which charges are proposed (17 roads or parts of roads in total in the London Borough of Bexley).</p>	<p>Officers conclude that these proposals align with the wider objectives of the Council's Carbon Neutral Plan and the Transport Strategy 2022, that although not yet formally adopted, has been subject to extensive consultation.</p> <p>The aims and objectives of the Transport Strategy is to discourage car use and promote alternative modes of transport. The proposal would help to meet these objectives and would contribute to discouraging unnecessary car journeys.</p> <p>The proposed control and management of the unrestricted parking in Rochester Way and Welling Way will help to further encourage active travel initiatives and will encourage walking, cycling and public transport.</p>
<p>Surveys carried out after we received notification of the proposed introduction of charges show in the region of 260 vehicles parked by railway commuters – a figure that could easily be higher when the holiday period is over.</p>	<p>Many of the current "railheading" parking problems, associated with Falconwood Station, in the Eltham Heights area of the Royal Borough is largely a consequence of the earlier Falconwood (EW) CPZ introduced by The London Borough of Bexley.</p>

<p>Whilst I appreciate the stated aim of RBG is to try to encourage more use of public transport by introducing these charges it is inevitable that a proportion of drivers who currently choose to drive then commute by rail do so because it is convenient for their personal circumstances and will continue to do this. Whilst on this point, all day parking for £2.00 or £4.00 is significantly lower than the market rate so I do not see how the charges will support the modal change RBG are seeking.</p> <p><b>The primary ground for objection is that roads in the London Borough of Bexley will be adversely affected by these proposals.</b></p>	<p>Any displacement of parking associated with Falconwood Station is likely to be dispersed widely both sides of the borough boundary and so unlikely to have the impact on Bexley roads and residents as suggested.</p> <p>The London borough of Bexley have objected to the proposed fee (£2 and £4) due to being lower than the market rate. Royal Greenwich has been for some time fully aware of the cost-of-living crisis is having and in no means wishes to add to the financial burden. Royal Greenwich is a diverse borough, and we are aware of the issues affecting our communities regarding the cost of living.</p> <p>Therefore, Royal Greenwich has set a fee to help not only meet our objectives of reducing car dependency and unnecessary car journeys, but also a rate that does not adversely impacts residents and commuters. Whilst it is agreed other London borough's such as LB Bexley may set higher rates, it is felt that the proposed fee set by Royal Greenwich will help to meet the objectives of the scheme.</p> <p>The fee of £4 to park outside the railway station entrance would however be more than a single fare bus trip and will hopefully encourage active travel choices such as cycling – whereby users can take advantage of the cycle schemes installed to Welling Way and Bellegrave Road by LB Bexley.</p> <p>A higher rate as suggested by LB Bexley may also result in widespread displacement, which was a key consideration by Royal Greenwich, which included any impact on the neighbouring borough.</p> <p>However, in the unlikely event that significant displacement occurs in one or more location, Royal Greenwich and the London Borough of Bexley have the power to mitigate that displacement through the introduction of parking controls and scheme review.</p>
<p>The above Orders are necessary:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. to improve the safety in the local area by providing waiting restrictions and amending parking controls which increases forward visibility and prevents obstructive parking;</li> <li>2. for avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road and for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising;</li> <li>3. to facilitate the passage on the road for vehicular traffic;</li> </ol>	<p>The reasons set out for promoting the scheme are valid.</p> <p>Item 1 - The proposed scheme will help to improve safety by helping to control and manage the unrestricted parking in the area.</p> <p>Item 2 is listed in relation to the additional waiting restrictions that will help to improve sightlines and forward visibility to help reduce danger.</p> <p>Item 3 - Parking can at times result in drivers double parking, or parking in locations that create an obstruction to the free</p>

<p>4. to preserve the amenities of the area through which the road runs.</p> <p>The reasons set out above do not appear valid for the following reasons:-</p> <p>Item 1 – The proposals develop changes to introduce payment charges or time limited waiting, the extents where parking is allowed are not changed so drivers will be able to park in the same locations whether or not the proposals are adopted. The existing waiting restrictions at the traffic signal junction do not change. I cannot therefore see how any of the proposals can improve safety as suggested or increase forward visibility or prevent obstructive parking as the extents of where parking is allowed do not change.</p> <p>Item 2 – It is not clear how adding parking charges or time limited waiting reduce danger.</p> <p>Item 3 - It is not clear how still allowing parking where it is currently allowed improves the passage of vehicular traffic on the roads concerned.</p> <p>Item 4 – The provision of free short term time limited waiting and low-cost payment parking will allow more opportunity for the public to access the open spaces and woodland, but I note the free time limited parking is not proposed on Welling Way to benefit those approaching from within the London Borough of Bexley.</p> <p>The above are the grounds on which the London Borough of Bexley object to the proposals for Rochester Way and Welling Way as set out in the proposals referenced Rochester Way &amp; Welling Way 22-08 in the public notice</p>	<p>flow of traffic. The scheme will help to alleviate such problems from arising regularly.</p> <p>Item 4 – The parking occurring in Welling Way is long term on street parking associated with the station.</p> <p>Surveys also carried out by LB Bexley would have confirmed this parking. Therefore, the same payment parking is proposed in this location to the borough boundary.</p> <p>Whilst LB Bexley may support higher costs, it remains that Royal Greenwich feels the proposed rate will help to strike the balance between encouraging modal shift whilst not adding significant costs to drivers.</p>
<p>As a resident of the Falconwood area I demand you drop all plans to enact paid parking this is a blatant money grab in hard enough times I have to take tools a lot of them and heavy ones too all the way to London on a train now I'm expected to walk them from my house to the station on rain snow and sun not to mention the people who use that parking to walk dogs and to use the woods that will be ripped off to do so local residents like me CANNOT afford your greed in these tough economic times. This will also cause a knock-on affect and force people who are looking to park onto residential roads such as mine leaving no space for LOCALS and RESIDENTS to park.</p>	<p>The proposed control and management of the unrestricted parking in Rochester Way and Welling Way will help to further encourage active travel initiatives and will encourage walking, cycling and public transport.</p> <p>The aims and objectives of the Transport Strategy is to discourage car use and promote alternative modes of transport. The proposal would help to meet these objectives and would contribute to discouraging unnecessary car journeys.</p>

<p>Not to mention the slamming of doors at 5.30am as people start arriving to the first train.</p>	
<p>My primary concern for the introduction of this unnecessary alteration to the current free parking provision is that cars which currently park in these spaces will seek alternative free parking, which in the locality will mean the use residential streets off Welling Way. This will cause major problems and inconvenience to local residents/users.</p> <p>Historically there have been no problems whatsoever with free parking on Welling Way/Rochester Way near to Falconwood Station. The road is passable in all directions, no blockages or safety issues relating to parking.</p>	<p>A higher tariff rate may also result in widespread displacement, which was a key consideration by Royal Greenwich, which included any impact on the neighbouring borough.</p> <p>However, in the unlikely event that significant displacement occurs in one or more location, Royal Greenwich have the power to mitigate that displacement through the introduction of parking controls and scheme review.</p>
<p>This practice has been going on for years with no problems. Both of these roads are wide enough for parking and allowing free flow of traffic. People also park here to go to the woods and Oxleas Meadows. This is just another money-making exercise with no real justification</p>	<p>Time limited bays have been proposed by RBG at the entrance to the woods to encourage visitors to park free of charge.</p> <p>Parking can at times result in drivers double parking, or parking in locations that create an obstruction to the free flow of traffic. The scheme will help to alleviate such problems from arising regularly.</p>
<p>I am totally opposed to this plan, if Welling Way becomes a controlled zone our local roads in Welling will be overrun with commuter cars. Ashmore Grove is a fairly quiet cul de sac leading to the woods. We do not want our road looking like a car park. There are a few off road parking spots, every other car has to park in the road, causing hold ups to dustcarts etc. We do not want our drives blocked by unknown vehicles. Why should residents of Bexley pay the price of this decision.</p>	<p>In the unlikely event that, significant displacement occurs in one or more location, Royal Greenwich have the power to mitigate that displacement through the introduction of parking controls and scheme review.</p> <p>The aims and objectives of the Transport Strategy is to discourage car use and promote alternative modes of transport. The proposal would help to meet these objectives and would contribute to discouraging unnecessary car journeys.</p>
<p>I pass these two roads everyday and don't have a problem, there is no congestion, the roads are always clear, the cars are not causing any hazards for anyone. people walk their dogs in Oxley Woods all the time. why do like taking peoples enjoyment from them, Its seems the thumb screws are getting tighter and tighter.</p>	<p>The aims and objectives of the Transport Strategy is to discourage car use and promote alternative modes of transport. The proposal would help to meet these objectives and would contribute to discouraging unnecessary car journeys.</p>
<p>I am a resident of Ashmore Grove. I live in the in the cul de sac, with an alley way accessing Welling Way, so a short walk to the station. If the proposed parking restrictions go ahead, I believe it would significantly increase parking in Ashmore, which is already problematic for delivery vans and larger vehicles. This would also stop dog walkers and walkers easy access to the wonderful oxleas woods</p>	<p>Time limited bays have been proposed by RBG at the entrance to the woods to encourage visitors to park free of charge.</p> <p>Royal Greenwich have the power to mitigate that displacement through the introduction of parking controls and scheme review.</p>

<p>I don't park there myself, but when passing have always how wonderful that there is still somewhere people can park and get on a train without bothering local residents and being charged. It had also crossed my mind how the local council had not yet 'cashed' in - well we didn't have to wait long did we.</p> <p>I am totally opposed to any charges on behalf of car drivers and people who can not afford to pay train fares from further out of London, and the basic principle of being able to park without being charged by a greedy local council.</p>	<p>The aims and objectives of the Transport Strategy is to discourage car use and promote alternative modes of transport. The proposal would help to meet these objectives and would contribute to discouraging unnecessary car journeys.</p> <p>Royal Greenwich is a diverse borough, and we are aware of the issues affecting our communities regarding the cost of living. Therefore, RBG has set a fee to help not only meet our objectives of reducing car dependency and unnecessary car journeys, but also a rate that does not adversely impacts residents and commuters.</p>
<p>I have a preschool son and opted for childcare on the Dartford to Victoria route as I am a public sector worker based at the Kings College Hospital site at Denmark Hill. As such I drive from my home in SE18 to take my son to childcare before parking and walking to catch a train. Even then I have to make up hours on my non-working day to be able to get him there and pick him up on time.</p> <p>All I see at the moment in the Greenwich times is how you want to help people with the cost of living crisis and yet here you are trying to make money from hard working people who are trying to make ends meet.</p>	<p>Royal Greenwich has been for some time fully aware of the cost-of-living crisis is having and in no means wishes to add to the financial burden. Royal Greenwich is a diverse borough, and we are aware of the issues affecting our communities regarding the cost of living.</p> <p>Therefore, Royal Greenwich has set a fee to help not only meet our objectives of reducing car dependency and unnecessary car journeys, but also a rate that does not adversely impacts residents and commuters. Whilst it is agreed other London borough's may set higher rates, it is felt that the proposed fee set by Royal Greenwich will help to meet the objectives of the scheme.</p>
<p>If the plan goes ahead it will however hinder and cause parking problems for residents further down Welling way and the adjoining residential roads. If these plans go ahead GREENWICH COUNCIL will create problems and inconveniences for BEXLEY RESIDENTS where none exist at the moment.</p>	<p>Royal Greenwich have the power to mitigate that displacement through the introduction of parking controls and scheme review.</p>
<p>It is simply unrealistic to ask all commuters to arrive by bus as paying for bus travel often increases commuting costs as well as commuting times. Anyone dropping children at minders or schools often cannot afford the extra time in the morning and/or evening and this often costs more.</p> <p>This will not be to the benefit of anyone but will be detrimental to many commuters who are just trying to get to work in a timely and cost-effective way and to visitors wanting to visit the green space we have. Such restrictions will simply push the commuters and visitors to park on the side roads outside housing which in turn will give Greenwich and Bexley the idea that residential parking permits to prevent commuter parking is the way forward. <b>It is not</b>, it is simply a money-making exercise that is penalising commuters</p>	<p>Royal Greenwich has been for some time fully aware of the cost-of-living crisis is having and in no means wishes to add to the financial burden. Royal Greenwich is a diverse borough, and we are aware of the issues affecting our communities regarding the cost of living. Therefore, Royal Greenwich has set a fee to help not only meet our objectives of reducing car dependency and unnecessary car journeys, but also a rate that does not adversely impacts residents and commuters. Whilst it is agreed other London borough set higher rates, it is felt that the proposed fee set by Royal Greenwich will help to meet the objectives of the scheme.</p>

<p>and visitors to the area. <b>I do not want any changes</b> to the current parking arrangement because what we have works and doesn't hurt anyone, only helps. I fail to understand why this has been raised as an issue at all.</p>	
<p>Great idea to stop commuters parking. They are not residents of Greenwich or Bexley. It will take more cars off the road. Make them use public transport.</p>	<p>The aims and objectives of the Transport Strategy is to discourage car use and promote alternative modes of transport. The proposal would help to meet these objectives and would contribute to discouraging unnecessary car journeys.</p>
<p>I live in Montrose Ave but park at the end of welling way as I have a bad leg and chronic fatigue following being chronically ill from covid in March 2020. Therefore, I find the walk to the station difficult. I park in welling way to enable me to travel up to London for hospital appointments. This enables me to avoid too much walking.</p> <p>There is no valid reason to charge people for parking by public/common land except as a money spinner! Charging commuters will simply mean the people will start parking on Montrose Ave and further down welling way, causing inconvenience for residents and their visitors.</p>	<p>Royal Greenwich has been for some time fully aware of the cost-of-living crisis is having and in no means wishes to add to the financial burden. Royal Greenwich is a diverse borough, and we are aware of the issues affecting our communities regarding the cost of living. Therefore, Royal Greenwich has set a fee to help not only meet our objectives of reducing car dependency and unnecessary car journeys, but also a rate that does not adversely impacts residents and commuters. Whilst it is agreed other London boroughs may set higher rates, it is felt that the proposed fee set by Royal Greenwich will help to meet the objectives of the scheme.</p> <p>Royal Greenwich have the power to mitigate that displacement through the introduction of parking controls and scheme review.</p>
<p>1. being the cost of the train I would get from Dartford, it would cost me over £120 a month extra rather than coming to Falconwood. I know of many others coming from a lot further away so it would cost them a lot more each month.</p> <p>2. People using it for the nature parks, going for long walks or spending time as a family making memories, I've lots of fond memories at this park and not having a 2 hour window stops that from happening. Lots of people use this as part of the London walking trails, again they now can't use this to park, due to you trying to make a few quid.</p> <p>3, the cost of living is currently going through the roof and getting worse. Yet you want to penalise the working man yet again. The people who use this to park are not top earners like myself.</p> <p>This is something that would affect lots of people currently struggling, having fun in a lovely park, going for walks etc.</p>	<p>The aims and objectives of the Transport Strategy is to discourage car use and promote alternative modes of transport. The proposal would help to meet these objectives and would contribute to discouraging unnecessary car journeys.</p> <p>Royal Greenwich has been for some time fully aware of the cost-of-living crisis is having and in no means wishes to add to the financial burden. Royal Greenwich is a diverse borough, and we are aware of the issues affecting our communities regarding the cost of living. Therefore, Royal Greenwich has set a fee to help not only meet our objectives of reducing car dependency and unnecessary car journeys, but also a rate that does not adversely impacts residents and commuters.</p>

<p>We all bought our houses in an area with no parking restrictions for a reason – so that our visiting friends and families as well as ourselves can park easily. The school was there long before we all moved in, so we knew the issues regarding that. If commuters use our road for parking, Bexley Council will then impose parking restrictions here and it will lower the price of our houses and change the peaceful, calm atmosphere of our road.</p>	<p>Royal Greenwich have the power to mitigate that displacement through the introduction of parking controls and scheme review.</p> <p>The aims and objectives of the Transport Strategy is to discourage car use and promote alternative modes of transport. The proposal would help to meet these objectives and would contribute to discouraging unnecessary car journeys.</p>
<p>As a resident of Crookston Road, I strongly oppose the proposed parking changes to restrict commuter parking in Rochester Way.</p> <p>The road is very wide at the point where potential commuters park and does not cause any traffic or driving issues. Restriction of the parking along this stretch of Rochester Way will affect local people who use the facilities of Oxleas Woods; as well as local residents as people will look for parking opportunities in local residential roads.</p>	<p>Royal Greenwich have the power to mitigate that displacement through the introduction of parking controls and scheme review.</p> <p>Time limited bays have been proposed by RBG at the entrance to the woods to encourage visitors to park free of charge.</p>
<p>It is a ridiculous idea. Which will cause mayhem and havoc to the local roads. What is the point of having a station that you can't park anywhere nearby. It's not like Falconwood has a car park attached to it like most stations do. If you want to change the parking, then build a car park for the station instead.</p>	<p>There are currently no plans to build additional car parking space at Falconwood Station and therefore the proposal is to address the on-street parking occurring across the area.</p>