

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**

Date: 11 May 2021

Dear Councillor

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

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

- **Proposed waiting restrictions in Elm Gardens (statutory consultation)**

and will be implemented at **noon on Friday 14 May 2021** 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

1. Title of report

Proposed waiting restrictions in Elm Gardens (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

11 May 2021

5. Date report made available to decision maker

11 May 2021

6. Decision

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

- 1) Notes the result of the statutory consultation carried out between 3rd March and 26th March 2021 on the proposals to reduce the 'at any time' waiting restrictions to single yellow lines at sections of the road as on drawing Z27-681-04 and attached as Appendix 1.
- 2) Notes and considers the representations received in respect of the proposal as detailed in Appendix 2.
- 3) Agrees to proceed with the making of the relevant Traffic Management Orders (TMOs) and the implementation of the waiting (single yellow lines) operating Mon – Fri between 8.30am and 6.30pm in Elm Gardens as shown in Drawing Nos. Z27-681-04 (see Appendix 1).
- 4) Agrees to exercise his discretion not to hold a public inquiry on the consultation process.

7. Alternative options considered and why rejected

Do nothing. This would be contrary to the concerns and requests received from the local communities and will do nothing to address representations received particularly in terms of dangerous and obstructive.

8. Declarations of Interest

Ward councillor for Pollards Hill. I also attended a meeting with residents of Elm Gardens in September

Councillor Martin Whelton

Cabinet Member for Housing, Regeneration, and the Climate Emergency

11 May, 2021

Cabinet Member Report

Date: 8 May 2021

Agenda item: Ward: Pollards Hill

Subject: Proposed waiting restrictions Elm Gardens - statutory consultation

Lead officer: Chris Lee, Director of Environment & Regeneration

Lead member: Councillor Martin Whelton, Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Housing and the Climate Emergency

Forward Plan reference number: N/A Contact Officer Paul Atie, Tel: 020 8545 3337 Email: paul.atie@merton.gov.uk

Recommendations:

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

- 1) Notes the result of the statutory consultation carried out between 3rd March and 26th March 2021 on the proposals to reduce the 'at any time' waiting restrictions to single yellow lines at sections of the road as on drawing Z27-681-04 and attached as Appendix 1.
- 2) Notes and considers the representations received in respect of the proposal as detailed in Appendix 2.
- 3) Agrees to proceed with the making of the relevant Traffic Management Orders (TMOs) and the implementation of the waiting (single yellow lines) operating Mon – Fri between 8.30am and 6.30pm in Elm Gardens as shown in Drawing Nos. Z27-681-04 (see Appendix 1).
- 4) 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 amend 'at any time' waiting restrictions to single yellow line.
- 1.2 It seeks approval to progress with the above recommendations.

2 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Following a representation from a resident via the local MP regarding the pavement parking in Elm Gardens the Council carried out the necessary site assessment and concluded that the footway width is 2m and the carriageway width is 4.9m. Many of the residents have off street parking which means there is very little on street parking. However, the road suffers from obstructive parking with the current manner of footway and carriageway parking. To remove this obstructive parking and ease crossover egress/access, the Council introduced 'at any time' waiting restrictions (double yellow lines. As per normal practice, every effort is made to maximise safe parking; therefore some partial footway parking where it is safe to do so were introduced.

- 2.2 Following the implementation of “At any time” waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) in Elm Gardens; the Council received a number of complaints and requests from residents of Elm Garden to reduce/remove the double yellow lines. The Cabinet Member after meeting with some residents of Elm Gardens instructed officers to carry out a statutory consultation to reduce the recently introduced double yellow lines to Single yellow line operating Mon – Fri between 8.30am and 6.30 pm

3 STATUTORY CONSULTATION

- 3.1 The statutory consultation on the Council’s proposal to reduce the recently introduced double yellow lines to Single yellow line in Elm Gardens was carried out between 3rd March and 26th March 2021. The consultation included the erection of street Notices on lamp columns within the vicinity of the proposals and the publication of the Council’s intentions in Wimbledon and Wandsworth Times and the London Gazette. The information was also available on the Council’s website and at the Civic Centre. A leaflet was also distributed to residents.
- 3.3 The statutory consultation resulted in 4 representations being received from Elm Gardens. The representations and officer’s comments are set out in Appendix 2.

Ward Councillors

- 3.4 The local Ward Members were informed of the proposed restrictions and the statutory consultation.
- 3.5 Waiting restrictions are applied to areas where safety and access concerns have been received. The Council makes every attempt to minimise the extent of any parking restriction and strike a balance of ensuring safety and maintaining unobstructed access for all road users whilst acknowledging the parking needs of the community.

4.0 PROPOSALS

- 4.12 Following the implementation of “At any time” waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) in Elm Gardens; the Council received a number of complaints and requests from residents of Elm Garden to reduce/remove the double yellow lines. The Cabinet Member after meeting with some residents of Elm Gardens instructed officers to carry out a statutory consultation to reduce the recently introduced double yellow lines to Single yellow line operating Mon – Fri between 8.30am and 6.30 pm

5.0 Officer’s recommendations

- 5.1 The Council has a statutory responsibility to respond appropriately to concerns raised regarding obstructive parking / access and to ensure safety and access for all road users at all times.
- 5.2 The objective of any parking management including the proposed restrictions is to ensure clear access is maintained on public highway (carriageway and footway) more specifically along narrow roads / footways; at bends, junctions, turning heads etc.

- 5.3 The proposed restrictions ensure clear sightlines, access and manoeuvrability for all road users especially for pedestrians, service vehicles and emergency services. Although it is acknowledged that loss of parking would be unacceptable to some residents, it is not for the Council to facilitate the parking needs of residents and visitors. The Council's statutory duty is to ensure access and safety are maintained at all times. Once the Council is aware of obstructive parking, lack of mitigating action could put the Council at risk. The Council could be accused of not acting responsibly in discharging its statutory duties

6 TIMETABLE

- 6.1 If agreed the 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 Wimbledon & Wandsworth Times and the London Gazette. The documents will also be made available on the Council's website. The measures will be introduced soon after.

7. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

- 7.1 Do nothing. This would be contrary to the concerns expressed by some road users and would not resolve the dangerous and obstructive parking that is currently taking place. In the event of an incident, lack of action could put the Council at risk.

8 FINANCIAL RESOURCE AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 To introduce the proposed restrictions will cost approximately £3k. This includes the making of The Traffic Management Orders. The set up costs will be funded from the budget identified for 2020 / 2021.

9 LEGAL AND STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 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.
- 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 Cabinet Member in reaching a decision.

10 HUMAN RIGHTS, EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY COHESION IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 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.
- 10.2 Bodies representing motorists, including commuters are included in the statutory consultation required for draft traffic management and similar orders.
- 10.3 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.
- 10.4 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.
- 10.5 Regulating and formulating the flow of traffic will ensure the safety of all road users and improved access throughout the day.

11 RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

- 11.1 The risk in not introducing the proposed 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.
- 11.2 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 the proposals outweigh the possible increase in demand.

12 APPENDICES

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

Appendix 1 – plans of proposed restrictions

Appendix 2 – Representations and Officer's Comments

Appendix B - Representations and Officers' Comments

Representations

Elm Gardens

001

Morning to whom it concerns,

I live in Elm Gardens CR41LY, Just asking for confirmation that after paying out for a drop curves, should we be subjected to having line in front of the parking space. We believe this will not make the house attractive when we come to selling? We thank you to put this into consideration when starting the work on the 26 March 2021.

002

To whom it may concern I would like to object the new plans for parking restrictions in the Elm Gardens area of CR4. The lines should be if anything just single yellow lines with no restrictions. I don't believe the road is always over populated with cars. We are not near any train or underground stations. It just doesn't seem necessary. What are the reasons for wanting to implement waiting restrictions?

003

**Proposed reduction of waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) to single yellow lines in Elm Gardens – statutory consultation.
ES/WR2021**

While I am pleased the double yellow lines in front of our houses will be removed, I still do not understand why we have to have any yellow lines at all in most of the road. As residents, we are almost as one voice that they are not anything that we want and we didn't report any issues that would precipitate these measures as a solution.

I am a ** year old, retired woman who is more likely to have visitors in the week and during the day. Those visitors are less likely to come in the evening as some just don't drive in the dark and some would be scared just to be out at night. Public transport is not the best in this area with the train and tram being 30 to 40 minutes' walk away and the latter being across the common. When they do come, in the daytime, some might be less able to walk any distance from where they might be able to park.

I am told, but only second hand, that there may have been some issues raised but I don't know any details.

ISSUES WHICH MAY HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO THE PROPOSAL OF ANY SCHEME

Emergency services access.

If that is the case, those issues would still apply on Saturdays and Sundays and in the evenings. They would also apply in Fern Avenue, the next road along which I believe, is just as narrow as Elm, compared to other roads in the area.

I would like to point out that the incidence of any narrowing of the road by parked cars was probably precipitated by the regulations introduced not so long ago, just a few years, to stop cars parking too far up on the pavement, making it more difficult for parents with prams and pushchairs or people with mobility problems using wheelchairs. That sounds reasonable until you realise that solving one problem that wasn't actually that bad, can just cause another problem that is worse. This is not, in general, a cut through road because it goes nowhere and its quite narrow. With so many dropped curbs, going around a parked car is not a major issue.

I have lived here for 40 years (August 1980) and we have gone from parking on one side of the road to parking on both sides, half up on the pavement, to putting in front drives, at our own expense. We have always done this with due care and consideration for anyone potentially affected, or stakeholders as you might call them. Various actions by the Council have changed things around here that has got us where we are. Refuse Collection vehicles no longer going round the alleys resulted in deterioration of those back alleys and less use of rear garages; dumping of rubbish and drugs use in the quiet, hidden space followed. Alley gates were put in, under Council initiative but "shared" resident expense to try to stop this. The result has been that practically no one uses their garages at all now, the alleys are overgrown and accumulating dumped items and there are even more cars needing to park on the road.

Complaints

Although I don't know what specific complaints you have had, I am aware that we, as residents, had talked about bad parking at the Sherwood Park end of the road. This has always been a bit of an issue with regard to parking for the church services but it perhaps got worse when planning permission was given for additional dwellings to be built on the ends of both sides of the rows of terraced houses, resulting in more cars with nowhere to park and those properties, in some

cases, having less space on any front drive to park cars, as the middle section of the road has. At least one additional dwelling has also now been built on one side at the Chestnut Grove end of the road and I note this evening, a van is actually fully parked in front of the access alley gates with impunity

Refuse Collection Vehicle Access

I have been told just this evening, while discussing my letter with one neighbour, that one of the problems may be access for Refuse Collection Vehicles. However, mostly, they come very early in the morning, before 8.30am and the “new” single yellow line restrictions will not have come in to play until 8.30am. Also, this could be easily solved with strong notices regarding obstruction, some dotted parking lines and associated enforcement.

Is it right that residents and Council Tax Payers should have to suffer to make it easier for those vehicles, which over the years have just been manufactured bigger and bigger.

Again it is also important to note, if this is a reason for the yellow lines scheme, then the same must apply to Fern Avenue, the next road along. Elm Gardens seems to be the only road receiving this treatment and we don't understand why.

CONSULTATION – Adequacy, appropriateness and timing

Double Yellows – Early 2020.

The first that most people knew about the proposed double yellow lines last year was when they woke up to them going in. You may say you gave the statutory consultation notice and perhaps you did, but it must have been during the early phase of Coronavirus and the various issues surrounding that. People were scared and worried about getting sick, stocking up on food and essentials and loss of income. We were glued to our TVs and radios. We were told to avoid touch and wash our hands frequently for fear of picking up the virus and putting to our mouths and faces. I for one was not even looking at my mail until it had sat on the mat for at least 3 days and fliers didn't get a look in.

For this current consultation, I could see a poster up on the lamp post, right outside my door. I can assure you, however that one was not put up there, this time last year. NB. I also note that that consultation notice has been taken down, I think today, and the yellow time restrictions have been put up on lamp posts, even though the official consultation period doesn't end until tomorrow, 26th March 2021, by which time you will have received this letter attached to an email. Is the result a foregone conclusion? I don't think they were there for the double lines already in place as they would apply all the time.

When the double lines were actually laid last year, many of us neighbours went on to the street in disbelief. In order to facilitate a continuing ability to access our own properties, some households made new or additional arrangements to park on their drives. This was an immediate priority, in our faces.

One resident coordinated a response and a Councilor arranged a meeting and alternatives must have been discussed. I never knew when the meeting was or I would have gone along. We should all note however, that this was still in a period of restricted gatherings. So, although on the face of it the current proposals are an improvement, they still do not address the fact the residents don't want them, there is no benefit to them and no obvious benefit to the community at large, that cannot be easily solved by other means.

Single Yellows - Now

We are again in a lockdown period, making it very difficult, as neighbours, to talk to each other about this issue.

The first notice I got, dated 1st March 2021, which was from CONWAY, said there was a diagram of the proposed road layout but it wasn't there. This was actually about the platforms at the ends of the road. This confused things because a second notice then came from yourselves, Merton Council, dated 3rd March 2021, which did have a map/layout on its reverse but it is so faded as to make it difficult to see very well. This one is about the lines.

I understand that the business of Government and Local Government cannot stop just because we are in a health crisis but I/we really are not happy about the consultation and fail to see who any of this benefits.

NEW ISSUES FROM THE DOUBLE (single to be) YELLOW LINES in place now

Speeding cars and damaged tyres

This road, which has always been relatively quiet and safe, with the children being able to play outside, now suffers with vehicles speeding down it because, with no parked cars, there is nothing to stop them. Even though there is no major destination benefit from coming through and speeding, some drivers just seem to do it because they can. The raised platforms at the end of the road both ends, will not change that. The bends in the road at both ends make entry reasonably slow without the platform but cars can just speed up for the now, uncluttered short stretch. The platform itself will eventually become potholed at the specific points the wheels cross in a restricted entry zone and it will be locals' tyres, our tyres, and suspension, that are damaged.

While I accept that the cushions and sleeping policemen all around this area are essential to slow traffic down for the safety of all, they are not maintained very well and the edges get damaged very quickly.

PROPOSED SOLUTION/S

Solutions would be twofold:

put dotted parking lines, half way on and half way off the pavement, and no yellow lines at all in the majority of the road; leave the double yellow lines but **only** at both ends of the road, possibly with similar on/off pavement parking lines on one side only.

The former will facilitate residents, visitors and visiting tradesmen and workmen to park safely and they have a vested interest in doing so properly and considerately. This then still allows all types of vehicles to access and go through at a sensible, slower speed and allows pedestrians sufficient pavement space.

The latter should stop, but will at least, deter, depending on enforcement, vehicles from parking on both sides of the ends of the road, which is the only problem residents might ever have been concerned about in the recent past, as these vehicles have caused obstruction or difficult access in conjunction with the bend. They are mostly non-residents and perhaps just don't take the same care.

Due Consideration

I'm sorry this is arriving at the 11th hour. It has taken some time to put together although much has been in my head for some time since the notices came but this is a strange time and I'm not paid to spend the many hours this has taken. I hope you will give it due consideration as I am reasonably certain that many, if not most of the residents of this road would agree.

It seems the scheme might be merely making life easier for the Refuse Collection vehicles on one day each week and not always that before 8.30am, rather than benefitting the Council Taxpayers and residents who live here.

004

Before you read the attached correspondence I have previously sent I would much appreciate an answer to the following question.....

I am in receipt of your letter dated the 3rd March 2021 inviting residents representations, comments and recommendations with regard to waiting restrictions and the introduction of single yellow lines (after already installing double yellow lines).

You then go on to explain that all residents representations will be presented in a report to the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and that all responses to any representations will not be made until a FINAL DECISION is made by the Cabinet Member.

In which case can you please explain why Merton Council have already installed 'parking restriction' signs (in the last week) even though the FINAL DECISION hasn't yet been made??? (photo attached for your assistance). It seems that once again, Merton Council have already decided what the final decision will be and has not bothered listening to their residents otherwise, why would you go ahead and spend funds you have so little of on something that might have to scrapped after the 'final decision' is made. I thought Merton Council may have learnt their lesson the first time around with the installation of double yellow lines having to be scrapped to make way for single yellow lines – complete waste of Tax Payers money.

Which leads me to my next question. I have been pleading and pleading over the last few years for Merton Council to introduce Traffic Calming along Elm Gardens as cars speed up and down the road endlessly – day and night (please see all correspondence attached). My initial concern was that if double yellow lines were introduced (which was the previous measure taken) it would make the situation much worse with speeding along our road as it left the road clear for speeding cars.

Each time I contacted your department I was met with 'not enough funds available' however, in the last year you have found funds to:

- Introduce double yellow lines
- Replace double yellow lines with single yellow lines – because first decision was rushed
- Drop curbs at each end of road
- Fill in pot holes
- Erect signs for parking restrictions – even though a decision hasn't yet been made

In which case I am assuming you now have the funds you were waiting on to make our road safer so once again, I ask for your consideration at the possibility of Traffic Calming along Elm Gardens by way of speed humps. I do not see this being a major cost or issue as the road will only need a couple at the most. It will also help once the new parking restrictions are introduced (if they aren't changed again!) as the road will be much clearer which makes it easier for cars to gain speed on the bend of the road.

I look forward to your response in due course.

Officer's comments

All the above proposals are as a direct result of receiving complaints about safety and access due to inconsiderate and obstructive parking.

Upon being made aware of safety and access issues, the Council undertakes a site assessment and determine the appropriate extent of restrictions. Every effort is made to minimise the extent of restrictions which is primarily determined by the width of the carriageway and the footway.

Although it is acknowledged that loss of parking would be unacceptable to some residents, it is not for the Council to facilitate the parking needs of residents and their visitors but it is the Council's statutory duty to ensure that access and safety are maintained at all times. Once the Council is aware of obstructive parking, lack of mitigating action could put the Council at risk. The Council could be accused of not acting responsibly in discharging its statutory duties.

This consultation is about waiting restrictions and it was explain in the letter sent to residents that objections must relate only to the elements of the scheme that are subject to this statutory consultation. In addition to the above, at a glance, given the level of crossovers along Elm Gardens, it simply would not be possible for the Council to introduce any traffic calming feature. The only features that could be considered would be junction entry treatment that may prove useful at the junctions, it will do nothing for the remaining length of the road. This feature has already been installed at the junctions.

ENVIRONMENT AND REGENERATION DEPARTMENT
Chris Lee, Director of Environment and Regeneration



James McGinlay
Head of Sustainable Communities
London Borough of Merton
Merton Civic Centre
London Road
Morden SM4 5DX

Direct Line: 020 8545 3700
Fax:

My Ref:
Please Ask For: Paul Atie

Your Ref:

Date: 3 March 2021

Dear Resident,

Proposed reduction of waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) to single yellow line in Elm Gardens – statutory consultation

The Cabinet Member for Housing, Regeneration and the Climate Emergency has instructed officers to reduce the recently introduced double yellow lines to single yellow line on both sides of the road except at the junction and bend. The single yellow line to operate Monday-Friday between 8.30am and 6.30pm.

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

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

A Notice of the Council's intention to introduce the above measures will be published in a local newspaper (Wimbledon Times), London Gazette and posted on lamp columns in the vicinity. Representations against the proposals described in this Notice must be made no later than **26 March 2021** quoting reference **ES/WR2021**. Objections must relate only to the elements of the scheme that are subject to this statutory consultation by emailing trafficandhighways@merton.gov.uk or to **Environment & Regeneration Department, future Merton, Merton Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, Surrey, SM4 5DX**.

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.

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

Yours sincerely,

Paul Atie
Parking Engineer |future Merton|

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 and Electoral Services, 1st floor, Civic Centre, London Road, Morden SM4 5DX.

For further information or advice contact the Head of Democracy and Electoral Services on

020 8545 3409