

CORPORATE SERVICES DEPARTMENT
Director – Caroline Holland



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

**Direct Line: 0208 545 3616
Email:
democratic.services@merton.gov.uk**

Date: 14 APRIL 2016

Dear Councillor

**Notification of a Decision taken by the Cabinet Member for
Environmental Sustainability and Regeneration**

The attached **Non-Key** decision has been taken by the Cabinet Member for Environmental Sustainability and Regeneration, with regards to:

- Proposed MTC CPZ (Langdale Avenue area, Mitcham Town Centre) Informal Consultation

and will be implemented at **Noon on Tuesday, 19 April 2016** unless a call-in request is received.

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

Yours sincerely

**Chris Pedlow
Democracy Services**

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

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

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

Proposed MTC CPZ (Langdale Avenue area, Mitcham Town Centre) Informal Consultation

2. Decision maker

Councillor Andrew Judge, Cabinet Member for Environmental Sustainability and Regeneration

3. Date of Decision

12-04-2016

4. Date report made available to decision maker

12-04-2016

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

6. Decision

A) I note the results of the informal consultation carried out between 14 January and 12 February 2016 on the proposals to introduce a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) MTC to include Albert Road, Elmwood Road, Langdale Avenue and Whitford Gardens.

B) I agree to proceed with a statutory consultation, to include Albert Road, Elmwood Road, Langdale Avenue and Whitford Gardens, into the proposed MTC CPZ, operational Monday to Saturday, between 8.30am and 11pm as shown in Drawing No. Z78-233-01 in *Appendix 1*.

C) I agree to exercise my discretion not to hold a public inquiry on the consultation



7. Reason for decision

Because the majority who expressed a view in the informal consultation supported this approach and in order to address obstructive parking as well as to increase the ability of residents to park their vehicles.

8. Alternative options considered and why rejected

Doing nothing: would not meet residents' concerns as expressed in the petition and the response to consultation.

9. Documents relied on in addition to officer report

10. Declarations of Interest

11. Publication of this decision and call in provision

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

*There is no need to resend Street Management Advisory Committee reports.

Notes

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

If the issue has been to Street Management Advisory Committee you may be able to use the same report to that committee together with the minute of the relevant discussion as the basis for the decision.

Otherwise you must complete an officer report for any non-key Cabinet member decision just as if the report was going to Cabinet. Use the standard [Committee report template](#) and change the first heading 'Committee' to 'Cabinet Member'.

Note on exempt information in reports

Rules regarding exempt information are the same as for Committee reports. Exempt information should be published in a separate appendix where possible. Where this is not possible the whole report will need to be exempt and the reason for exemption should be shown on the decision form. A reason for exemption must also be given in the report. If the decision form contains exempt information a redacted copy for publication must be made available.

(Constitution part 4B Section 10)

2 Decision maker

The title of the Cabinet member making the decision. Currently (2 April 2009) only the Cabinet Member for Planning and Traffic Management has a delegated authority to make individual decisions.

3 Date of Decision and 4 Date report made available to decision maker

You should advise the decision maker to allow three clear normal working days* between the receipt of the report and taking the decision. This shows that they have given due consideration to the issues.

(Constitution Part 4B Section 22.1).

* Clear days exclude the days of publication and decision so day 1 = publication, clear days 2, 3 and 4, decision day 5.

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

You must make the report available to the Chairs of the Commission and any relevant panel as soon as practicable after making it available to the decision maker.

(Constitution Part 4B Section 22.2)

6 Decision

Record the proposed action and advise the decision maker to make any amendments here.

7 Reason for decision

If the reason for the decision is entirely contained in the officer report then you can say so. If there are reasons which are not included in that report – for example if the recommendations are rejected in favour of another course of action – then this reasoning should be shown here.

8 Alternative options considered and why rejected

The report should have examined alternative options and given reasons for rejection of these or it may have presented alternative options with an either/or option. The decision maker may reject the recommendations in the report in favour of another course of action in which case the recommendations themselves were a possible alternative and a reason for their rejection should be explained. Doing nothing is an alternative option that should be considered.

9 Documents relied on in addition to officer report

This may be any document which does not form part of the report or its appendices but which contains relevant information. For example, an Act of Parliament, Statutory Guidance issued by a Government Minister or some other public domain document. If the documents are part of the Council's records consider whether to produce them or excerpts from them as part of the report or an exempt appendix.

10 Declarations of Interest

If the decision maker has an interest it must be declared. Not all interests will preclude the decision maker from proceeding but failing to declare an interest could be a breach of the Members Code of Conduct. Check with the Monitoring Officer or Head of Civic and Legal Services for further advice.

(Constitution Part 5A)

11 Publication of this decision and call in provision

The decision cannot be enacted until noon on the third working following publication to allow time for a possible call-in. Check with Democratic Services for the publication date.

If the decision is called in by the deadline the decision cannot then be acted upon until the rest of the call-in procedure has been completed.

(Constitution Part 4E Section 16(c) & (d))

If the decision is urgent and cannot be delayed for the call-in procedure to be completed please contact Democratic Services regarding the call-in and urgency procedure.

(Constitution Part 4E Section 17)

Committee: Cabinet Member Report

Date: 07th April 2016

Agenda item:

Wards: Figge's Marsh

Subject: Proposed MTC CPZ (Langdale Avenue Area, Mitcham Town Centre) – Informal consultation

Lead officer: Chris Lee, Director of Environment & Regeneration

Lead member: Councillor Andrew Judge, Cabinet Member for Environmental Sustainability and Regeneration

Forward Plan reference number: N/A

Contact Officer: Barry Copestake; Tel 020 8545 3840

Email: barry.copestake@merton.gov.uk

Recommendations:

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

- A) Notes the results of the informal consultation carried out between 14 January and 12 February 2016 on the proposals to introduce a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) MTC to include Albert Road, Elmwood Road, Langdale Avenue and Whitford Gardens.
 - B) Agrees to proceed with a statutory consultation, to include Albert Road, Elmwood Road, Langdale Avenue and Whitford Gardens, into the proposed MTC CPZ, operational Monday to Saturday, between 8.30am and 11pm as shown in Drawing No. Z78-233-01 in *Appendix 1*.
 - C) Agrees to exercise his discretion not to hold a public inquiry on the consultation process.
-

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report presents the results of the informal consultation carried on the Councils' proposals to introduce a CPZ in the Langdale Avenue area of Mitcham, to include Albert Road, Elmwood Road, Langdale Avenue and Whitford Gardens.
- 1.2 It seeks approval to proceed with a statutory consultation to include Albert Road, Elmwood Road, Langdale Avenue and Whitford Gardens into the proposed MTC CPZ, operational Monday to Saturday between 8.30am and 11pm as shown in Drawing No.Z78-233-01 in *Appendix 1*.

2. DETAILS

- 2.1 The key objectives of parking management include:
 - Tackling of congestion by reducing the level and impact of traffic in town centres and residential areas;
 - Making the borough's streets safer and more secure, particularly for pedestrians and other vulnerable road users through traffic management measures;

- Managing better use of street spaces for people, goods and services, ensuring that priority is allocated to meet the objectives of the strategy;
- Improving the attractiveness and amenity of the borough's streets, particularly in town centres and residential areas;
- Encouraging the use of more sustainable modes of transport.

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

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

Pay and display shared use/permit holder bays: - For use by pay and display customers and permit holders.

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

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

2.5 The CPZ design comprises mainly of permit holder bays to be used by residents, their visitors or business permit holders and a limited number of pay and display shared use bays, which are mainly located near businesses. The layout of the parking bays are arranged in a manner that provides the maximum number of suitable parking spaces without jeopardising road safety and the free movement of traffic.

3. INFORMAL CONSULTATION

3.1 The Council received a petition on 18 March 2015 from the residents of Langdale Avenue requesting a CPZ in their road, see *Appendix 4*.

3.2 The informal consultation on proposals to introduce parking controls in the Langdale Avenue area commenced on 14 January 2016 and ended on 12 February 2016. 259 premises were consulted via documents containing a newsletter explaining the proposals; an associated plan showing the proposed parking layout and a sheet of frequently asked questions. Residents were directed to the Council website to fill in the online questionnaire. A copy of the consultation document is attached as *Appendix 2*. The consultation document was posted to all households and businesses within the catchment area.

- 3.3 Notification of the proposals along with the web link to the online questionnaire (e-form) was also posted on the Council’s website showing the parking controls within the zone including the following:
- ‘At any time’ double yellow lines at key locations such as at junctions, bends, and ends of cul-de-sacs;
 - Single yellow lines (mainly between parking bays and across dropped kerbs);
 - Permit holder bays for use by residents, businesses and their visitor.
- 3.4 The consultation resulted in a total of 53 questionnaires returned (after removing duplicates / multiple returns from some households), representing a response rate of 21%. A summary table of the results is attached as *Appendix 3*. See plan below showing the extent of the consultation.



3.5 As shown in table 1 below, of the 53 who responded, 62% support a CPZ in their road, compared to 32% who do not and 6% who are unsure.

Table 1 – summary of results to question: Do you support a CPZ?

ROAD	DO YOU SUPPORT A CPZ					
	YES	NO	UNDECIDED	% YES	% NO	% UNSURE
Albert Road	12	7	1	60%	35%	5%
Elmwood Road	0	0	0	Nil	Nil	Nil
Langdale Avenue	10	10	0	50%	50%	Nil
Whitford Gardens	11	0	2	85%	Nil	15%
London Road	0	0	0	Nil	Nil	Nil
Total	33	17	3	62%	32%	6%

3.6 Residents were also asked which days of operation they would prefer if a CPZ was introduced in their road. Results show that 24% of respondents prefer Mon – Fri, 45% support Mon - Sat and 31% prefer Mon – Sun as shown in table 2.

Table 2 – summary of results to question: Preferred days of operation?

ROAD	PREFERRED HOURS OF OPERATION						
	MON - FRI	MON - SAT	MON - SUN	UNDECIDED	% MON - FRI	% MON - SAT	% MON - SUN
Albert Road	5	11	4	0	25%	55%	20%
Elmwood Road	0	0	0	0	Nil	Nil	Nil
Langdale Avenue	3	7	6	4*	15%	35%	30%
Whitford Gardens	4	4	5	0	31%	31%	38%
London Road	0	0	0	0	Nil	Nil	Nil
Total	12	22	15	4**	24%	45%	31%

* Percentage not illustrated ** Excluded from total

3.7 Residents were further asked which hours of operation they would prefer should the CPZ be introduced in their road. Results show that 59% of respondents prefer 8.30am – 11pm, while 25% prefer 8.30am – 6.30pm and 16% prefer 10am – 4pm. As shown in table 3.

Table 3 – summary of results to question: Preferred hours of operation?

ROAD	PREFERRED HOURS OF OPERATION						
	8.30am - 11pm	8.30am – 6.30pm	10am – 4pm	UNDECIDED	% 8.30am – 11pm	% 8.30am – 6.30pm	% 10am – 4pm
Albert Road	9	5	6	0	45%	25%	30%
Elmwood Road	0	0	0	0	Nil	Nil	Nil
Langdale Avenue	11	3	2	4*	55%	15%	10%
Whitford Gardens	9	4	0	0	69	31%	Nil
London Road	0	0	0	0	Nil	Nil	Nil
Total	29	12	8	4**	59%	25%	16%

* Percentage not illustrated ** Excluded from total

3.8 Ward Councillor Comment

All local ward Councillors have been fully engaged during the consultation process and they are supportive of the recommendations made in this report.

4. PROPOSED MEASURES

4.1 Based on the informal consultation results it is recommended that a statutory consultation be carried out to include Albert Road, Elmwood Road, Langdale Avenue and Whitford Gardens into the proposed MTC CPZ, operational Monday to Saturday between 8.30am and 11pm as shown in Drawing No.Z78-233-01 in Appendix 1.

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

4.3 An element of pay and display parking to facilitate visitors / shoppers to the area for local amenities will be included as part of the proposals.

4.4 Hours of operation

The majority of respondents favoured a proposed MTC CPZ to operate Monday to Saturday between the hours of 8.30am and 11pm.

4.5 Permit issue criteria

It is proposed that the residents' permit parking provision should be identical to that offered in other controlled parking zones in Merton at the time of consultation. The cost of the first permit in each household is £65 per annum; the second permit is £110 and the third permit cost is £140. An annual Visitor permit cost is £140.

4.6 Visitors' permits

All-day Visitor permits are £2.50 and half-day permits at £1.50. Half-day permits can be used between 8.30am & 2pm or 12pm & 6.30pm. The allowance of visitor permits per adult in a household shall be 50 full-day permits, 100 half-day permits or a combination of the two.

4.7 Pay and display parking

To provide parking availability for visitors to the local amenities pay and display will be proposed with a tariff of £1.20p per hour, with a minimum payment of 40p for 20 minutes. Maximum stay for pay and display parking will be 4 hours.

5. **TIMETABLE**

- 5.1 The statutory consultation will be carried out soon after a decision is made. The consultation will include the erection of the Notices on lamp columns in the area; the publication of Council's intentions in the Local Guardian and the London Gazette. The documents will also be available at the Link, Civic Centre and on the website. A newsletter will also be distributed to all consultees. It will detail the result of the informal consultation; Council's intention of undertaking the statutory consultation on the proposed parking controls.

6. **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS**

- 6.1 Do nothing. This would not address the current parking demands of the residents in respect of their views expressed during the informal consultation, as well as the Council's duty to provide a safe environment for all road users.

7 **FINANCIAL RESOURCE AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS**

- 7.1 The cost of implementing the proposed measures is estimated at £15k. This includes the publication of the made Traffic Management Orders and the appropriate road markings and signage. This will be met by the Environment and Regeneration revenue budget for Parking Management schemes.

8. **LEGAL AND STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS**

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

- 8.3 The Council's powers to make Traffic Management Orders arise mainly under sections 6, 45, 46, 122 and 124 and schedules 1 and 9 of the RTRA 1984.

9. HUMAN RIGHTS & EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY COHENSION IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 The implementation of new CPZs and the subsequent changes to the original design affects all sections of the community especially the young and the elderly and assists in improving safety for all road users and achieves the transport planning policies of the government, the Mayor for London and the Borough.
- 9.2 By maintaining clear junctions, access and sightlines will improve, thereby improving the safety at junctions by reducing potential accidents.
- 9.3 The Council carries out careful consultation to ensure that all road users are given a fair opportunity to air their views and express their needs. The design of the scheme includes special consideration for the needs of people with blue badges, local residents, businesses as well as charitable and religious facilities. The needs of commuters are also given consideration but generally carry less weight than those of residents and local businesses.
- 9.4 Bodies representing motorists, including commuters are included in the statutory consultation required for draft traffic management and similar orders published in the local paper and London Gazette.

10. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATION

- 10.1 N/A

11. RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

- 11.1 The risk of not introducing the proposed parking arrangements is that the existing parking difficulties would continue and it would do nothing to assist the residents.
- 11.2 The risk in not addressing the issues from the informal consultation exercise would be the loss of confidence in the Council. The proposed measures may cause some dissatisfaction from those who have requested status quo or other changes that cannot be implemented but it is considered that the benefits of introducing the measures outweigh the risk of doing nothing.

12. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

- 12.1 When determining the type of parking places are to be designated on the highway, section 45(3) requires the Council to consider both the interests of traffic and those of the owners and occupiers of adjoining properties. In particular, the Council must have regard to: (a) the need for maintaining the free movement of traffic, (b) the need for maintaining reasonable access to premises, and (c) the extent to which off-street parking is available in the neighbourhood or if the provision of such parking is likely to be encouraged by designating paying parking places on the highway.
- 12.2 By virtue of section 122, the Council must exercise its powers under the RTRA 1984 so as to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and

other traffic including pedestrians, and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway. These powers must be exercised so far as practicable having regard to the following matters:

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

13. APPENDICES

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

Appendix 1 – Drawing No.Z78-233-01

Appendix 2 – Informal consultation document

Appendix 3 – Informal consultation results table

Appendix 4 – Petition: Request for a CPZ in Langdale Avenue

vehicles. It is also necessary to provide yellow lines (effective during the CPZ hours of operation or At Any time) where the kerb is lowered, i.e. at crossovers for driveways.

The key objective of managing parking is to reduce and control non-essential parking and assist the residents, short-term visitors and the local businesses. Within any CPZ, only those within the zone are entitled to permits. This means that long-term parkers will not be able to park within the permit bays during the operational times. An incremental pricing structure for 2nd and subsequent permits also assists in minimising the number of permits issued to individual residents and help discourage multiple car ownerships. CPZs comprise of various types of parking bays such as permit holder bays (for use by resident or business permit holders and those with visitor permits); shared use bays (for permit holders and pay and display) and pay and display only bays (permits are not valid).

Council appointed Civil Enforcement Officers will enforce the controls by issuing fines/Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs) to vehicles parked in contravention of the restrictions. Outside the controlled times the restrictions are not enforced. However, Civil Enforcement Officers will issue PCNs for any other parking contravention such as parking on double yellow lines, footways and parking across individual crossovers without the property owner's consent. The Council aims to reach a balance between the needs of the residents, businesses and the safety of all road users. In the event that the majority of those consulted do not support a CPZ in their road or area, and if the Cabinet Member agrees, officers may recommend that only the proposed double yellow lines identified at key locations are introduced to improve safety and maintain access.

PROPOSAL

The proposals include a number of provisions which are detailed below

Operational Hours - The choice of operational hours are explained below:

All Day Controls (8.30am - 6.30pm or 8.30 - 11pm) - This will provide maximum protection to the residents by removing short and long-term parking. It will, however, be less flexible for residents and their visitors who will need to obtain a visitor's permit from the resident they are visiting in order to park in the permit holder bays.

Part Time Controls (10am - 4pm) - These operating times offer less restrictions on residents and their visitors than 'all day' controls. It is still effective in preventing long-term parkers. However, it may encourage short-term parking by non residents or businesses, such as shoppers outside the operating times. Residents returning from work later in the afternoon may find less available parking in their street due to this.

However, it may encourage other short term parking outside the restricted time, by non-residents such as shoppers and non-residents who may also work their way around the 4 hours by moving their vehicles and then returning to park for the rest of the day.

The proposed operational days include:

Monday to Friday - This will offer more flexibility to residents and visitors at weekends. However it may encourage non residents, especially shoppers, to park on Saturdays, therefore reducing available parking for your visitors.

Monday to Saturday - Provides maximum protection to the residents. However, it will be more restrictive on visitors who would require a visitor's permit to park during the controlled times.

The Cost of the annual parking permits remains unchanged whether the CPZ operates all day or part time.

Parking Controls - The following are incorporated within the proposed measures:

- Double yellow lines at junctions, bends, ends of cul-de-sac and at strategic sections of the road to create passing gaps. (This will improve safety and

access at all times by reducing obstructive parking that is currently taking place)

- Shared Use Pay and Display bays are also proposed where it is necessary to allow non residents to pay for parking for a short period at specific locations such as near shops, schools, churches and also in areas for longer term parking where residents are not directly affected, to allow effective use of the bays. (This will increase the use of parking provisions in the area by pay and display customers whilst still maintaining parking facilities for permit holders)

LET US KNOW YOUR VIEWS

The decision on whether or not to proceed with the next step, which would involve a statutory consultation on the proposals, will be subject to the responses received during this consultation. We would ask that you submit your questionnaire online using this link www.merton.gov.uk/cpzmtc. The online system has been created to keep costs down and allow the Council to process your views more efficiently. Please let us have any comments or suggestions you may have by **12 February 2016**.

We regret that due to the number of responses received during an informal consultation of this size, it will not be possible to individually reply to each respondent. We welcome your comments on this proposal, which will be noted and included within the proposed measures where appropriate. It should be noted that subject to the responses received, a recommendation may be made to only include those roads where there is a majority in support of the proposals.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

It is envisaged that the results of the consultation along with officers' recommendations will be presented in a report to the Cabinet Member for Environmental Sustainability and Regeneration. Once a decision is made you will be informed accordingly.

You can visit our website using the following link www.merton.gov.uk/cpzmtc. You may also view the plans in Merton Link at Merton Civic Centre, Morden during our working hours, Monday to Friday between 9am and 5pm or Mitcham Library.

APPENDIX 3 Informal consultation results table

Proposed MTC CPZ Informal Consultation		
53 of 259 properties accessed the campaign		
Response rating		21%
Resident or business?		
This single response question was answered by 53 properties.		
Response	Number of	Percentage of
Resident	53	100%
Business	nil	nil
Both	nil	nil
Do you support a CPZ in your road?		
This single response question was answered by 53 properties.		
Response	Number of	Percentage of
Yes	33	62%
No	17	32%
Unsure	3	6%
Preferred days of operation		
This single response question was answered by 49 properties.		
Response	Number of	Percentage of
Monday - Friday	12	24%
Monday - Saturday	22	45%
Monday - Sunday	15	31%
Preferred hours of operation		
This single response question was answered by 49 properties.		
Response	Number of	Percentage of
8.30am - 11pm	29	59%
8.30am - 6.30pm	12	25%
10am - 4pm	8	16%

PAUL CARTER

67 LANGDALE AVENUE, MITCHAM, SURREY CR4 4AJ

TELEPHONE: 020 8648 4956

MOBILE: 07702 193816

EMAIL: *mapcart103@btinternet.com*

18th. March 2015

Dear Mr. Atie

Re. Petition for a CPZ in Langdale Avenue CR4

Enclosed a copy of a petition from the residents of Langdale Avenue and a copy of a letter to Cllr. Andrew Judge.

With best wishes

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Paul Carter". The signature is written in a cursive style with a horizontal line underneath the name.

Paul Carter

PAUL CARTER

67 LANGDALE AVENUE, MITCHAM, SURREY CR4 4A

TEL: 020 8648 4956

MOBILE: 07702 193816

EMAIL: *mapcart103@btinternet.com*

18 March 2015

To : Cllr. Andrew Judge

Copies to: Cllr. Judy Saunders, Cllr. Geraldine Stanford, Cllr. Peter Walker,

Cllr. Agatha Akyigyina, Mr. Paul Atie (Traffic and Highways).

Dear Cllr. Judge

Re. Parking in Langdale Avenue

I am enclosing a petition from the residents of Langdale Avenue who would like the road to become a Controlled Parking Zone.

Parking in Langdale Avenue has become very difficult for the residents, sometimes impossible. This not just a day-time problem but also the problem occurs in the evenings, overnight and at weekends when people from other roads use Langdale Avenue as their car park. I was advised by a resident that people even as far afield as Mitcham Park use Langdale Avenue to park their vans for the night and weekend and return to their own road on foot or in their cars thereby reducing their parking costs at Langdale Avenue's expense. Many Langdale Avenue residents feel that the night time problem is even worse than the day time.

As you can see, the majority is in favour of a Controlled Parking Zone. The gaps in the petition are those properties where I was unable to make contact despite numerous attempts.

Yours sincerely,


Paul Carter

LANGDALE AVENUE, MITCHAM CR4

PETITION FOR LANGDALE TO BECOME A CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE

Parking for the residents of Langdale Avenue has almost become an impossibility both by day and by night. This, along with the litter, has seriously eroded quality of life and suppressed the value of the houses.

We, the undersigned, want Merton Council to grant Langdale Avenue the status of a Controlled Parking Zone.

NUMBER	NAME	SIGNATURE	DATE
1	NO.		
3			
5	Can't speak English		
7	NO		
9			
11	MUNIR MUSSA		7/3/2015
13	DALIUS KUCINSKAS		7/3/2015
15	Sai King CHUNG		3/3/2015
17	MOHAMMED KHAN		3/3/2015
19	NO		
21	Christina Hancock		7/3/2015
23	VACANT PROPERTY		
25	NO.		
27	MITHILA BALAKRISHNAN		28/02/15
29	FRANK PIARFO		28/2/15
31	J STANLEY		27-2-15
33	J. League		27/2/15
49	MOWKOSH MAHA		17/3/15
51	N. Thiruchem.		3/3/15
53	G. MOHANAKUMAR		09/03/15
55	N J CHAMPAN		13 3 15
57	N. J. SULLIVAN		27. 2. 15
59	NO.		
61	THERE IS NO HOUSE		
63	63 houses		27.2.15
65	THOMAS JAS		27/02/15
67	E.P. CARTER		27.02.15

See below

See below

N.B. There are no houses between Hse. N° 33 and House N° 49

N.B. There is no house between 59 and 63.

LANGDALE AVENUE, MITCHAM CR4

PETITION FOR LANGDALE TO BECOME A CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE

Parking for the residents of Langdale Avenue has almost become an impossibility both by day and by night. This, along with the litter, has seriously eroded quality of life and suppressed the value of the houses.

We, the undersigned, want Merton Council to grant Langdale Avenue the status of a Controlled Parking Zone.

NUMBER	NAME	SIGNATURE	DATE
2	Charlotte	[Redacted]	07/08/15
* 8	[Redacted]	[Redacted]	07/03/15
6	Wai Kam Lill	[Redacted]	12/3/15
* 4		[Redacted]	
10		[Redacted]	
12		[Redacted]	
14		[Redacted]	
16		[Redacted]	
18	NO -	[Redacted]	
20		[Redacted]	
22	FARHAT WALKER.	[Redacted]	11-3-15.
24		[Redacted]	
26	ANH SING TO	[Redacted]	8/3/15
28	SMADIAN	[Redacted]	11/3/15
30	NAS AWADH	[Redacted]	13/3/15
32	NO - ABUSIWA AND	[Redacted]	
34	DERMICK HICKLE	[Redacted]	9/3/2015
38		[Redacted]	
40	Ray & Brenda Stacey	[Redacted]	28/2/2015
42	JONATHAN CHANDLER	[Redacted]	2/3/2015
44	JASH AZAR.	[Redacted]	07/03/2015
46	YOUNG WANG	[Redacted]	2/3/15
48	DANIELLE BOHAN	[Redacted]	2/3/15
48A		[Redacted]	
50	KNA BENT	[Redacted]	5/3/15
52	AUSTIN SIM HIDGE	[Redacted]	23/03/15
52A	Beverley Lowell	[Redacted]	13/03/15

Merton Council - call-in request form

1. Decision to be called in: (required)

--

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

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

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

3. Desired outcome

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

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

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

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

5. Documents requested

6. Witnesses requested

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

8. Notes

Call-ins must be supported by at least three members of the Council (Part 4E Section 16(c)(a)(i))

The call in form and supporting requests must be received by by 12 Noon on the third working day following the publication of the decision (Part 4E Section 16(c)(a)(iii)).

The form and/or supporting requests must be sent **EITHER** by email from a Councillor's email account (no signature required) to democratic.services@merton.gov.uk **OR** as a signed paper copy (Part 4E Section 16(c)(a)(iv)) to Democracy Services, 7th floor, Civic Centre, London Road, Morden SM4 5DX.