

# **Merton Council Council**

**2 April 2014**

## **Public questions**

- |   |  |       |
|---|--|-------|
| 5 | Public Questions to Cabinet Members (including supplemental questions) | 1 - 4 |
|---|--|-------|

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Council 2 April 2014 Public questions**

### **Procedure**

The Mayor will call your name and ask if you have a supplementary question arising from the answer you have received.

If you do not have a supplementary question then simply respond thank you, no.

If you do have a supplementary question respond thank you, yes. You will be shown to a seat in the chamber where you will ask your supplementary question. Make sure you use the microphone.

Having put your question, please be seated whilst the Cabinet member responds.

Once the response has been given, please return to your seat in the public gallery.

The questions and answers and all supplementary questions and replies will be published on Merton's website after the meeting.

**From Charles Bush  
To the Cabinet Member for Environmental Sustainability and Regeneration  
Question**

What plans do the Council have to ensure that the traffic changes envisaged under the mini-Holland Scheme do not result in residential roads, like Gladstone Road, becoming "rat runs" for traffic heading to the South Wimbledon area.

**Reply**

There is no basis whatsoever, beyond scaremongering, for suggesting that the Mini Holland bid proposals, which were signed up to in detail by all political groups on the Council, will lead to residential roads becoming 'rat runs'. All our proposals to date have been subject to scrutiny by independent expert traffic consultants as well as advice from Merton Council officers.

Whilst Merton has not be selected for full mini-Holland status, the borough's submission has been the subject of praise from the Mayor and Andrew Gilligan, the Mayor's Cycling Commissioner, and the Council will remain part of the mini-Holland programme. The commitment has also been made that substantial public funds will be provided to deliver some of the schemes included in the bid. We are expecting early discussions with Andrew Gilligan and TfL on the funding and the schemes to which they will be applied.

It is important to emphasise that the projects forming part of the mini-Holland programme will be subject to detailed design, testing and consultation with residents and businesses to ensure that the proposals work and are fully supported locally.

**From Daniel Holden  
To the Cabinet Member for Environmental Cleanliness and Parking**

**Question**

"Many residents in flats in Hillside ward are being penalised on parking issues by planning rules saying they can't apply for permits. Until recently many could park nearby. This means they have to move their cars further away even though some roads nearby do have spaces, what will this council do to help these hardworking people?"

**Reply**

In line with the Mayor of London's London Plan, the council can grant planning permission on condition that new residents do not receive an on-street parking permit from the council. New residents should be aware via their purchase that the property will not be eligible for a council parking permit.

One of the main reasons for permit free parking is to protect existing residents from excessive parking and congestion. If landowners choose not to provide parking on-site then it is important that the council takes some action to prevent established residential areas from excessive parking and the conflict this can cause.

The alternative is for the council to issue more parking permits than there are parking places. If permits were offered to properties that are currently permit-free, even if it was for parking zones further away that are currently perceived to have capacity, local residents in these further away areas would be disadvantaged by the added parked vehicles and local congestion this approach would bring.

### **Supplementary Question**

Thank you for your answer, but you didn't fully answer the question. What we wanted was some method to help residents that have been trapped by changes in policy over the years, when once they were OK but subsequent changes have affected them and that's why it was we were seeking an answer to rather than just an explanation of the London Plan. Is there anything we can do maybe changing permits similar to what teachers have or possibly changing a few of the business ones where they are available permits and switching those for those residents who have been trapped by these rule changes?

### **Reply**

I think that would be difficult because permit free developments are quintessentially where there is already high demand for parking by existing residents and where the planning process is required that the development is permit free in order to get planning permission, so to offer spaces even on a permanent basis like school permits to those new residents coming into a new area with new developments would firstly undermine the process and decisions that have been made very often by committees and certainty around that and make it difficult for future planning applications but could also undermine the whole system of controlled parking where residents themselves have elected to have charges but I wholly understand your concern because residents do have parking needs and it is something we have to continue to be watchful of and if any new solution was to offer itself that doesn't increase problematic parking in existing areas we would be open to it.

This page is intentionally left blank