

**CORPORATE SERVICES DEPARTMENT**  
Director – Caroline Holland



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

**Direct Line: 0208 545 3357  
Email: [democratic.services@merton.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@merton.gov.uk)**

**Date: 20 August 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 waiting restrictions in Heathfield Drive area (statutory  
consultation)**

and will be implemented at **noon on Friday 23 August 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

**Amy Dumitrescu  
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**

Proposed waiting restrictions in Heathfield Drive area (statutory consultation)

**2. Reason for exemption (if any)**

**3. Decision maker**

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

**4. Date of Decision**

19 August 2019

**5. Date report made available to decision maker**

19 August 2019

**6. Decision**

- 1) Notes the result of the statutory consultation carried out between 16th May 2019 and 7th June 2019 on the proposals to introduce 'at any time' waiting restrictions in Heathfield Drive area.
- 2) Agrees to proceed with the making of the relevant Traffic Management Orders (TMOs) and the implementation of the waiting 'at any time' in Heathfield Drive area as shown in Drawing Nos. Z27-664-01A in Appendix A.
- 3) Agrees to exercise his discretion not to hold a public inquiry on the consultation process.

**7. Documents relied on in addition to officer report**

None

**8. Declarations of Interest**

None



Cllr Martin Whelton

Cabinet member for regeneration, housing and transport

19 August 2019

# **Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Environment and Housing:**

**Date:** 16<sup>th</sup> August 2019

**Agenda item:**

**Ward:** Lavender Fields

**Subject:** Proposed waiting restrictions in Heathfield Drive area (statutory consultation)

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

**Lead member:** Councillor Martin Whelton, Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Housing and Transport

**Forward Plan reference number:** N/A

Contact Officer: Barry Copestake, Tel: 020 8545 3840

Email: [barry.copestake@merton.gov.uk](mailto:barry.copestake@merton.gov.uk)

---

## **Recommendations:**

That the Cabinet Member considers the issues details in this report and:

- 1) Notes the result of the statutory consultation carried out between 16<sup>th</sup> May 2019 and 7<sup>th</sup> June 2019 on the proposals to introduce 'at any time' waiting restrictions in Heathfield Drive area.
  - 2) Agrees to proceed with the making of the relevant Traffic Management Orders (TMOs) and the implementation of the waiting 'at any time' in Heathfield Drive area as shown in Drawing Nos. Z27-664-01A in Appendix A.
  - 3) 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 details the undertaking of the statutory consultation and the outcome on the Councils' proposals to introduce waiting restrictions in Heathfield Drive area operating 'at any time'.
- 1.2 It seeks approval to proceed with the making of the relevant Traffic Management Orders (TMOs) and the implementation of the proposed waiting restrictions in Heathfield Drive area operational 'at any time' as shown in drawing nos. Z27-664-01A in Appendix A.

## **2 BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 Officers received complaints from local Ward Councillors and the local MP on behalf of residents regarding obstructive parking and access issues at various junctions in the Heathfield Drive area. Much of the carriageway in Heathfield Drive, Wilkins Close, Wilson Avenue and neighbouring roads in the area is not wide enough to accommodate parking on both sides of the road without parked vehicles causing obstruction to moving traffic or pedestrian access on the footways. Obstructive parking is of particular concern for refuse collection services and swift access for emergency services in the event of an emergency.

## **3 STATUTORY CONSULTATION**

- 3.1 The statutory consultation on the Council's proposal to introduce waiting restrictions in Heathfield Drive area commenced on 16<sup>th</sup> May 2019 and concluded on 7<sup>th</sup> June 2019. The consultation included erecting 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.

Details and plans of the proposals (see appendix A) were also available on the Council's website and a link to this website was included on all street notices.

- 3.2 The statutory consultation resulted in 12 representations to the proposals, which includes seven representations in support, four in conditional support and one representation in objection. The content of the representations are detailed in appendix C.
- 3.3 It is important to note that the council must strike a balance of ensuring safety and maintaining unobstructed traffic flow whilst acknowledging the parking needs of the community.

#### Ward Councillor Comment

- 3.4 Ward Councillors have been engaged during the consultation process and have been advised of the outcome of the consultation; at the time of writing this report, no comments have been received against the proposed measures.

### **4 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED**

- 4.1 Generally, there is support for the concept of the proposal and an appreciation of the objectives of the proposed restrictions with a request for further waiting restrictions to be introduced such as extending proposed restrictions or introducing restrictions to the opposite side of the carriageway.
- 4.2 A couple of representations raised concerns that the introduction of double yellow lines will not be sufficient to tackle the parking pressure experienced by residents and that a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) would address the issue of long term visitor / commuter parking.
- 4.3 One representation opposing the proposal is on the basis that the current parking pressure in the area will be exacerbated by the introduction of the proposed waiting restrictions by reducing kerbside parking places; however, the resident would support the proposal if off-road parking was provided for them, therefore addressing the lack of available residential parking.
- 4.4 Considering all the representations, the aim of the proposal is to maintain clear access at the junctions and narrow sections of carriageway by restricting parking at locations that would cause obstruction. The Council makes every attempt to maximise safe on street parking without compromising access and safety; the extent of yellow line restrictions are, therefore, always kept to a minimum.

### **5 TIMETABLE**

- 5.1 If a decision is made to proceed with implementation of the proposed waiting restrictions, Traffic Management Orders could be made six weeks after the made decision. This will include the erection of the Notices on lamp columns in the area, the publication of the made Orders in the Local Guardian and the London Gazette. The documents will be made available at the Link, Civic Centre and on the Council's website. The measures will be introduced soon after.

### **6 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS**

- 6.1 Do nothing. This would be contrary to the concerns expressed by the local community, and would not resolve the dangerous and obstructive parking that is currently taking place.

### **7 FINANCIAL RESOURCE AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS**

- 7.1 To introduce the proposed restrictions will cost approximately £4.5k. This includes the making of The Traffic Management Orders. The costs will be funded from the Capital budget identified for controlled parking zones within the Capital Programme 2019 / 2020.

## **8 LEGAL AND STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS**

- 8.1 The Traffic Management Orders would be made under Section 6 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.
- 8.2 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 Cabinet Member in reaching a decision.

## **9 HUMAN RIGHTS, EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY COHESION IMPLICATIONS**


- 9.1 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 parking needs of the residents and visitors are given consideration but it is considered that maintaining safe access must take priority.
- 9.2 Bodies representing motorists, including commuters are included in the statutory consultation required for draft traffic management and similar orders.
- 9.3 The implementation of waiting restrictions affects all sections of the community especially the young and the elderly and assists in improving safety for all road users as well as achieving the transport planning policies of the government, the Mayor for London and the borough.
- 9.4 By maintaining clear access points, visibility will improve thereby improving the safety at junctions; bends and along narrow sections of a road and subsequently reducing potential accidents.
- 9.5 Regulating and formulating the flow of traffic will ensure the safety of all road users and improved access throughout the day.

## **10 RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

- 10.1 The risk in not introducing the proposed waiting restrictions would be the potential risk to all road users, businesses and visitors, in the case of an emergency, and access difficulties will not be addressed. It would also be contrary to the support and concerns expressed and could lead to loss of public confidence in the Council.
- 10.2 The risk of introducing the proposed restrictions could lead to possible extra pressure on the current parking demand in the surrounding roads at each location. However, the benefits of safety and access outweigh the possible increase in demand.

## **11 APPENDICES**

- 11.1 The following documents are to be published with this report and form part of the report.
- 11.2 Appendix A - Drawing No. Z27-664-01A
- 11.3 Appendix B – Statutory consultation newsletter and plan
- 11.4 Appendix C - Representations and Officer's Comments



**Key**

- Proposed Waiting Restrictions 'At any time'
- Existing Waiting Restrictions
- Dropped Kerb

**Notes**  
Do not scale from this drawing

| Rev. | Revisions | Drawn | Sp. | Date | Chk. | Sp. | Date | Appr. | Sp. | Date |
|------|-----------|-------|-----|------|------|-----|------|-------|-----|------|
|      |           |       |     |      |      |     |      |       |     |      |
|      |           |       |     |      |      |     |      |       |     |      |
|      |           |       |     |      |      |     |      |       |     |      |
|      |           |       |     |      |      |     |      |       |     |      |

**TRAFFIC & HIGHWAYS**  
**Sustainable Communities**  
 environment & regeneration

Drawn by: **IC**  
 Checked by: **Sp.**  
 Approved by: **Sp.**

Date: **12/08/18**  
 Date: **12/08/18**  
 Date: **12/08/18**

**PROJECT**  
 WAITING RESTRICTIONS (PROPOSED)  
 HEATHFIELD DRIVE

Drawing No. **Z27-664-01**  
 Revision **A**  
 Client: **Merton Civic Centre**  
 Location: **Morden, Surrey**  
 Ref: **SM4.5DX**  
 www.merton.gov.uk

## Proposed Waiting Restriction Heathfield Drive Area



ISSUE DATE : 16 MAY 2019

**Dear Resident,**

Proposed waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) in Heathfield Drive statutory consultation

The Council has received reports from residents regarding obstructive parking in Heathfield Drive area. In response to these reports the Council is proposing to introduce waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) to address obstructive parking and assist with movement of traffic.

Please see the plan, overleaf, to illustrate the proposed extents of the double yellow lines.

### WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

A Notice of the Council's intentions to make the relevant Traffic Management Orders (TMOs) for the required changes will be published in the local newspaper (The Guardian), London Gazette and posted on lamp columns in the vicinity.

All representations must be in writing by either emailing [trafficandhighways@merton.gov.uk](mailto:trafficandhighways@merton.gov.uk) or to Environment & Regeneration Department, futureMerton, Merton Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, Surrey, SM4 5DX.

All comments must be received no later than **7 June 2019** quoting reference ES/WRHeathfield

Objections must relate only to the elements of the scheme that are subject to this statutory consultation. The Council is required to give weight to the nature and content of your representations and not necessarily the quantity. Your reasons are therefore important to us.

Copies of the proposed Traffic Management Order (TMO), a plan identifying the area affected by the proposal and the Council's 'Statement of Reasons' can be inspected at Merton Link, Merton Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, Surrey, SM4 5DX during the Council's normal office hours Monday to Friday, 9am to 5pm. A copy will also be available

at the Collier's Wood library.

All representations along with Officers' comments and recommendations will be presented in the report to the Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Environment and Housing. Please note that responses to any representations received will not be made until a final decision is made by the Cabinet Member. Once a decision is made by the Cabinet Member you will be informed accordingly.

### LAVENDER FIELDS WARD COUNCILLORS

**Cllr Mark Allison**

Phone - 020 8545 3425

Email: [mark.allison@merton.gov.uk](mailto:mark.allison@merton.gov.uk)

**Cllr Billy Christie**

Tel - 020 8545 3424

Email: [billy.christie@merton.gov.uk](mailto:billy.christie@merton.gov.uk)

**Cllr Edith Macauley**

Tel - 0208 545 3425

Email: [edith.macauley@merton.gov.uk](mailto:edith.macauley@merton.gov.uk)

**Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Housing and Transport.**


**Cllr Martin Whelton**

Phone: 020 8545 3425

Email: [martin.whelton@merton.gov.uk](mailto:martin.whelton@merton.gov.uk)

*(The contact details of ward councillors are provided for information purposes only)*





**Key**

- Proposed Waiting Restrictions 'At any time'
- Existing Waiting Restrictions
- ⊗ Dropped Kerb

Notes  
Do not scale from this drawing

Rev. Revisions

| Rev. | Date | By | Check | Date | By | Date | By |
|------|------|----|-------|------|----|------|----|
|      |      |    |       |      |    |      |    |
|      |      |    |       |      |    |      |    |
|      |      |    |       |      |    |      |    |
|      |      |    |       |      |    |      |    |

**Sustainable Communities**  
Environment & Regeneration

TRAFFIC & HIGHWAYS

| Drawn | By | Date | Checked | Date | By | Date | By |
|-------|----|------|---------|------|----|------|----|
|       |    |      |         |      |    |      |    |
|       |    |      |         |      |    |      |    |
|       |    |      |         |      |    |      |    |

| Drawn by | Checked by | Approved by | Date |
|----------|------------|-------------|------|
|          |            |             |      |
|          |            |             |      |
|          |            |             |      |

**PROJECT TITLE**  
WAITING RESTRICTIONS (PROPOSED)  
HEATHFIELD DRIVE

**Drawing No.**  
Z27-664-01

**Revision**

**Drawn by**  
CONSULTATION

**Scale**  
S1M4.5DX

**Sheet**  
1. 1200



## Appendix C - Representations and Officers' Comments

### Heathfield Drive area, CR4 – support and conditional comments

#### ES/WRHeathfield/001

I owner of \*\* Wilson Avenue agree for the proposed changes, and I would also like to see abandoned cars removed from the area.

#### ES/ WRHeathfield/002

I live in Wilson Avenue and there will be yellow lines in the entrance to the no through road Wilson Avenue. Where these yellow lines will be is of no use. The danger is not the side where the kerbs drop, the issue and danger is on the opposite side (where the all cars park!) I have had many near misses turning into Wilson Avenue because the cars are parked in the lane, or what should be a lane. This in turn makes it one lane and not two as that is what it should be.

Could this please be re-considered as this is a hazard and is dangerous? It makes sense to have the double lines opposite the houses with the dropped kerbs. Since parking restrictions in Colliers Wood I have noticed more cars (possibly commuters) parking there.

#### ES/ WRHeathfield /003

I am fully supportive of this proposal. It is pleasing that other residents have raised major concerns about traffic obstructions and general safety. I am delighted to hear that the corner of Hawkes road and Border Gate has been addressed as the chicanes at the end of the road have narrowed the entry to the corner, and with cars often parked obstructing the turning has led to a blind spot which is actually quite dangerous - such that my wife car was scratched quite recently as another driver darted through rather than slow down and be patient with the space available. I am therefore delighted to hear about these improvements.

My only suggestion would be why the rest of Border Gate has not been looked at? This road has other chicanes around bends which narrow the road and visibility, particularly when cars are parked obstructing the bend. I would definitely recommend those sections were addressed as part of this consultation.

#### ES/ WRHeathfield /004

I live in \*\* Heathfield Drive. Could I suggest the new proposed waiting restrictions line in front of 47-49 Heathfield Drive? (See attached) As we live the drive and someone always park their car on the street which is next to light pole. It is very difficult for all the residents drive in or out of the driveway. This is the only one entrance and exit for all the residents who live in this drive.

#### ES/ WRHeathfield /005

I welcome and support the Council's TMO initiative for Heathfield Drive, Mitcham. In recent years it has become apparent that households owning multiple vehicles who either live in this street or adjacent streets have resorted to using Heathfield Drive as an overflow parking space. There are some households in Victoria Road parking their surplus vehicles in Heathfield Drive in order to avoid paying their CPZ fee. Obstruction in this street has consequently increased.

Since the width of Heathfield Drive permits only two vehicles to pass each other safely so that when several vehicles are parked in a row causing an obstruction, I have witnessed moving vehicles having to pass each other by one driving on the pavement. This manoeuvre is contrary to the rules of the Highways Code. Obstruction is especially prevalent at or near the T-junctions and bends in Heathfield Drive. So extending DYLS some distance along the street from these points is the right and proper thing to do. Traffic flow should be improved, potential accidents should be reduced as well as disputes between drivers should be avoided, and road safety thereby should be increased.

Finally, I believe a CPZ should be implemented to stop unnecessary continuous parking in Heathfield Drive at locations where there will be no DYLS.

#### ES/ WRHeathfield /006

We have looked at the plans and my Husband and I disagree with no yellow lines opposite our cul-de-Sac, this is the main issue when we turn out on to the main Heathfield Drive.

We understand that there will be no parking by the give way in our cul-de-sac, but our main concern is that when there is cars parked opposite it becomes very difficult to turn out of the cul-de-sac.

It also causes problems when we turn into our cul-de-sac as we have to mount onto the pavement and

also onto a resident's front garden.

There has been a number of near misses when there is a vehicle coming round the corner and nearly caused a collision.

We would appreciate if this can be reviewed again regarding, putting double yellow lines opposite our cul-de-sac to stop vehicles parking there, and for us residents trying to turn out of our cul-de-sac more easier.

**ES/ WRHeathfield /007**

I live at \*\* Heathfield drive.

I am writing in, to give my FULL SUPPORT to the current proposed waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) code ES/WRHeathfield on Heathfield Drive, Mitcham, CR4 3RD.

I am in agreement with the council and these proposals should happen for safety reasons.

I have attached web link to my private secure HTTPS Google Drive site to an image/figure. Zooming in on this image will allow you to read the annotations within them. I will refer to this image/figure during this email.

image link:

[https://drive.google.com/open?id=1mPOp\\_5XKA32YbXqTh-aWvLHd8eZGVUPo](https://drive.google.com/open?id=1mPOp_5XKA32YbXqTh-aWvLHd8eZGVUPo)

I have outlined important safety reasons below

See the figure/image, this is the view outside my property (\*\* Heathfield Drive). The proposed waiting restrictions would occur on the pavement opposite my property.

This is sensible and needed because:

A) This pavement area acts as a "main road bottleneck area". When cars park on the opposite side marked in figure/image. It causes a blockage of traffic. It then becomes a major collision zone hazard to road users. See figure/image. Vehicles sometimes park here (but rarely). During the parking, other vehicles travel from opposite sides of the road, and they come round their respective corners of Heathfield drive at some speed. This pavement is centre of the road. The vehicle parked in this area, causes a sudden unseen break of the 2 vehicles coming at opposite directions (around corners) and there is risk of collision. I have witnessed close collision encounters at times. The road only really has space for 1 car to come through either side, and a parked car in the centre reduces that space further and creates a central bottleneck on the road.

B) The other problem is, resident vehicles on the opposite side of road, have a shared access to enter/exit their driveways. This pavement area is near that shared access point. A car parked on this area, causes them to perform awkward unnatural exit turns/manoeuvres. They have to sometimes swerve to avoid the parked vehicle. Thus this is a key collision zone. Adding double yellow lines here will solve this problem, as vehicles will then avoid parking here and thus accidents are avoided and safety improved. See figure/image for diagram.

C) Any car parked opposite here means we cannot enter our drive at a proper right angle or exit out safely. This creates hazards for the public road oncoming traffic too. Turning our vehicle in, when a guest vehicle is parked here will hit their vehicle and also drastically slow traffic flow. We simply cannot turn in safely with their guest vehicle parked there as it narrows our space. The proposal solves the problem as this gives us more space to enter and exit the drive safely at the right angle, and is more safe for road users around us

D) The introduction of CPZ on Victoria road (Zone CW3) - see here on 3rd March 2017 [https://www2.merton.gov.uk/transport-streets/parking/cpz/cpz\\_consultations-2/cpz\\_current\\_consultations/cpzcw3.htm](https://www2.merton.gov.uk/transport-streets/parking/cpz/cpz_consultations-2/cpz_current_consultations/cpzcw3.htm) has created a new congestion problem, where non-residents of Heathfield Drive (usually residents of Victoria Road) park their cars on Heathfield Drive. This is to avoid paying the CPZ permit on Victoria Road. Sometimes these vehicles have been parked here for weeks at a time, or they stay on weekdays to avoid the CPZ on Victoria Road. This creates parking congestion and is now taking away key parking facilities for Heathfield Drive resident guests. This was never a problem before the CPZ on Victoria Road was introduced. It is not fair on the residents and it takes away key permit revenue from the council - the council are losing money because of this. Because of the above, it is difficult for genuine Heathfield Drive guests to find parking. Guests then resort to parking in dangerous spots - like on corners and middle of the road etc.

Adding the proposed double yellow lines on the opposite pavement as per the plan and image, will solve

the above problems. The proposal will improve our safety and the safety of other road users, as detailed above.

### **ES/ WRHeathfield /008**

I am the owner and resident of \*\* Heathfield Drive. I am writing because there are no plans to paint double yellow lines to the part of the road directly opposite the courtyard of houses 108 to 116. (Your plans show that the yellow lines will only be painted on one side of that part of the road).

I would like to ask for the double yellow lines to be extended to include the stretch of road directly opposite the courtyard of houses 108 to 116 for the following reasons:

1. When cars are parked opposite the entrance to the courtyard it is very difficult to pull out of the courtyard. This is because due to the space taken up by parked cars, there is no space to make a full turn in order to exit the courtyard. This means it becomes necessary to reverse in the road and back onto the dropped pavement by the exit to the courtyard in order to have enough space to complete the turn.

Clearly this is less safe than being able to make a normal turn out of the courtyard onto Heathfield Drive. If there are no yellow lines in the section of the road opposite the entrance/exit to the 108 to 116 courtyard, but they are painted along most of the rest of the road, more people will park in that section on a regular, possibly almost permanent basis. As a result it will never be as safe to exit the courtyard by car as it would be if yellow lines were added to that section to ensure there is always space to make the turn.

2. Following on from my point above, the part of the pavement where cars have to reverse in order to get out of the 108 to 116 courtyard is immediately by a park with a play area for young children. As a result there are regularly small children walking and on scooters coming down the section of pavement where cars coming out of the 108 to 116 courtyard are forced to reverse as a result of cars being parked on the road opposite the entrance/exit to the courtyard.

Clearly this is unsafe and the number of occasions cars are forced to reverse onto that stretch of pavement should be kept to an absolute minimum in order to avoid a tragic accident from occurring, where a reversing car has not seen a small child. I believe this safety issue can be resolved by painting yellow lines onto the road opposite the courtyard, so that there is always space for cars to exit the courtyard without the need to reverse back on to the pavement where a young child could be.

3. Cars looking for a place to park will get to know they may find a space opposite the 108 to 116 courtyard. I believe this will involve them driving fast down Heathfield Drive from Victoria Road to check whether there is a space available and, if there is not, then driving quickly to the end of the road where it is wide enough to turn around and then speeding back up the road again.

Not only would this be unsafe in that it would encourage fast driving on the part of the road between the turning off Victoria Road and the turning point I have described, but the obvious turning spot for anyone looking for a space to park is right by the park with the children's play area I mentioned above.

I believe allowing this arrangement to go ahead would risk the safety of children coming out of the park, many of whom will walk to the same corner in the road where cars would naturally choose to turn, in order to join the pavement to walk/scooter home. Again, I believe this could be resolved by extending the proposed area for yellow lines to include the section of road opposite the entrance to the courtyard of houses 108 to 116.

To help with identifying the part of the road I am referring to I have provided a photo of the map you sent around with the part of the road where I believe yellow lines should also be added circled in blue. To be clear, I think the yellow lines should be added in addition to your proposed area for yellow lines.

I hope very much that you will take my comments above into account and extend the yellow lines as I have suggested.

### **ES/ WRHeathfield /009**

I have looked at the plans I disagree with no yellow lines in the green highlighted of the drawing, this is a main issue for the resident living from 17-37.

Currently the neighbour and I observe that at least 6 vehicles are frequently (90% of the time, day and week) parked at the entrance to Heathfield Drive ( in the green highlighted) that obstruct vehicles attempting to enter or leave Heathfield Drive cul-de-sac on a daily bases . Please see photos below and attached for reference. With the new proposed waiting restriction to be in place, the neighbour and I are concern that vehicles permanently seek the green highlighted areas as the only parking space along Heathfield Drive. The concerns of the neighbour and I continue.

The problems persist with vehicles parking outside of the 17-37 Heathfield Drive cul-de-sac and vehicles are unable to turn into the road without having to mount up onto a resident's (number 15) front garden, you also see the car tyre mark on number 15 driveway.

Vehicles coming out of 17 - 37 Heathfield Drive (cul-de-sac) often stuck when other vehicles hoping to drive into the cul-de-sac in the same time forcing it to be a one way drive. This is due to the tight space as the vehicles consistently park on the green highlighted area, the vehicles have been making the driveway (pink area) as a single way, but as the original road markings of the 17 - 37 Heathfield Drive (cul-de-sac) and the Heathfield Drive leading to Victoria Road suggest that it should be two way drive.

More importantly, the neighbour and I are aware that a number of near misses when there is a vehicle coming round the corner and nearly caused a collision in the pink area highlighted due to the reason explained above and there is currently no speed reduction ramp along Heathfield Drive.

The neighbour and I would appreciate if this can be reviewed again regarding, extending double yellow lines on the green highlighted area to stop vehicles parking there. We understand it has been a long term request from the residents 17- 37 and we will continue enquire about it.

#### **ES/ WRHeathfield /011**

I am a resident of Wilson avenue and have received a letter for the proposed waiting restrictions in this area I feel that this plan will not solve the problems residents are having which is being able to park down the roads we live in, this is because parking permits have been brought in on connecting roads e.g. Victoria Road, Alexander Road & Fleming mead & therefore people who have been parking on these roads to go to the train station/work are now using the roads that don't have permits so when the actual residents that live down the roads come home there is no spaces having yellow lines may solve the Obstructive parking/movement of traffic but will not help residents. I feel having permits holder bays will resolve these issues better then what is currently being suggested.

#### **ES/ WRHeathfield /012**

Thank you for your correspondence regarding the above Proposals and I can confirm the following;  
We residents of Bodergate strongly object to the proposals outlined in your recent letter and in particular object to the direct proposals of a 'no waiting restriction' outside our home whereby we park our vehicle. The proposals put forward will have a significant impact on residents in Bodergate but more prominently a direct impact on us as we will no longer be able to park outside our home. Our representation to reject the proposals has considered several evidences that highlight why these proposals will only add to the already congested road and lack of access for residents who wish to park close to their home. Our reasons are listed below. We would also like to bring to your attention the missing information on a map included with your correspondence which has not highlighted the already existing driveways that residents have on Bodergate. We believe this is vital information that needs to be considered in in order to fully understand our objections to the proposals.

##### **Parking implications**

Loss of available parking affecting us directly and residents on Bodergate, no waiting restrictions at all times unnecessary on both sides.

- We have lived at Bodergate for over 18 years and have witnessed the decreasing number of off-street parking spaces available to residents and visitors. Whilst I understand the need to ensure roads are safe for users and access is available for all we believe we have been impacted the most as a result of the various parking strategies used in and around the Heathfield areas, i.e. parking restrictions along Victoria road and the controlled parking zones. This has pushed back road users to use Bodergate as a 'fee parking space', leaving their cars between working hours and returning in the evening. This has caused a lot of residents struggling for parking. The new proposal in the Heathfield area will further encourage residents to push back onto Bodergate limiting the number of parking available for those that actually live on the Bodergate road.

- It appears from the proposals that the restrictions will be implemented directly outside our house, as a result impacting and limiting our access to our home. The restrictions also put in other areas in the Heathfield area will further encourage other road users who would usually park in the Heathfield to push back onto Bodergate as mentioned above. Bodergate is a very congested road and we are concerned not only about the limited parking space but the complete loss of parking due to the increasing number of driveways been granted to residents.

##### **Existing driveways (Appendix 1)**

Appendix 1 highlights the existing driveways on Bodergate. This has meant that residents who do not have a driveway have limited off street parking. The no waiting restrictions outside our home will force us to park our vehicle further up the road if at all possible and cause greater obstructive parking.

- Over the last 18 years residents have been granted permission to build driveways which we have no

objection too and the number is increasing. This has had a detrimental effect on those who solely rely on off street parking including visitors. If the double yellow lines are to be implemented outside our home (and in the Heathfield area) we will face a greater difficulty to secure parking near our home due to the influx of cars. Please note that I reside at Bodergate with my elderly mother. Easy Access to our home is there for paramount to her quality of life.

#### Risk implications

The no waiting restriction seeks to ease congestion on the area but in fact will narrow the roads and cause obstructive parking further along Bodergate causing greater chaos on an already congested road.

- The proposal sets out its aim to improve safety, visibility and access for all road users but in reality, the proposals will cause greater cars to scramble for a space on Bodergate causing obstruction all along Bodergate. The congestion in the road will in fact make it difficult for emergency services to access the road. Including Fire services. The proposals will narrow the road on Bodergate rather than widen it.
- Over the last 18 years we have witnessed a growing number of drivers using this road as a through road and parking spot. There has also been an issue with speed in this area, the no waiting restrictions may encourage that further.

#### Conclusion

It appears that we are the only residents on Bodergate that will be directly affected by the proposals and will actually be faced with a 'Double whammy' of restrictions ( unable to park outside our home and also struggle to find parking further up due to the already limited parking available). We believe this to be unfair. Implementing no waiting restrictions will not help ease traffic has suggested but cause obstructive parking where the restrictions are not being implemented, encouraging other road users to continue to use this road as a cut through, causing more congestion. The proposal will further limit the number of off-street parking but more importantly we will no longer be able to park outside our house which will impact my elderly mother. The restrictions on the Heathfield area will also push back residents to come and park on Bodergate as we have seen before by restrictions on Victoria road.

We ask the council to consider the following should the proposals go ahead.

- To not include double yellow lines directly outside our home but to implement them on the opposite side where there are no homes. This will help to achieve your objective of widening this section of the road whilst causing minimum impact to us. We hope that you will give our reasons for rejecting the proposal careful consideration.

#### *Officer's Comments:*

*The aim of the proposal is to maintain clear access at the junctions and narrow sections of carriageway by restricting parking at locations that would cause obstruction. The proposal is in response to complaints from local Ward Councillors and the local MP on behalf of residents regarding obstructive parking and access issues at junctions in the Heathfield Drive area.*

*The points made regarding the placement of the waiting restrictions have been taken into consideration and very slight amendment to the proposal where possible. It is appreciated residents may park over their own driveways and not cause an obstruction to moving traffic. Officers have noted residents' concerns for further waiting restrictions and this will be progressed with future investigation as part of the Council's borough-wide proposed waiting restrictions programme.*

*The process for consideration of new CPZ schemes is driven by the community and therefore with the provision of evidence of support for parking controls in the immediate community (evidence such as a signed petition from residents in the road and neighbouring roads for example). Once a petition is received, the Council will programme an assessment and a consultation. We also recommend contacting ward councillors setting out the views of the community with regards to parking issues in their ward.*

#### **Heathfield Drive area, CR4 – objections**

#### **ES/ WRHeathfield /010**

I am writing after seeing this notice on my road about some changes being made on the corner of Bodergate road which connects to Hawkes Road. This noticed has informed me of how the rules for parking are changing within this area and I completely am against this change as the amount of problems this change will cause is ridiculous. The amount of space being taken away from people to park their vehicles will create so many problems for a lot of us who live in the area, I live on \*\* Bodergate and sometimes even now I struggle to find a parking spot near my house due to the amount of vehicles on our road, removing this section will have so many people with no place to park their car.

There are already so many driveways built on this road which already restricts people from parking in front of them and now with this change where would you expect us to park. In a residential area like this I don't



understand why such a rule is being applied when I've never noticed there to be any problems with how it is already. If the matter of this change is to go forward then I would demand a driveway to be built for me where I live as I will have no place to park my car. If you can guarantee me something like that I will have no objection to this but without a guarantee that I will have peace of mind to park my car somewhere I will never agree with this and will continue to object this rule. I look forward to hearing from you soon as this is an important matter for a lot of people who live here.

Already people further down Bordergate road are parking in front of my house due to not having parking near their houses due to the amount of driveways there so in all honesty if you can explain to me how any of these changes make sense please do because I can't see it making sense.

*Officer's Comments:*

*The aim of the proposal is to maintain clear access at the junctions and narrow sections of carriageway by restricting parking at locations that would cause obstruction. The proposal is in response to complaints from local Ward Councillors and the local MP on behalf of residents regarding obstructive parking and access issues at junctions in the Heathfield Drive area. Much of the carriageway in Heathfield Drive Wilkins Close, Wilson Avenue and neighbouring roads in the area is not wide enough to accommodate parking on both sides of the road without parked vehicles causing obstruction to moving traffic or pedestrian access on the footways. Obstructive parking is of particular concern for refuse collection services and swift access for emergency services in the event of an emergency.*

*It is appreciated that parking may be a priority for residents but as the Traffic and Highway Authority, Council's priority is to ensure that safety and access are maintained at all times and as a result officer's recommendations would be to introduce the proposed restrictions. It is recommended that the use of off-road parking areas is maximised where possible by the residents.*

## 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](mailto:democratic.services@merton.gov.uk)
- ) **OR** as a signed paper copy to the Head of Democracy Services, 7<sup>th</sup> floor, Civic Centre, London Road, Morden SM4 5DX.

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