Merton Council

STREET MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Membership:

Brian Lewis-Lavender
Ian Munn
Russell Makin
Krystal Miller
Leighton Veale
Jonathan Warne

A meeting of the Street Management Advisory Committee will be held on
Date: Monday 11 September 2006
Time: 19.15
Venue: Council Chamber

Merton Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, Surrey

For information about this meeting please contact Democratic Services on 020 8545 3616 or email democratic.services@merton.gov.uk
1. Declarations of interest (See ‘Note 1’ at the foot of this agenda)

2. Appointment of Chair

3. Apologies for absence

4. Minutes of the meeting held on 19 July 2006

5. Proposed parking arrangements for Haydons Road – formal consultation

6. Pay and display parking bays – High Street and Parkside, Wimbledon Village

7. Loading bay – Morden Road

8. South Wimbledon Proposed Controlled Parking Zone

9. Proposed Waiting restrictions in Watery Lane – Result of formal consultation

NOTE:

1 Members are advised to make declarations of personal or prejudicial interests they may have in relation to any item on this agenda. Members may make their declaration either under this item or at any time it becomes apparent that they have an interest in any particular item. To facilitate the recording of declarations members are asked to complete the pro-forma attached to this agenda and hand it to the Democratic Services Officer in attendance. If a Member believes that their interest is prejudicial they should leave the meeting while the item is discussed. If in doubt, Members are advised to seek advice from the Head of Civic and Legal Services prior to the meeting.
STREET MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
19 JULY 2006
(19:15 to 21:15)

PRESENT: Councillors Brian Lewis-Lavender, Russell Makin, Krystal Miller, Ian Munn, Leighton Veale and Jonathan Warne.

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor Rod Scott. Richard Schmidt (Ursuline High School). Head Teacher Ursuline High School. Mary Sinfield (Merton Association of Pensioners) Alison Broom, Ray Puddy, Mitra Dubet and Tony Robinson (LBM Street Management), Colin Millar (LBM Democratic Services)

1 APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR
Russell Makin and Leighton Veale nominated Councillor Ian Munn, Jonathan Warne and Brian Lewis-Lavender nominated Krystal Miller.

There voted:
for Councillor Munn – 3 votes
for Councillor Miller – 3 votes

The Democratic Services Officer asked if members would be able to agree on appointment of a Chair for this meeting only and the members agreed that Councillor Munn should take the Chair for this meeting.

2 THE DOWNS – SAFER ROUTES TO SCHOOL
The head teacher of Ursuline high school made a representation asking the Council to approve the proposed measures.

Mr Schmidt made a representation asking the Council to approve the proposed measures.

Councillor Rod Scott indicated that the ward members were also in favour of the proposal. He asked that the Council should also consider this area for inclusion in a 20 mph zone. It was also suggested that the road be considered for a CPZ with free short term parking provisions for parents dropping/picking up pupils.

RESOLVED: That the Advisory Committee recommends that the Cabinet member:
1) agrees to the making of the Traffic Management Order and the implementation of the proposed speed table in The Downs outside the Ursuline School as shown on Drawing Z55/16/10 attached as appendix 1 to the report;

All minutes are draft until agreed at the next meeting of the committee/panel. To find out the date of the next meeting please check the calendar of events at your local library, online at www.merton.gov.uk/committee or by using the contact numbers at the end of this volume.
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2) approves the introduction of coloured anti-skid carriageway surfacing, 20m either side of the ramps of the proposed speed table; and

3) agrees that a public inquiry should not be held at this time.

3 SOUTH WIMBLEDON TRANSPORT INITIATIVES

RESOLVED: That the Advisory Committee recommends that the Cabinet member:

1) Proceeds to the formal consultation on the introduction of a new 7am-10am and 4pm-7pm Monday to Friday southbound bus lane on Merton Road between the junction with Quicks Road and a point opposite the northern kerbline of Balfour Road to also include the conversion of the existing zebra crossing on Merton Road, just south of the junction with Pelham Road, to a pelican crossing and if no substantial objections are received to proceed to implementation. Details are shown in ‘Appendix 1’.

2) Proceeds to the formal consultation on the introduction of a new 7am-10am and 4pm-7pm Monday to Friday southbound bus lane on Morden Road between the junction with Merton High Street and the bus stop by Gilbert Close and if no substantial objections are received to proceed to implementation. Details are shown in ‘Appendix 1’.

3) Proceeds to the formal consultation on the introduction of a new 7am-10am and 4pm-7pm Monday to Saturday westbound bus lane on Merton High Street from a point opposite the party wall of 38/40 Merton High Street to a point opposite the party wall of 32/33 Merton High Street and if no substantial objections are received to proceed to implementation. Details are shown in ‘Appendix 1’.

4) Proceeds to the formal consultation on the introduction of a new 7am-7pm Monday to Saturday westbound bus lane on Merton High Street between a point opposite the party wall of 128/130 Merton High Street and a point opposite 224/226 Merton High Street and if no substantial objections are received to proceed to implementation. Details are shown in ‘Appendix 1’.

5) Approves the introduction of the proposed package of highway improvement measures in the South Wimbledon junction and Haydon’s Road area as detailed in section 3.10 and 3.12 of this report, subject to detailed design and capital funding allocation from Transport for London.

6) Irrespective of the timings of the bus lanes detailed above the Cabinet member is recommended to consider the timings to apply to all the bus lane elements in 1-4 above and the possible standardisation of these
STREET MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
19 JULY 2006

times taking into account the advice received in the report.
7) That the formal consultation should include at least the whole area shown on the map on page 26 of the agenda.

4 LOADING BAY – ELMHURST AVENUE

RESOLVED: That the Advisory Committee recommends that the Cabinet member:

1) agrees to the making of an experimental traffic management order and the implementation of the loading bay as shown on plan Z28/258/01A attached as appendix 1 to the report; and

2) agrees that a review of the operation of the loading bay be undertaken 9 months after its introduction.
SUBJECT: Proposed Parking Arrangements for Haydon’s Road – Formal Consultation

LEAD OFFICER: Richard Rawes, Director of Environment & Regeneration

LEAD MEMBER: Councillor Tariq Ahmad

KEY DECISION REFERENCE NUMBER: N/A

RECOMMENDATIONS:

That the Committee considers the issues detailed in this report and recommends that the Cabinet member:

1) Note the results of the formal consultation carried out in February/March 2006 to:

1.1 Amend the existing single yellow line restrictions on Haydon’s Road; Kingsley Road, Kohat Road, Caxton Road, Tennyson Road, Dryden Road, Milton Road and Cowper Road to release kerb side space for unrestricted free parking.

1.2 Introduce double yellow lines (junction protection) at all the identified junctions along Haydon’s Road and other key locations between Gap Road and Merton High Street as shown in Appendix 1 plan Z78-128-05 (on display).

1.3 Introduce limited free parking bays, as shown on drawing Z78-128-05 with a 1 hour maximum stay and no return within one hour outside Nos. 341 – 347 Haydon’s Road; Nos. 321 – 333 Haydon’s Road; Nos. 286 – 294 Haydon’s Road.

1.4 Extend the existing boundary of Controlled Parking Zone 3E to include the properties on Haydon’s Road, east side, between Cowper Road and Caxton Road (Nos 191 to 317 Haydon’s Road); west side between South Park Road and Effra Road (Nos 156 to 224 Haydon’s Road) and to introduce additional bays as shown on drawing Z78-128-05.

1.5 Introduce pay and display bays and shared use bays to Zone 3F.

1.6 Introduce additional parking bays in Zone S2.

1.7 Replace some of the yellow line restrictions with free parking bays on Haydon’s Road’s east side between North Road and Merton High Street between Nos 29 and 51; between 55 and 77; 83 and 102 Haydon’s Road; outside No 117 (Public House) Haydon’s Road;

2) Notes the representations received and officers’ comments as detailed in Appendix 2.

3) Agrees to undertake a formal consultation on the amended proposal as detailed in section 5, in appendix 3 and drawing Z78-128-05 and to include the correct title for the
1. **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1.1 This report details the results of the formal consultation carried out in February / March 2006 on proposals to introduce the measures as detailed in section 5 of this report. It also details the recommended changes to the previous measures that is necessary and recommends a further formal consultation with those directly affected.

   For full details see section 5 of this report and plan Z78-128-05.

2. **INTRODUCTION**

2.1 It is Council policy to improve the environment by regulating the number of parked vehicles in the area, thereby improving safety and access for all road users. The key objective of the proposal to introduce the recommended parking measures in Haydon's Road is to provide kerb side spaces where residents, local businesses and visitors can park safely without compromising road safety or access for pedestrians, emergency services' vehicles and buses, to improve traffic flow and discourage commuter parking and non-essential traffic in the area. This objective is in line with the Mayor for London’s Transport Strategy, which aims to tackle congestion and reduce traffic.

2.2 A controlled parking zone aims to manage kerb side spaces in an area in a way that gives priority access to parking spaces to residents, local businesses and visitors whilst promoting the safety of all road users. A CPZ comprises of various types of bays, such as permit holder bays (for either resident and/or business and visitor permit holders); shared use bays (permit holders and pay and display) and pay and display only bays (tickets must be purchased and displayed). The measures also include double yellow line (No Waiting at Any Time) restrictions at critical locations such as junctions, turning heads and bends where parking could be hazardous, cause circulation difficulties or impede traffic flow. Double yellow lines are also used on long narrow sections of road to provide a “passing gap” for opposing traffic.

2.3 Waiting restrictions can sometimes be introduced as a “minimum” scheme to address problems associated with parking where support for controlled parking proposals is too weak for a CPZ to be implemented.

2.4 The purpose of double yellow line restrictions is to maintain visibility and access at all times and provide safe conditions for all road users. Section 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 provide suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway" when exercising any of its functions under the Act. Road safety is therefore a matter that
the Council pays regard to when considering whether to make an Order under s.6 of the Act.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 Haydon’s Road is part of the route classified as the A218, which runs north to south, linking the A3 and A205 in Wandsworth with the A238 Merton High. It forms part of Bus Route 200 and although it is not a wide road, it is of significant traffic importance, carrying all classes of traffic. There are waiting/loading restrictions (yellow lines) operating Monday to Saturday between 8am and 6.30pm along some sections of the road to facilitate general traffic flow and assist bus operation.

3.2 In recent years, the west side of Haydon’s Road and all side roads on the west of the road between Gap Road and Merton High Street have become part of either CPZs 3E, 3F or S2. Only the east side of Haydon’s Road and roads east of it remain uncontrolled. The displacement of parking from Haydon’s Road and other roads west of it has resulted in extra parking pressure on the uncontrolled area to the east of Haydon’s Road resulting in illegal parking and pressure on the local residents and businesses.

3.3 Feedback from the various consultation exercises that the Council conducted in the area, included many requests for the Council to review the current parking arrangements and the extent of the existing yellow line restrictions along Haydon’s Road with a view to providing parking facilities for the residents and reducing the parking pressure on the side roads.

3.4 Between 2003 and 2004, the Council received letters from residents in the Poets Area complaining of parking difficulties in their streets and requesting for more parking to be allowed on Haydon’s Road.

3.5 Businesses have also expressed concern over the lack of parking spaces on Haydon’s Road and the consequent loss of passing trade. They were of the view that the current yellow line restrictions along the road discourage short stay parking, which was essential for their businesses.

3.6 To address these parking difficulties, the Council proposed the introduction of a controlled parking zone in the ‘Poets’ area and undertook the informal consultation on it in April / May 2004. In that exercise, a majority of the respondents rejected the proposal and consequently a CPZ was not introduced. However, in August 2005, double yellow lines were introduced in the area to address visibility related accidents and to improve the general road safety along Haydon’s Road, especially between its junctions with North Road and Caxton Road. Council officers had a meeting on 8th September 2005 with Ward Members, Poets Residents’ Association, Haydon’s Bridge Residents’ Association and South Park Residents’ Association at which it was agreed for the Council to undertake a public consultation on proposals to address the parking issues. Consequently, in October / November 2005 the Council consulted the section of Haydon’s Road between Plough Lane and Merton High Street on proposals for new parking arrangements for the road. Three proposed options were presented on the consultation questionnaire (attached as Appendix 5). The preferred options are detailed on drawings Z78-128-05.
The informal consultation resulted in 22.34% response rate. This included 65 from the residents, 11 from the businesses and 4 marked as both.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Haydon’s Road</th>
<th>OPTION 1 free bays &amp; junction protection</th>
<th>OPTION 2 CPZ &amp; junction protection</th>
<th>OPTION 3 junction protection</th>
<th>Total No of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gap Road – Caxton Road</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caxton Road – North Road</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Road – Merton High Street</td>
<td>16 east side 10 west side</td>
<td>9 east side 7 west side</td>
<td>3 east side 2 west side</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The informal consultation resulted in three distinct preferences within the following specific sections of Haydon’s Road:

- Section of Haydon’s Road between Gap Road and Caxton Road; respondents mostly requested that free bays be introduced.
- Eastern side of Haydon’s Road between Caxton Road and Cowper Road (between No 191 and No 317 Haydon’s Road); The respondents in this section of Haydon’s Road were mostly in favour of being included within the neighbouring CPZ 3E.
- North eastern side of Haydon’s Road between North Road and Merton High Street (between No 5 and No 119 Haydon’s Road); respondents mostly requested that free bays be introduced.

3.7 The results of the informal public consultation were reported to the Cabinet Street Management Committee on 6th December 2005, who, after considering the report, gave approval to proceed with formal consultation on proposals to:

- Reduce the extent of existing single yellow line restrictions at various locations to allow free parking.
- Introduce double yellow lines (junction protection) at all the junctions along Haydon’s Road.
- Introduce double yellow lines at other key locations where a parked vehicle could pose a danger to road users and/or impede traffic flow or cause difficulties for buses pulling in/out of bus stops.
- Introduce free parking bays.
- Extend CPZ 3E to include Nos. 189 - 317 Haydon’s Road.
- Introduce additional bays in the existing Zone 3E.
- Introduce additional bays in the existing Zone 3F.

3.8 Following these decisions, the formal consultation was undertaken in February/March 2006 and the representation period ended on 10th March 2006. The formal consultation newsletter is attached to this report as Appendix 4.

3.9 This formal consultation resulted in a total of 12 representations. Seven were in support of the proposals, 3 were against and 2 provided general comments.
4. RESULT OF FORMAL CONSULTATION

4.1 The formal consultation started on 16th February 2006 and concluded on 10th March 2006. Representations received after the closing date have been included in this report. The consultation resulted in a total of 12 representations, a breakdown of which is as follows:

- 8 representations from Haydon's Road of which 5 were in support, 2 against and 1 was neither for nor against but provided general comments. One of the representations against the proposals was from the Vice Chair of Haydon's Bridge Residents' Association, which represents a section of Haydon’s Road, Plough Lane, Gap Road, Avondale Road, Haydon Park Road, Kingsley Road, Cromwell Road, Ashcombe Road, Kohat Road, Havelock Road and Regent’s Place.
- 3 representations from neighbouring roads, of which 1 was in support and 2 against.
- There was 1 representation, from a statutory consultee, in support of the proposals.

Representations and officers’ comments have been detailed in Appendix 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Objection</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haydon's Road</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring Streets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 During the formal consultation an audit was carried out by another engineer and at that time it was realised that a number of mistakes had been made. These consisted of the following:

- There were some errors within the topographical survey upon which the design was based; consequently the design allowed parking where it would cause obstruction due to existing islands, which were marked in the wrong location on the original plan. It has, therefore, been necessary to amend the design which involves replacing some of the proposed parking bays with double yellow lines and vice versa.
- Within the publication of the schedule, one of the headings was misunderstood and as such was printed to give an inaccurate definition of the proposed measures i.e. the heading should have read ‘single yellow lines to be removed and existing double yellow lines to be retained – this, however was rewritten as ‘single yellow lines to be replaced with double yellow lines’. This was contrary to the proposed measures as shown on the plans and officer’s recommendations. It is proposed to readvertise this with the exception of the small length of single yellow line in Kohat Road near its junction with Haydon’s Road whereby due to the existing central refuges parking would cause obstruction. In this instance it is proposed to convert the single yellow line to double yellow lines. Photographic evidence of obstructive parking and the need for the proposed restriction is attached as appendix 6.

4.3 Due to the above errors it would be necessary to undertake a further formal consultation. If approved the proposed amendments as detailed in appendix 3 will
also be advertised. It is proposed to formally consult those directly affected by means of a newsletter.

4.4 Haydon’s Road falls under 3 wards. Officers invited all 9 Ward Councillors to a meeting. A meeting was convened on 24\textsuperscript{th} July 2006. Those present included Councillors Neil Mills and Neless (Abbey Ward); Councillors Miller and Dean (Trinity Ward) and Councillor Kerin (Wimbledon Park). The background of the proposed measures, the proposed measures and Officer’s recommendations were explained and discussed. Following the meeting, on 28\textsuperscript{th} July, an e mail summerising the proposals was also sent to all the Councillors with a request for comments. Issues that were raised included the provisions of trees and more parking bays. As with any design the maximum number of parking has been permitted without compromising safety and access. With regards to provisions of trees the request has been forwarded to the Highways team for further investigation and could require substantial funding.

Final comments from 3 of the Councillors (relating to the actual parking proposals):
- No Comments other than those made at the meeting.
- It is important to have free short term free parking for shoppers.
- In general, I support the proposal that has been put forward but am somewhat concerned with the very low number of responses received to the consultation. Need confirmation regarding council’s policy on double yellow lines.

**Officer’s Comments**
The proposals allow for free short term parking for the local businesses. With regards to the response rate, during a formal consultation people (any one, resident or not) are invited to forward a representation. It is normal practice to make a decision whilst considering the contents of the representations rather than the numbers. The number of representations received here is considered reasonably good. With regards to double yellow lines and extent of restrictions, each case is considered on its merit/its environment. As a rule it is recommended that double yellow lines are introduced:
- at junctions (on average 10m, in minor arms between 6 & 10m).
- at turning heads
- at bends
- along narrow sections of roads where access could be impeded if parking was to take place.

5 OFFICERS’ RECOMMENDATION

5.1 It is recommended that the representations be noted; objections be considered and those that have not been resolved be overruled and the proposed recommendations be put into action. The recommendations include the undertaking of a further formal consultation on:

5.1.1 The removal of the existing single yellow line restrictions on Haydon’s Road; Kingsley Road, Caxton Road, Tennyson Road, Dryden Road, Milton Road and Cowper Road to release kerb side space for unrestricted free parking.
5.1.2 The conversion of the single yellow line (5m) in Kohat Road to double yellow lines.

5.1.3 Retention of the existing single yellow line outside No 286.

5.1.4 Conversion of existing single yellow line between 309/311 and 313/315 Haydon’s Road to double yellow lines.

5.1.5 Retention of the single yellow line across crossover between 295 and 299.

5.1.6 Convert 4.5m of existing single yellow line outside Nos 265 and 267 Haydon’s Road to double yellows lines.

5.1.7 Retention of the single yellow line between 222/224 and the zig zag markings adjacent to Effra Road.

5.1.8 To abandon the proposed double yellow lines outside 219 and extend the proposed parking bay.

5.1.9 Retention of the single yellow line between 197/199 and 193/195 and convert single yellow line between 193/195 and 191 to double yellow lines.

5.1.10 Retention of the existing single yellow line outside 117 Haydon’s Road.

5.1.11 Increase the proposed parking bay between Nos. 83/85 and 101 by 1.6m.

5.1.12 Extension of the existing double yellow lines from the southern kerb line of Deburgh Road to a point opposite the northern flank wall of No. 73; and extend the proposed double yellow lines from the northern kerb line of Gilbert Road to outside Nos 61/63.

5.1.13 Remove double yellow lines outside 27 and 29 and allow parking.

5.1.14 Convert 4.7m of single yellow line near its junction with Regent Place to double yellow lines.

5.1.15 The above is in addition to the following proposed measures that the Council has already formally consulted on :-

1. Introduce double yellow lines (junction protection) at all the identified junctions along Haydon’s Road and other key locations between Gap Road and Merton High Street as shown in plan 1 Z78-128- 05
2. Introduce limited free parking bays, as shown on drawing Z78-128- 05 with a 1 hour maximum stay and no return within one hour outside Nos. 341 – 347 Haydon’s Road; Nos. 321 – 333 Haydon’s Road; Nos. 286 – 294 Haydon’s Road.
3. Extend the existing boundary of Controlled Parking Zone 3E to include the properties on Haydon’s Road, east side, between Cowper Road and Caxton Road (Nos 191 to 317 Haydon’s Road); west side between South Park Road and Effra Road (Nos 156 to 224 Haydon’s Road) and to introduce additional bays as shown on drawing Z78-128- 05.
4. Introduce pay and display bays and shared use bays to Zone 3F.
5. Introduce additional parking bays in Zone S2.
6. Replace some of the yellow line restrictions with free parking bays on Haydon’s Road’s east side between North Road and Merton High Street between Nos 29 and 51; between 55 and 77; 83 and 102 Haydon’s Road; outside No 117 (Public House) Haydon’s Road;

5.2 In deciding whether or not to implement the proposed measures, Members will need to consider the following:

- **On site conditions** – there is a high level of demand for on street parking on Haydon’s Road from the residents, businesses and visitors. It is considered that the proposed arrangements will give residents, businesses and visitors access to safe parking spaces. The proposals currently under consideration, would provide the following extra parking bays in Haydon’s Road:-

- **Free unlimited parking spaces**
  - Between Nos 29 & 53 - 11 spaces
  - Between Nos 63 & 73 - 5 spaces
  - Between Nos 85 & 101 - 8 spaces
  - Total No of new bays - 24

- **Free limited 1 hour parking spaces**
  - Between Nos 321 & 333 - 6 spaces
  - Between Nos 341 & 347 - 4 spaces
  - Between Nos 286 & 294 - 3 spaces
  - Total No of new bays - 13

- **Additional bays in Zone 3F**
  - Between Nos 100 & 106 - 2 extra P&D bays
  - Between Nos 140 & 144 - 2 extra shared use bays
  - Total No of new bays - 4

- **Additional permit holder bays in Zone 3E**
  - Between Nos 199 & 207 - 4 spaces
  - Between Nos 194 & 224 - 13 spaces
  - Between Nos 213 & 221 - 4 spaces
  - Between Nos 271 & 309 - 15 spaces
  - Between Nos 170 – 188 - 8 spaces
  - Total No of new bays - 44

- **Council’s duties and powers** – Section 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 Act. Road safety is therefore a matter that the Council should pay regard to when considering making an Order under S.6 of the Act.

- **Representations made in respect of the formal consultation** – although the response rate can be considered as low, it should be noted that this is often the case during a formal consultation as those who are strongly against tend to make representations. It is clear that the majority of those who have made representations support the proposals. At the informal consultation there was a 22.35 response rate; 48% opted for option 1.
5.3 It is considered that the proposed measures will improve the parking difficulties currently encountered by the residents businesses and their visitors without compromising safety and access.

5.4 Road Safety Audit Stage 1/2 has been carried out by WSP on the amended recommendations/proposals. This was carried out in accordance with the Departmental Standard HD 19/03.

6 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

6.1 An alternative option would be to abandon the proposed scheme and do nothing. However, this would be contrary to the support from the majority of respondents in Haydon’s Road evidenced by the informal consultation results summerised in section 3.6 of this report. Also, it would be seen as failure on the part of the Council to address the local community’s concern about parking and access difficulties currently experienced in side roads and on Haydon’s Road. This option will not address the concern that has been raised by businesses about lack of parking provision on Haydon’s Road itself, a situation they perceive as damaging to their business.

7 RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

7.1 The risk of not introducing the proposed parking arrangements in Haydon’s Road is that the existing parking difficulties on this road and adjacent side roads would continue and it would do nothing to assist the residents and the local business community.

7.2 A further risk of not introducing the proposed parking arrangements in Haydon’s Road would be that the problem of obstructive and dangerous parking on the carriageway and footway would continue, with implications for bus operation, road safety and general traffic movement.

7.4 Not implementing the proposed parking arrangements in Haydon’s Road would be contrary to the support expressed in the consultation by the majority of respondents from Haydon’s Road and could this lead to loss of public confidence in the Council.

8 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

8.1 The cost of implementing the proposals shown on drawing No. Z78-128-05 (including the publication of Draft Orders) is estimated at £19000. This does not include staff costs.

8.2 The cost of implementing the proposals will be funded from the Capital budget identified for controlled parking zones.

8.3 The financial effects will be reviewed as part of the 2006/2007 revenue budget monitoring. These have been taken into account in the 2004-7 business planning process.
9. **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

9.1 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 in a local newspaper and the London Gazette). 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 cause a public inquiry to be held or modifications to be made to the published draft order in respect of objections received before reaching a decision on making a traffic management order. A public inquiry should only be held if it would provide material information that would assist the Council in reaching a decision. It is considered unnecessary for the Council to hold a public inquiry in this instance since it has followed its consultation procedure by undertaking extensive consultation to ascertain the views of the local community and other stakeholders.

10. **HUMAN RIGHTS & EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS**

10.1 The implementation of controlled parking zones and consequent double yellow lines has implications for all sections of the community. These measures assist in improving visibility and access at road junctions and other critical locations, and assist in improving safety for all road users, benefiting most especially the young, the elderly and pushchair and wheelchair users. By minimising incidences of dangerous and indiscriminate parking and excluding non-essential parking in the area, the controls would assist in improving the street environment by minimising traffic movement, noise and pollution. The condition created would assist in enhancing residents’ quality of life and contribute to achieving the aims of Government, Mayor for London and Merton Council’s transport policies.

10.2 The Council undertakes extensive and inclusive public consultation to ensure that all road users are given a fair opportunity to have a say on any proposals that may impact on them. In designing a parking scheme, special consideration is given to meeting the needs of the disabled, local residents and businesses, bus operators, emergency and refuse collection services as well as those of charitable, public services and religious establishments. The needs of commuters are also given consideration but generally carry less weight than those of residents and local businesses.

10.3 At the statutory or formal consultation stage, people had a further opportunity, along with bodies representing various interests, to have a say on the proposals before the traffic management order is made and the scheme implemented. The statutory consultation is the final stage of the consultation process that any similar scheme has to undergo before it can be implemented. And undertaking a formal consultation
as proposals are amended will provide further opportunity for the Community to air their views.

APPENDICES:

Appendix 1 – Plans of Proposals – Drawing No. Z78-128-05 (on display)
Appendix 2 – Representations received in respect of the formal consultation
Appendix 3 – Proposed amendments
Appendix 4 – Formal consultation newsletter
Appendix 5 - Informal consultation newsletter/questionnaire
Appendix 6 - Photographs

DRAWINGS – The following drawings form part of this report:
Drawing No. Z78-128- 05 showing proposed parking arrangements for Haydon's Road

BACKGROUND PAPERS – Cabinet Street Management Committee Report of 6th December 2005 on Proposed Parking Arrangements for Haydon’s Road and Committee's decision.

OFFICER CONTACTS:
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## Representations in support from Haydon’s Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confirm No. / Road Name</th>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Officers’ Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22005356 Haydon’s Rd SW19 8TX</td>
<td>I am writing in my capacity as a resident of Haydon’s Road to fervently support the proposed changes to the parking arrangements in Haydon’s Road. I believe they will make the road safer, quieter and relieve pressure on the parking on the side roads off Haydon’s Road</td>
<td>Support noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22005443 Haydon’s Rd SW19 8TR</td>
<td>I am in favour of the proposed parking arrangements in principle although I would be against the proposals if the following two points were not implemented at the same time: (a) Traffic calming measures along the whole of Haydon’s Road as the new arrangements will increase the number of people parking and getting out of their cars into fast and large oncoming traffic and there will be a very high risk of death in many cases (b) For the above reason people who currently park in existing bays and on yellow lines in the evenings would be inclined to mount the pavements to avoid possible collisions with other vehicles and the illegal footway parking would continue unchecked as it currently is.</td>
<td>Observation noted Traffic calming measures cannot be incorporated within these parking proposals. There are a number of criteria that must be met and would be subject to TfL approval and funding. Any such measure would also be subject to a series of consultation processes. Due to the nature of the road as defined in section 3.1 of this report it would be extremely difficult to introduce physical deflections / speed reducing features. In previous years, Haydons Road has been subject to a series of accident remedial measures and is continuously monitored. It is considered that the proposed measures would improve road safety as parking bays will be clearly marked and anyone outside of the road markings would be fined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22005513 Haydon’s Rd SW19 8LA</td>
<td>I am writing to express my full support for the change to free one hour parking bays outside 321 Haydon’s Road. This can only be most helpful to all the small businesses in that road who have to struggle along in a highly competitive business environment</td>
<td>Support noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22005460 Haydon’s Road SW19 8TR</td>
<td>I support the proposed changes to the current parking arrangements. I am particularly in favour of the introduction of permit holder bays within zone 3E on the west side of Haydons Road between Nos. 196 to 226; this area is outside my property and it would be useful for me to park my car here. In addition I feel it would provide me with extra security, as I would be able to hear the car alarm should someone attempt to break into our vehicle. I would be in favour of these bays being enforced, as there is on occasion a problem finding a parking space due to extra vehicles parking in the area, mainly for attendance at the nearby temple on Effra Road</td>
<td>Support noted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a financial victim of the current parking situation in Haydon’s Road area I cannot stress enough how much parking permits are needed for the embattled residents of this area. We currently have to park on the pavement outside our houses and regularly pick up parking tickets due to parking restrictions and yellow lines. Since the surrounding area is permit parking only it is blatantly obvious to anyone that there will be huge pressure for the few remaining parking spaces. Hence the overflow on the main road and parking tickets for those of us who do not work and live with the 8.30am-6.30pm restricted time zones. The parking policy has actually been more effective than the great clearances of the Scottish Highlands. I think you will find that all my neighbours have gradually moved away due to the fact they do not work 9–5 office jobs, and like myself, were getting fines on a regular basis. Clearly parking permits are the only way to go for residents & for any sort of parking along Haydon’s Road. If you open the road to all then residents will still be faced with the prospect of not getting any parking spaces at all. I will be delighted to purchase a parking permit and very much look forward to having the opportunity to do so. If anyone is in any doubt as to how much they are needed by residents then please do get in touch and I will gladly forward statements and correspondence from those residents who have now left the area.

Representations in support from roads adjacent to Haydon’s Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confirm No. / Road Name</th>
<th>Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22005467 Acting Chair, South Park Estate Residents’ Association Faraday Rd SW19 8PA</td>
<td>We are in favour of and understand the reasons for the proposals. Whilst we accept that the additional resident only bays created in Haydon’s Road may compensate for the additional number of permits that will be issued as a direct result of this changed, we are concerned that Zone 3E may be disadvantaged at some future date if a new CPZ is created to the east of Haydon’s Road. We seek assurances that in these circumstances the properties on the eastern side of Haydon’s Road would be included within the new zone and permit holders would be restricted to parking in the newly created zone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representation in support - from statutory consultees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confirm No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22005442</td>
<td>London Travel Watch</td>
<td>Middle Street London EC1A 7JA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Members of London TravelWatch support the implementation of “at-any-time” i.e. double yellow line restrictions as it also promotes pedestrian safety and access. They would also stress the importance of an adequate enforcement regime so that the benefits of the restrictions are not diminished by persistent violations. Members support the proposed parking arrangements for Haydon’s Road. London TravelWatch believes that there should be a presumption that schemes should provide favourable conditions for buses and that stopping, parking and loading restrictions should apply on bus routes that are subject to congestion to reduce delay and inconvenience to passengers and also encourage a modal switch from the private car to buses. Legitimate loading requirements of businesses on bus routes should be accommodated either in adjacent side streets or restricted to times when buses are least delayed by congestion.

Officers’ Comments
Support and comments are noted
Representations against - from Haydon’s Road

22005461 Haydon’s Road SW19

We own the freehold of showrooms and our tenants have occupied the premises for the past 40 years. We would object to your proposals on the following grounds:

1. This section of Haydons Road is extremely busy, especially so in the rush hours. Your parking bays would make this section into a single lane causing tremendous traffic queues for Durnsford Road and Plough Lane into Haydons Road.

2. Cars coming out of Kingsley Road would have difficulty in seeing traffic coming from the direction of Plough Lane and Durnsford Road.

3. There is a traffic light operated pedestrian crossing, which would also tend to halt the flow of traffic.

4. There would also be a tendency for pedestrians to cross Haydons Road from the uneven numbers to the other side and walkout between parked cars, a highly dangerous situation.

5. It is not clear whether the double yellow lines outside No 337 Haydons road continue past 339 Haydons Road as both of these premises are a car showroom the cars need to be moved in and out of the showroom so any parking bays outside 337 would make it impossible to move cars.

These proposals will have the effect of making the business virtually impossible and put several people out of work. We are sure the council does not want to create an accident black spot or put people out of work. Your consideration of the above points would be appreciated.

Officer’s comments - It is Council policy to improve the environment by regulating the number of parked vehicles in the area, thereby improving safety and access for both motorists and pedestrians. The key objective of the proposal is to assist residents, short-stay visitors and local businesses by providing safe parking provisions and to improve safety & access for all road users. The current situation whereby vehicles are parked indiscriminately, blocking pedestrian crossing points and pavements, impeding free flow of traffic, restricting access and visibility, is potentially dangerous to all road users. During the consultation it was verbally explained to those who are currently operating a business from these premises that their current practice of driving their vehicles across the footway without the provision of a footway crossover is illegal and dangerous to all road users particularly pedestrians. As part of junction protection double yellow lines are proposed for outside No 337 / 339 which is also within a pelican crossing area. An independent safety audit has been carried out and it is not considered that the proposed measures would cause danger as suggested by the objector.

22005494 Vice Chair Haydon’s Bridge Residents’ Association Kohat Road

We, Haydon’s Bridge Resident’s Association, have asked our Residents for their views on this subject. The result and the common view are to leave Haydon’s Road AS IT IS. Since your Department does not give this democratic option to us residents, stating that the NO option was not available for this issue! We would like to inform you that we strongly object to your proposals. We also like to inform you, that it is unjustified to extend the double yellow lines in Regent’s Place as far as you have in your Plan since this will result in loss of valuable CAR PARK SPACES for commuters and visitors to the corner Church. Any reasons given for safety issues are unjustified, as we never had any problems or accidents in Regents Place, or adjacent areas. Your Department insists on reducing available car parking spaces extending the double yellow lines to unnecessary length, it is seen as a spiteful act against Residents.

Officer’s comments

It is Council policy to improve the environment by regulating the number of parked vehicles in the area, thereby improving safety and access for both motorists and pedestrians. The key objective of the proposal is to improve safety and access for all road users. The current situation whereby vehicles are parked indiscriminately, blocking pedestrian crossing points and pavements, impeding free flow of traffic, restricting access and visibility, is potentially dangerous to all road users. For the Council to ignore the current situation would be irresponsible and a failure in its duty as the highway authority. The Council has a duty to provide for the safety of all road users and to maintain access at all times, particularly for emergency services and the public service vehicles. Double yellow lines are provided as a proactive measure at locations where parking would be dangerous. They are not an accident remedial measure which is traditionally installed to reduce accident re-occurrence.

The informal and formal consultation as carried out by the Council have resulted in majority in favour of the proposals. Despite the various requests made by officers, this association has failed to provide information regarding the roads and % of residents they represent and no information has been provided regarding their consultation (content, extent etc).
Representations against - from roads adjacent to Haydon’s Road

I wish to object to the proposed imposition of double yellow lines to replace single yellow lines as specified on the street notices and newspaper advertisement re this scheme - entire schedule of ‘Waiting restrictions Operating at all times. These Restrictions Replace the Existing Single Yellow Lines.’ which covers areas of Kingsley Road, Kohat Road, Caxton Road, Tennyson Road, Cowper Road, Dryden Road and Milton Road. I would point out that this is the second time in a year that this has been proposed by Street Management in complete contradiction to a previous plan put up for consultation for a proposed CPZ (H3) where some or all of the areas were designated there as residents’ parking bays; against a democratic decision by the Scrutiny Committee when a similar plan to that of the current public notices for extended double yellow lines over 10m from major junctions was put forward by Street Management and was decided against; against the agreement in principle arrived at in a meeting of members of the traffic department, councillors and representatives of local residents associations to remove the single yellow lines, not put double yellow lines in; and in contradiction to the information specified very clearly in the newsletter and plan sent to me on this scheme where it is clearly stated that the consultation refers to removal of waiting restrictions and not to making them restricted at all times. Apart from this matter, the rest of the scheme seems fairly reasonable.

As mentioned in section 4.2 of the report due to an error in interpreting the schedule it would be necessary to readvertise the schedule in that the single yellow lines as proposed and shown on the consultation documents would be removed with the exception of the small length of single yellow line in Kohat Road whereby due to the existing central refuges parking would cause obstruction. In this instance it is proposed to convert the single yellow to double yellow lines. Photographic evidence is attached as appendix 6 that shows the obstructive parking and supports the needs for the proposed restriction.

I read the notice in the Wimbledon Guardian of 16 February 2006 about the further parking restrictions the Council is proposing in the Poets Area. I would like to register my most forceful objections to these proposals. My objections are as follows:

1. Lack of consultation. Merton Council failed in its attempt in 2002/2003 to impose a controlled parking zone in the Poets Area. For the three years since then the residents of the Poets Area have been subjected to a constant barrage of threats from the Council of further parking restrictions. Until this year all of the threatened restrictions were notified to residents by means not only of notices on lampposts but also of letters through residents’ doors. This time we have been accorded no such courtesy, as there have been no letters through our doors. After more than three years of proposals from the Council, we the residents have gained a legitimate expectation of proper consultation whenever the Council decides to propose new measures. You will no doubt be aware that a lack of proper consultation which has been legitimately expected is a ground for challenge to any measure which is passed as a result of your proposals.

2. The Council’s most recent attempt to curb residents’ parking in the Poets Area was in November/December 2004, during which the Council proposed to impose double yellow lines for 10m around every junction in the roads from Caxton Road to Cowper Road. According to the information provided to councillors at the meeting of the Street Management Overview and Scrutiny Panel on 16 March 2005, you received 88 responses, of which one was in favour of the proposed restrictions and 87 were against. Nevertheless, the restrictions were approved, although they were reduced to 5m in all places except on the eastern side of Haydons Road where double yellow lines were approved for a 10m stretch. Two months later a further consultation was carried out, again by means of letters through doors, informing residents of the decision to increase the length of the double yellow lines at the Haydons Road end of each side road to 8m. No mention was made of the single yellow lines that extend further down the Haydons Road end of each side road in any of the consultation documents, and it was again our legitimate expectation that these would be removed. Not only were they not removed, it is now proposed that they be changed into double yellow lines. This means that there will be 18m of double yellow lines on each of the side roads. I would like to know the reason for this proposed extension, which must relate to night-time driving, since the proposed double yellow lines are currently single yellow lines meaning that no-one is parking on them during the day. And yet at night drivers have the benefit of headlights to warn them of approaching...
traffic. What is the reason please? If 18m of double yellow lines is what is really necessary for safety reasons, why was it not proposed initially in 2004 when the double yellow lines were first proposed?

3. You are no doubt well aware of my objections to any restriction on residents' parking in the Poets Area, but for the sake of completeness, they are basically these:

- there is only just enough room for all residents to park as it is, any restriction would mean that residents were unable to park anywhere near their homes
- there is very little evidence of commuter parking in the Poets Area, particularly away from Caxton Road
- there is little evidence of accidents at any of the junctions concerned, and no proof that any of the accidents to which the Council refer actually occurred as a result of poorly parked vehicles, since official accident reporting techniques require all accidents that take place IN THE VICINITY OF a junction to be reported as taking place AT the junction.

The lack of consultation combined with the apparent lack of any reason for the proposed extension of the restrictions and the attempt to get this measure through Council before the local council elections in May shows this proposal to be simply another cynical attempt to reduce parking in our streets to such an extent that residents ask for a controlled parking zone, which would of course be most lucrative to the Council. At present there is just enough parking space for all residents and therefore minimal support for a CPZ. Evan Jeposa told me in his letter of 1 September 2005 that there would be a consultation in September 2005 on parking on the eastern side of Haydon’s Road. Please could you tell me what was consulted on and what the outcome of that consultation was?

I would appreciate an acknowledgement of this email, and an assurance that its contents will be taken into account despite the fact that the deadline for responses as noted in the Wimbledon Guardian was 2 days ago.

**Officers’ Response:**

Objection 1): The consultation on the proposals has been conducted in accordance with Merton Council’s consultation procedures. The current proposals will directly affect Haydon’s Road and therefore all those premises on Haydon’s Road and corner properties were directly consulted informally and formally by means of individually delivered documents. Local Ward Members and resident’s associations were also directly consulted. During a formal consultation the legal obligation for the Council is to erect Notices (Council’s intensions) on lamp columns in the area and publish in the Local Guardian and the London Gazette as done in this case. The documents were also available in the Wimbledon Library, at the Civic Centre and on the Council’s web site. This formed part of the Formal consultation. The fact that representations have been received, it can be considered that the Council succeeded in reaching the local community. The objector has forwarded a representation, which is being considered; the formal consultation between the Council and residents, has been carried out.

Objection 2): There is no proposal to extend and convert existing single yellow lines to double yellow lines up to 18 metres as suggested by the objector. This misunderstanding is due to the error already explained regarding the removal of single yellow lines. Minimum double yellow lines are proposed at critical locations on safety grounds.

Objection 3): The proposals will provide safe and convenient parking spaces for both residents, businesses and visitors whilst improving sightlines and safety for all road users.

**Comments from Haydon’s Road**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confirm No. / Road Name</th>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Officers’ Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haydon’s Road SW19</td>
<td>I am writing about the proposed double yellow lines outside Nos. 27 and 29 Haydon’s Road, which is at the beginning of a bus stop. There are residents of properties along this section of road who are both elderly and disabled and have a daily carer who call quite often with shopping, washing, etc. Double yellow lines would make life much more difficult for those who care for these residents. Therefore, I would ask you to re-consider. Would it be possible to have a disabled parking bay or something else to their benefit.</td>
<td>Originally consideration was given to the Bus Route 200 pulling in to this stop; however, upon further consideration it has been agreed that the cage is of sufficient length to facilitate the bus. It is therefore recommended to adhere to the residents’ request for the removal of the proposed small section of double yellow lines leading up to the bus stop and to amend the proposal to allow parking. With regards to the provision of a disabled parking bay, this would be subject to the approval of the residents’ application and a separate formal consultation that can be carried out under delegated authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Initial Proposal</td>
<td>Variation to Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Proposed parking bay outside Nos. 286 -294</td>
<td>Parking bay to start from a point 15m north of the northern kerb line of Cromwell Road northwards for a distance of 21m. The existing single yellow line outside No 286 to be retained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Removal of single yellow line along southern kerb line of Kohat Road</td>
<td>Convert 5m length of single yellow line to double yellows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>To retain the single yellow line near Regent Place</td>
<td>Extend the double yellow line from the junction of Regent Place into Haydon's Road to join the bus stop clear way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Replace single yellow line with proposed parking bay between Nos. 271/273 and 311/315</td>
<td>To replace single yellow line between 309/311 and 313/315 with double yellow lines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>Proposed parking bay outside Nos. 295 and 299</td>
<td>To retain the single yellow line across the footway crossover between 295 and 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Existing single yellow line outside Nos. 267-265</td>
<td>Convert this 4.5m length of single yellow line to double yellow lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Proposed parking bay between 194 and 226/228</td>
<td>To retain the single yellow line between 222/224 and the zig zag markings adjacent to Effra Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Proposed parking bay between Nos. 213 and 217/219; double yellow line outside 219; bus stop clearway between 219 and 229</td>
<td>To remove the proposed double yellow lines outside 219 and extend the proposed parking bay to meet the bus stop clearway which has been marked closer to Dryden Road providing more parking space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Proposed parking bay between Nos.</td>
<td>Proposed bay to be reduced to between 197/199 and 207; retain the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193/195 and 207</td>
<td>single yellow line between 197/199 and 193/195 and convert single yellow line between 193/195 and 191 to double yellow lines which will meet the existing double yellow lines north of the northern kerb line of Cowper Road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Proposed parking bay outside No. 117 (Marquis of Lorne Public House)</td>
<td>Due to the narrowness of the road and the close proximity to the bend and the zebra crossing and the associated pedestrian island, it has been deemed necessary to retain the existing single yellow line and not to permit parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Proposed parking bay between Nos. 83/85 and 101</td>
<td>Extend parking bay northwards by 1.6m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Proposed parking bay between Nos. 55/57 and 77</td>
<td>To reduce the proposed length of the proposed parking bay by extending the existing double yellow lines from the southern kerb line of Deburgh Road to a point opposite the northern flank wall of No. 73. Also to extend the proposed double yellow lines from the northern kerb line of Gilbert Road to outside Nos 61/63. Parking to be permitted between Nos 61/63 and 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Proposed double yellow line outside 27 and 29</td>
<td>This double yellow line to be removed and parking to be permitted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Resident/Business

The purpose of this newsletter is to let you know the outcome of the informal public consultation carried out in October / November 2005, on the proposed parking arrangements for Haydon's Road and to inform you of the Council's intentions.

After analysing the results and taking note of your views, the initial proposals were amended. The results were reported to the Cabinet Street Management Committee on 6th December 2005 where the following decisions were made:

- to undertake a formal consultation on amending the existing single yellow line restrictions and to allow free parking outside property Nos. 1/1a Cowper Road; Milton Road adjacent to Nos. 209/211 Haydon's Road; Dryden Road adjacent to Nos. 231/233 Haydon's Road; Tennyson Road between Nos. 269a Haydon's Road and 10 Tennyson Road; Caxton Road (both sides outside No. 5); Kohat Road (south side, outside the Church); Kingsley Road adjacent to Nos. 337 and 335 Haydon's Road.

- to undertake a formal consultation to replace some of the yellow line restrictions with free parking bays on the east side of Haydon's Road, between North Road and Merton High Street between Nos. 29 and 51; between Nos. 55 and 77; 83 and 102 Haydon's Road; outside No. 117 Haydon's Road (Marquis of Lorne public house).

- to include the properties on the east side of Haydon's Road, (Nos. 191 to No. 317 Haydon's Road) between Caxton Road and Cowper Road in the existing zone 3E.

- to undertake a formal consultation to introduce permit holder bays within zone 3E on the east side of Haydon's Road between Nos. 195 and 207; between Nos. 213 and 217; between Nos. 273 and 315 Haydon's Road. On the west side between Nos. 170 and 188 and between Nos. 196 and 226 Haydon's Road.

- to undertake a formal consultation on the introduction of two additional shared use bays to the existing shared use bays within zone 3F on the west side of Haydon's Road outside Nos. 142 and 144 Haydon's Road. There would also be the need to introduce a small length of double yellow lines outside No. 140 Haydon's Road between the existing disabled persons parking bay and the proposed shared use bays. This will protect the disabled persons bay and prevent confusion.

- to undertake a formal consultation on the introduction of two pay & display only bays within Zone 3F outside Nos. 100 to 106 Haydon's Road with a maximum stay of two hours.

- to undertake a formal consultation on the introduction of double yellow lines at the following locations:
  - Outside Nos. 27-29 Haydon's Road.
  - From outside No. 105 and the public house (Marquis of Lorne)
  - East side - between the bus stop and the proposed free bays outside the public house (Marquis of Lorne)
  - Outside Nos. 156 to 160 Haydon's Road.
  - Haydon's Road, west side, outside the South Wimbledon Community Centre adjacent to the pedestrian refuge islands.
  - Haydon's Road, east side, between the bus stop and the pedestrian crossing zig zag markings.
  - Haydon's Road / Gap Road/Durnsford Road/Plough Lane junction.
  - Haydon's Road / Regent Place junction.
  - Haydon's Road / Cowdrey Road junction.
  - Haydon's Road / Effra Road junction.
  - Haydon's Road / York Road junction.
  - Haydon's Road / South Park Road junction.
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- Haydon's Road / Cardigan Road junction.
- Haydon's Road / All Saints Road junction.
- Haydon's Road / Gilbert Road junction.
- Haydon's Road / North Road junction.
- Haydon's Road / Deburgh Road junction.

- to undertake a formal consultation on the introduction of Free Parking Bays on Haydon's Road between Gap Road and Kohat Road and Cromwell Road and Haydon Park Road - as listed below, with a one hour maximum stay and no return within one hour outside:
  - Nos. 341 - 347 Haydon's Road.
  - Nos. 321 - 333 Haydon's Road.
  - Nos. 286 - 294 Haydon's Road.

- To report the results of the formal consultation to the Cabinet Street Management Committee (date to be determined at a later date and will be posted on the website shown below.

What Happens Next?

Your Council has carefully considered all the feedback it received during the informal public consultation and is now undertaking a formal consultation on its intentions to introduce the above approved changes.

At the conclusion of this formal consultation the Cabinet Street Management Committee will make a decision on whether or not to implement these proposals.

An advert for the Traffic Management Orders will be published in the local newspaper on Thursday 16th February 2006 and in the London Gazette and posted on lamp columns in the area. We urge anyone who is either in favour or against the scheme to make representation in writing to: Head of Street Management, Merton Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, Surrey, SM4 5DX by no later than 10th March 2006, quoting reference ES/SGE/Haydon’s Road.

Please note that no response will be made to representations until the Cabinet Street Management Committee has made a decision.

Anyone who opposes the scheme must state the grounds on which their objection is made. We also welcome letters in support.

A copy of the proposed Traffic Management Orders (TMOs), a plan identifying the areas affected by the proposed TMOs and the Council’s Statement of Reasons for the TMOs can be inspected during the Council’s normal office hours Mondays to Fridays at the Merton Link, Merton Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, Surrey. Alternatively, this information can be viewed on the Merton Council website, www.merton.gov.uk/haydonsroad or at Wimbledon Library.

Please let us have your views, they are important and will have a bearing upon the decision made.

We would like to thank you for the feedback provided on the initial proposals. If you require further information, you may contact Mitra Dubet on 020 8545 3201.
Dear Resident/Business

The London Borough of Merton conducted an informal consultation for a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in the ‘Poets’ area in April / May 2004. The majority of respondents rejected the proposal and consequently a CPZ was not introduced. However, in August 2005 some Double Yellow Lines (DYL) were introduced at key locations as a means to improve sightlines, access and general road safety.

During the various consultations in the area, requests have been made for the Council to review the current parking arrangements along Haydon’s Road. The Council has now completed its review of the restrictions and is now undertaking this informal consultation to seek your views on proposed changes to parking on Haydon’s Road including the introduction of parking bays.

EXISTING SITUATION

Haydon’s Road is an A-Class road and between its junctions with Queens Road and Merton High Street forms part of the bus route 200. To facilitate the smooth running of the bus service, waiting restrictions have been introduced and operate Monday to Saturday, between 8am and 6.30pm. The single yellow line restrictions prevent parking during these hours. Due to an increase in parking demand over the years, the residents of Haydon’s Road have been parking in the side roads, putting extra pressure on the parking space available there and consequently competing for parking space in the side roads. This has resulted in some sections of Haydon’s Road’s western side being included into CPZs 3E, 3F and 52. The remainder of Haydon’s Road is either managed by means of a single yellow line or it is totally uncontrolled.

Businesses have also expressed concerns over the lack of parking spaces on Haydon’s Road and the subsequent loss of passing trade. They state that the yellow lines discourage short term parking which is essential for their businesses.

The personal injury accident records between January 2002 and December 2004 show that 40 personal injury (PI) accidents occurred in Haydon’s Road. Although most of the accidents occurred at junctions, the causes of the accidents vary. The majority of the accidents are as a result of sightline problems at the junctions and some accidents have been speed related.

Double yellow lines were introduced in the Poets Area in August 2005 to address sight line related accidents and general road safety for Haydon’s Road between its junctions with North Road and Caxton Road. In light of this, other sections of Haydon’s Road need to be addressed and this consultation endeavours to do that.

THE PROPOSALS

The Council is considering three options relating to the proposed parking measures on Haydon’s Road. These options include junction protection on Haydon’s Road at its junction with Gilbert Road; Deburgh Road; Saints Road; North Road; Cardigan Road; South Park Road; York Road; Effra Road and Cowley Road.

OPTION 1 - FREE BAYS AND JUNCTION PROTECTION

This option as shown on the attached plans (278/128/01 and 278/128/02) identifies areas where safe parking can be permitted. Parts of the single yellow line restrictions on Haydon’s Road would be removed and replaced by parking bays. Those outside residential premises would be without any
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journey to excellence
restrictions/limitations. Those outside business premises would be limited to a one-hour stay. All the bays would operate on a first come first served basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Advantages</th>
<th>The Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Free parking provision on Haydon's Road</td>
<td>• The parking spaces can be used by anybody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improved visibility at junctions through junction protection (double yellow lines)</td>
<td>• There are no time restrictions on most bays. This could lead to all day parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parked cars act as speed reducing features</td>
<td>• It is difficult to enforce and could lead to abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Possible reduction in speed</td>
<td>• Increased street furniture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Possible reduction in severity of personal injury accidents</td>
<td>• Proposed double yellow lines at junctions may lead to a reduction in parking spaces and an increase in demand over the available space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ease of access and egress for buses to the existing bus stops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improved access, particularly for emergency vehicles to enter the side roads with proposed junction protection (double yellow lines)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OPTION 2 - Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ)

This proposal includes removing parts of the single yellow line restrictions on Haydon's Road and the introduction of a combination of permit holder bays, shared used bays and pay and display bays outside residential and business properties, where it is safe to do so. These bays will be incorporated into one of the existing CPZs on the western side of Haydon's Road. The hours of operation for the zones are Monday to Saturday, between 8.30am and 6.30pm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Advantages</th>
<th>The Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Priority access to parking bays will be given to the residents, businesses and their visitors</td>
<td>• Pay for a permit to park in the zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improved visibility at junctions through junction protection</td>
<td>• Parking is not guaranteed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improved access at the junctions</td>
<td>• Increased street furniture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Possible reduction in speed</td>
<td>• Displacement of commuter parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Severity of Accidents may be reduced</td>
<td>• Proposed double yellow lines at junctions may lead to a reduction in parking spaces and an increase in demand over the available space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ease of access and egress for buses at existing bus stops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• the controls/restrictions are almost self enforcing and are easy to enforce during hours of operation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Removes long term/commuter parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OPTION 3 - Junction Protection (Double Yellow Lines at Junctions)

Under this option the extent of the yellow lines on Haydon's Road will remain unchanged. However, there will be additional double yellow lines at all the junctions that are not currently protected. The single yellow lines that operate Monday to Saturday, between 8am and 6.30pm, were originally put in place to facilitate the smooth running of the bus route 200 that operates between Queens Road and Merton High Street. The single yellow line will prohibit anyone parking there during the restricted hours and may subsequently put extra pressure on the side roads that are not within a Controlled Parking Zone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Advantages</th>
<th>The Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Unobstructed sight lines as the current restrictions prohibit parking during restricted hours</td>
<td>• No parking on Haydon's Road for residents, businesses and their visitors during restricted hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wider road space, as no cars are parked there during restrictive hours</td>
<td>• Proposed double yellow lines at junctions may lead to a reduction in parking spaces and an increase in demand over the available space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improved visibility at junctions through junction protection (double yellow lines)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improved access for emergency and public service vehicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Safer Crossing points for pedestrians, people in wheel chairs and pushchairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is normal practice to offer “Do Nothing” as an option. However, due to safety concerns, this option is not being offered. It is considered necessary to introduce double yellow lines at the junctions listed in this document.

**LET US KNOW YOU VIEWS**

Please complete and return the enclosed questionnaire (no stamp required) with any further comments / suggestions you may have by 4th November 2005. We regret that we will not be able to respond to all the comments received during this consultation. However, any comments received will be taken into consideration.

**CONTACT DETAILS**

If you would like more information before completing the questionnaire please contact Evan Jeposa on 020 8545 3840 or by email at evan.jeposa@merton.gov.uk.

**WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?**

At the end of this consultation period all responses will be analysed and the appropriate amendments will be made to the design of the scheme to meet the needs and demands of the residents and businesses of Haydon’s Road. The results will be presented to the Cabinet Street Management Committee for consideration on 6th December 2005.

**EXHIBITION VENUE AND DATES**

You may want to attend one of our public exhibitions to be held at:

**South Wimbledon Community Centre,**

72-74 Haydon’s Road, Wimbledon,
London,
SW19 1HL

at the following times:

**Wednesday 19th October 2005, 10.30am till 7pm**

**Saturday 22nd October 2005, 9am till 5pm.**

Alternatively you may wish to view the plans at Merton Link at Merton Civic Centre, Wimbledon Library or by downloading the files from the Merton Council Website [www.merton.gov.uk/haydonsroad](http://www.merton.gov.uk/haydonsroad)

---

If you would like more information in your own language, please contact us at the address shown in the bottom box.

---

Information is also available in large print, Braille and tape.

---

Evan Jeposa, London Borough of Merton, Merton Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, Surrey, SM4 6DX.
Frequently Asked Questions

Where may I park in a CPZ?
Vehicles may only be parked in marked parking bays. These bays are located where it is safe to park and unlikely to cause a physical or visual obstruction. Each bay may be restricted by charge, length of stay or permit requirement. Permit holder bays will be undivided to ensure greater parking efficiency. 'Pay & display' bays and shared use bays will be marked individually.

What is a permit holder bay?
This is a bay in which only vehicles displaying a valid Resident, Business or Visitor Permit may be parked.

What is a 'pay & display' bay?
These are bays designed for short or long-term parking. Any vehicle parked in these bays must display a valid 'pay & display' ticket that may be purchased from a nearby ticket machine. Each of these bays will allow non-permit holders' vehicles to park for a 'maximum stay'. Parking will be free in these bays until they become operational. However, it will not be possible to purchase a ticket until the bays become operational. The operational times of the bays will be shown on parking signs.

What is a shared use bay?
This is a bay that may be used by either permit holders (without additional charge) or by non-permit holders who must purchase a 'pay & display' ticket. These bays have a 'maximum stay' that only 'pay & display' users must adhere to.

How much will 'pay & display' cost?
Tariffs vary across the Borough from £0.30 per hour to £1.50 per hour.

Where may motorcyclists park?
Solo motorcycles may be parked in permit holder bays and motorcycle bays free of charge.

Where can't I park?
Yellow lines indicate where vehicles should not be parked. Single yellow lines operate only during the controlled hours of a zone unless signs indicate otherwise. Double yellow lines are operational at all times.

How much do Resident and Business Permits cost?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>Business Permit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>first car</td>
<td>£ 45.00 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second car</td>
<td>£ 80.00 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>third and subsequent car</td>
<td>£105.00 per annum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A permit will not be issued for a vehicle greater than 2.28 metres in height or more than 4.95 metres in length. Business permits are provided for vehicles used to assist in the operations of a business rather than providing reduced rate commuter parking. No more than two business permits will usually be issued per business except in exceptional circumstances.

How much do Resident Visitor Permits cost?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit type</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>half day (08.30 - 14.00/14.00 - 18.30)</td>
<td>£1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full day</td>
<td>£2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annual permit</td>
<td>£105.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Permit</td>
<td>Free (These are for housebound/disabled residents who require daily care)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why must I pay to park in my street?
In order to meet the costs of installation, maintenance, enforcement and review of the zone, we must charge residents/businesses and their visitors. Controlled parking is not a core service of the Council and government advice states that it should be financially self-sufficient. By law, any revenue generated from parking must be spent on transport related schemes.
Purpose of report
This report details the results of the formal consultation and officer’s recommendations and seeks approval to formally reconult on the amendments.

Background
Haydon’s Road is part of the route classified as the A218, which runs north to south, linking the A3 and A205 in Wandsworth with the A238 Merton High. It forms part of Bus Route 200 and although it is not a wide road, it is of significant traffic importance, carrying all classes of traffic. There are waiting/loading restrictions (yellow lines) operating Monday to Saturday between 8am and 6.30pm along some sections of the road to facilitate general traffic flow and assist bus operation.

Feedback from the various consultation exercises that the Council conducted in the area, included many requests for the Council to review the current parking arrangements and the extent of the existing yellow line restrictions along Haydon’s Road with a view to providing parking facilities for the residents and reducing the parking pressure on the side roads. Following a meeting on 8th September 2005 with Ward Members, Poets Residents’ Association, Haydon’s Bridge Residents’ Association and South Park Residents’ Association it was agreed for the Council to undertake a public consultation on proposals to address the parking issues.

Informal consultation
During October / November 2005 the Council consulted the section of Haydon’s Road between Plough Lane and Merton High Street on proposals for new parking arrangements for the road.
The informal consultation resulted in three distinct preferences within the following specific sections of Haydon’s Road: -

• Section of Haydon’s Road between Gap Road and Caxton Road; respondents mostly requested that free bays be introduced.
• Eastern side of Haydon’s Road between Caxton Road and Cowper Road (between No 191 and No 317 Haydon’s Road); The respondents in this section of Haydon’s Road were mostly in favour of being included within the neighbouring CPZ 3E.
• North eastern side of Haydon’s Road between North Road and Merton High Street (between No 5 and No 119 Haydon’s Road); respondents mostly requested that free bays be introduced.

Formal Consultation
In December 2005 the Cabinet approved the undertaking of a formal consultation on the proposed parking management measures. The formal consultation was carried out in February/March 2006.

Following the receipt of a number of representations and the realization of a number of errors, the design has been amended to reflect these factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Objection</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haydon’s Road</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring Streets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objections
1. From car show room – against the proposed parking bays as they will prevent them driving illegally across the footway.
2. Haydon’s Bridge Association – leave as is
3. Poets Association – disagrees with the conversion of single to double yellow lines *(this is a misunderstanding due to the wrong title on the schedule)*
4. Milton Road – lack of consultation; against the introduction of 18m of double yellow lines. *(this is a misunderstanding due to the wrong title on the schedule)*

Recommendation
It is recommended that a formal consultation is undertaken on :-

1. The removal of the existing single yellow line restrictions on Haydon’s Road; Kingsley Road, Caxton Road, Tennyson Road, Dryden Road, Milton Road and Cowper Road to release kerb side space for unrestricted free parking.
2. The conversion of the single yellow line (5m) in Kohat Road to double yellow lines.
3. To retain the existing single yellow line outside No 286.
4. Conversion of existing single yellow line between 309/311 and 313/315 Haydon’s Road to double yellow lines.
5. Retain the single yellow line across crossover between 295 and 299.
6. Convert 4.5m of existing single yellow line outside Nos 265 and 267 Haydon’s Road to double yellows lines.
7. Retain the single yellow line between 222/224 and the zig zag markings adjacent to Effra Road.
8. To abandon the proposed double yellow lines outside 219 and extend the proposed parking bay.
9. Retain the single yellow line between 197/199 and 193/195 and convert single yellow line between 193/195 and 191 to double yellow lines.
10. Retain the existing single yellow line outside 117 Haydon’s Road.
11. Increase the proposed parking bay between Nos. 83/85 and 101 by 1.6m.
12. Extend the existing double yellow lines from the southern kerb line of Deburgh Road to a point opposite the northern flank wall of No. 73; and extend the proposed double yellow lines from the northern kerb line of Gilbert Road to outside Nos 61/63.
13. Remove double yellow lines outside 27 and 29 and allow parking.
14. Convert 4.7m of single yellow line near its junction with Regent Place to double yellow lines.

The above is in addition to the following proposed measures that the Council has already formally consulted on :-

1. Introduce double yellow lines (junction protection) at all the identified junctions along Haydon’s Road and other key locations between Gap Road and Merton High Street as shown in Appendix 1 plan Z78-128- 05
2. Introduce limited free parking bays, as shown on drawing Z78-128- 05 with a 1 hour maximum stay and no return within one hour outside Nos. 341 – 347 Haydon’s Road; Nos. 321 – 333 Haydon’s Road; Nos. 286 – 294 Haydon’s Road.
3. Extend the existing boundary of Controlled Parking Zone 3E to include the properties on Haydon’s Road, east side, between Cowper Road and Caxton Road (Nos 189 to 317 Haydon’s Road) and to introduce additional bays as shown on drawing Z78-128- 05
4. Introduce pay and display bays and shared use bays to Zone 3F.
5. Introduce additional parking bays in Zone S2.
6. Replace some of the yellow line restrictions with free parking bays on Haydon’s Road’s east side between North Road and Merton High Street between Nos 29 and 51; between 55 and 77; 83 and 102 Haydon’s Road; outside No 117 (Public House) Haydon’s Road;

Ward Councillors
A meeting was convened on 24th July 2006. Those present included Councillors Neil Mills and Neless (Abbey Ward); Councillors Miller and Dean (Trinity Ward) and Councillor Kerin (Wimbledon Park). The back ground of the proposed measures, the proposed measures and Officer’s recommendations were explained and discussed. Following the meeting, on 28th July, an e mail summerising the proposals was also sent to all the Councillors with a request for comments.

Final comments from 3 of the Councillors (relating to the actual parking proposals):
- No Comments other than those made at the meeting.
- It is important to have free short term free parking for shoppers.
- In general, I support the proposal that has been put forward but am somewhat concerned with the very low number of responses received to the consultation. Need confirmation regarding council’s policy on double yellow lines.

Officer’s Comments
The proposals allow for free short term parking for the local businesses.
With regards to the response rate, during a formal consultation people (any one, resident or not) are invited to forward a representation. It is normal practice to make a decision whilst considering the contents of the representations rather than the numbers. The number of representations received here is considered reasonably good.
With regards to double yellow lines and extent of restrictions, each case is considered on its merit/its environment. As a rule it is recommended that double yellow lines are introduced :
- at junctions (on average 10m, in minor arms between 6 & 10m).
- at turning heads
- at bends
- along narrow sections of roads where access could be impeded if parking was to take place
SUBJECT: Pay & Display Parking Bays – High Street & Parkside, Wimbledon Village

LEAD OFFICER: Director of Environment and Regeneration – Richard Rawes

LEAD MEMBER: Councillor Tariq Ahmad, Environment & Street Management

KEY DECISION REFERENCE NUMBER: N/A

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

1. Considers the objection received prior to the formal consultation to install the proposed Pay & Display parking bays in High Street & Parkside, Wimbledon Village and officers response to this

2. Agrees to make a Traffic Management Order and the implementation of the Pay and Display bays (as shown drawing no. Z38/62/10 attached)

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 The report advises the Committee of the proposal to install new pay & display parking bays in High Street, Wimbledon & Parkside, following liaison with the Wimbledon Village Business Association.

1.2 This report recommends that the Advisory Committee Cabinet Member considers the objection received during the statutory consultation period against the proposal to install new Pay & Display parking bays in High Street, Wimbledon & Parkside, and the officer’s comments as detailed in paragraph 4.2 of this report and agree to the making of the Traffic Management Order for the implementation of the pay & display parking bays in High Street, Wimbledon & Parkside

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 High Street, Wimbledon is a major thoroughfare, which links A3, Putney and the Wimbledon Town Centre. Its frontages consist of mainly commercial properties. There is a stable by the ‘Dog & Fox’ Public House, which is constantly used by riders who use Wimbledon Common. High Street is used as part of 93 bus route. This results in a constant flow of traffic.

2.2 As part of the Borough Spending Plan Submission to TfL in 2003 High Street, Wimbledon was identified as a road with a high accident record. There had been 16 recorded personal injury accidents along the above length of High Street over the three year period.
2.3 The Council received a number of complaints from local traders, in particular the proprietor of the local stables and the local Member of Parliament, regarding traffic noise and speed, particularly between Southside Common and Church Road, which causes horses in the area to react nervously.

2.4 Council officers were also in close contact with members of the local Traders/Business Association, who requested the following:

- Improvements to the existing crossing points, particularly at Church Road junction.
- The installation of additional parking bays.
- The installation of a ‘Gateway’ feature at the junction with Parkside, which is proposed as part of the Parkside Local Safety Scheme (see separate report on this Agenda).

3. DETAILS

3.1 The Council carried out two consultation exercises in September 2005, the “Wimbledon Village Review” and the “Local Safety Scheme – High Street Wimbledon Village”.

3.2 The Wimbledon Village Review informed residents that the proposed ‘Pay & Display’ bays in High Street, Wimbledon Village & Parkside, that was agreed with the Business Association during the development of the scheme. Regrettably the Local Safety Scheme Newsletter stated that the bays would be ‘Shared use’, which caused confusion for local residents.

3.3 A resident and member of the Parkside House Residents’ Association has written to the Council during the public consultation process, objecting to the proposals and highlighting the anomaly.

3.4 The letter objected to the installation of Pay & Display bays in High Street and Parkside, and urged the Council make the proposed bays either ‘Residents Only’ or ‘Pay & Display Shared Use’ because it was felt that the current parking provisions along High Street poorly serve local residents.

3.5 The Council sent a letter apologising for the confusion resulting from this mistake and would like to proceed with the proposal to install pay & display bays.

3.6 It is therefore proposed that this objection be considered but that the parking bays are progresses to implementation on the grounds of the need to install additional pay & display parking bays was identified in consultation with the business community and would be beneficial for this area.

3.7 The need for additional Resident Parking bays has already been recognised by the addition of 3 Resident only bays in Marryat Road, which should be available for use imminently.
4. FORMAL CONSULTATION

4.1 The Council carried out the formal consultation on proposal to install new pay & display parking bays in High Street, Wimbledon & Parkside on 2nd March 2006.

4.2 The Council received an objection from a representative of the Parkside House Residents’ Association. Table 1 in Appendix 1 summarises the objections received and officer’s comments.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 The commercial premises in Wimbledon Village depend in part upon the ability of customers being able to reasonably find parking spaces. These proposals help facilitate this.

5.2 It is therefore recommended that the objection is considered but that the parking bays are implemented and the Council:

- Install 6 ‘pay & display’ parking bays in Parkside between Maryatt Road and the War Memorial.
- Install 2 ‘pay & display’ parking bays in High Street between nos. 33 & 34.

5.3 The proposed hours of operation are Monday to Saturday, operating between 10:00am and 4:00pm, maximum stay 1 hour. The tariff is £1.50 per hour (see drawing no. Z38/62/10 attached).

6. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

6.1 An option would be to do nothing. This would not address the concerns of businesses in the area, which would not the meet the demand for short-term parking in the area.

6.2 The installation of ‘shared use’ parking, which would not be beneficial to the area, which is mainly commercial.

7. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7.1 The estimated cost of implementing this scheme is £7K, which will be taken from a budget of £100K for Local Safety Schemes in the area. The budget has been approved by Transport for London.

8. STRATEGIC ROUTE IMPLICATIONS

8.1 As High Street and Parkside does not form part of the Strategic Road Network, the Council will not need to inform the Network Assurance Team at Transport for London.

9. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS AND STATUTORY PROVISION

9.1 The additional parking bays can be introduced under powers conferred by Section 45 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
10. **RISK MANAGEMENT AND HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS**

10.1 The risks that have been identified during the preliminary design stage, and the measures that have been implemented to manage them, are detailed in the table below.

**Management of Health and Safety Risks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Measures to Reduce Risk</th>
<th>Information on Residual Risk Passed To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Possible risk to vehicles while passing the proposed site. | Certain aspects of the scheme will have to be implemented during the school holiday period to reduce risk to pedestrians, also the installation of signing to provide a safe environment for all road users during construction. | • Highways Project Officers undertaking detailed design  
• Planning Supervisor |

11. **HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS**

11.1 None for the purpose of this report.

12. **APPENDICES**

Appendix 1 Summary of Public & Officers’ Comments

13. **BACKGROUND PAPERS** - Report to Cabinet Committee 26\(^{th}\) March 2006  
- Report to Cabinet Committee 19\(^{th}\) October 2005  
- Letter from the Parkside House Residents Association

**OFFICER CONTACTS:** If you have any queries regarding this scheme please contact Stephen Daway either by phone on 020 8545 3210 or via e-mail at stephen.daway@merton.gov.uk

[Signature]
### TABLE 1: Summary of Public & Officers’ Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residents’ comments</th>
<th>Officers’ comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On 1 September 2005 the Traffic &amp; Parking Section issued a newsletter titled “Newsletter – Wimbledon Village Review”. On the map included within the newsletter, it was proposed the 6 ‘Pay &amp; Display’ parking bays were to be established on the High Street between Marryat Road and the War Memorial. On 5 September 2005 the Traffic &amp; Parking Section issued a newsletter titled ‘Proposed Local Safety Scheme – High Street Wimbledon Village’, which was sent to all High Street residents and businesses. Page 1, Para no. 2 reads “To meet the parking demand in the area it is proposed to provide 2 shared use bays outside no. 33/34 and 6 shared bays between Marryat Road and the War Memorial. These bays can be used by permit holders (free of charge) and by those who wish to pay and display (NB Text underlined by the objector).” It should be pointed out that on the accompanying map, 3 of the proposed bays are labelled ‘Proposed P &amp; D Shared use’, whilst 3 are labelled ‘Proposed P &amp; D Only’. Since the written text indicating that the proposed bays were to be Shared Use, was so definite, however, it is reasonable to assume that the intent was indeed to have 6 Shared Use bays. Indeed, this was what Parkside House Residents reasonably assumed. The 6 proposed Bays are to be situated within 50 metres of Parkside House. Should the 6 bays be designated Shared Use, this would, in conjunction with the proposed Marryat Rd 3 Resident Only bays, substantially restore to Parkside House residents the parking availability that the 14 Shared Use bays originally proposed for Marryat Road between High Street and Peek Crescent would have afforded. It would also set aside for the complaint lodged with Ombudsman to be pursued further.</td>
<td>The error regarding the type of bays proposed ‘Pay and Display’ instead of ‘Shared Use’, was entirely an officer’s mistake. The Formal Notice always described the bays as ‘Pay and Display only’, but the informal suggested that these bays are to be ‘Shared Use’. The purpose of the bays is to cater for the needs of short-term visitors, mainly customers to the local shops and businesses in this commercial area. In response to concerns on the availability of parking for residents in the area, approval has already been granted to remove Business Permit parking from The Green, thus freeing up space for use by Residents. Also three additional ‘Resident Only’ bays are to be introduced in Marryat Road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Purpose of this report**
   This report is to consider representations received regarding the implementation of the above scheme and to seek approval to proceed with the installation of Pay & Display parking bays.

2. **Reason for the scheme**
   As part of a Local Safety Scheme the Council received a request from the local businesses to provide additional Pay & Display bays in High Street & Parkside, which would increase parking for potential customers in the area.

3. **Location of the ‘pay & display’ bays (see drawing no. Z38/62/10 attached)**
   - High Street, southwest side, opposite the party wall of nos. 32 & 33, for a distance of 11 metres.
   - Parkside, northeast side, from a point 18m northwest of Maryatt, northwest for distance of 16 metres
   - Parkside, southwest side, from a point 14.5m northwest of no. 1 The Green, northwest for distance of 16 metres

4. **Proposed Hours of Operation**
   Monday to Saturday, 10.00am to 4.00pm, with a maximum stay of 1 hour.

5. **Public Consultation**
   Copies of the public consultation document were distributed to local residents, businesses in January 2006, which lasted three weeks. The scheme was presented to the Cabinet Street Management Committee, who approved the undertaking of the Formal consultation process to install the above bays.

6. **Formal Consultation**
   The formal consultation was carried out during March 2006. Newsletters were distributed to all the premises in the consultation area. It provided a breakdown of the Council’s proposal to introduce the proposed pay & display bays and invited anybody who wished to make representations. Notices were also erected on lamp columns in the area and published in the Local Guardian and the London Gazette. The documents were also available at the Civic Centre, Wimbledon Library and on the Council’s web site.

7. **Result**
   The Council received 1 letter of objection on the above proposal during the formal consultation exercise. The objections were mainly on the following grounds:
   - The public consultation document referred to these bays as shared use, but the Wimbledon Village Review referred to the same bays as Pay & Display only.
   - Shared-use bays should be used to meet the demands, particularly for residents.

8. **Recommendation**
   - To note and consider the objections and officer’s recommendation.
   - To make the Traffic Management Order & implement the scheme as detailed in the report.
SUBJECT: Loading Bay – Morden Road

LEAD OFFICER: Director of Environment and Regeneration – Richard Rawes

LEAD MEMBER: Councillor Tariq Ahmad, Environment & Street Management

KEY DECISION REFERENCE NUMBER: N/A

RECOMMENDATIONS:

That the Committee considers the issues detailed in this report and recommends that the cabinet:

1. Notes the result of the formal consultation carried out in April / May 2006 to introduce a loading bay in Morden Road, Mitcham.

2. Considers the objections received during the formal consultation to install the proposed Loading Bay (Option 1) in Morden Road and officers’ response.

3. Agrees to make a Traffic Management Order and the implementation of the loading bay as shown on plan Z28/256/01 attached as Appendix 1. Its hours of operation would be 7.00am to 7pm, Monday to Saturday.

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 The report advises the Committee of a request received from an industrial premise on Morden Road for a loading bay to facilitate their business.

1.2 This report recommends that the objections received during the statutory consultation against the proposal and officer’s comments as detailed in Appendix 3 of this report are considered and that the proposal to implement the bay is agreed, including to the making of the Traffic Management Order and the implementation of the proposed loading bay on the north-eastern side of Morden Road, Mitcham, from a point opposite the south-eastern kerb line of Heatherton Close, south-eastwards to for a distance of 15.0m. The loading bay shall operate between 7.00am and 7.00pm Monday to Saturday, with a maximum stay of 30 minutes (as shown on drawing no. Z28/256/01B).

2. DETAILS

2.1 The Council received a letter from KNK Building Services requesting the installation of a Loading bay on Morden Road, Mitcham. The aim is to assist loading, hence aid the smooth running of a business in the area whilst maintaining a steady flow of traffic on Morden Road. Currently the company cannot legally load directly outside their premises and have received a number parking fines.
2.2 The proposed loading bay is on the northeastern side of Morden Road, Mitcham, from a point opposite the southeastern kerbline of Heatherdene Close, southeastwards for a distance of 15.0m. The loading bay would operate between 7.00am and 7.00pm Monday to Saturday, with a maximum stay of 30 minutes.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 Morden Road is a London Distributor route that serves as a link between the Morden area and Mitcham / Sutton. It accommodates both residential and business properties. It is also a bus route. Along its length, Morden Road is subject to various parking restrictions. The area in close proximity to the KNK Building Services is subject to a bus stop clearway; Monday-Saturday 7am-7pm waiting restrictions and areas without any parking restrictions. According to the residents, and confirmed by Officer’s site observation, the problem is that the business has minimum on-site parking spaces and those who work at this business park their vehicles in the residential side roads. They also park their business vehicles (mostly vans) on Morden Road.

3.2 In March 2001 as part of the London bus priority initiative the Council introduced Monday to Saturday 7am-7pm waiting restrictions and loading restrictions 7-10 and 4-7 Monday to Friday on this section of Morden Road. The formal consultation was carried out in February 2001 and no objections were received. It should be noted that KNK’s building was unoccupied and being refurbished at that time.

3.3 As part of routine enforcement, penalty charge notices have been issued to KNK vehicles who were regularly observed parking in contravention of the waiting restrictions for long periods of time without any evidence of loading/unloading taking place. In March 2005 the company forwarded a request for a loading bay outside their property.

3.4 A meeting was convened with the company to discuss the provision of a loading bay with a limited loading period. KNK advised that they have 40 business vehicles and need loading provision for 15 vehicles that may require up to 20 minutes to load. At the meeting it was observed that the KNK’s yard could possibly be used for loading/unloading purposes. It was also observed that their vehicles were parked throughout the area both on Morden Road and in the side roads.

3.5 Detailed examination of Morden Road was undertaken in conjunction with a representative from London Buses and the Metropolitan Police and 2 options for the proposed loading bay were identified.

3.6 The Council carried out an informal public consultation exercise, which requested the views from residents/businesses on the following options to install a short term loading bay, located on the north-eastern side of Morden Road, Mitcham :-

- **Option 1**, from a point opposite the southeastern kerbline of Heatherdene Close, southeastwards to for a distance of 15.0m.
• **Option 2**, between the vehicular access to no. 12 Morden Road and the existing bus border.

In either case the bay the loading bay was proposed to operate between 7.00am and 7.00pm Monday to Saturday, with a maximum stay of 30 minutes.

3.7 The results of this consultation were reported to Cabinet Street Management Committee on 29th March 2006, where Officers presented the scheme to Committee, and recommended that the Committee approve the installation of Option 1, on the grounds that it would maximise loading and parking provisions without causing obstruction or danger to other road users.

3.8 The Committee authorised officers to undertake a formal consultation to introduce Option 1.

4. **FORMAL CONSULTATION**

4.1 The formal consultation was carried out during April/May 2006. Appendix 3 summarises the objections received and officers’ comments:

4.2 The Council also received comments from the Metropolitan Police, who made two points:

i. They suggested that the Morden bound Bus Stop was closer to Heatherdene Close than shown on the plan, and

ii. Suggested that the proposed Loading Bay be moved east so that it was not opposite the junction of Heatherdene Close.

The detailed response to these is given in Table 1 of Appendix 3. In summary, the first statement is incorrect and the proposed location of the loading bay suggested by the Police could cause traffic congestion, and is further away from KNK’s desired location of the loading bay. It is therefore recommended that the proposals put forward to amend the Councils intended location for the loading bay are not progressed.

4.3 It is proposed that these objections are considered and that the bay should be implemented taking the arguments on balance on the grounds that the installation of the loading bay in the proposed location would be beneficial for the business area, as it would provide a loading area while also preventing continuous parking where vehicles can load safely without a hindrance to passing traffic.

5. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

5.1 Loading to and from this business in Morden Road is a problem. The proposed Loading bay is located at the most practical location for the company’s vehicles to load and unload safely while not causing obstruction to passing traffic. The operational hours will need to be 7.00am to 7.00pm, Monday to Saturday, with a maximum stay of 30 minutes. The operational hours will coincide with the existing waiting restrictions.

5.2 It has also been noted that the Loading bay will not address the problems of obstructive parking on surrounding roads. Therefore officers are recommending to review the parking in the area...
6. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS
6.1 To do nothing would not address the current problems experienced by the business.
6.2 Locate the Loading bay further east on Morden Road. However, this location would have significant problems for traffic movement.
6.3 In the event of receiving a petition from residents the Council will consider the installation of a Loading Bay as part of a Controlled Parking Zone.

7. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS
7.1 The cost of the current proposal has been estimated at £3000, which includes the cost of making the Traffic Management Order and fees. These costs can be met from existing resources.

8. STRATEGIC ROUTE IMPLICATIONS
8.1 Morden Road is not on the Strategic Road Network so it will not be necessary to make notification to TfL

9. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS AND STATUTORY PROVISION
9.1 The provision of a loading bay can be introduced under powers conferred by Section 45 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

10. RISK MANAGEMENT AND HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS
10.1 The risks that have been identified during the preliminary design stage, and the measures that have been implemented to manage them, are detailed in the table below.

Management of Health and Safety Risks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Measures to Reduce Risk</th>
<th>Information on Residual Risk Passed To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Possible risk to vehicles using the junction | Certain aspects of the scheme will have to be implemented during the school holiday period to reduce risk to pedestrians, also the installation of signing to provide a safe environment for all road users during construction. | • Highways Project Officers undertaking detailed design  
• Planning Supervisor                   |
11. HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

11.1 None for the purpose of this report.

12. APPENDICES – APPENDIX 1: Drawing no. Z28/256/01
   APPENDIX 2: Copy of the Newsletter
   APPENDIX 3: Table 1 ‘Summary of Police Comments’
               Table 2 ‘Summary of Public & Officers’
               Comments

13. BACKGROUND PAPERS – Report to Cabinet Committee 26th March 2006

OFFICER CONTACTS: If you have any queries regarding this scheme please contact
Stephen Daway either by phone on 020 8545 3210 or via e-mail at
stephen.daway@merton.gov.uk

Further information about Merton Council can be obtained from its web site
www.merton.gov.uk

[Signature]
Dear Resident/Business,

The purpose of this newsletter is to inform you of the outcome of the informal consultation carried out in February 2006.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all those who responded to the consultation. The returns received showed that there is support for a limited time loading bay, and 86% of these preferred option 1.

The results and comments of those who responded to the consultation were reported to the Cabinet Street Management Committee on 29th March 2006.

What happens next?

Formal Consultation

It was agreed by Committee to proceed with the formal consultation on Option 1, which will be to install a loading bay in Morden Road outside the eastern flank wall of no. 10, with the operational hours of Monday to Saturday, 7am - 7pm with a maximum stay of 30 minutes, no return within 2 hours.

The plan overleaf shows the location of the proposed loading bay. Detailed plans are available on Merton’s website www.merton.gov.uk

A notice for the draft Traffic Management Order (TMO) for the above loading bay has been published in the local newspaper and on Merton’s website. Alternatively, this information can be viewed on the Merton Council website, www.merton.gov.uk/mordenloadingbay.

Anyone who opposes the scheme must state the grounds on which their objection is made. We also welcome letters of support.

Please note that no response will be made to representations until the head of Street Management or the Cabinet Street Management Committee has made a decision.
### TABLE 1: Summary of Police Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Police Comments</th>
<th>Officers’ response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Morden bound Bus Stop, incorrectly identified as east of Heatherdene Close, was closer to than side road than shown on the plan.</td>
<td>A detailed re-examination of the site has been undertaken and the position of the Bus Stop and Bus Cage marking, as shown on the plan, are correct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Police would like to see the proposed Loading Bay be moved a similar distance to the east (of Heatherdene Close as the Bus Stop is to the west) so that it is not opposite the junction of Heatherdene Close</td>
<td>The location chosen as Option One, although partially opposite Heatherdene Close, was proposed because it lies in a natural lay-by, and vehicles loading from here will not interfere with the natural passage of traffic on Morden Road. Further to the east the road width narrows and loading vehicles will, on occasions, impede traffic travelling towards and queuing from the London Road junction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2: Summary of Public & Officers’ Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residents’ comments</th>
<th>Officers’ response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The location of the bay would be dangerous to other road users in the area, particularly those entering Morden Road from Heatherdene Gardens.</td>
<td>The proposed Loading Bay is located in a natural lay-by, in an area that is already used by KNK (albeit illegally) without causing the problems suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The loading bay will not reduce the problem of obstructive parking by the applicant’s vehicles on obstructive parking by the applicant’s vehicles in Morden Road and surrounding roads.</td>
<td>The proposal will address the problem of loading for the applicant and is not designed to address parking issues in the surrounding area. Therefore a study would need to be carried out in the area to ascertain what can be introduced (e.g. a Controlled Parking Zone) to alleviate this problem. Further discussion would then take place with residents &amp; local Ward Members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The hours of operation begin too early because it would encourage noisy work to be carried out at 7am</td>
<td>KNK commence their business from 7am. It is essential that the loading bay also operates from that time. Concerns regarding noise have been drawn to the attention of the Environmental Health officers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. KNK vehicles park at the top of Heatherdene Close, on either side of the road and on yellow lines, hence blocking view for oncoming traffic so I have to drive right out of the road to see any oncoming traffic. I find parking the vans at the top of the Close unacceptable and this will undoubtedly in the near future cause an accident. My main concern is the safety of pulling out of Heatherdene Close onto a very busy main road early in the morning when there are vans and pick trucks parked on the corners of my road and Morden Road.</td>
<td>Parking on the corners of Heatherdene Close, can be dealt with by the installation of “At any time” restrictions on both corners of the junction, which will improve visibility throughout the day, hence improve safety for all road users. The request has been added to the Council of waiting restrictions for installation. With respect to preventing non-residents’ vehicles from parking in Heatherdene Close, this could only be achieved by introducing a Resident Parking scheme, and the Council would only consider this if the majority of residents indicated they would support such a proposal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. If option 1 is approved may I suggest that a condition of approval is that a ‘KEEP CLEAR’ box junction is added to the eastbound carriageway of Morden Road opposite Heatherdene Close. This will assist cars turning right out of Heatherdene Close and waiting for a gap in the stationary traffic. Recommendation accepted.

6. The applicant should look for larger premises to cater for the fleet of vehicles, which has increased, hence resulting in these problems.

7. I am writing in disgust that Merton Council think that by putting a loading bay in Morden Road. If you visited Morden Road at 8am each morning, you would see just how bad the road is, clogged up with KNK vans (who think that they own the road). It makes getting out of Heatherdene Close very difficult. I would also like to know who is going to man this 30 min loading bay. What also happens to the rest of the vans?

8. I feel I must point out my concerns. I feel that KNK should have had the foresight that their van fleet was going to expand to the point that there premises and parking spaces just are not big enough. Vehicles are illegally parked, as there are loading restrictions from 7am in the morning until 10am in the morning and a 15 metres long parking bay would still leave 38 spaces short. I am constantly being woken up between 7/7.30 every morning by their workers using their horns, shouting abuse at each other, and transferring rubbish and old sanitary equipment from their rubbish area directly opposite my house. I have talked to the Council about this, but for 3 years nothing has been done, I have also asked people in the rubbish transfer trade and they have confirmed that a licence is needed for the storage and then transfer of rubbish, I have checked and KNK have no such licence. I have asked the Council and nothing has been done. If you allow KNK a parking bay from 7am in the morning you are giving them permission to make as much noise as they wish with no regard for the people that have lived here before they were even a company. If the parking bay is for the delivery of goods to their offices then I have no problem with that, as I know it is necessary for KNK to function as a business. Could you therefore put in the bays but from 9am in the morning to show that you and KNK do respect the residents of Morden Road. How are you going to enforce a 30 min parking restrictions? I think the real answer to KNK’s problem is that they are in the wrong premises for the size of their company, and should relocate to larger premises with parking enough for their vans.
SUMMARY SHEET
PROPOSED LOADING BAY – MORDEN ROAD
11th September 2006

1. Purpose of this report
This report is to consider representations received regarding the implementation of the above scheme and to seek approval to proceed with the installation of a Loading Bay.

2. Reason for the scheme
In March 2005 the Council received a request from a local business to provide a Loading Bay, which would facilitate the operation of their business.

3. Location of the scheme
Morden Road, outside no. 10 south of the junction with Heatherdene Close junction.

4. Proposed Hours of Operation
Monday to Saturday, 7.00am to 7.00pm, with a maximum stay of 30 minutes.

5. Public Consultation
Copies of the public consultation document were distributed to local residents, businesses in January 2006, which lasted for three weeks. The scheme was presented to the Cabinet Street Management Committee, who approved the undertaking of the Formal consultation process to install Option 2.

6. Formal Consultation
The formal consultation was carried out during April / May 2006. Newsletters were distributed to all the premises in the consultation area. It provided a breakdown of the Council’s proposal to introduce the proposed loading bay and invited anybody who wished to make representations to do so by 5th May 2006. Notices were also erected on lamp columns in the area and published in the Local Guardian and the London Gazette. The documents were also available at the Civic Centre and on the Council’s web site.

7. Result
The Council received 5 letters of objection on the above proposal during the formal consultation exercise. The objections were mainly on the following grounds:
- The location of the proposed bay
- The hours of operation
- Obstructive parking on neighbouring roads
- The size of the business is too big for the premises
- Noise

8. Recommendation
- To note and consider the objections and officer’s recommendation.
- To make the Traffic Management Order & implement the scheme as detailed in the report.
STREET MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
11th September 2006

SUBJECT: South Wimbledon Proposed Controlled Parking Zone SW

LEAD OFFICER: Richard Rawes, Director of Environment & Regeneration

LEAD MEMBER: Councillor Tariq Ahmad, Environment & Street Management

KEY DECISION REFERENCE NUMBER: N/A

RECOMMENDATIONS:

That the Advisory Committee recommends that the Cabinet Member considers the issues detailed in this report and:

1) Notes the result of the formal consultation carried out in March/April 2006 on proposals to introduce:
   a) Controlled Parking Zone (SW) in High Path area, comprising of Mill Road; Station Road; Abbey Road; Dane Road; Meadow Road; Croft Road and Abbey Parade (Merton High Street between Mill Road and Abbey Road), as detailed on plan Z78/127/01B attached as Appendix 3). Hours of operation Monday- Saturday 8.30am-6.30pm.
   b) Double yellow lines at all the identified junctions and other key locations on the west side of the proposed SW Zone as detailed on drawing Z78/127/01B (Appendix 3)
   c) Footway parking on the south side of Abbey Road outside Lovell House.
   d) Reduce the extent of the existing single yellow line restrictions Mon - Sat 8.00am - 6.30pm on Pincott Road and Nelson Grove Road, as shown on drawing Z78/127/01B

2) Notes and considers the representations received in respect of the proposals and officers’ comments as detailed in Appendix 2.

3) Agrees to the undertaking of a further formal consultation on the amended plan Z78/127/01D (Appendix 1, on display) and recommendations detailed in section 5.

4) Agrees to exercise his discretion to not hold a public inquiry on the consultation process

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 This report brings to the Cabinet Member’s attention the current parking conditions in the High Path area. It sets out the background to the consideration of a comprehensive parking management proposals for the area and details the results of the formal consultation carried out in February/March 2006 on the proposals with residents, businesses, Ward Members and residents’ associations in the area.
1.2 The formal consultation that was carried out in March 2006 was to introduce the following measures:

- The introduction of a Controlled Parking Zone (SW) to include Mill Road; Station Road; Abbey Road; Dane Road; Meadow Road; Croft Road and Abbey Parade, as supported by the majority of respondents to the informal consultation.
- The introduction of double yellow lines at all the junctions and other key locations as shown on plan Z78/127/01B so as to improve general road safety and access for all road users.
- The reduction of the extent of the existing single yellow lines on Pincott Road west side (between Merton High Street and Nelson Grove Road) and on Nelson Grove Road to allow free unlimited parking.
- The legalisation of the current footway parking on Abbey Road west side outside Lovell House.

1.3 This report seeks approval to undertake a further formal consultation on the amended proposed measures as shown on plan Z78/127/01D (appendix 1 on display) and detailed in section 5. The amendments are as a result of the representations received to the formal consultation carried out in February/March 2006 and the recent agreement between Merton Council’s Community Housing Department and Environment and Regeneration to take over maintenance and management of some of the estate roads at public expense as a result of a case law.

2. INTRODUCTION

2.1 It is Council policy to improve the environment by regulating the number of parked vehicles in the area, thereby improving safety and access for all road users. The key objective of the proposal to introduce the recommended parking measures in High Path area is to provide kerb side space where residents, local businesses and visitors can park safely without compromising road safety or access for pedestrians, emergency services’ vehicles and buses, to improve traffic flow and discourage commuter parking and non-essential traffic in the area. This objective is in line with the Mayor for London’s Transport Strategy, which aims to tackle congestion and reduce traffic and with L.B.Merton policies as set out in the Local Implementation Plan.

2.2 A controlled parking zone aims to manage kerb side space in an area in a way that gives priority access to parking spaces to residents, local businesses and visitors whilst promoting the safety of all road users. A CPZ comprises of various types of bays, such as permit holder bays (for either resident and/or business and visitor permit holders); shared use bays (permit holders and pay and display) and pay and display only bays (tickets must be purchased and displayed). The measures also include double yellow line (No Waiting at Any Time) restrictions at critical locations such as junctions, turning heads and bends where parking could be hazardous, cause circulation difficulties or impede traffic flow. Double yellow lines are also used on long narrow sections of road to provide a “passing gap” for opposing traffic.
address problems associated with parking where support for controlled parking proposals is too weak for a CPZ to be implemented.

2.4 The purpose of double yellow line restrictions is to maintain visibility and access at all times and provide safe conditions for all road users. Section 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 provide suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway" when exercising any of its functions under the Act. Road safety is therefore a matter that the Council pays regard to when considering whether to make an Order under s.6 of the Act.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 In September 2004 Ward Councillors and local Residents' Associations held a meeting with the residents of the High Path Estate and neighbouring roads, that is the area bounded between Abbey Road and Sava Centre Merantun Way, regarding their parking concerns. Since the meeting correspondence has been received from the residents of Dane Road, Mill Road and Meadow Road stating that since the introduction of a Controlled Parking Zone in Colliers Wood they are experiencing greater difficulty in parking in their roads and they have requested that a Controlled Parking Zone be considered for their roads.

3.2 The High Path area is made up of two halves with two distinct characteristics. The area east of Abbey Road is mostly residential (mainly terraced houses without off-street parking facilities) with a number of businesses located along Abbey Parade. On the west of Abbey Road is a Council housing estate (High Path Estate) with, typically higher density housing, including a number of tall buildings.

3.2 The London Borough of Merton's Housing Services had been operating a parking permit scheme enforced by a private clamping company on High Path Estate since early 2000. The parking scheme was fully enforced until two years ago when the contract with the clamping company expired. The contract was not renewed and consequently the scheme has not been enforced since then. Currently, there is frequent parking obstruction of the turning heads in Doel Close, Dowman Close and Hayward Close - a manner of parking that creates access difficulties particularly for emergency services and refuse vehicles. An agreement has been reached between Merton Council’s Community Housing Department and Environment and Regeneration to take over maintenance and management of some of the estate roads at public expense as a result of a case law. At the time of undertaking the consultations the assumption was made that all the Housing roads would be subject to the change in status. However, it has now been established that not all roads are subject to this agreement and consequently Housing will continue their responsibility with regards to those excluded service roads. In traffic terms it means that not all the roads would be subject to the proposed restrictions. The plan has been modified to reflect this. Therefore objections received from roads such as Priory Close no longer apply as no regulations will be introduced by means of a Traffic Management Order.
Hillborough Road, there are no other businesses. Although this is a densely populated area, the pressure on parking had been contained by the existence of not only the garages which some tenants rent from the Council, but a significant number of designated parking bays, which although do not form part of the tenancy agreement, are used by the tenants. The estate is adjacent to South Wimbledon Underground Station and site observations have shown that the area is becoming subject to more commuter and displacement parking pressure.

3.4 The Council, having given careful consideration to the residents’ concerns about the parking conditions in their area as described above, devised proposals to address the parking problems. The proposals also addressed the associated road safety issues by protecting junctions and other critical locations to provide improved visibility for both pedestrians and motorists. The proposed scheme provides permit holder bays to meet the long stay parking needs of residents, their visitors and local businesses and shared-use pay & display and pay & display only bays for short stay visitors.

3.5 An informal public consultation was carried out in November 2005. The consultation documents were circulated to all the properties in High Path Estate area bounded by Morden Road, Merton High Street High Path and Sava Centre, Colliers Wood. The documents were also forwarded to the Ward Members and the representatives of residents’ associations. Along with a pre-paid questionnaire reply card, the consultation pack contained a plan and details of the parking proposals. The consultation concluded on 25th November 2005. A copy of the informal consultation document is attached as Appendix 4.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROAD</th>
<th>RESIDENT</th>
<th>BUSINESS</th>
<th>BOTH</th>
<th>WHICH OPTION DO YOU PREFER?</th>
<th>% WHICH OPTION DO YOU PREFER?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CPZ</td>
<td>JUNCTION PROTECTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABBEY ROAD</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROFT ROAD</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANE ROAD</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEADOW ROAD</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERTON HIGH STREET</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILL ROAD</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATION ROAD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNKNOWN ADDRESS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5.1 The informal consultation resulted in two distinct preferences within the following specific sections of consultation area:

- The area east of Abbey Road supported a CPZ and
- The area west of Abbey Road, High Path Estate supported yellow line restrictions.
3.6 The results of the informal public consultation were reported to the Cabinet Street Management Committee on 8th February 2006, who, after considering the report, gave approval to proceed with the formal consultation on the following proposals:

- To introduce CPZ SW to include Mill Road; Station Road; Abbey Road; Dane Road; Meadow Road; Croft Road and Abbey Parade (Merton High Street between Mill Road and Abbey Road), as detailed on plan Z78/127/01A (Appendix 3)
- To introduce double yellow lines at all the identified junctions and other key locations as detailed on plan Z78/127/01A (Appendix 3)
- To legalise footway parking on the west side of Abbey Road outside Lovell House
- To reduce the extent of the existing single yellow line restrictions in Pincott Road and Nelson Grove Road.

3.7 Following the informal consultation and the decision made by Cabinet to undertake a formal consultation, a newsletter (copy attached as appendix 3) was distributed to all the premises in the consultation area. It detailed the result of the informal consultation; the Council’s intentions and the undertaking of the formal consultation on the proposed restrictions and invited all to make representations. Within the same newsletter advice was given with regards to making representations with the closing date of 7th April 2006. The Notices were also erected on lamp columns in the area and published in the Local Guardian and the London Gazette. The documents were also available in the Wimbledon Library and at the Civic Centre. This formed part of the Formal consultation. The fact that representations have been received, it can be considered that the Council succeeded in reaching the local community.

4. RESULT OF FORMAL CONSULTATION

4.1 The formal consultation started on 16th March 2006 and concluded on 7th April 2006. Representations received after the closing date have also been included in this report. The consultation resulted in 35 individual representations and a signed petition representing 14 households in Rodney Place, High Path Estate.

The representations received from both within and outside the consultation area :-

- Police – No comments
- London Traffic Watch – Support

From within the proposed CPZ –

- 11 residents in support of proposed CPZ
- 1 resident requested a reduction in extent of proposed double yellow lines
- Against – 5 residential and 8 businesses (2 from Abbey Parade and 6 from Station Road businesses)

From the consulted area but outside the proposed CPZ

- 1 business requested additional double yellow lines.
- 1 business in agreement but has requested parking provisions for its staff/visitors
• 1 resident against proposed double yellow lines.

• 2 against the removal of the existing single yellow lines in Pincott Road (1 representation did not provide a name/address)
• 2 from unadopted/unaffected road against previously proposed waiting restrictions in their road

From outside the consulted area
• 1 business requested parking permits

4.2 An analysis of the formal consultation responses indicates support from the residents within the proposed zone for the proposed CPZ; objections are mainly from the businesses, 2 from Abbey Parade and 6 from Station Road.

Table 1: Representations – Proposed CPZ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Objection</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbey Parade</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbey Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croft Road</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadow Road</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane Road</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Road</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring Streets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 In addition to the 35 representations, there was a petition signed by 14 out of the 16 households in Rodney Place, opposing the proposed yellow lines in their road wanting to keep the current parking arrangements which involves parking on the footway and within the turning head. Of the 35 representations 1 did not bear the address of the respondent and so has not been included in the analysis. This particular representation was against the removal of the single yellow line from Pincott Road.

4.5 Many respondents from the Housing estate expressed the desire for the Council to restore the parking scheme that was previously managed by the Council’s Housing Department. Respondents in this area do not want to pay for a permit and would welcome the return of the old system that was run by Merton’s Housing department. At the time of the consultation it was assumed that all the estate roads would become public highway and therefore that particular system could not be offered. A similar system i.e. CPZ was put to the residents and was rejected. A parking scheme should be self-funding and subsequently a fee is charged for a permit. However, since the Council is now aware of the obstructive parking and the possible access implications for the emergency services the Council is duty bound to take the appropriate action and that would involve the introduction of double yellow lines. However since the completion of the consultation process it has been concluded that not all the roads have the status of public highway and consequently the double
4.6 Businesses

4.6.1 Abbey Parade – this parade fronts onto Merton High Street which is subject to waiting restrictions (Monday – Saturday 8am – 6.30pm and loading restrictions Monday – Friday 8.00 - 9.30am and 4.30-6.30pm. The proposed measures do not involve any changes to this arrangement.

All the properties along Abbey Parade have rear access and a crossover that serves this rear access. The proposed single yellow line across this crossover and the existing double yellow lines that extend from its junction with the High Street can be used as a loading area. Within the proposed CPZ there will be a number of short term pay and display bays in Abbey Road, Mill Rd and Croft Road. These bays can be utilized by visitors to the area.

4.6.2 Station Road

Station Road is a relatively narrow road. On its north side it is residential and majority of the residents have off street parking. On its south side there is a number of businesses in the form of vehicle servicing/MOT/repair shops. Additionally there is Tiger Eye (a popular children’s play centre) with an off street parking facility. Station Road continues onto High Path (which is outside the proposed CPZ) where there is a number of other businesses. There is also a large carwash establishment on Merantun Way. It has also been brought to our attention that businesses from other areas are also using this area to accommodate their own and their customers’ vehicles. All these businesses park on the road and it has been observed that parking particularly in Station Road can be obstructive.

The formal consultation has resulted in 6 objections from the businesses that are based in Station Road; 2 objections from the Station Road residents; 1 Station Road resident in support and 2 requests from the businesses based in High Path. These have been summarised in Appendix 2.

4.6.3 The proposal attempts to provide maximum number of parking bays whilst improving safety and access. Due to the number of business the majority of the bays proposed for Station Road are shared use and pay and display only bays. There are also 6 permit holder bays. It is considered that the proposed measures would organize the parking pattern. It is acknowledged that there will be a need for most of the businesses to change their current practice whereby, for example, several vehicles are dropped off at the same time but the business can only attend to a few at any one time. If staggered times are put into practice there will be no need for vehicles to take up parking spaces all day. Notwithstanding this, due to the nature of the businesses and lack of support for a CPZ from the residents and businesses it is considered reasonable to exclude Station Road from the proposed CPZ. However, it is deemed essential that the proposed double yellow lines are introduced at the junction for safety and access reasons.

4.7 A summary of all the representations and officers’ comments are detailed in Appendix 2.
The new Ward Members were invited to discuss the proposals and a meeting took place on 21st June 2006 when only one Ward Councillor attended. Officers explained the situation and the proposed measures were discussed. The Councillor did not present an opinion for or against the proposed measures. In August 2006, the following comments via email were forwarded from another Ward Councillor:

East Area CPZ
1. Maximise the number of parking bays;
2. Minimum the length/incidence of both single and double yellow lines;
3. Provide one hour free bays for customers.

West Area High Path Estate
1. Reinforce/upgrade the signage indicating that parking is for residents;
2. Minimise the length/incidence of double yellow lines;
3. Use the opportunity to improve the building and road signage in the High Path Estate;
4. Remove existing single yellow lines where possible.

Officers’ comments
As with any CPZ design, every attempt has been made to provide the maximum number of parking spaces without compromising safety and access. The Highway Code stipulates that motorists should not park within 10 metres of a junction. Yellow line (No Waiting at Any Time) restrictions are introduced at critical locations such as junctions, turning heads and bends where parking could be hazardous, cause circulation difficulties or impede traffic flow. Double yellow lines are also used on long narrow sections of road to provide a “passing gap” for opposing traffic. The aim of the proposed double yellow line waiting restrictions at junctions is to improve visibility and to provide clear access for all road users particularly vulnerable road users such as pedestrians, push chairs and wheelchair users who for example may wish to make proper use of the section of dropped kerb at junctions.

Provisions for short term parking has been made by means of a number of pay and display bays, maximum stay 2 hours, 30 pence per hour. This will ensure a reasonable turn over and will control supply Vs demand. Free parking bays are often abused and are extremely difficult to enforce.

Street Management has no jurisdiction over the buildings in the area, other than the removal of graffiti it is not possible to improve the buildings in the area by means of parking management, but this observation has been brought to the attention of the Housing Service. All signs erected on public highway are maintained accordingly. The existing Resident parking signs on the estate, are not in accordance with The Traffic Signs Regulations & General Directions 1994 and if considered inappropriate those on public highway will be removed.

5 OFFICERS’ RECOMMENDATION

5.1 In light of the representations received from Station Road and the status of some of estate roads, it is proposed to modify the proposed measures and undertake a formal consultation on the following new proposals:
• To introduce a Controlled Parking Zone (SW) in High Path area, comprising of Mill Road; Abbey Road; Dane Road; Meadow Road; Croft Road and Abbey Parade (Merton High Street between Mill Road and Abbey Road), as detailed on plan Z78/127/01D attached as Appendix 1 (on display).

• To introduce Double yellow lines at all the identified junctions and other key locations on the west side of the proposed SW Zone as detailed on drawing Z78/127/01D (Appendix 1).

• To legalise the footway parking on the south side of Abbey Road outside Lovell House.

• To reduce the extent of the existing single yellow line restrictions Mon - Sat 8.00am - 6.30pm on Pincott Road and Nelson Grove Road, as shown on drawing Z78/127/01D.

5.1.1 The proposed changes include:
• Removing Station Road from the proposed CPZ. The businesses are against the proposed measures and there has not been very little support from the residents. It appears that there is a mutual agreement between the businesses and the residents regarding the crossover obstructive parking that is currently taking place. To address the obstructive parking at the junctions, it is necessary to maintain the proposed double yellow lines.
• Not applying double yellow lines on those estate roads that are not subject to the Highway agreement.
• To reduce the extent of the proposed double yellow lines from 10m to 6m at Croft Road, Meadow Road and Dane Road at their junctions with Abbey Road.
• To extend the double yellow lines outside No 25 High Path as requested.

5.2 In deciding whether or not to implement a controlled parking zone and waiting restrictions, Members will need to consider the following:
• On site conditions – there is a high level of demand for on street parking on from residents, businesses and visitors. It is considered that within the proposed CPZ the arrangements will give residents, businesses and visitors priority access to available parking spaces over commuters.
• Council’s duties and powers – Section 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 Act. Road safety is therefore a matter that the Council should pay regard to when considering making an Order under S.6 of the Act.
• Representations made in respect of the formal consultation - analyses of the representations received in respect of the formal and informal consultation show that there is majority support from the affected area for the proposals contained in this report.
5.3 Considering the benefits of the proposed CPZ, the proposed waiting restrictions and the Council's duty and responsibilities under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 in the light of majority support from the residents of the core area, it is recommended that the representations are considered and the implementation of the proposals contained in this report are approved.

5.4 **Resident Permits**

It is proposed that the residents’ permit parking provision should be identical to that offered in other controlled parking zones in Merton. The current cost of the first yearly permit in each household is £45, the second permit £80 and the third permit £105.

5.5 **Visitor Permits**

It is recommended that the system and charges applied elsewhere in the Borough for visitor permits apply to this cpz i.e. one annual visitor’s permit per household. The current cost of an annual visitor permit is £105. All day visitor permits should remain at £2 and half day permits at £1. Half day permits could be used either 8.30am – 2pm or 12 pm – 11pm. Allowance of visitor permits per adult in a household is 50 full day or 100 for half day or a combination of the two.

5.6 **Business Permits**

It is proposed that the current business permit system used in other cpzs in the Borough also apply to this cpz. The current is charge £150 for 6 months. The current is charge £150 for 6 months with a maximum of 2 permits for a business with no off street parking place.

6 **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS**

6.1 An alternative option would be to abandon the proposed CPZ scheme and proposed waiting restrictions and do nothing. This would however, be contrary to the support from the majority of respondents on the eastern side of the consulted area and would not address their parking difficulties. It would also lead to loss of confidence in the Council. Although some residents of High Path Estate may prefer the current situation because they are free to park where they choose, the Council has to address the issue in order to fulfil its highway authority duty to tackle congestion, promote road safety and facilitate free passage of all types of traffic. It would be irresponsible of the Council not to address the local community’s concern about parking and access difficulties currently experienced in the area.

6.2 A second option would be to incorporate the whole of consulted area into a CPZ. This, however, would be contrary to the wishes of the respondents who did not support the proposed CPZ and may have to exclude those roads that do not form part of the highway adoption agreement.

6.3 A further option would be to introduce the proposed amended measures without further consultation. This, however, may be subject to a legal challenge as the proposals can be deemed as considerably different to the measures that were previously consulted.
7 RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

7.1 The risk of including the roads to the east of Abbey Road into a CPZ is that it could lead to possible extra pressure on parking demand within the unrestricted roads within the High Path estate. It is considered that this is minimal risk and it can be addressed by means of extending the parking measures (should it go ahead) subject to the normal consultation requirements. Such proposals will only be brought forward upon residents demonstrating support. It should also be noted that the residents were consulted and rejected the proposed controls and the fact that due to their status not all the roads would qualify.

7.2 The risk in not introducing the proposed waiting restrictions would be the potential accidents as a direct result of obstruction and obscured sightlines. These safety implications will affect all road users particularly vulnerable road users. Double yellow lines will remove the risk of obscured sightlines and obstruction, and will subsequently improve safety and access.

7.3 The introduction of the waiting restrictions will lead to loss of parking spaces. The risk of introducing the proposed restrictions could lead to possible extra pressure on the current parking demand. It is, however, considered to be an acceptable risk, compared to the risk presented by possible obstructive parking and it is considered that the risks of not introducing the measures outweigh the risks of introducing the proposed restrictions.

7.4 Not implementing the proposed CPZ would be contrary to the support expressed by the majority of those who took part in the consultation process (from Abbey Road, Mill Road, Croft Road, Meadow Road and Dane Road i.e. those residential roads that are subject to commuter parking pressure.

7.5 All works will be carried out in accordance with the Health and Safety at Work Act and the Construction Design and Management Regulations

8 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

8.1 The cost of implementing the proposals shown on drawing No. Z78-127-01D (including the publication of Draft Orders) is estimated at £25,250. This does not include Merton’s officer staff costs. There will be additional warden costs in terms of the need for an additional quarter of a post at the cost of approximately £5,000. This will generate an estimated net income of about £8,000 per annum. Legislation states that any ‘surplus’ revenue generated must be used in accordance with section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

8.2 The cost of implementing the proposals will be funded from the Capital budget identified for controlled parking zones.
9. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

9.1 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 in a local newspaper and the London Gazette). 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 cause a public inquiry to be held or modifications to be made to the published draft order in respect of objections received before reaching a decision on making a traffic management order. A public inquiry should only be held if it would provide material information that would assist the Council in reaching a decision. It is considered unnecessary for the Council to hold a public inquiry in this instance since it has followed its consultation procedure by undertaking extensive consultation to ascertain the views of the local community and other stakeholders.

10. HUMAN RIGHTS & EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

10.1 The implementation of controlled parking zones and consequent double yellow lines have implications for all sections of the community. These measures assist in improving visibility and access at road junctions and other critical locations and assist in improving safety for all road users, benefiting most especially the young, the elderly and pushchair and wheelchair users. By minimising incidences of dangerous and indiscriminate parking and excluding non-essential parking in the area, the controls would assist in improving the street environment by minimising traffic movement, noise and pollution. The condition created would assist in enhancing residents’ quality of life and contribute to achieving the transport planning policies of the government, the Mayor of London and the borough.

10.2 The Council undertakes extensive and inclusive public consultation to ensure that all road users are given a fair opportunity to have a say on any proposals that may impact on them. In designing a CPZ scheme, special consideration is given to meeting the needs of the disabled, local residents and businesses, bus operators, emergency and refuse collection services as well as those of charitable, public services and religious establishments. The needs of commuters are also given consideration but generally carry less weight than those of residents and local businesses.

10.3 Residents, for whom parking near their homes has become a daily source of anxiety, may benefit from an enhanced quality of life and improvement by reduction of non-essential vehicle movements.
At the statutory or formal consultation stage, people had the final opportunity, along with bodies representing various interests, to have a say on the proposals before the traffic management order is made and the scheme implemented. The statutory consultation is the final stage of the consultation process that any CPZ scheme has to undergo before it can be implemented.
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Representations in support from within the consulted Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confirm No. / Road Name</th>
<th>Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22005505 Croft Rd SW19 2NF</td>
<td>I was very pleased and delighted to read in the 2 March edition of the local Guardian Newspaper that at last the Council is proposing controlled parking zones in my neighbourhood. I have lived in the Borough for 35 years and for the majority of the time, parking has been a big problem. Firstly, with the Wimbledon Palais as a bingo hall. Secondly, Furnitureland and finally the bus drivers from Merton Garage and the local commuters. You will gather from the tone of my letter that I am fully in support of the proposals contained in your Notices and await developments with great interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22005475 Croft Rd SW19 2NF</td>
<td>We are writing to express our wholehearted support for the proposed street management changes in High Path area, in particular the CPZ in Croft Road. Given the extreme difficulty we find in trying to park on a daily basis, I would encourage expediency in resolving the situation with such measures to ease congestion, making parking easier and, more importantly, increase road and pedestrian safety in the area. Should you have any more questions, or if I can be of any more assistance please do not hesitate to contact me on the numbers above (two telephone nos. given)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22005479 Meadow Rd SW19 2ND</td>
<td>We refer to the Newsletter of 24 February 2006 which sets out details of the proposed parking arrangements for the South Wimbledon Area and in particular the proposal for a controlled parking zone (CPZ) for the area east of Abbey Road. We have been involved in the informal public consultation mentioned in the newsletter and are 100% in favour of the CPZ scheme proposed. The rationale put forward in that consultation process, over the past three years at various meetings in the area and further supported by direct feedback to Councillor Judge and his colleagues at the recent event at Merton Abbey School in our view more than supports without further repetition the arguments for introduction of such schemes as are now put forward. At present we have recently gained the benefit of a disabled parking bay outside of our property, primarily to support our disabled elderly mother-in-law but we are well aware of the terms of use of that facility. We are quite content to operate under those terms and in the event of a change of circumstances to leave the facility for the general use of any other disabled users in the Meadow Road area. We are also more than prepared to subscribe the amount considered appropriate for a resident permit and for any charges that may be incurred by visitors to our home and who may be assisted with access to controlled parking facilities in the near vicinity. We also support the proposal for the area west of Abbey Road for double yellow line junction protection. The proposal seems to us to be perfectly reasonable and sensible as a measure of controlling what are very busy roads that would benefit from such arrangements. It follows from the above that we are wholly supportive of such proposals as are to be considered by the Cabinet Street Management Committee and would wish our views to be taken into account.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22005564 Dane Rd SW19 2NB</td>
<td>As a resident of forty years I am in full agreement with the proposed parking measures for the South Wimbledon area. In recent years parking has increased considerably in the area due to the developments on the Abbey Mills, the Tigers Eye, Furniture Warehouse, Language School and commuters and drivers from Merton Bus Garage who park in the area, making it extremely difficult for local residents to park. Also, vehicles are parked on street corners, making it very difficult for any large vehicles to gain access to the area for deliveries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22005502 Dane Rd SW19 2NB</td>
<td>With a view to the proposed CPZ in our area we in this household are in favour of the scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22005507 Station Rd SW19 2LP</td>
<td>I am writing to confirm our support for the proposed parking scheme for the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22005483 Meadow Rd SW19 2ND</td>
<td>We live in Meadow Road within the proposed CPZ as outlined in the above-referenced formal consultation. We are happy to support this measure and having studied the detailed plan could we make the representations as below. An area of Abbey Road footway, in front of Lovell House is proposed for parking. It is a wide footway in front of housing and this seems reasonable. However, the “existing” parking already done all over the rest of the footway on the same side of Abbey Road is now to be officially disallowed it would appear. This would be a very good move; cars park all over this footway with little regard for pedestrians - with or without pushchairs, children etc — blocking all access without any thought for pedestrians who have to skirt round them by walking in Abbey roadway itself. We really do need to know that this pavement parking will be a) banned, and b) permitted by use of Pay and Display bays to be installed. The CPZ seems a very well thought plan. We do not know if this is within your remit but we note that there is a rat run problem through Abbey Road in particular as a connection between Haydon’s Road and Merantun Way and this is too heavy and...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
too dangerous for such a basically residential street.

**Officer's comments** - Support and comments noted.
The traffic related issues that have been raised are currently being investigated as part of a separate scheme. It is proposed to undertake a public consultation after September 2006.

Representations from within the consulted Area-

### in support but with an objection/comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22005579 Croft Rd SW19 2NF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I actually support the proposal for the new parking measures in the area, except for one significant point, which is that the plan includes a double yellow line in front of my house which is a mid-terrace property and I don’t understand this and I am opposed to it. There is no other double yellow line in front of the other mid-terrace houses on the street. Can you please clarify, and take my opposition into consideration when re-drawing the plan. It is important that I am allowed to park outside my house as I have a small baby and always carry a lot of items with me. For security reasons, it is also important that I am able to see my car. I have already made my comments heard in the last consultation (a couple of months ago).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Officer's comments** - The proposed double yellow lines known as “passing gaps” are essential in narrow roads so as to maintain flow of traffic. Every Road carries a similar restriction. Maintaining vehicular access takes priority over demand for on street parking. However to provide some form of compromise it is proposed to reduce the extent of the double yellow lines in Croft Rd, Meadow Rd and Dane Road from 10m to 6m at their junctions with Abbey Rd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22005606 Croft Rd SW19 2NF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With reference to the parking measures for South Wimbledon area I wish to make a plea. My house is situated on the north side of Croft Road at the junction with Abbey Road. I note that a yellow line is proposed to go in front of my house and half of my neighbour's. If this were to be reduced to 4 metres maximum from the corner of Abbey Road I would be able to park outside my house, likewise my neighbour outside his. Please remember as residents we will be PAYING for SPACE, not to be DENIED it. Likewise a reduction in the line opposite on the south side of Croft Road (say to 8 metres) would create another space. Sightlines for cars going INTO Abbey Road would not be affected as yellow lines (as proposed) on both corners of Abbey Road would stop people parking and give clear view, which is more than can be said has happened for the last 15 years or so. I hope my plea will be given due consideration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Officer's comments** - The Highway Code stipulates that motorists should not park within 10 metres of a junction. The aim of the proposed double yellow line waiting restrictions at junctions is to improve visibility and to provide clear access for all road users particularly vulnerable road users such as pedestrians, push chairs and wheelchair users who for example may wish to make proper use of the section of dropped kerb at junctions. However, it is considered reasonable to reduce the extent of the double yellow lines in Croft Rd, Meadow Rd and Dane Road from 10m to 6m at their junctions with Abbey Rd.

Abbey Road is a busy road and currently links Merantum way to Merton High Street. Abbey Road is also relatively narrow. It is essential to maintain the flow of traffic and ensure clear sightlines at every junction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22005615 Meadow Rd SW19 2ND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| In reference to the proposed parking changes for the Abbey Road area we would like to register the following views: We are broadly in agreement with the proposed introduction of the controlled parking zone. There are two aspects we believe merit further consideration. Cost of Parking Permits:

We would like the council to consider making the cost of the initial residents parking permit relatively low whilst all subsequent applications from the same property should be significantly higher. On our street we a wide mix of income levels and a number of residents who own multiple vehicles and block-park. We believe that a low initial permit fee would not penalise those on lower income while the cost of multiple permits should be scaled to reflect the inconvenience block parking has for one vehicle households.

Footway Parking / Access:

With reference to the footway parking on the west side of Abbey Road outside of Lovell House we would like to register an objection. This parking already makes traversing the road and pavements difficult, more so for parents with pushchairs and disabled people using wheelchairs. Thank you for taking our views into consideration. |

**Officer’s comments** - The permit price structure is consistent with all the other controlled parking zones in the borough. It would not be plausible to have a different permit fee for this or any other zones. The price structure has been agreed
The introduction of a Controlled Parking Scheme involves various set up costs for implementation e.g. road markings, signs, and pay and display machines, advertising the TMOs along with the cost of enforcing and maintaining the zone. Guidance for Controlled parking schemes recommends that they should be at least self-funding. Charging residents, visitors and businesses to park in return for a permit can fund this cost. As per the legislation any “surplus” revenue generated must be used in accordance with section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. Footway parking currently takes place illegally and in the absence of marked bays vehicles park in an obstructive manner. The footway width at this location is 3.9m – with the proposed parking bay marked at 1.9m this would leave a clear 2m footway for pedestrians.

22005509 Dane Rd SW19 2NB

I am writing to support your proposals for the above proposed CPZ but would like to make the following comments. I am concerned about the number of parking spaces that will be lost because of the DY lines but I am pleased that most of the suggestions made at the initial consultation have been incorporated into the revised proposals and for this I thank you. I appreciate that you must have DY lines on the corners but still feel that it is unnecessary to have the passing gap in the middle of Dane Road and also on the other roads. At the moment it is rare to find a vacant parking space anywhere in the roads, even on the corners but vehicles still manage to pass one another without too much difficulty. The only problem is when a dustcart or removal lorry parks. I would ask that the passing gaps be removed. I am sure that the CPZ will improve the parking situation during the day but am a bit worried what the evening parking will be like.

Officer's comments - Support and concerns noted.

The proposed double yellow lines known as “passing gaps” are essential in narrow roads so as to maintain flow of traffic. Every Road carries a similar restriction. Maintaining vehicular access takes priority over demand for on street parking. However to provide some form of compromise it is proposed to reduce the extent of the double yellow lines in Croft Rd, Meadow Rd and Dane Road from 10m to 6m at their junctions with Abbey Rd.

22005482 Abbey Rd SW19

We received the formal consultation document detailing proposed parking measures in the South Wimbledon Area. We live in Abbey Road. We support most of the proposed measures for the area, however we would also make the following objections:
1- Proposals for double yellow lines on the corners of Abbey Road/Meadow Road and Abbey Road/Croft Road. We think the length of the double yellow lines are too long, and won't leave enough parking spaces for residents. We propose that half the proposed length would be sufficient.
2- Proposals for single yellow and double yellow lines opposite 24 Abbey Road- we propose an extension of the footway parking instead, pay and display shared use.
3- Proposals for double yellow lines in the middle of Meadow Rd outside nos 19-21, Dane Road outside nos 26-28 and Croft Road nos 27-29. We object to these as unnecessary and propose a continuation of residents permit parking.
4- There seems to be no allowance made for residents of Abbey Parade to park. There will not be enough room for them to be included in the residents permit area on Croft Road, and Merton High Street is a combination of single and double yellow lines. 5- Abbey Parade includes a busy Doctors surgery and a dentist. Where will patients be expected to park? We also have the following questions: What is the cost for residents of residents permit parking? How much will it be for a visitor pass? What are the time restrictions on the single yellow lines?

Officer's comments - Support welcomed. Concerns have been noted.

The Highway Code stipulates that motorists should not park within 10 metres of a junction. The aim of the proposed double yellow line waiting restrictions at junctions is to improve visibility and to provide clear access for all road users particularly vulnerable road users such as pedestrians, push chairs and wheelchair users who for example may wish to make proper use of the section of dropped kerb at junctions. However, it is considered reasonable to reduce the extent of the double yellow lines in Croft Rd, Meadow Rd and Dane Road from 10m to 6m at their junctions with Abbey Rd. Abbey Road is a busy road and currently links Merantum way to Merton High Street. Abbey Road is also relatively narrow. It is essential to maintain the flow of traffic and ensure clear sightlines at every junction. By introducing another parking bay outside no 24 Abbey Road would mean that the extent of the double yellow lines would be reduced to 3m and this would have serious sightline and safety implications.

The proposed double yellow lines known as “passing gaps” are essential in narrow roads so as to maintain flow of traffic. Within any CPZ design every attempt is made to provide the maximum number of safe parking spaces and the Council aims to reach a compromise between the needs of the residents, businesses and visitors. In such a densely populated area it would be impossible to cater for every ones’ parking needs. Those who reside along Abbey Parade do not have any off street nor on street parking facilities and within the proposed CPZ they can continue to park in this area with a valid parking permit. Some provisions have been made for visitors by means of short term pay and display bays. The consultation documents contained a facts sheet ‘frequently asked questions’ which provides the details of the issues raised i.e. the costs of permits, yellow line restrictions and other parking provisions. See appendix 3 for details.
I welcome the introduction of the proposed CPZ for the area east of Abbey Road which should alleviate the problems experienced by residents with long-term street parking by non residents. However, as a result of a visit to the Civic Centre to speak to the responsible traffic engineer, I have reservations that in its current form that the proposals for High Path Estate will result in it becoming a tube station parking lot. My reason for this statement is at present although not being policed the High Path Estate has a free residents parking scheme. The proposals shown on the consultation document do not give any indication that this scheme still exists, as a result I sought clarification from the engineer leads me to believe that he has been informed by Housing that the scheme will be discontinued. If this is the case then I believe that myself and other residents would not wish the scheme to continue as it stands without full reassurance that the residents scheme for Housing Estate will be continued. To this extent I would request that the committee consult again with High Path residents to clarify that the free parking scheme for residents will continue along side the proposals for yellow line restrictions within the Housing Estate area.

**Officers’ Comments**  
The residents were informed via the consultation documents that the previously operated free parking permit by Housing has not been operating for more than 2 years; the alternative to this is a CPZ but residents must purchase a permit. The Council consulted on CPZ and those on the Housing estate and Pincott Road rejected it; consequently Pincott Road and the High Path Estate roads are not included in the proposed CPZ. Double yellow lines are proposed for those roads outside the proposed CPZ and the restrictions are proposed at key locations such as at junctions, bends and along narrow sections of roads where parking would cause obstruction. A parking scheme should be self-funding and subsequently a fee is charged for a permit. However, since the Council is now aware of the obstructive parking and the possible access implications for the emergency services the Council is duty bound to take the appropriate action and that would involve the introduction of double yellow lines. Since the completion of the consultation process it has been concluded that not all the roads are subject to the adoption agreement and consequently the double yellow lines previously proposed for certain areas such as Priory Close no longer apply. It should be noted that provisions for free permit parking on the estate roads is entirely the decision of the Housing department and cannot have any bearing on what is being proposed.

### Representations in support from statutory consultees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confirm No. / Road Name</th>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Officers’ Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22005722 London TravelWatch Middle Street London EC1A 7JA</td>
<td>Members of London TravelWatch support the implementation of parking controls. However, this may lead to parking displacement onto adjacent roads that are bus routes. If this is likely to happen, can you please ensure that parking controls on any bus routes are such that any displaced parking does not cause delays. How do you plan to avoid displacement from the CPZ onto bus routes?</td>
<td>Haydons’ Road and Merton High Street which are the immediate neighbouring bus routes already have restrictions in place that prevents parking and it is therefore extremely unlikely that the proposed measures would have any traffic related impact on the buses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Representations against from within the consulted Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confirm No. / Road</th>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Officers’ Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22005506 Pincott Road SW19 2NW</td>
<td>I object to the removal of the existing yellow line on Pincott Road because: 1) it will enable parking outside the entrance to Tanner House making access difficult for residents especially the elderly and disabled, b) allowing parking opposite Lamperts, the ironmongers in Pincott Road that frequently attracts larger vehicles due to the nature of its business, would make it extremely difficult for vehicles to pass, and c) parking very close to Tanner House would be too close to the bedroom windows of Flats Nos. 1, 8 and 15.</td>
<td>Pincott Road is one way and the road is of sufficient width to accommodate parking on one side without impeding the flow of traffic. Currently there is a single yellow line, which means that after 6.30pm vehicles can park and there have been no records to indicate this to be a problem. The proposals are intended to assist, rather that disadvantage the residents and local businesses. However, concerns have been noted and the appropriate action will be taken if and when necessary. Regarding parking close to Tanner House, it should be noted that the bedroom windows of Flat Nos. 1, 8 and 15 are at least 7 metres away from...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22005518  Pincott Rd  SW19 2LD  High Path Residents Association
We have spent a few years bringing up our objection to the withdrawal of the permit system, at the Housing Consultative Forum, to be told that a meeting was to be set up to discuss our problems, not only has this not happened, but your group, without consulting us, has decided to turn our estate into a paying car park for the borough, not only are residents expected to put up with other peoples' cars on the estate, but are expected to pay for the privilege, we had a representative turn up at your public consultations who was told this was not open for discussion, the purpose of the consultations was to let residents know what the council were doing, this is to let you know we are strongly against the proposal and we will do what we can to stop this venture.

Officer's comments
The residents, Ward Councillors and known resident associations were consulted prior to the public consultation. Street Management did consult the local community – public consultation in November 2005 that included an exhibition, which a representative from the association attended and formal consultation in March/April 2006 to which the association has forwarded a representation that is being considered. It should also be noted that it is arguable that an engineer would say that the proposed measures are not open to discussion – the purpose of the consultation is to determine support for the measures and what the residents want. The design is always subject to change and it is often the case when recommendations are made to change the design as a direct result of feed back from the local community. The future of any scheme is also determined by the feedback. The Council consulted on CPZ and those on the Housing estate rejected it; consequently Pincott Road and the High Path Estate roads are not included in the proposed CPZ. Double yellow lines are proposed for those roads outside the proposed CPZ and the restrictions are proposed at key locations such as at junctions, bends and along narrow sections of roads where parking would cause obstruction. It should also be noted that the recent talks between Legal, Highways and Housing regarding adopting the estate roads has concluded in that only certain sections of those roads are to be adopted and therefore the proposed restrictions on the unadopted sections will not apply.

When considering road safety in this area. 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.

It would be irresponsible of the Council to ignore the manner of obstructive parking that is currently taking place. The Council has duty and care to ensure the safety of all road users and to maintain access at all times, particularly for the public service vehicles and the emergency services.

The residents were informed via the consultation documents that the previously operated free parking permit by Housing has not been operating for more than 2 years; the alternative to this is a CPZ but residents must purchase a permit – an option that has been rejected by the majority in this area. The introduction of a Controlled Parking Scheme involves various set up costs for implementation e.g. road markings, signs, and pay and display machines, advertising the TMOs along with the cost of enforcing and maintaining the zone. Guidance for Controlled parking schemes recommends that they should be at least self-funding. Charging residents, visitors and businesses to park in return for a permit can fund this cost. As per the legislation any "surplus" revenue generated must be used in accordance with section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. Although some yellow line restrictions are being introduced parking will be permitted on the west side of Pincott Road where currently parking is prohibited.

22005605  Meadow Rd  SW19 2ND
I do not agree with the current proposal. 1. What residents actually want is to be able to park outside their houses, particularly to be able to drop off children or heavy shopping easily. The CPZ will not give the residents that.
2. While people grumble, but accept, that "first come, first parked" means that sometimes you have to drive round the block to park, paying for a CPZ permit (another tax on car ownership, albeit this time one paid to Merton Council) will raise expectations that you will be able to park outside your house. This will not be the case.
3 The Council will sell permits to all residents who apply for them. A number of houses have 2 cars, or even one car that is at least as long as their house's frontage. Who has checked that the length of vehicles used by residents is not longer than the road frontage that will be permitted for parking? Or is it not relevant to the Council that they will be taking money without giving the service that people are expecting in return?
4 In addition residents have friends who come to stay, builders who come to do work on their houses and carers who need to attend regularly. We are being offered the opportunity to buy day ticket for spaces, which at certain times of the day won't exist. Again the Council will be selling what it has not got.
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5. The CPZ will result in residents having to pay so that neither they nor their visitors can park outside their house, indeed even in the road they live in. With the reduction of available spaces in the area east of Abbey Road will those residents now be permitted to park in the wider area e.g. outside De Burgh House? What are the parking requirements of the redevelopment of Hubert House? Have they been taken into account in forming these proposals?

6. From observation in Meadow Road a high proportion of the non-resident parking would appear to be the bus drivers for the local bus garage. We all want frequent and reliable public transport, particularly at the ends of the day. Who has evaluated the impact of the proposed CPZ on local bus services? From observation this week (which seems to have been an average week) at 8.30 a.m. each weekday there have been at least 8 spaces in Meadow Road, while at 7 p.m. there have been none, 1 or 2 spaces. CPZ from 8.30a.m. to 6.30 p.m. would restrict when there does not need to be a restriction and not improve the congestion in the evening.

7. 2 points of detail on Meadow Road: the plan appears to have "lost" the disabled space recently marked for number 24 and has put a space outside number 21 for no discernible reason. The proposed CPZ will not, in my view, solve the area's parking congestion, but it will add several new problems, as well as increase the amount of tax paid to Merton Council.

Officer’s Comments - It is Council policy to improve the environment by regulating the number of parked vehicles in the area, thereby improving safety and access for both motorists and pedestrians. The key objective of the proposal is to reduce and control non-essential parking and assist residents, short-stay visitors and local businesses and to improve safety and access for all road users. The current situation whereby vehicles are parked indiscriminately, blocking pedestrian crossing points and pavements, impeding free flow of traffic, restricting access and visibility, is potentially dangerous to all road users. Within any CPZ design every attempt is made to provide the maximum number of safe parking spaces and the Council aims to reach a compromise between the needs of the residents, businesses and visitors. In such a densely populated area it would be impossible to cater for every one’s parking needs. A CPZ gives residents a priority over the available safe parking spaces by removing the competition. Within a CPZ residents compete against each other rather than commuters. In an attempt to control and minimise the number of permits issued the Council has put in place a price structure so that the second, third and subsequent permit is more expansive than the first permit. For fees see appendix 3. The disabled parking bay is now shown on the plan and the area outside No 21 is subject to double yellow lines (passing gap).

22005535 Abbey Parade SW19 1DG
I strongly object to the introduction of further restrictions due to the adverse effect they will have on this business. Currently, customers are able to park within walking distance of the shop, or use the 6 bays that are available across the road. If these are to be removed customers will not visit the area. I notice that you are proposing to legalise footway parking in Abbey Road and suggest that you also implement this along Abbey Parade where the pavement is wide enough to accommodate vehicles without encroaching on the main road. At the end of the day we still need to receive deliveries. Please give the businesses on Abbey Parade consideration. By implementing more and more restrictions it will drive us away when the Council should be trying to attract business to the area.

22005603 Abbey Parade SW19 1DG
I am extremely concerned about the impact of the current proposal on my business and on the local residents. With our company being established for over 60 years we are on very friendly terms with many of the local residents and nobody seems to have a real issue with the parking. The situation at present is not perfect but it is workable. The scheme you are proposing would make working life impossible for shopkeepers as well as residents as there would be parking wardens around all of the time making life hell. At a rough estimate there are 300 residences with only 189 allocated parking spaces which I would think is not anywhere near enough. I have 2 employees working for me and one of them has no other way of getting to work as he is unable to walk any distance due to arthritis. Our delivery van, which I use to travel to and from work, will be unable to stop anywhere near our rear doors as there will be ‘Pay and Display’ bays along that side. Some of the sheets we deliver can be very heavy and/or awkward to carry and there is no convenient provision for loading and unloading. Where are we supposed to park? With regards to my vehicle being a van used for deliveries I refer to my previous letters dated 21st November 2005 and the 11th October 1999 (copies enclosed). I have had no response to either letter and as you can appreciate it is imperative that I know what is happening. Where are our customers supposed to park with such limited parking? Our customers should not be expected to pay to visit our premises. Why was the small car park opposite my gates in Abbey Road sold off some years ago? It was the only off-street area for car parking in the area and now that it has gone we have no parking facilities at all, even less should the proposals go ahead. It is very difficult for the small business to survive at the moment. These proposals will just help to kill us off entirely.

Officer’s Comments - It is Council policy to improve the environment by regulating the number of parked vehicles in the area, thereby improving safety and access for both motorists and pedestrians. The key objective of the proposal is to reduce and control non-essential parking and assist residents, short-stay visitors and local businesses and to improve safety and access for all road users. The current situation whereby vehicles are parked indiscriminately, blocking pedestrian crossing points and pavements, impeding free flow of traffic, restricting access and visibility, is potentially...
dangerous to all road users. For the Council to ignore the current situation would be irresponsible and a failure in its duty as the highway authority. The Council has a duty to provide for the safety of all road users and to maintain access at all times, particularly for emergency services and public service vehicles. Due to the long term commuter parking there is very little provision for potential customers to stop. Within the proposed CPZ there will be a number of short term pay and display bays in Abbey Road, Mill Rd and Croft Road. The proposal does not include any changes to the parking bays on the north side of the High Street. Merton High Street is subject to waiting restrictions (Monday – Saturday 8am – 6.30pm and loading restrictions Monday – Friday 8.00-9.30am and 4.30-6.30pm. The proposed measures do not involve any changes to this arrangement. The inclusion of the businesses simply allows them to purchase business permits. All the properties along Abbey Parade have a rear access (not in use) and a crossover that serves this rear access. With the proposed single yellow line across this crossover and the existing double yellow lines, this area can be used as a loading area.

The footway width along Abbey Parade varies between 1.7m and 2m. There is the perception of a wide footway but in fact the remaining is a private forecourt. A full footway parking would require a minimum of 1.85m parking bay and this cannot be permitted as it would not leave any clear footway area for pedestrians and part footway parking cannot be permitted due to the nature of Merton High Street and the flow of traffic. It should also be noted that any footway parking would also cause site line difficulties/accidents for motorists exiting Abbey Road. Footway parking, therefore, cannot be permitted here. It should also be noted that there are vehicles who illegally drive over the footway and park on the private forecourt area.

As a rule businesses are entitled to a maximum of 2 permits subject to terms and conditions.

22005477 Station Rd SW19 2LP (business)
We object to the introduction of parking restrictions in Station Road. Our customers are often in to arrange an estimate on their vehicle and would be totally inconvenienced to have to find yet another parking scheme. We feel it would jeopardise our livelihood unfairly and be of little benefit to local residents who are often away from home during our working hours.

22005574 Station Rd SW19 2LP (business)
With reference to your proposal for controlled parking in Station Road I must object in the strongest terms on the following grounds:

As a business owner & employer I feel it would place my business in serious jeopardy if there was no parking provision for my customers & staff. Station Road has nine business premises situated on it making the road as industrial as it is residential, indeed one whole side of the street is entirely industrial. There is no current parking problem in the road enabling the businesses to utilise the parking in the day & residents in the evening. There is a good working relationship between the businesses & residents of Station Road. I hope the Committee will consider these points and reject this proposal.

22005480 Station Rd SW19 2LP (business)
I wish to address, in particular, those restrictions which relate directly to Station Road and the east end of High Path. The right hand side of Station Road consists of 6 small motor trade business units, of which this is one, and we have all been operating in this location for several years without, as far as I am aware, causing any disruption, congestion or any major inconvenience for local residents. Many of the local residents are our customers. Autotechnics is a registered MOT Testing Station carrying out between 10 and 15 Tests per day in addition to repairs to, and servicing of, cars. Clearly this represents a high turnover of cars during the working day which runs from 8am to 5pm Monday to Friday and 8.30 am to 2 pm on Saturdays. A high percentage of our customers are unable to wait whilst their cars are Tested or serviced and since we only have facility to park 2 cars off road at any one time they must be able to park on the road. MOT Testing of vehicles is a Mandatory requirement and facilities to carry them out need to be readily available to car owners in order to encourage compliance. This unit employs people and the staffing levels at the other units are similar. The majority of our staff drive to work because of the distances they travel and lack of satisfactory transport links. They too need to be able to park their vehicles on the road and, even if they were prepared to pay a parking fee to do so, the proposed time restrictions would make this impossible given the length of their working day. Government and Local Councils argue for small local businesses to be encouraged but we already pay high business rates. The proposed parking restrictions will increase the burden placed on us and could, ultimately, result in loss of jobs and the closure of some of the units as we are forced to turn work away because both the cost and time restrictions of parking cars is punitive and, financially, not viable. Should this happen the local residents and surrounding communities will lose an essential service that they will be forced to seek further away.

22005582 Station Rd SW19 2LP (business)
I wish to state my objection to the proposed parking measures as they relate to Station Road and the adjoining section of High Path. The south side of Station Road is entirely made up of small businesses, mostly motor trade, who rely on unrestricted parking for staff and customer parking. Whilst adequate for most visitors, the proposed maximum stay of 5 hours does not permit staff to park for he entirety of their working day, and for some staff other means of transport are not a practical option. Further, the proposed bays would only serve to restrict the total amount of parking available. I am
I am writing to object to the Council's proposed parking restrictions in the South Wimbledon area, in particular Station Road. In Station Road there are six small business units, which are all operated as Motor Trade businesses, all of which have been here for many years. Delta Autos is a Car Body Repair, Servicing and M.O.T. garage, we have a high turnover of vehicles, customers normally prefer to leave their vehicles with us for the day, as this is more convenient to them, therefore we have to leave vehicles in the road outside for some time during the day. It seems that although the Government appears to be in support of small businesses like ours, these parking restrictions and the extremely high business rates we have to pay, which were in fact doubled in February 2004, all make it a very uphill struggle to keep our heads above water. If these restrictions are brought in we will have to turn customers away, which in turn will probably mean job losses.

Having studied the plans, I feel you may have made a sorry omission: there appear to be no resident permit holder's spaces marked outside our properties in Station Road (unlike the arrangements in neighbouring Dane Road, Meadow Road, Croft Road and Mill Road). We appear to have a single yellow line instead. I also note that additional parking on the other side of the road has been removed and "Shared Use" has replaced it. This leaves us with very little space to park anywhere in the immediate vicinity. Is this just an oversight or a deliberate attempt to make us all dig up our front gardens? I do observe that a few spaces have been reserved for us up either end of the road, but assuming we value our cars, I would in no way attempt to leave my car in any of these spaces overnight, given that many cars are regularly vandalised in these parts of the road. In any case, this provision (approximately 5 spaces) is nowhere near enough in my opinion. Please tell me why I should pay an annual parking fee to park there instead of in a safe and convenient space outside my house, as I have done, for free, for the last 13 years? We have established good and amicable relationships with the garage owners on the opposite side of the road and work out current parking issues between us without any intervention from the Council. I see no reason why this situation shouldn't continue in Station Road. Should this proposal go ahead, we would have to put in place one (or more) of the following inconvenient arrangements:

a) Park during the day in the designated permit holder's spaces and then play musical cars after 6.30pm (or whenever the single line rule doesn't apply anymore) and move our car outside the house, or b) Park in one of the neighbouring roads where we run the risk of having abusive notes left on the car saying "We know you live in Station Road - why don't you ark there" - yes, this has happened to us. And then, have to walk down a dark and dangerous path by the Wandle to get to my house. or c) Dig up the front garden. I am reluctant to do this because I enjoy having a free green space in front of my house before reaching the concrete hell, which has grown out of Merton Abbey Mills in recent months. It makes environmental sense to retain a garden too – we all know about the drainage/flooding problems in London owing to people concreting over their gardens. Station Road should be a special consideration in your plans. The way the road is used is quite different from neighbouring roads. I do appreciate, however, the issues that residents have in neighbouring roads and indeed if those roads were to have permit holder's bays only, something would need to be done in Station Road, otherwise our parking situation would become an issue. In view of this, I propose that permit holders spaces should be allowed outside our properties. There are only 7 houses in the road which have retained their gardens;
these six spaces plus the ends of the road should be sufficient. In addition, I think some consideration for business permit holder's spaces should be given for the opposite side of the road. As it stands, I am opposed to the scheme you propose for Station Road and wish my comments to be taken into account when the Committee next meets.

22005580 Station Rd SW19 2LP (Residential)
I am writing to express my objection to the Controlled Parking Proposals for Station Rd and request that my family's opinion is registered as part of the Consultation exercise. Due to the fact that Station Road is a no through road I consider that over the seven years my family have lived here the present uncontrolled parking system works adequately and does not need changing. Adding new Controlled Parking proposals will not deter any new non-residents' or commuter vehicles parked during weekdays and the introduction of parking fees or permit costs will penalise local residents and businesses (as well as their visitors or customers) who at present do not have off road parking with no resulting improvement. It would seem this proposal may be introduced for the sole reason of raising a small amount of extra annual revenue for the council. However it will not only cost money to implement that could be better spent on other services but will actually reduce council income due to driving out or impeding local businesses. It will also lead to the loss of the remaining front gardens in Station Road, which at present give the road an unusual character in an area usually without these features.

Officer's comments
In light of the feedback received, this it is recommended that Station Road is removed from the proposed CPZ. The businesses are against the proposed measures and there has not been support from the residents. It appears that there is a mutual agreement between the businesses and the residents regarding the crossover obstructive parking that is currently taking place. To address the obstructive parking at the junctions, it is necessary to maintain the proposed double yellow lines.

22005484 Rodney Place SW19 2LQ
I am extremely concerned by the proposals for yellow lines to put in at the end of our cul-de-sac. At present, residents have to park cars beyond the turning circle in order that each resident can park in our street. We are in a unique environment here with all neighbours co-operating well to park sensibly and amicably. I would ask you to consider one of two things: - Can we not have any yellow lines in the turning circle, allowing us to park sensibly as we do now, - Can we have access to park beyond the yellow tines, granting us footway parking as you have done in Abbey Road. Please be aware that if these options are not taken, the result will be to push at least six cars in to parking out of Rodney Place and putting the problem onto someone else's doorstep.

22004882 Rodney Place SW19 2LQ (Petition signed by 14 residents of Rodney Place)
We, the undersigned, have read the Proposed Parking arrangements for High Path Area document submitted for consultation by Merton Council and agree the following: 1) We wish to keep the arrangements currently in place, and b) We do not wish Option 1 or 2 of the proposed Parking arrangements for High Path Area document to be applicable to Rodney Place

Officer's comments There are 16 residential properties in Rodney Place and the petition has been signed by 14 households. Rodney Place is a narrow cu-de-sac and comprises of a bend. A Turning head is an area for vehicles to turn and if obstructed, motorists are forced to reverse up to the junction or another area where they can turn. This practice is considered dangerous. The average footway width is 3m – too narrow to allow footway parking and maintaining sufficient footway width for pedestrians particularly those with push chairs or/and wheelchair users. The average carriageway width is 5m and is not wide enough to accommodate parking on both sides and maintain access particularly for the Fire brigade/ambulance Services and the refuse vehicles.

Representations from unadopted road that is not subject to restrictions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confirm No. Road</th>
<th>Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22005604 Priory Close SW19 2TG</td>
<td>I am dismayed at your parking proposal, there are at least 22 cars owned by residents on our side of the block, and you are allowing us 9 parking spaces. I work until 11pm at night and find it hard to park when I come home as it is, where do you suggest I park once you have put double yellow lines all over that close. We pay road tax, council tax and rent, surely we are allowed to park near our homes, I would prefer not to have to worry about being attacked because I have been forced to park God knows</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
prove they live in the flats by having their log books checked. Why can’t you enforce this?

22005804
Priory Close
SW19 2TG

It is with quite some dismay that I feel I have to write to you this e-mail, upon inspecting the Councils ‘proposals’ concerning the issue of parking with regard to the area of High Path Estate. If I could start by outlining the fact that I reside in Priory Close, in the far southwestern corner of the Estate. I have witnessed the complete and utter shambles that the existing parking measures had turned into after the Estate Office was closed a couple of years ago. But the present proposals seem to take little or no consideration for the actual logistical needs for the residents. In my particular area there are some 60 flats, and barely enough space for the residents to park their vehicles. If you then consider then putting Double Yellow Lines as outlined in the proposals, then where exactly do you expect us to park? Will we get exemption permits? I cannot see why you need quite as many Double Yellows not just in my Priory Close area, or indeed for the vast majority of the western end of the Estate. One of my friends lives on a similar Estate in Kennington, all he has to do is takes his documents in once a year and get issued a Parking Permit for his car. Surely a similar arrangement could be implemented for the residents of High Path Estate? I have a degree in Environmental Science and Geography, so am well capable of ascertaining the possible impact of these present proposals, which seem positively ‘ludicrous’ to me. I do not need an additional degree in Mathematics to see that barely 20 parking spaces for some 60-odd flats is farcical. I definitely oppose these proposed ‘Traffic Management’ plans.

Officer’s comments

Priory Close is not within the proposed CPZ and is not within a reasonable/acceptable walking distance to the proposed CPZ.

As already explained in this report and to the residents via the consultation documents, the previously operated free parking permit by Housing has not been operating for more than 2 years; the alternative to this is a CPZ but residents must purchase a permit.

The introduction of a Controlled Parking Scheme involves various set up costs for implementation e.g. road markings, signs, and pay and display machines, advertising the TMOs along with the cost of enforcing and maintaining the zone. Guidance for Controlled parking schemes recommends that they should be at least self-funding. Charging residents, visitors and businesses to park in return for a permit can fund this cost. As per the legislation any “surplus” revenue generated must be used in accordance with section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

Double yellow lines are proposed only for sections where parked vehicles would be a hazard to other road users or/and where they would restrict access. Safety and maintaining vehicular access takes priority over demand for on street parking. Due to the fact that the status of this road is to remain the same i.e. is not adopted/public highway, the proposed restrictions no longer apply.

Representations from roads within the consulted area but outside the proposed CPZ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confirm No. / Road Name</th>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Officers’ Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22005796 High Path SW19 2JL</td>
<td>We would like to request that the area outside our loading bays, which fronts High Path, is double yellow lines instead of single. We are in the exhibition business and have vehicles coming to unload and reload at all times of day night and if access is restricted it will make it very difficult for our drivers. An alternative might be &quot;illegal crossover/driveway&quot;. The area concerned is marked on the attached copy of the plan.</td>
<td>The loading bays refer to are on private property and not on public highway. There are 2 crossovers adjacent to this property protected by a single yellow line. Only one crossover belongs to this property and is used to gain access to the yard. The company’s request for 30m of double yellow lines has been investigated and it is considered reasonable to extend the double yellow lines to cover their crossover i.e. by 20m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In view of the proposed parking measure currently under consideration, I am writing to you on behalf of the staff working at Martin Harknett House. After consultation with managers within the building we would like you to consider our comments below and would highlight the fact that we are a public service, and any withdrawal of parking spaces in the surrounding streets will affect staff and visitors to the building, as there is nowhere else to park due to the redevelopment of the Merton Abbey area. Whilst we fully understand and agree the necessity for a Controlled Parking Zone, particularly in the residential area, our building is located in a business area. The Probation Service is fully involved and committed to encouraging a safer neighbourhood and Public Protection, and compliance by offenders to attend the building and complete the requirements of their Community Orders. We currently have 80 staff working in our building, some of whom are essential car users as required by the nature of the work we do. Our concern is that there will not be sufficient parking places for our staff, and visitors to the building, which include offenders, and that our work will be severely affected. From a Health & Safety aspect, we have staff working in the building in the evening as we run groupwork programmes for offenders four nights a week until 10 p.m. The majority of staff are female and one member of staff has already been followed by an offender to her car, which was parked in the street. If there is no available street parking nearby, this would mean staff would have to walk further to their cars, sometimes on their own, late at night, particularly in areas where the street lighting is insufficient. The building is open seven days a week as we also run Unpaid Work (CS) projects.
Office hours are:
Monday to Thursday: 8 a.m. - 10 p.m.
Friday: 8 a.m. - 5 p.m.
Saturday: 8 a.m. - 6 p.m.
Sunday: 8 a.m. - 5 p.m.
We had hoped we could provide extra parking bays within the grounds of the building but this has been turned down. Martin Harknett House was built in a designated business area and the amount of people working and visiting the building has increased since it was built 14 years ago.
When you consider your final plans for implementation, can you please consider what provision can be offered for essential businesses like our’s, which is a Public Sector.

This property is outside the proposed CPZ. The residential roads are densely populated, with little or no off street parking facilities and although every attempt is made to provide the maximum number of parking spaces, it is unlikely that demand for space can be met if the local businesses outside the zone were to be permitted to continue parking in the proposed CPZ. Also it would be extremely unlikely that the residents would welcome or understand such an agreement.
The key objective of any parking management proposal is to reduce and control non-essential parking and assist the residents, short-term visitors and the local businesses. This is in line with the Mayor’s Transport strategy, which aims to tackle congestion and reduce traffic and specifically supports the introduction of Controlled Parking restrictions. The area is not capable of accommodating the parking needs of all the residents, businesses and visitors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confirm No. / Road Name</th>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Officers' Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22005503 113a Hardy Rd SW19 2JB</td>
<td>I would like to thank you for the support when you introduced the CPZ S2 zone by providing us with 5 business permits and the continuous support from your team. We are running a MOT testing station and motor vehicle repair workshop at the above premises. We used to park our customers cars (5 - 10 cars) in the adjacent streets of CPZ SW zone when the work finished or while we wait to get the parts. Most of the non-running cars being delivered by the recovery straight to the garage at the above address. While we appreciate your efforts to provide the residents requirements to park their cars we need your help and support to run our car repair workshop as part of the community. Since we deal with cars CPZ S2 zone has already made a big impact to our business and becoming more difficult with the introduction of CPZ SW to continue as a car repairing business. We have been trying to get other places for parking and storages but it is very difficult to get any place for motor trade purposes. It is very important to apply for more business permits to carry on our business. We have three employees and two of us the owners totally depend on this business. Please consider our requirements sympathetically and support our application to safeguard our livelihood by providing at least 10 business permits for our MOT business.</td>
<td>This business is in Zone S2 and if the proposed CPZ is introduced this business will not be entitled to SW permits and therefore will not be allowed to continue its current practice. This business has already been provided 5 business address permits which is more than the maximum of 2 that is allowed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3

Dear [Name],

Thank you for your interest in [Organization Name] and the South Wimbledon Ares of Merion South Parking Measures for Formal Consultation.

[Content of the letter]

[Diagram or table]

[Contact Information]

[Signature]

[Organization Name]

[Date]
Dear Resident/Business

In September 2004 Ward Councillors and local Residents’ Associations held a meeting with residents living in the High Path Estate area between Abbey Road and Sava Centre in Colliers Wood regarding their parking concerns in their roads. Since the meeting correspondence has been received from residents of Dane Road, Mill Road and Meadow Road stating that since the introduction of a Controlled Parking Zone in Colliers Wood they are experiencing greater difficulty in parking in their roads and requesting that a Controlled Parking Zone be considered.

The London Borough of Merton’s Housing Services have been operating a parking permit system enforced by a private clamping company on the High Path Estate since early 2000. The parking system was fully enforced until two years ago when the contract with the clamping company expired and consequently the area has not been enforced since then. At the moment the turning circles at Doel Close, Downman Close and Hayward Close are being abused. This results in emergency services not being able to access the area adequately. The Council therefore proposes to introduce a Controlled Parking Zone to address road safety issues and the parking problem in the area.

In the proposed CPZ, provision has been made for essential long-stay parking by introducing permit bays for residents and for essential business car users. Residents’ visitors would be able to obtain visitors’ permits for their stay, while short-term visitors to businesses could park in shared-use pay and display bays.

This informal consultation exercise is an opportunity for the Council to inform residents and local businesses of the options available to improve parking, access and safety in the area. It also allows you to tell the Council whether or not these options meet your needs. The proposals shown on the plan overleaf are intended to reduce and control all day parking by non-residents, and to improve the environment by reducing the number of parked vehicles in the area.

The Proposal
The Council is considering two options relating to the proposed parking measures in your area. These options include junction protection and a proposed controlled parking zone.

**OPTION 1 - Junction Protection (Double Yellow Lines at Juncions)**
Under this option it is proposed to introduce double yellow lines at junctions and areas where it is dangerous to park for road safety reasons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Advantages</th>
<th>The Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unobstructed sight lines as the current restrictions prohibit parking during restricted hours</td>
<td>Proposed double yellow lines at junctions may lead to a reduction in parking spaces and an increase in demand over the available space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider road space, as no cars are parked there during restrictive hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved visibility at junctions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved access for emergency and public service vehicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer crossing points for pedestrians, people in wheelchairs and pushchairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OPTION 2 - Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ)**
The options for controlled times are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday to Friday</td>
<td>8:30am - 6:30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday to Friday</td>
<td>10:00am - 4:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday to Friday</td>
<td>One Hour Only (10am-11am or 2pm-3pm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
<td>8:30am - 6:30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday to Saturday</td>
<td>One Hour Only (10am-11am or 2pm-3pm)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Advantages of a CPZ:
- Formalised parking provision
- Priority is given to residents, businesses and their visitors with permits to park within the zone.
- Improved visibility at junctions
- Removing long term/commuter parking

The Disadvantages of a CPZ:
- Pay for a permit to park in the zone
- Parking space is not guaranteed
- Increased street furniture

How to make your view count!
Please be sure to complete your questionnaire and return it, together with any further comments or suggestions you may have, by 25th November 2005.

We thank you for considering these proposals. All comments will be considered and where possible incorporated into the design. If you would like more information before completing the questionnaire please contact Evan Jeposa on 020 8545 3840 or by e-mail to evan.jeposa@merton.gov.uk

What happens next?
The Council will consider introducing a CPZ in the roads where a majority of respondents are in favour. Any zone, however, must have a cohesive and logical boundary. It is intended to report the results of this informal consultation to the Cabinet Street Management Committee on 11th January 2006 at 7:15pm. Once a decision has been made you will be informed accordingly via a newsletter. Should the Council decide to proceed further with a CPZ it will, following the 11th January meeting, undertake a formal consultation exercise on the proposals, the results of which will be reported back to the Cabinet Street Management Committee in due course. The final decision as to whether or not to introduce a CPZ scheme will only be made at that subsequent meeting.

Public Exhibitions
You may want to attend one of our public exhibitions to be held at: High Path Resource Centre, High Path Road, South Wimbledon, London, SW19 2YF at the following times: Wednesday 16th November 2005 and Thursday 17th November 2005, 10am till 7pm; Saturday 19th November 2005, 10am till 5pm. Alternatively you may wish to view the plans at Merton Link at Merton Civic Centre, Wimbledon Library or by downloading the files from the Merton Council Website www.merton.gov.uk/sw

If you would like more information in your own language, please contact us at the address shown in the bottom box.

Your Councillors for Abbey Ward are:

Councillor Su Assinen
Telephone 020 8646 5043

Councillor Pauline Dawkins
Telephone 020 8545 3424

Councillor Mick Fitzgerald
Telephone 020 8540 2704

For more info
We would like to thank you for your feedback. If you require further information please contact Evan Jeposa

Telephone 020 8545 3840 or Email evan.jeposa@merton.gov.uk

Issue Date: 4th November 2005

PLEASE NOTE: In view of the large number of
Appendix 5

High Path – Outside No. 25
Mill Road, by Abbey Parade
Purpose of the report
This report details the result of the formal consultation that was carried out in March/April 2006 on proposals to introduce a controlled parking zone and selective waiting restrictions in South Wimbledon area between Mill Rd/Morden Rd/High Path/Merton High Street. It seeks authority to undertake a further formal consultation on the proposals that have been amended to accommodate some of the representations received.

Reasons for the scheme
Following meetings between the previous Ward Councillors and the local residents it was agreed for the Council to undertake an informal consultation on a proposal to address the parking and access difficulties in the area. The informal consultation that was carried out in November 2005 resulted in the area east of Abbey Road in favour of the proposed CPZ and the area west of Abbey Road, High Path Estate supported yellow line restrictions. The results of the informal public consultation were reported to the Cabinet Street Management Committee on 8th February 2006 who approved the undertaking of the formal consultation.

Consultation
The formal consultation started on 16th March 2006 and concluded on 7th April 2006. It resulted in 32 representations and 1 petition.

In support – 14  Against – 15  3 representations from businesses making requests

- In favour of CPZ - 8
- In favour but with some objections - 6

- Against – 5 residential and 8 businesses (2 from Abbey Parade and 6 from Station Road businesses)
- Against waiting restrictions in their road – petition from Rodney Place
- Against waiting restrictions in their road – 2 from unadopted/unaffected road

The new Ward Members were invited to discuss the proposals and a meeting took place on 21st June 2006 when only one Ward Councillor attended. Officers explained the situation and the proposed measures were discussed. The Councillor did not present an opinion for or against the proposed measures. Following further correspondences concerns raised by another Ward Councillor were addressed (details in section 4.8 of the main body of report)

Recommendation
In light of the representations received, the proposed measures have been modified and would therefore require a further formal consultation. The formal consultation would include:

- The introduction of a Controlled Parking Zone (SW) in High Path area, comprising of Mill Road; Abbey Road; Dane Road; Meadow Road; Croft Road and Abbey Parade (Merton High Street between Mill Road and Abbey Road), as detailed on plan Z78/127/01D attached as Appendix 1).
- The introduction of double yellow lines at all the identified junctions and other key locations on the west side of the proposed SW Zone as detailed on drawing Z78/127/01D (Appendix 1).
- The legalisation of the footway parking on the south side of Abbey Road outside Lovell House.
- The reduction of the extent of the existing single yellow line restrictions Mon - Sat 8.00am - 6.30pm on Pincott Road and Nelson Grove Road, as shown on drawing Z78/127/01D.
SUBJECT: Proposed Waiting restrictions in Watery Lane – Result of formal consultation

LEAD OFFICER: Richard Rawes, Director of Environment & Regeneration

LEAD MEMBER: Councillor Tariq Ahmad, Environment & Street Management

KEY DECISION REFERENCE NUMBER: N/A

RECOMMENDATIONS:

That the Street Management Advisory Committee recommends that Cabinet Member considers the issues detailed in this report and:

1) Notes the result of the formal consultation carried out in March 2006 to extend the existing double yellow lines (waiting restrictions) on both sides of Watery Lane as per plan Z78/105/03A attached as appendix 1.

2) Notes and considers the representations received in respect of the proposals and officers’ comments as detailed in Appendix 2.

3) Agrees to proceed with the making of the traffic Management Order and to implement the amended proposal as shown on plan Z78/105/03A attached as Appendix 1.

4) Agrees to exercise its discretion to not hold a public inquiry on the consultation process.

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 This report brings to the Street Management Advisory Committee’s attention the current parking conditions in Watery Lane. It sets out the background to the consideration of extending the existing double yellow lines and details the results of the formal consultation carried out in March 2006 on the proposals with residents and the Ward Members.

1.2 It recommends that the Cabinet Member:

- notes the representations received and officers’ comments as detailed in section 4 of this report.

- Considers the objections against the proposed restrictions and the argument for their implementation and agrees to the making of the Traffic Management Order and the implementation of the proposed restrictions in Watery Lane. See plan Z78/105/03A attached as appendix 1.
2. INTRODUCTION

2.1 It is Council policy to improve the environment by regulating the number of parked vehicles in the area, thereby improving safety and access for all road users. The key objective of the proposal to introduce the recommended restriction in Watery Lane is to improve safety and vehicular access.

2.2 The purpose of double yellow line restrictions is to maintain visibility and access at all times and provide safe conditions for all road users. Section 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 provide suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway" when exercising any of its functions under the Act. Road safety is therefore a matter that the Council pays regard to when considering whether to make an Order under s.6 of the Act.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 In February 2006, the problem of obstructive parking was brought to the Council’s attention by one of the Ward Councillors who reported that at one of the meetings with the local residents the residents of Watery Lane demonstrated concerns about vehicles parking along Watery Lane within the bend causing sightline problems and obstruction to flow of traffic and access to their properties. It has been reported that the problem becomes worse during the day when vehicles are parked on the unrestricted section of this road just beyond the junction of Church Path. The reason being that the road is narrow with a bend and parking on certain sections of this road prevents flow of traffic and obscures sightlines.

3.2 It was suggested by the Ward Member that white lines be laid to prevent parking. Upon a site visit it was found that white lines are already in place, albeit faded but still visible. Following an exchange of correspondence all Ward Members agreed that the best course of action would be to extend the existing double yellow lines and that the informal and formal consultation be rolled into one.

3.3 Watery Lane is a relatively narrow road of varying width with 3.8m at its narrowest section. It is a cul-de-sac and provides vehicular access from The Rush to Manor Gardens and the properties along Watery Lane. In 2004 the Cabinet member for Community Services and Community Engagement approved a proposal to extend MP1 controlled parking zone to include The Rush and the introduction of ‘At any time' waiting restrictions on both sides to the south of its junction with Church Path. The residents of Watery Lane rejected the CPZ and any further restrictions. At that time it was considered that due to the narrow nature of the road vehicles would not park, as it would cause obstruction and therefore, the restrictions stopped short of the bend. However, due to the increase in demand for parking it appears that vehicles are now parking in this road causing obstruction to the flow of traffic.

3.4 The Head of Street Management (under delegated powers) approved the undertaking of the formal consultation to implement “At time waiting restrictions” in Watery Lane as per the attached plan Z78/105/03 (Appendix 2). The consultation
was carried out by means of distributing a newsletter (attached as appendix 2) to all the premises in the consultation area. It detailed the Council’s intentions and the undertaking of the formal consultation on the proposed restrictions and invited all to make representations. Within the same newsletter advice was given with regards to making representations with the closing date of 24th March 2006. The Notices were also erected on lamp columns in the area and published in the Local Guardian and the London Gazette. The documents were also available at the Civic Centre. This formed part of the Formal consultation.

3.5 The formal consultation resulted in 5 objections. These objections are detailed in section 4 of this report.

4. RESULT OF FORMAL CONSULTATION

4.1 The formal consultation concluded on 24th March 2006 and the following 5 objections were received.

4.2.1 22005572 – Watery Lane, SW20 9AD
There are already double yellow lines. While I agree with the idea of double yellow lines, there is no need to go any further than the current extent immediately outside No 18 Watery Lane. Your proposal is too far. This section is becoming difficult to park in at times and the proposal would mean loss of parking space. The double yellow should not exceed past the outer gatepost of the school vehicle entrance. This will maintain access and parking.

Officer’s Comments
The existing double yellow lines do not cover the area suffering from obstructive parking i.e. they do not extend as far as No 18 as the objector states. The existing double yellow lines only cover the Manor Gardens/Watery Lane/Church Path junction as shown on the plan. The road markings that the objector is referring to are white lines, which are advisory and therefore not enforceable. Considering the objections received, it is considered reasonable to reduce the extent of the proposed double yellow lines by approximately 3.3m as shown on the revised plan Z78/105/03A (appendix 1).

4.2.2 22005570 - Watery Lane, SW20 9AD
You are correct in saying that there is obstructive parking, but this is taking place at the bend. Keep ugly yellow lines to a minimum. In all my time here I have never seen vehicles parked in the narrow section. If after say a year the lane becomes obstructed then the yellow line should be extended.

Officer’s Comments
The extent of the proposed double yellow lines have been kept to a minimum. Due to the high demand for parking and the neighbouring CPZ, obstructive parking is taking place and will continue to take place. Prior to the consultation, the extent of the proposed double yellow lines were agreed with the one of the Ward Councillors who brought this issue to our attention and requested that an immediate action be taken.
4.2.3  22005607 - Watery Lane, SW20 9AD
I live directly opposite the proposed yellow lines. Although I agree with some of the comments in the newsletter, the real problem only occurs during the day when 3 or 4 cars frequently park there all day. Our family problem is when we leave our property and our gate opens directly onto Watery Lane, so these cars do cause a problem. The double yellow lines will cause problems for my family and Nos 12, 14 and 17. This area is used for my / family / friends picking up and dropping off purposes. Delivery vehicles also stop here to load / unload. How do I move furniture from my front door to my car. When gardening, we park here to load. We do not want double yellow lines, would prefer single yellow line that would deter all day commuter parking but would enable us to still use the area as we have done for many years.

Officer’s Comments
The purpose of the proposed double yellow lines is to remove obstructive parking regardless of who causes it. Loading / unloading is permitted for up to 20 minutes on double yellow lines. This objector has off street parking facility and therefore the double yellow lines would have very little affect on their parking facilities. With regards to gates opening onto public highway, Section 153 Highways Act 1980 prohibits the opening of gates, doors etc onto the highway. This infringement has been referred to the Highway team for the appropriate action.

4.2.4  22005613 - Watery Lane, SW20 9AA
I oppose the double yellow lines. Parking in Watery Lane and Manor Gardens is a problem – the extension of double yellow lines will add to the problem. The Rush has parking restrictions and the car user dealership abuses parking in the surrounding roads. The Rush is not policed and the double yellow lines will not be policed. Because The Rush is full, one of the businesses parks his van here. Please revisit the parking problem caused by the car dealership – currently they have 6 cars parked in Manor Gardens. I suggest that you - (1) place some resident parking bays at Church Path junction and (2) consult all the residents with CPZ.

Officer’s Comments
The comments regarding enforcement have been passed to Parking Services. The problem with the car dealer ship has been passed to the District Officers. Both of these issues have already been highlighted by the Ward Member. This area was consulted on a CPZ proposal and was rejected. Since the implementation of the CPZ in Merton Park the Council have not had any requests/ petitions with regards to a CPZ for Watery Lane and Manor Gardens. Should the Council receive a petition requesting a CPZ, this area will be added to the programme for investigation.

4.2.5  22005545 - Watery Lane, SW20 9AD
I am familiar with the patterns of vehicle movements and use. No one that I am aware of between Nos 16 and 36 Watery Lane owns and parks more than one car on the highway. Even so all the spaces between the school crossover and the semi circular area is mostly full with residents cars. The proposed double yellow lines involves the loss of one parking space and I request that the lines be stopped short
of the crossover to the school. Vehicles rarely travel at more than 15mph and so the issue of vision from the school entrance looking west is not a major safety issue.

**Officer’s Comments**
Upon further considerations it is deemed feasible to reduce the extent of the proposed double yellow lines by 3.3m so that the proposed double yellow lines terminate at 1.5m past the tangent point at the crossover to the school as shown on the revised plan Z78/105/03A (appendix 1). This has been discussed with Merton Park Ward Councillors.

5. **RECOMMENDATION**

5.1 It is considered that the proposed ‘At any time’ waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) will alleviate the obstructive problems and the concerns raised by the residents through their Ward Councillor. It is recommended that the above representations be considered; the extent of the proposed double yellow lines be amended to reflect the new definition as detailed below and as shown on plan Z78/105/03A; the Traffic Management Order be made and the amended proposed restrictions as detailed on plan Z27/418/3A be implemented.

Definition - From a point 10m south of the southern kerb line of Manor Gardens to a point 3.1m south west of the party wall of Nos. 16 and 18 Watery Lane.

The proposed double yellow lines are being reduced by 3.3m and it is not considered necessary to undertake a further formal consultation. This is supported by the Ward Councillors.

5.2 In deciding whether or not to implement the proposed waiting restrictions, the Cabinet Member will need to consider the following:

- **On site conditions** – there is a high level of demand for on street parking from residents, businesses and visitors. Watery Lane is a narrow lane and accommodates a bend. It is considered the proposed measures will improve safety and access.

- **Council’s duties and powers** – Section 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 Act. Road safety is therefore a matter that the Council should pay regard to when considering making an Order under S.6 of the Act.

5.3 Considering the benefits of the proposed waiting restrictions and the Council’s duty and responsibilities under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, it is recommended that the representations are considered and the implementation of the proposals contained in this report are approved.

5.4 If agreed, the measures can be implemented 6 weeks after the making of the TMO.
6. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

6.1 The cost of implementing the scheme is estimated at £2,500. This includes the making of the Traffic Management Order and the road markings. It does not cover staff costs.

6.2 The set up costs for the proposals will be funded from the Capital budget identified for controlled parking zones.

7. **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS & STATUTORY PROVISION**

7.1 The Traffic Management Orders would be made under Section 6, and 124 and Part IV of Schedule 9 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.

7.2 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.

8. **HUMAN RIGHTS & EQUALITIES**

8.1 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 are given consideration but it is considered that maintaining safe access must take priority.

8.2 Bodies representing motorists, including commuters are included in the statutory consultation required for draft traffic management and similar orders.

8.3 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.

8.4 By maintaining clear access points, sightlines will improve thereby improving the safety at junctions; bends and along narrow sections of a road and subsequently reducing the risk of accidents.

9. **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS**

9.1 To retain the exiting white road markings; however, due to the high demand for parking this has proven ineffective.
10. RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

10.1 The risk in not introducing the proposed waiting restrictions would be that the existing access and sightline difficulties will not be addressed and the potential accidents as a direct result of obstruction and obscured sightlines. These safety implications will affect all road users particularly vulnerable road users. Double yellow lines will remove the risk of obscured sightlines and obstruction, and will subsequently improve safety and access. Not addressing the access issues could lead to loss of public’s confidence in the Council.

10.2 The introduction of the waiting restrictions will lead to loss of parking spaces. The risk of introducing the proposed restrictions could lead to possible extra pressure on the current parking demand. It is, however, considered to be an acceptable risk, compared to the risk presented by possible obstructive parking and it is considered that the risks of not introducing the measures outweigh the risks of introducing the proposed restrictions.

10.3 All works will be carried out in accordance with the Health and Safety at Work Act and the Construction Design and Management Regulations.

APPENDICES – The following appendices form part of this report:

Appendix 1 – Amended Plan Z78/105/03A showing layout of proposed restrictions.
Appendix 2 – Copy of formal consultation newsletter & Plan Z78/105/03
Appendix 3 - photographic evidence of obstructive parking

BACKGROUND PAPERS - The papers used to compile this report is:
Delegated report to head of Street Management dated 14th February 2006.

OFFICER CONTACTS: If you have any queries regarding this scheme please contact Mitra Dubet either by phone on 020 8545 3201 or via e-mail at mitra.dubet@merton.gov.uk

Further information about Merton Council can be obtained from its web site www.merton.gov.uk

Press Contact: Gareth Greene, 020 8545 3483, gareth.greene@merton.gov.uk
Dear Residents/Business

In February 2006, the problem of obstructive parking was brought to the Council’s attention by one of the Ward Councillors who reported that at their monthly meeting with local residents, the residents of Watery Lane expressed concerns about vehicles parking along Watery Lane within the bend causing sightline problems, obstruction to flow of traffic and potential danger to pedestrians. It has been reported that the problem is worse during the day when vehicles are parked on the unrestricted section of this road just beyond the junction of Church Path. Here, the road is narrow with a bend and parking on certain sections obstructs vehicular access.

It was suggested by the Ward Members that white lines be laid to discourage parking. Upon a site visit it was found that white lines are already in place, albeit faded but still visible. Following a series of correspondences all Ward Members agreed that the best course of action would be to extend the existing double yellow lines, subject to consultation.

Watery Lane is a relatively narrow road measuring 3.8m at its narrowest section. It is a cul-de-sac and provides vehicular access from The Rush to Manor Gardens and the properties along Watery Lane. In 2004 the Cabinet member for Community Services and Community Engagement approved a proposal to extend MP1 controlled parking zone to include The Rush and the introduction of ‘At any time’ waiting restrictions on both sides to the south of its junction with Church Path. The residents of Watery Lane and Manor Gardens had earlier rejected the CPZ and any further restrictions. At that time it was considered that due to the narrow nature of the road vehicles would not park, as it would cause obstruction and therefore, the restrictions stopped short of the bend. However, due to the increase in demand for parking it appears that vehicles are now parking in this road causing obstruction to the flow of traffic.

It is considered that the proposed ‘At any time’ waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) will alleviate the obstructive problems and the concerns raised by residents.

What happens next

The Council is now undertaking a formal consultation to implement the proposal. The outcome of this formal consultation will be reported to the Head of Street Management for a decision whether or not to implement the proposals.

An advert for the Traffic Management Order will be published in the local newspapers and posted on lamp columns in the area. We urge anyone who is either in favour or against the proposals to make representations in writing:

The Head of Traffic & Parking Section, Merton Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, Surrey, SM4 5DX by no later than 24th March 2006, quoting reference ES/SGE/WL.

A copy of the notice, a plan identifying the area affected, and the Council’s Statement of Reasons can be inspected at Merton Link in Merton Civic Centre (Monday to Friday 9am - 5pm) and Wimbledon Reference Library. Alternatively, you can logon to the Council’s website on www.merton.gov.uk/waterylane

Please note that no response will be made to representations until a decision is made. Anyone who opposes the scheme must state the grounds on which their objection is made. We also welcome representations in support.

We would like to thank you for the feedback provided on the initial proposals.

Please let us have your views, they are important and will have a bearing upon the decision made.

Merton Park Ward Councillors:
Cllr. Jillian Ashton
Tel. 020 8543 6905
Cllr. John Nelson-Jones
Tel. 020 8542 1686
Cllr. Peter Southgate
Tel. 020 8542 2053

For more information, please contact Mitra Dubet
Tel. 020 8545 3201
email: mitra.dubet@merton.gov.uk

Issue Date : 27th February 2006
Appendix 3

Watery Lane

February 2006
Proposed Waiting restrictions in Watery Lane – Result of formal consultation

Purpose of the report
This report details the result of the formal consultation that was carried out in March 2006 on proposals to extend the existing double yellow lines (waiting restrictions) on both sides of Watery Lane as per plan Z78/105/03A attached as appendix 1.

It seeks approval to make the Traffic management Order and introduce the double yellow lines.

Reasons for the scheme
Watery Lane is narrow with a bend and parking on certain sections of this road prevents flow of traffic and obscures sightlines. In February 2006, the problem of obstructive parking was brought to the Council’s attention by one of the Ward Councillors who reported that at one of the meetings with the local residents the residents of Watery Lane demonstrated concerns about vehicles parking along Watery Lane within the bend causing sightline problems and obstruction to flow of traffic and access to their properties.

It is considered that the proposed double yellow lines will alleviate the obstructive parking and improve safety/access.

Consultation
The formal consultation started during March 2006. It resulted in 5 objections from Watery Lane residents. The results were summerised and forwarded to the Ward Councillors and it was mutually agreed that Watery Lane would benefit from the proposed double yellow line restrictions.

Recommendation
In light of the representations received, it is proposed to modify the proposed measures by reducing the extent of the proposed double yellow line restrictions.

Considering the benefits of the proposed waiting restrictions and the Council’s duty and responsibilities under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, it is recommended that the representations are considered and the implementation of the proposed double yellow lines is approved.

All 3 Ward Councillors have been involved in this project and are aware of the objections and Officers’ recommendation and they acknowledge the need for the proposed restrictions.
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NAME : ____________________________________________________________

DATE : ____________________________________________________________
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EXISTENCE OF INTEREST : PERSONAL / PREJUDICIAL
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ADVICE TO MEMBERS ON DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

1. Do you have a personal interest in any matter on the agenda?
   You will have a personal interest if (for example) :-

   (a) The report relates to something, which you have already registered on the Register of Interests. The Register of Interests will include your employment; business; corporate bodies (companies) in which you have shares (with a nominal value of over £25k or 1:100 of the share capital); contracts with the Council; paid directorships; land or property in which you have an interest (includes freehold, leasehold, tenancy or licence over 28 days) or any partnership or company in which you are involved, or

   (b) A decision on the matter may be regarded as affecting your well being or that of a friend or relative of yours to a greater extent than it will affect the well-being of others living/working in the Borough.

   Note : A decision on the matter may be regarded as affecting the well being of one of the following; you; or your relative or your partner, or any employment / business / partnership / Directorship / company in which you or they have a share (exceeding £5k),bodies where you represent the Council, other public bodies, charity, bodies whose purpose is to influence the Council or Trade Unions or professional association.

2. If you have a personal interest
   You should state this at the beginning of the meeting (or as soon as you realise you have one during the meeting). You need to state the item the interest relates to, the nature of the interest (i.e. that it is personal) and why you have a personal interest (i.e. the facts which give rise to the interest).

   You may stay throughout the meeting, take part in the debate and vote unless the interest is also prejudicial.

3. When will a Member’s personal interest also be prejudicial?
   A personal interest will be prejudicial when the interest is such that it may reasonably be regarded by the public as significant enough that it is likely to prejudice judgement of the public interest.

   However, it may not be prejudicial if it arises because of your involvement in another public authority, or any body to which you have been appointed by the Council, or the housing functions of the Council where you are a tenant/leaseholder (provided you are not in arrears of rent/service charge and the decision does not relate directly to your property); or the decision relates to school meals, travel, etc and you are a parent/governor at a school (unless your child attends that school); or the matter relates to Member’s allowances. In these cases Members should consider whether there are any other facts which would still warrant declaring the interest as prejudicial.

4. If your personal interest is also prejudicial
   The Member must state that as well as personal the interest is prejudicial and at the point the item is discussed should leave the room. The Member may return once that agenda item (or items) is concluded.