



**Democracy Services
London Borough of Merton
Merton Civic Centre
London Road
Morden SM4 5DX**

**Direct Line: 0208 545 3356
Email: democratic.services@merton.gov.uk**

Date: 11 June 2019

Dear Councillor

**Notification of a Decision taken by the Cabinet Member for
Regeneration, Housing and Transport**

The attached non-key decision has been taken by the Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Housing and Transport with regards to:

) Proposed MTC2 CPZ –Hallowell Close – second informal consultation

and will be implemented at **noon** on **Friday 14 June 2019** unless a call-in request is received.

The [call-in](#) form is attached for your use if needed and refers to the relevant sections of the constitution.

Yours sincerely

**Lisa Jewell
Democracy Services**

NON-KEY DECISION TAKEN BY A CABINET MEMBER UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

See over for instructions on how to use this form – all parts of this form must be completed. Type all information in the boxes. The boxes will expand to accommodate extra lines where needed.

1. Title of report and reason for exemption (if any)

Proposed MTC2 CPZ – second informal consultation

2. Decision maker

Councillor Martin Whelton, cabinet member for regeneration, housing and transport.

3. Date of Decision

11 June 2019

4. Date report made available to decision maker

11 June 2019

5. Date report made available to the Chairs of the Overview and Scrutiny Commission and of any relevant scrutiny panel

6. Decision

- A) Notes the results of the second informal consultation that was carried out between 25 April and 24 May 2019 on the recently implemented Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) MTC2 in Hallowell Close and neighbouring roads. All comments are attached as Appendix 3
- B) Agrees to proceed with the removal of Hallowell Close from the recently introduced MTC2 CPZ as shown in Drawing No. Z78-354-03 and attached in Appendix 1.
- C) Agrees to retain the recently introduced 'At any time' waiting restrictions and the banned footway parking in Hallowell Close as shown in Drawing No. Z78-354-03 and attached in Appendix 1.
- D) Agrees to exercise his discretion not to hold a public inquiry on the consultation process.

7. Reason for decision

- 1) A majority of residents not supporting a controlled parking zone in the road following a further consultation
- 2) The introduction of 'at any time' waiting restrictions will allow full access to footways and improve road safety in the road. Due to parking on the footways, pedestrians were often forced to walk on the carriageway or cross the road to the other side.

3) Hallowell Close is not wide enough to accommodate parking on both sides, and although it has sufficient footway width to allow partial footway parking (two wheels on the footway), the carriageway is not wide enough to allow partial footway parking

8. Alternative options considered and why rejected

- 8.1 Do nothing. This would not address the current concerns of the residents in respect of their views expressed during the second consultation; also it is against Council's practise to introduce CPZ in a road that rejects a CPZ.
- 8.2 To remove the double yellow lines and allow footway parking. This however would not be in line with Council's normal practice. Also, in the event of an incident, residents and other road users can be at risk and the Council would have failed in its duties by not giving safety and access priority.

9. Documents relied on in addition to officer report

None

10. Declarations of Interest

None

11. Publication of this decision and call in provision

Send this form and the officer report* to democratic.services@merton.gov.uk for publication. Publication will take place within two days. The call-in deadline will be at Noon on the third working day following publication.



Councillor Martin Whelton

Cabinet member for regeneration, housing and transport

11 June, 2019

Committee: Cabinet Member Report

Date: 10 June 2019

Agenda item:

Wards: Figge's Marsh

Subject: Proposed MTC2 CPZ –Hallowell Close – second informal consultation

Lead officer: Chris Lee, Director of Environment & Regeneration.

Lead member: Councillor Martin Whelton, Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Environment and Housing.

Forward Plan reference number: N/A

Contact Officer: Paul Atie, Tel: 020 8545 3337

Email: <mailto:paul.atie@merton.gov.uk>

Recommendations:

That the Cabinet Member considers the issues detailed in this report and

- A) Notes the results of the second informal consultation that was carried out between 25 April and 24 May 2019 on the recently implemented Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) MTC2 in Hallowell Close and neighbouring roads. All comments are attached as Appendix 3
- B) Agrees to proceed with the removal of Hallowell Close from the recently introduced MTC2 CPZ as shown in Drawing No. Z78-354-03 and attached in Appendix 1.
- C) Agrees to retain the recently introduced 'At any time' waiting restrictions and the banned footway parking in Hallowell Close as shown in Drawing No. Z78-354-03 and attached in Appendix 1.
- D) Agrees to exercise his discretion not to hold a public inquiry on the consultation process.

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report presents the results of the second informal consultation that was carried in response to complaints from residents of Hallowell Close in order to determine whether or not the recently introduced MTC2 CPZ should be removed from Hallowell Close.
- 1.2 It seeks approval to progress the above recommendations.

2. DETAILS

- 2.1 The key objectives of parking management include:
 - Tackling of congestion by reducing the level and impact of traffic in town centres and residential areas.
 - Making the borough's streets safer and more secure, particularly for pedestrians and other vulnerable road users through traffic management measures.
 - Managing better use of street spaces for people, goods and services, ensuring that priority is allocated to meet the objectives of the strategy.

- Improving the attractiveness and amenity of the borough's streets, particularly in town centres and residential areas.
- Encouraging the use of more sustainable modes of transport.

2.2 Controlled parking zones aim to provide safe parking arrangements, whilst giving residents and businesses priority access to available kerbside parking space. It is a way of controlling the parking whilst improving and maintaining access and safety for all road users. A CPZ comprises of yellow line waiting restrictions and various types of parking bays operational during the controlled times. These types of bays include the following:

Permit holder bays: - For use by resident permit holders, business permit holders and those with visitor permits.

2.3 A CPZ includes double yellow lines (no waiting 'At Any Time') restrictions at key locations such as at junctions, bends and along certain lengths of roads (passing gaps) where parking impedes the flow of traffic or would create an unacceptable safety risk e.g. obstructive sightlines or unsafe areas where pedestrians cross. These restrictions will improve access for emergency services; refuse vehicles and the overall safety for all road users, especially those pedestrians with disabilities and parents with prams. Any existing double yellow lines at junctions will remain unchanged.

2.4 The CPZ design comprises of permit holder bays to be used by residents, their visitors or business permit holders. The layout of the parking bays are arranged in a manner that provides the maximum number of suitable parking spaces without jeopardising road safety and the free movement of traffic.

2.5 Within any proposed CPZ or review, the Council aims to reach a balance between the needs of the residents, businesses, visitors and all other users of the highway. It is normal practice to introduce appropriate measures if and when there is a sufficient majority of support or there is an overriding need to ensure access and safety. In addition the Council would also take into account the impact of introducing the proposed changes in assessing the extent of those controls and whether or not they should be implemented.

2.6 In 2017 some residents of Commonside East and Hallowell Close petitioned the Council requesting the introduction of a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in their roads. This instigated the start of the consultation process.

3. Informal consultation

3.1 The informal consultation on the proposals to introduce parking controls in Commonside East (Between Nos 1 and 159), Esher Mews and Hallowell Close commenced on 18 June and ended on 20 July 2018. 133 premises were consulted via documents containing a newsletter explaining the proposals; an associated plan showing the proposed parking layout and a sheet of frequently asked questions. Residents were directed to the Council's website to fill in the online questionnaire. The consultation document was posted to all households and businesses within the catchment area.

- 3.2 Notification of the proposals along with the web-link to the online questionnaire (e-form) was also posted on the Council's website showing the proposed parking controls within the zone including the following:
- 'At any time' double yellow lines at key locations such as at junctions, bends, and ends of cul-de-sacs;
 - Single yellow lines (mainly between parking bays and across dropped kerbs);
 - Permit holder bays for use by residents, businesses and their visitor.
- 3.3 The consultation resulted in a total of 50 questionnaires returned representing a response rate of 34%. Of the 50 who responded, 88% supported a CPZ, compared to 10% who did not and 2% who were unsure. Residents were also asked which days of operation they would prefer if a CPZ was introduced. Results show that 58% of respondents preferred Monday – Saturday, 22% support Monday - Friday and 20% Monday – Sunday or no response. Residents were further asked which hours of operation they would prefer should the CPZ be introduced. Results show that 84% of respondents preferred 8.30am – 6.30pm, while 2% preferred 10am – 4pm, 8% preferred 11am – 3pm and 6% other hours or no response.
- 3.4 The results of the consultation along with officers' recommendation were presented in a report to the Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Housing and Transport on 6 August 2018. After careful consideration of the consultation results and officers' recommendations, the Cabinet Member agreed to proceed with a statutory consultation.
- 3.5 **Statutory consultation**
- 3.5.1 The statutory consultation on the Council's intention to introduce MTC2 CPZ to include Commonsides East (Between Nos 1 and 159), Esher Mews and Hallowell Close was carried out between 19 November and 7 December 2018. The consultation included the erection of street Notices on lamp columns in the vicinity of the proposals and the publication of the Council's intentions in the Local Guardian and the London Gazette. Consultation documents were available at the Link, Merton Civic Centre and on the Council's website. A newsletter with a plan, was also distributed to all those properties included within the consultation area.
- 3.5.2 The newsletter detailed the following information:
- The undertaking of the statutory consultation
 - A plan detailing the following:
 - Zone operational hours (Monday to Friday between 8.30am and 6.30pm)
 - Double yellow lines operating "at any time' without loading restrictions
 - Permit holders only parking bays
 - Zone boundary
- 3.5.3 The statutory consultation resulted in 12 representations which include 3 representations in support, 3 comments and 6 objections. The main objection is that the current level of parking is being removed from the footway on one side of Hallowell Close which would reduce the available parking in the road by half. All representations received during the statutory consultation along with officer's

recommendations were reported to the Cabinet Member for Member for Regeneration, Housing and Transport in January 2019. After careful consideration of the consultation results and officers' recommendations, the Cabinet Member agreed to proceed with the implementation of MTC2 CPZ.

- 3.5.4 Following the Council's decision to introduce the MTC2 CPZ in the Commonsides East area, the installation of the CPZ commenced in 25 March and was completed 5 April 2019.

4 Hallowell Close

- 4.1 Following the decision to implement the CPZ, the Council received a number of representations from Hallowell Close residents setting out their concerns about the impact of the CPZ on parking particularly the removal of footway parking. The Cabinet Member met with Ward Councils and officers to discuss the Hallowell Close residents' concerns. After careful consideration, the Cabinet Member instructed officer to carry out a second informal consultation to determine the level of support from Hallowell Close residents for the recently introduced CPZ. The second informal consultation was only linked to the element of the CPZ. It was made clear that the yellow lines and the footway parking ban were not subject to this further consultation. It was explained that if the majority of Hallowell Close residents were to opt to be excluded from the CPZ, the road markings would remain; the ban on the footway parking would remain but residents would be able to park within the available space free of charge and they would not be entitled to purchase a permit. The inevitable displaced parking was also detailed to the residents.
- 4.2 The second informal consultation on the recently installed CPZ in Hallowell Close commenced on 25 April and ended 24 May 2019. 37 premises were surveyed via documents containing a newsletter explaining the concerns raised by residents; their options and an associated questionnaire. The leaflet is attached as appendix 2
- 4.3 15 households responded representing a response rate of 40.5%. Of the 15 who responded, 80% want the CPZ removed, compared to 20 who support the CPZ. The results are set out in the table below.
- 4.4 As shown in table below, of the 15 who responded, 80% support the removal of the CPZ from Hallowell Close, compared to 20% who do not. Please note that the previous informal consultation result has been included in the table for information.

Table 1 – summary of results to question:

ROAD	No of Properties	Previous informal consultation result			Latest informal consultation result (do you want the CPZ remove)		
		No of returns	YES	NO	No of returns	YES	NO
Hallowell Close	37	19	14	5	15	12	3

- 4.5 In accordance with the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1974, parking on any part of a footway is illegal; although there are occasions where provided there is sufficient footway (minimum 2m) and carriageway width (6.5m) parking on footway can be permitted via an Exemption Order. This Order is a legal document that needs to be produced by the Local Traffic and Highway Authority. Once the Exemption Order is obtained, the necessary road markings and signage are erected to define the exempted area. This exemption, however, does not apply where the footway comprises of a grass verge.
- 4.6 As mentioned in previous reports and in all related documents / correspondences, Hallowell Close is not wide enough to accommodate parking on both sides, and although it has sufficient footway width to allow partial footway parking (two wheels on the footway), the carriageway is not wide enough to allow partial footway parking. That is to say that due to footway and carriageway, it is not possible to maintain minimum footway and carriageway width whilst allowing parking. Prior to the ban, vehicles parked fully on one side on the carriageway and fully on the footway on the other side to allow adequate space for emergency Services and refuse vehicles but did not provide adequate space for pedestrians using the footway. In fact, pedestrians were often forced to walk on the carriageway or cross the road to the other side and now that the Council is aware of this unsafe and illegal practice, we are compelled to take the appropriate action. It should be noted that although the ban is now in place, due to concerns raised about the CPZ, the ban has not been enforced. However, once a decision is made to finalise the implemented scheme, enforcement will be carried out as per normal practice.

4.7 A number of respondents expressed concerns about loss of parking spaces due to the double yellow lines and ban on footway parking in Hallowell Close and that it would not be possible to accommodate all the parking needs of the residents. They feel that they have lived in the road for many years and are better placed to understand the parking pattern of motorists in their road. Not to address obstructive parking once it has been investigated by the Council could be considered as a failure by the Council in its duty to provide clear access and in the event of an incident, the council can be held responsible. Where possible, the Council works with all emergency services to ensure that any unnecessary delay to their emergency call is addressed effectively. Although residents are of the opinion they have lived in these roads for many years and no such incident has occurred, this is a moot point when considering safety and access. The Council also has photographic evidence of inconsiderate and obstructive footway parking that is taking place in this road at various times of the day. Within any parking management design, every effort is made to maximise the number of safe parking spaces; however, it is important to note that safety and access always takes priority over parking. It is normal practice to introduce yellow lines even if a CPZ is not introduced.

4.9 When considering road safety, S.122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 places a duty on the Council "to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway "when exercising any of its functions under the 1984 Act. Road safety is therefore a matter that the Council should have proper regard to when considering whether to make an Order under S.6 of the 1984 Act.

4.8 Ward Councillor Comments

The local Ward Councillors have been fully engaged during the consultation process. Although the Ward Members have been advised of the outcome of the most recent consultation and officer's recommendations, at the time of writing this report, no comments have been received against the proposed measures.

5. PROPOSED MEASURES

5.1 Based on the results of the consultation, it is recommended that Hallowell Close is removed from the recently introduced MTC2 CPZ as shown in Drawing No. Z78-354-02 and attached in Appendix 1

5.2 It is recommended to retain the recently introduced 'At any time' waiting restrictions and the ban on footway parking in Hallowell Close as shown in Drawing No. Z78-354-0* and attached in Appendix 1.

6. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

6.1 Do nothing. This would not address the current concerns of the residents in respect of their views expressed during the second consultation; also it is against Council's practise to introduce CPZ in a road that rejects a CPZ.

- 6.2 To remove the double yellow lines and allow footway parking. This however would not be in line with Council's normal practice. Also, in the event of an incident, residents and other road users can be at risk and the Council would have failed in its duties by not giving safety and access priority.

7. TIMETABLE

- 7.1 If agreed, the TMO will be made soon after the publication of the Cabinet Member's decision and the CPZ element will be removed from Hallowell Close 6 -10 weeks after the Order is made.

8.0 FINANCIAL RESOURCE AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 It would cost approximately £500 to remove the CPZ signs.

9. LEGAL AND STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 The Traffic Management Orders would be made under Section 6 and Section 45 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended). The Council is required by the Local Authorities Traffic Order (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 to give notice of its intention to make a Traffic Order (by publishing a draft traffic order). These regulations also require the Council to consider any representations received as a result of publishing the draft order.
- 9.2 The Council has discretion as to whether or not to hold a public inquiry before deciding whether or not to make a traffic management order or to modify the published draft order. A public inquiry should be held where it would provide further information, which would assist the Council in reaching a decision.
- 9.3 The Council's powers to make Traffic Management Orders arise mainly under sections 6, 45, 46, 122 and 124 and schedules 1 and 9 of the RTRA 1984.

10. HUMAN RIGHTS & EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY COHENSION IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 The implementation of new CPZs and the subsequent changes to the original design affects all sections of the community especially the young and the elderly and assists in improving safety for all road users and achieves the transport planning policies of the government, the Mayor for London and the Borough.
- 10.2 By maintaining clear junctions, access and sightlines will improve, thereby improving the safety at junctions by reducing potential accidents.
- 10.3 The Council carries out careful consultation to ensure that all road users are given a fair opportunity to air their views and express their needs. The design of the scheme includes special consideration for the needs of people with blue badges, local residents, businesses without prejudice toward charitable and religious facilities. The needs of commuters are also given consideration but generally carry less weight than those of residents and local businesses.
- 10.4 Bodies representing motorists, including commuters are included in the statutory consultation required for draft traffic management and similar orders published in the local paper and London Gazette.

11. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

11.1 N/A

12. RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

12.1 The proposed measures may cause some dissatisfaction from those who have requested status quo or other changes that cannot be implemented but the Council is acting in line with the majority feedback received regarding the CPZ and in line with its normal adopted practice whilst discharging its statutory duties in terms of access and safety.

13. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

13.1 When determining the type of parking places are to be designated on the highway, section 45(3) requires the Council to consider both the interests of traffic and those of the owners and occupiers of adjoining properties. In particular, the Council must have regard to: (a) the need for maintaining the free movement of traffic, (b) the need for maintaining reasonable access to premises, and (c) the extent to which off-street parking is available in the neighbourhood or if the provision of such parking is likely to be encouraged by designating paying parking places on the highway.

13.2 By virtue of section 122, the Council must exercise its powers under the RTRA 1984 so as to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic including pedestrians, and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway. These powers must be exercised so far as practicable having regard to the following matters:-

- (a) the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises.
- (b) the effect on the amenities of any locality affected including the regulation and restriction of heavy commercial traffic so as to preserve or improve amenity.
- (c) the national air quality strategy.
- (d) facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and securing the safety and convenience of their passengers.
- (e) any other matters appearing to the Council to be relevant.

14. APPENDICES

14.1 The following documents are to be published with this report and form part of the report.


Appendix 1 – Drawing No. Z78-354-02

Appendix 2 – informal consultation Document.

15. BACKGROUND PAPERS

15.1 Report dated 30/07/2018 titled proposed MTC2 Commonsides East area CPZ – Informal Consultation.

15.2 Report dated 19/01/2019 titled proposed MTC2 Commonsides East area CPZ – Statutory Consultation.



NOTES
Do not scale from this drawing

No.	Revision	Drawn	By	Checked	By	Date

Sustainable Communities
environment & regeneration

TRAFFIC & HIGHWAYS

Revised from/used from the previous survey? (if not applicable, tick box)
 Checked by: CS Date: 17 Apr 2017
 Approved by: SS Date: 17 Apr 2017
 Drawn by: SS Date: 14 Sep 2017

PROJECT TITLE
Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs)
MTC2 CPZ
Mon-Sat - 8.30am-6.30pm

merion
Merion Civic Centre
Merion Road
Merion Surrey
SM4 6SX
www.merion.gov.uk

Drawing No. Z87-351-03
Revision: -
Title: IMPLEMENTATION
Scale: 1:500

- EXISTING**
- GROSSOVERS
 - DISABLED BAY
 - LAMP COLUMN
 - SINGLE YELLOW LINE
 - DOUBLE YELLOW LINE

- PROPOSED CPZ**
- PERMIT HOLDER BAY
 - PROPOSED SINGLE YELLOW LINE
 - PROPOSED DOUBLE YELLOW LINE
 - POST
 - P&D TICKET MACHINE
 - CPZ BOUNDARY
 - NEW POST

KEY

Control Parking Zone (CPZ) Parking Survey - Hallowell Close



ISSUE DATE : 25 APRIL 2019

Dear Resident

As you are aware following a comprehensive informal and statutory consultations, the Council recently introduced a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in Commonsides East and Hallowell Close which currently excludes footway Parking.

We have received a number of representations from Hallowell Close residents setting out their concerns about the impact of the CPZ on parking particularly the removal of footway parking. After careful consideration, it has been decided to carry out a survey to determine the level of support from Hallowell Close residents for the recently introduced CPZ. It is essential to note that the survey is only linked to the CPZ and does not include the yellow lines nor the ban on footway parking. This means that if the majority of Hallowell Close opt to be excluded from the CPZ, the road markings will remain, the ban on the footway parking will remain but residents would be able to park within the available space free of charge and you would not be entitled to a permit.

It should also be noted that since we have only received objections from Hallowell Close, this survey does not apply to Commonsides East / Esher Close which will remain within a CPZ.

In accordance with the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1974, parking on any part of a footway is illegal; although there are occasions where provided there is sufficient footway (minimum 2m) and carriageway width (6.5m), parking on footway can be permitted via an Exemption Order. This Order is a legal document that needs to be produced by the Local Traffic and Highway Authority. Once the Exemption Order is obtained, the necessary road markings and signage are erected to define the exempted area.

This exemption, however, does not apply where the footway comprises of a grass verge.

Although Hallowell Close has sufficient footway width to allow partial footway parking (two wheels on the footway), the carriageway is not wide enough. This means that to allow partial footway parking so as to not to cause obstruction on the carriageway would mean total obstruction to pedestrians which can no longer be permitted. Currently vehicles park fully on one side on the carriageway and fully on the footway on the other side to allow adequate space for emergency services and service delivery vehicles / refuse vehicles but do not provide adequate space for pedestrians using the footway. As set out in previous communications, this can no longer be permitted.

Some years ago, due to a number of issues, Parking Services stopped enforcing footway parking in many roads across the borough. Their reasoning was that in the absence of other restrictions, if enforcement is carried out in those roads, drivers would park on both sides of the carriageway which would impede the flow of traffic including emergency services and service vehicles. This is an agreed concession and has no legal standing. There is no Exemption Order for this area and given the footway and carriageway width, footway parking cannot be permitted even if the CPZ was to be removed.

Despite the fact that the Council's consultation documents and plans did refer to parking restrictions and locations of parking bays, due to the number of representations received from Hallowell Close residents implying that they would not have voted for a CPZ if they were informed that footway parking would not be allowed, the Council is offering Hallowell Close residents a further

www.merton.gov.uk

opportunity to vote on the CPZ element only.

Factors to consider include

- Under no circumstance the yellow lines would be removed or reduced
- Under no circumstance footway parking would be permitted
- Should Hallowell Close opt out of the CPZ, residents would not be able to purchase a permit
- CPZ on neighbouring roads will remain and non-permit holders would not be able to park in those roads

Available safe parking bays in Hallowell Close would be available for anyone to utilise including those within the CPZ who may not wish to purchase a permit / visitors etc

Please use the attached prepaid envelope and card to tell us your preference. Please note that it is one vote per property and photocopies will not be accepted. This is standard practice and in line with the Council's consultation process.

For all information regarding MTC2 CPZ and this survey, please see Council's web site www.merton.gov.uk/cpsmtc2

Thank you in advance for your feedback.



Paul Atie

Senior Engineer, Parking
020 8545 3337



FIGGE'S MARSH WARD COUNCILLORS

Cllr Agatha Mary Akyigyina
Phone - 020 8545 3396
Email: agatha.akyigyina@merton.gov.uk

Cllr Mike Brunt
Phone - 020 8640 1538
Email: mike.brunt@merton.gov.uk

Cllr Geraldine Stanford
Phone - 020 8545 3424
Email: geraldine.stanford@merton.gov.uk

Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Transport and Housing.

Cllr Martin Whelton
Phone: 020 8545 3425
Email: martin.whelton@merton.gov.uk

(The contact details of Ward Councillors are provided for information purposes only)



Comment – please note that although your comments will be considered by the Council and the Cabinet Member, you will not receive a response.

We feel we have no option but to support the CPZ if you are going to implement it in to commonside east. If it is removed it will lead to more cars parking on Hallowell Close and there will not be enough space for residents. Currently if parking is not allowed on the pavement on Hallowell Close then there isn't enough space for resident cars when parking on the road. If you then make us permit free but keep them in commonside east we will be even worse off. Both options are not viable. If we do have to keep the permits then we would like them to only be Monday - Friday which your previous communications said it would be.

Many Thanks.


Please return questionnaire in the prepaid envelope provided.

For all information regarding MTC2 CPZ and this survey, please see Council's web site www.merton.gov.uk/cpsmtc2



Comment – please note that although your comments will be considered by the Council and the Cabinet Member, you will not receive a response.

We are very happy the way we are parking you should allow foot path parking and not make our lives miserable. You should be helping us and not put us in trouble. We are pay enough council tax so you should leave as it is.



Please return questionnaire in the prepaid envelope provided.
For all information regarding MTC2 CPZ and this survey, please see Council's web site www.merton.gov.uk/cpsmtc2



Comment – please note that although your comments will be considered by the Council and the Cabinet Member, you will not receive a response.

I am still dazed by your not very thought through decision to introduce a CPZ from Mon - Sat @ the hours you thought of that ends up penalising the very people who come to you for help.

Not sure how you all consulted and came to such an appalling decision - that compounds the problem we all have.

It is disgraceful and you'll want to vote and participate in any community initiative?

Please return questionnaire in the prepaid envelope provided.
For all information regarding MTC2 CPZ and this survey, please see Council's web site www.merton.gov.uk/cpsmtc2



Comment – please note that although your comments will be considered by the Council and the Cabinet Member, you will not receive a response.

Whether the CPZs are removed or stay there still will not be enough parking spaces for all residents in Hallowell Close even the odd spaces along Commonsides East will not accommodate any overflow from Hallowell Close. Who would want to pay for a space to park when there is not one. Why doesn't Merton Planning Dept. know that Three Kings & The Beehive no longer exist as Public Houses and haven't done so for many many years. Where these properties made into residential spaces without permission?

Please return questionnaire in the prepaid envelope provided.
For all information regarding MTC2 CPZ and this survey, please see Council's web site
www.merton.gov.uk/cpsmtc2



Comment – please note that although your comments will be considered by the Council and the Cabinet Member, you will not receive a response.

This is, as you well know, a rigged poll designed to give a pretence of democracy. To ask if you want to be shot in the left foot or the right is not going to give a sensible answer. We were promised by Cllr Whelton that the yellow lines would only be introduced if the CPZ went ahead.

All the residents on that side of the street agree. There are elderly residents and a disabled child in a wheelchair, both want the sensible compromise that they will cross a narrow and very quiet street to the pavement on the other side. I would be happy to pay the residents parking charge if there was going to be sufficient parking for the residents who live here.

Please return questionnaire in the prepaid envelope provided.

For all information regarding MTC2 CPZ and this survey, please see Council's web site

www.merton.gov.uk/cpsmtc2



Comment – please note that although your comments will be considered by the Council and the Cabinet Member, you will not receive a response.

The CPZ in its current format is unworkable.

Roughly 60 parking spaces have to be shared among 200 homes and a school which is ridiculous.

The CPZ should be halted until a decision has been made over the land opposite the Sparrow hawk site which can hold 15/17 parking spaces.

Otherwise I request CPZ be stopped ^{on} ~~and~~ both Hallowell close and Commons side east and pavement parking on Hallowell close continue on Hallowell close.

Please return questionnaire in the prepaid envelope provided.

For all information regarding MTC2 CPZ and this survey, please see Council's web site

www.merton.gov.uk/cpsmtc2



Comment – please note that although your comments will be considered by the Council and the Cabinet Member, you will not receive a response.

PLEASE RETAIN THE CPZ FOR HOLLOWELL CLOSE AS THIS HAS ~~BEEN~~ NOW RESIDENT MOTORISTS AND PROVIDED PARKING FOR RESIDENTS.

THE FOOTWAY PARKING SHOULD BE REMOVED AS THIS ONLY APPLIES TO HOUSING N^{OS} ~~17-35~~ 17-35 AND THESE PROPERTIES HAVE GARAGES AT THE REAR OF THE HOUSES.

IF RESIDENTS OF N^{OS} 17-35 HAVE VEHICLES THEY CAN BE PARKED AT THE REAR WITHOUT HAVING A PERMIT.

SHOULD RESIDENTS WANT TO PARK AT THE FRONT THEY CAN BUY PERMITS AND PARK ON THE "EVEN" SIDE OF HOLLOWELL CLOSE WITHOUT CAUSING ANY PROBLEMS.

Please return questionnaire in the prepaid envelope provided.

For all information regarding MTC2 CPZ and this survey, please see Council's web site

www.merton.gov.uk/cpsmtc2



Comment – please note that although your comments will be considered by the Council and the Cabinet Member, you will not receive a response.

I cast my support for
CPZ.
Since its implementation,
vehicles have not been
parking on the footway in front
of my house which they often
block my gate previously.

Please return questionnaire in the prepaid envelope provided.
For all information regarding MTC2 CPZ and this survey, please see Council's web site
www.merton.gov.uk/cpsmtc2

Merton Council - call-in request form

1. Decision to be called in: (required)

--

2. Which of the principles of decision making in Article 13 of the constitution has not been applied? (required)

Required by part 4E Section 16(c)(a)(ii) of the constitution - tick all that apply:

(a) proportionality (i.e. the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome);	
(b) due consultation and the taking of professional advice from officers;	
(c) respect for human rights and equalities;	
(d) a presumption in favour of openness;	
(e) clarity of aims and desired outcomes;	
(f) consideration and evaluation of alternatives;	
(g) irrelevant matters must be ignored.	

3. Desired outcome

Part 4E Section 16(f) of the constitution- select one:

(a) The Panel/Commission to refer the decision back to the decision making person or body for reconsideration, setting out in writing the nature of its concerns.	
(b) To refer the matter to full Council where the Commission/Panel determines that the decision is contrary to the Policy and/or Budget Framework	
(c) The Panel/Commission to decide not to refer the matter back to the decision making person or body *	
* If you select (c) please explain the purpose of calling in the decision.	

4. Evidence which demonstrates the alleged breach(es) indicated in 2 above (required)

Required by part 4E Section 16(c)(a)(ii) of the constitution:

5. Documents requested

6. Witnesses requested

7. Signed (not required if sent by email):

8. Notes – see part 4E section 16 of the constitution

Call-ins must be supported by at least three members of the Council.

The call in form and supporting requests must be received by 12 Noon on the third working day following the publication of the decision.

The form and/or supporting requests must be sent:

-) **EITHER** by email from a Councillor’s email account (no signature required) to democratic.services@merton.gov.uk
-) **OR** as a signed paper copy to the Head of Democracy Services, 7th floor, Civic Centre, London Road, Morden SM4 5DX.

For further information or advice contact the Head of Democracy Services on
020 8545 3864