

APPENDIX I

Doug Napier

From: Tom Goose
Sent: 21 April 2017 13:32
To: Doug Napier; Alan Trumper
Cc: Chris Lee
Subject: RE: Newly published decision: Proposals to improve parking facilities in selected borough parks - authorisation to carry out statutory consultation

Many thanks for your response, Doug. This helps set in some context the decision by the Cabinet Member. We will check back to the budget papers from March 2016 then.

Opposition members appreciate that there is an issue with parking abuses that needs addressing but are not yet convinced that the proposals as drafted are the optimum way forward. They are also concerned that there has been no formal consultation with residents and park users on the plans. For this reason, relevant ward councillors are seeking to call this decision in and have today submitted a call in form to Democracy Services so that there can be further consideration of the matter before the decision takes effect.

Best wishes,
Tom

From: Doug Napier
Sent: 21 April 2017 08:29
To: Alan Trumper
Cc: Tom Goose
Subject: RE: Newly published decision: Proposals to improve parking facilities in selected borough parks - authorisation to carry out statutory consultation

There was a capital allocation in the 16/17 budget to deliver this, hence the progress made last year in terms of the prep work. It is indeed savings-related in part and so would have been in the budget papers in March 2016.

The concept has been discussed for more than a couple of years now and was raised with members formally as a proposal at least as far as back as 2015, from memory, before the last local elections. I remember questions being raised by opposition members back then.

My impression has been that there's local support for this scheme it has been driven by the need to flush parking abuses (that is, commuters and business users) out of parks in parking control zone areas in order to release parking capacity for legitimate park users.

There is already good awareness of the scheme/proposals amongst local parks stakeholder groups and a number of local residents are pressing for the scheme's introduction a.s.a.p.

Doug

From: Alan Trumper
Sent: 20 April 2017 11:35
To: Doug Napier
Subject: FW: Newly published decision: Proposals to improve parking facilities in selected borough parks - authorisation to carry out statutory consultation

From: Tom Goose
Sent: Thursday, April 20, 2017 11:09 AM GMT Standard Time
To: Alan Trumper
Cc: Chris Lee
Subject: FW: Newly published decision: Proposals to improve parking facilities in selected borough parks - authorisation to carry out statutory consultation

Sent at the request of Cllr Oonagh Moulton

Dear Alan

Further to the decision published below, could you possibly advise when the original decision to proceed with this policy was made i.e. the decision that led to the installation of the P&D machines (currently unused) in the car parks of these 5 parks?

Am I right in thinking this was a Budget saving and that was when the original decision on this was taken i.e. at Budget Council? If so, in which year's Budget was that?

It would be really helpful if you could get back to us today on this.

Many thanks

Tom Goose
Tel: 020 8545 4024

From: Merton Council [<mailto:democratic.services@merton.gov.uk>]
Sent: 18 April 2017 17:07
Subject: Newly published decision: Proposals to improve parking facilities in selected borough parks - authorisation to carry out statutory consultation

A decision by Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Environment and Housing has been published: Proposals to improve parking facilities in selected borough parks - authorisation to carry out statutory consultation

You can view this decision using the link: [Decision details on the intranet web site](#)

To see the publicly available information, follow the link: [Decision details on public web site](#)

Doug Napier

From:
Sent: 11 July 2017 18:06
To: Councillor Nick Draper; davegdawson@gmail.com
Cc: Redirector for Cllr Linda Taylor; Doug Napier; Councillor Linda Taylor; Redirector For Cllr Janice Howard; Redirector for Cllr Oonagh Moulton; Councillor Janice Howard; Councillor Oonagh Moulton; Paul Atie
Subject: Re: RE: Consultation on car parking charges for Revelstoke Road

Hi

Many thanks for your speedy response. I understand the consultation period has now been extended to Friday 14th July so that will give more people the chance to comment.

Kind regards

-----Original message-----

From : Nick.Draper@merton.gov.uk
Date : 06/07/2017 - 11:34 (GMTST)
To :
Cc : Oonagh.Moulton@merton.gov.uk, Oonagh.moulton@me.com
Councillor.LindaTaylor@merton.gov.uk,
Janice.Howard@merton.gov.uk, Paul.Atie@merton.gov.uk, Doug.Napier@merton.gov.uk
Subject : RE: Consultation on car parking charges for Revelstoke Road

Hello

As I understand it, the consultation was advertised to your ward Councillors, on notices within the car park itself, in the local Guardian newspaper and on Merton's website. Whereas for street parking individual households affected would also be contacted directly, where a car park in a nearby park is concerned that normally wouldn't be the case, as there would be no clarity as to the boundary for those affected.

I would agree with that the charges are low. The rationale behind bringing in charges at all, in this and some other Merton parks, is that currently our parks are being abused by commuters using the free spaces to park all day, depriving park users of the chance to park themselves. The charges are designed not to hurt park users unduly, while at the same time deterring commuters. This also goes some way to explaining the reason for charging Monday to Saturday only.

This is Merton's first borough-wide initiative in charging for parking in parks. We have been charging for car parks and on-street parking for many years, and we therefore have history to back up our methods and charges: this is new to us, so we have to rely on the experience of others and on knowledge accumulated elsewhere that may not be applicable to the needs of park users. There is therefore something of the experimental in these proposals, and I would be surprised if there were no modifications over time.

All the best

Councillor Nick Draper (*Labour, Colliers Wood Ward*)
Cabinet member for Community & Culture

From: Tom

Sent: 05 July 2017 22:25

To: D

Cc:

Councillor Oonagh Moulton; Redirector for Cllr Oonagh Moulton;
Councillor Linda Taylor; Redirector for Cllr Linda Taylor; Redirector For Cllr Janice Howard; Councillor Janice Howard;
Councillor Nick Draper

Subject: Re: Consultation on car parking charges for Revelstoke Road

Thanks for forwarding this. I have received no communications whatsoever from Merton Council or from our Conservative Ward Councillors about this proposal which I find worrying given the location of my property and the fact that I am a Merton ratepayer. As you point out the consultation ends on Friday which gives no time at all to consider the proposal and submit a reasoned response. This is not acceptable. I hope you don't mind but I am copying this correspondence to our Ward Councillors and also to Nick Draper and shall be glad of their confirmation that the consultation period will be extended and that a proper consultation process will be undertaken to give local residents the opportunity to comment on the proposals.

Kind regards

On 5 Jul 2017, at 18:44, _____ <_____> wrote:

We've just received the attached notification (dated 23rd June) from the three Wimbledon Park ward councillors (LB Merton). The deadline for comments is this Friday. I'm concerned that I hadn't heard of it any other way and only just yesterday, but perhaps I missed something circulated by the Friends?

The notification states that we can see the proposed traffic order and plans by attending Merton Link in the Civic Centre, which is not very helpful, given the very short notice.

I cannot find the consultation on the LB Merton website. It's not under traffic consultations in Wimbledon Park. I did locate a two-year old plan of the car park layout for charging (also attached), but no other document.

The actual proposed Traffic Order may answer some of my questions, but I would suggest a few:

1. Why Monday to Saturday, given that Sundays and Saturdays are times when the demand for car parking is greatest?
2. Why 08:00 to 16:00, given that demand is high well into the evening on summer days?
3. As the car park lies largely within LB Wandsworth, what consultation is undertaken there?
4. What arrangements are made for disabled parking, group visits to the park (e.g. for Water Sports or Bowls), and to control the number of vehicles parked at the Cafe, Bowls Pavilion and Water Sports Centre?

5. Why not charge also for the Wimbledon Park Road car park?
6. What's the rationale for the, remarkably low, charge?
7. How does the proposal relate to adopted policies in Merton (e.g. those on sustainable travel)?

Dave

Please help to reduce waste and do not print this message unless you really need to.

This message, including any attached files, is intended just for the use of the individual or organisation to whom it is addressed. Any opinions expressed are those of the sender, not Merton Council. Email is not secure, and the council accepts no responsibility for any inaccuracy, corruption or virus which has occurred during transmission.

This email may be subject to monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation and may be disclosed in response to a request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

The message may contain information that is confidential or sensitive; you should handle it accordingly.

If you have received this email message in error, you must not copy, disclose or make any further use of the information contained within it. Please notify the system manager (postmaster@merton.gov.uk) or the Head of Information Governance (data.protection@merton.gov.uk), and delete the message.

postmaster@merton.gov.uk

<http://www.merton.gov.uk>

Doug Napier

From: Councillor Linda Taylor
Sent: 25 July 2017 19:34
To: Redirector For Cllr Janice Howard; Councillor Nick Draper; Councillor Oonagh Moulton
Cc: Doug Napier
Subject: RE: ES/OFFSTREET

Dear Nick,

I fully agree with and endorse Janice's points below and confirm that I am completely against charging in Parks, as are the majority of our residents, whose views we represent.

Linda

Sent with Good (www.good.com)

-----Original Message-----

From: Janice
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2017 07:10 PM GMT Standard Time
To: Councillor Nick Draper; Councillor Oonagh Moulton; Councillor Janice Howard; Councillor Linda Taylor
Cc: Doug Napier
Subject: RE: ES/OFFSTREET

Hi Nick

Thanks for forwarding, I personally am against any charging for parking in parks. However, the [redacted] make a valid point, both Wimbledon Park car parks should have charges, it seems very odd that just the Revelstoke Road car park has been chosen.

I appreciate the impact of introducing charges may have on surrounding roads in nice sunny weather, however this is limited to a few weeks a year and therefore would not support any changes to the CPZ hours.

I agree that every effort needs to be made to encourage park users to come via public transport or their "own steam" and perhaps this is a borough wide project in the making to have a "walk, cycle or run" to your park campaign?

I am sure my fellow councillors will have their own views, but as I am off to France tomorrow, wanted to put my thoughts down for you.

Janice

From: Councillor Nick Draper [<mailto:Nick.Draper@merton.gov.uk>]
Sent: 25 July 2017 12:55
To: Councillor Oonagh Moulton <Oonagh.Moulton@merton.gov.uk>; Councillor Janice Howard <Janice.Howard@merton.gov.uk>; Councillor Linda Taylor <Councillor.LindaTaylor@merton.gov.uk>

Cc: Doug Napier <Doug.Napier@merton.gov.uk>

Subject: FW: ES/OFFSTREET

Hello Oonagh, Janice, Linda

have some interesting comments here. I would welcome your thoughts.

All the best

Nick

From:

Sent: 14 July 2017 16:25

To: Traffic And Highways

Cc: Councillor Oonagh Moulton; Councillor Linda Taylor; , Councillor Nick Draper; Councillor Janice Howard

Subject: ES/OFFSTREET

Dear Madam,

Representations on the proposed introduction of car parking charges at the Revelstoke Road Car Park, Wimbledon Park.

Please find attached our formal representation on this proposal.

We trust that this representation will be taken fully into account as these proposals are taken forward.

Yours sincerely,

Please help to reduce waste and do not print this message unless you really need to.

This message, including any attached files, is intended just for the use of the individual or organisation to whom it is addressed. Any opinions expressed are those of the sender, not Merton Council. Email is not secure, and the council accepts no responsibility for any inaccuracy, corruption or virus which has occurred during transmission.

This email may be subject to monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation and may be disclosed in response to a request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

The message may contain information that is confidential or sensitive; you should handle it accordingly.

If you have received this email message in error, you must not copy, disclose or make any further use of the information contained within it. Please notify the system manager (postmaster@merton.gov.uk) or the Head of Information Governance (data.protection@merton.gov.uk), and delete the message.

postmaster@merton.gov.uk

<http://www.merton.gov.uk>

Doug Napier

From: Councillor Nick Draper
Sent: 10 August 2017 18:20
To: Redirector For Cllr Janice Howard; Councillor Oonagh Moulton; Councillor Janice Howard; Councillor Linda Taylor
Cc: Doug Napier
Subject: RE: ES/OFFSTREET

Hello Janice

Many thanks for answering. I appreciate that you and your ward colleagues may feel differently about charging for parking than I do, and I thoroughly respect that.

I have done a little bit of research on the subject and have found that many Labour and Conservative councils have adopted the policy of charging for parking in parks throughout England, both in a metropolitan and non-metropolitan setting, which suggests that it's usually a local rather than a political issue, although opposition has tended to be strongest in marginal councils. Charging for parking in parks tends to be most prevalent, however, in independently-controlled parks, such as those run by the National Trust, National Parks and some Royal Parks. There does not appear to be great shared public opposition to those charges.

For my part, there are a number of reasons why I feel charges are appropriate, in particular the abuse of spaces by commercial businesses and, of course, the perennial problem of the commuter who doesn't want to pay, but I'm also quite happy to confess that the hard surfaces of our parks (rather than the green ones!) are to me a worthwhile source of revenue; and, of course, persuading local people to exercise going to the park by walking rather than driving is in line with the Government's current thinking on public health. As I say, I appreciate and respect that this isn't the way everyone else thinks.

The question, for me, is how we do it if we do. If it happens, I want it to work in the interests of the borough. We represent and understand our own parts of the borough; we know what works and what doesn't. I believe, if the boot were on the other foot, that I would like to be consulted, and for my opinions to be taken seriously. So I'm really grateful, despite your overall objection, that you have responded to the Dawson's points. Thank you!

All the best
Nick

From: Janice Howard
Sent: 25 July 2017 19:11
To: Councillor Nick Draper; Councillor Oonagh Moulton; Councillor Janice Howard; Councillor Linda Taylor
Cc: Doug Napier
Subject: RE: ES/OFFSTREET

Hi Nick

Thanks for forwarding, I personally am against any charging for parking in parks. However, the make a valid point, both Wimbledon Park car parks should have charges, it seems very odd that just the Revelstoke Road car park has been chosen.

I appreciate the impact of introducing charges may have on surrounding roads in nice sunny weather, however this is limited to a few weeks a year and therefore would not support any changes to the CPZ hours.

I agree that every effort needs to be made to encourage park users to come via public transport or their "own steam" and perhaps this is a borough wide project in the making to have a "walk, cycle or run" to your park campaign?

I am sure my fellow councillors will have their own views, but as I am off to France tomorrow, wanted to put my thoughts down for you.

Janice

From: Councillor Nick Draper [<mailto:Nick.Draper@merton.gov.uk>]
Sent: 25 July 2017 12:55
To: Councillor Oonagh Moulton <Oonagh.Moulton@merton.gov.uk>; Councillor Janice Howard <Janice.Howard@merton.gov.uk>; Councillor Linda Taylor <Councillor.LindaTaylor@merton.gov.uk>
Cc: Doug Napier <Doug.Napier@merton.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: ES/OFFSTREET

Hello Oonagh, Janice, Linda

There are some interesting comments here. I would welcome your thoughts.

All the best
Nick

From: ...
Sent: 14 July 2017 16:25
To: Traffic And Highways
Cc: Councillor Oonagh Moulton; Councillor Linda Taylor; Nick Steiner; Councillor Nick Draper; Councillor Janice Howard
Subject: ES/OFFSTREET

Dear Madam,

Representations on the proposed introduction of car parking charges at the Revelstoke Road Car Park, Wimbledon Park.

Please find attached our formal representation on this proposal.

We trust that this representation will be taken fully into account as these proposals are taken forward.

Yours sincerely,



Please help to reduce waste and do not print this message unless you really need to.

This message, including any attached files, is intended just for the use of the individual or organisation to whom it is addressed. Any opinions expressed are those of the sender, not Merton Council. Email is not secure, and the council accepts no responsibility for any inaccuracy, corruption or virus which has occurred during transmission.

This email may be subject to monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation and may be disclosed in response to a request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

The message may contain information that is confidential or sensitive; you should handle it accordingly.

If you have received this email message in error, you must not copy, disclose or make any further use of the information contained within it. Please notify the system manager (postmaster@merton.gov.uk) or the Head of

Doug Napier

From: Doug Napier
Sent: 31 January 2013 14:58
To: James McGinlay; Chris Lee
Subject: RE: EN45

My reply:

None of the savings proposals within the Greenspaces service are designed, directly or indirectly, to deter residents or users of our parks. The Council fully recognises the significant contribution that parks can and do make in terms of health benefits. This is why the service has invested in and provides support for an ever wider number of sports and recreational activities in recent years: outdoor table tennis, softball, netball, beach volleyball and green gyms, for example.

Whereas there are specific proposals to increase our fees and charges, these remain broadly in line with current national inflationary figures and remain competitive with similar fees levied by others, including neighbouring local authorities. Our fee structure does and will continue to provide a range of concessions for appropriate groups and individuals.

Proposals to introduce car parking fees to some parks will, by their very nature, discourage commuter use of parks for car parking purposes, freeing up parking capacity for legitimate park users to enjoy those facilities as, at the current time, we have every intention to provide a fee-free period or periods within our charging policy in order not to adversely affect genuine open space visitors. Parking fees will undoubtedly also encourage some park users to switch to public transport to access parks, or alternatively to walk or cycle, thereby making a direct and positive contribution to improving community health.

Do you want something more from me on income?

Doug

From: James McGinlay
Sent: 30 January 2013 14:21
To: Doug Napier
Subject: FW:
Importance: High

Hi Doug.

Can you prepare a response for me on EN 45.

I need it back as soon as possible.

Ta.

James

James McGinlay
Head of Sustainable Communities
London Borough of Merton
Civic Centre London Road Morden SM4 5DX
Direct Line 020 8545 4154

james.mcginlay@merton.gov.uk

From: Chris Lee
Sent: 30 January 2013 09:03
To: John Hill; James McGinlay; Cormac Stokes

Cc: Rosemarie Embray-Clare Nicholas

Subject:

This is the email that Cllr Evans asked to be circulated to Scrutiny last night . I would like to be able to deal with as many of these as possible at Overview and Scrutiny on Thursday so could you please provide me with the responses

Clare pls coordinate onto one doc.

James , I spoke to Cllr George after the meeting to better understand which matters she was expecting answers to at last nights meeting . She was particularly interested in getting further and better info on the parks savings and the income growth [EN45]

What would be useful would be to have a breakdown available for me showing how current income is made up and any infor with regard to how these income growth figures were arrived at that we are prepared to share with Scrutiny.

In addition Cllr Hanna advised that John Innes Park has opportunity for car park income from commuters currently using it.

Thanks

Chris Lee | Director of Environment & Regeneration

London Borough of Merton

Merton Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, Surrey SM4 5DX
Direct: 020 8545 3050 | Switchboard: 020 8274 4901

chris.lee@merton.gov.uk

www.merton.gov.uk

Doug Napier

From: Chris Lee
Sent: 17 June 2016 14:09
To: Doug Napier
Cc: Clare Nicholas
Subject: RE: Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing Fields pay and display parking scheme.

Looks fine , thanks

Clare pls arrange despatch

Thanks

From: Doug Napier
Sent: 17 June 2016 12:24
To: Chris Lee
Cc: Clare Nicholas
Subject: FW: Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing Fields pay and display parking scheme.

Draft reply to a couple of recent letters on this matter which needs to be copied to the MP and Gilli-LL and Mary-Jane too as well as the two residents (and) (email addresses below in the string) - these two have copied mails into each other and has picked up on the mail and so it's appropriate to cover off both in the same reply).

Dear XXX,

Thank you for your recent enquiry of the matter of pay and display parking at Sir Joseph Hood Recreation Ground.

This scheme is being reluctantly introduced at a small number of key parks across the borough in order to help drive out a number of persistent parking abuses, principally, commuter and local business parking, which is having an adverse impact upon the use and enjoyment of some of our most popular open spaces by park users.

The proposals for the parking scheme are:

30p per hour is the standard charge. Mobile phone payments will be possible, as well as coins.

The proposal is that parking charges will apply from 8am to 4pm. Charges will apply between Monday and Saturday, not Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Parking will not be permitted between 11pm and 6am. Sanctions can therefore be applied to vehicles left overnight and we will also enjoy new powers to address issues in relation to untaxed and abandoned vehicles that are currently unavailable to us.

There will imminently be a local consultation exercise on the scheme in line with normal Council procedures for such traffic management initiatives with an opportunity for local people to submit their views.

The income secured from the new parking scheme will be retained within the Greenspaces' accounts and will support the service's on-going revenue costs and new developments, particularly in those key parks where the parking scheme is being introduced. We expect that the

overall capital costs of the scheme will be recovered during the second full operational year and on that basis consider this to be a worthwhile investment.

Whilst we recognise that we have recently employed a scheme whereby the park gates are left locked until 9.30am in order to deter parking that it is unrelated to the park's use, that scheme has not been universally popular amongst park users, and understandably so, considering that our parks formally open at 8am in the midweek and at 9am at weekends. We also consider that this arrangement has not successfully addressed the issue as we hoped that it would; our Greenspaces Manager has reported, for example, that on a recent midweek visit to the park, he struggled to find a parking space during the second half of the morning when the park was quiet and that the car park was entirely full when he departed site at around 11am.

We certainly recognise that there are some historical parking pressures in the Marina Avenue area but consider that these are adversely and unnecessarily affecting the park, and not vice versa, and that it is not unreasonable that we now seek to ensure that the benefits that the car park was designed to secure continue to be enjoyed by those that they were intended for, including customers of the commercial enterprises that operate within the park.

From: Doug Napier
Sent: 13 June 2016 12:05
To: Alan Trumper
Subject: FW: Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing Fields pay and display parking scheme.

And another. I expect more soon. Need to get our ducks lined up.

Can you have a go at the issues outlined so far and then let's discuss.

Doug

From: Chris Lee
Sent: 13 June 2016 11:57
To: Doug Napier
Cc: Clare Nicholas
Subject: FW: Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing Fields pay and display parking scheme.

Hi Doug , another one , could you please draft a short response for me to send

Thanks

From: Ged Curran
Sent: 13 June 2016 11:54
To: Sophie Jones-Lisa Barwell
Cc: Chris Lee
Subject: FW: Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing Fields pay and display parking scheme.

Kindly acknowledge and say Chris will respond.

Thanks

Ged Curran
Chief Executive
London Borough of Merton

T: 020 8545 3332

E:

W: www.merton.gov.uk

From: HAMMOND, Sally [<mailto:HAMMONDSP@parliament.uk>]

Sent: 13 June 2016 08:57

To:

Cc: Councillor Brian Lewis-Lavender; Councillor Gilli Lewis-Lavender; Councillor Stephen Alambritis; Ged Curran

Subject: RE: Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing Fields pay and display parking scheme.

Dear I

Thank you for sending Stephen Hammond MP a copy of your e-mail. I can appreciate your concern, and hope that the Council will be able to respond to you on this.

Best wishes.

Sally Hammond for Stephen Hammond MP
Office Manager

From:

Date: 12 June 2016 19:07:45 WEST

To: "Mary-Jane.Jeanes@merton.gov.uk" <mary-jane.jeanes@merton.gov.uk>, "brian.lewis-lavender@merton.gov.uk" <brian.lewis-lavender@merton.gov.uk>, "gilli.lewis-lavender@merton.gov.uk" <gilli.lewis-lavender@merton.gov.uk>, "stephen.alambritis@merton.gov.uk" <stephen.alambritis@merton.gov.uk>, "chief.executive@merton.gov.uk" <chief.executive@merton.gov.uk>

Cc: "stephen.hammond.mp@parliament.uk" <stephen.hammond.mp@parliament.uk>

Subject: RE: Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing Fields pay and display parking scheme.

Dear Mr Curran and Mr Alambritis

I was shocked and surprised to hear the news that there has been a pay and display meter installed in the car park of Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing Field and I would be keen to know the plans for cost and usage periods.

I live at Marina Avenue which is immediately adjacent to the park and I have no doubt that introducing any kind of payment scheme in the park's car park will negatively impact on the parking in Marina Avenue. At present the car park gates are opened at 9.30am and closed in the evening and this is very effective at deterring commuter parking, so I fail to see what problem the parking meters will solve, however I can see all too clearly what problems they will cause.

I agree with all of the points raised by my neighbour in his email below, so I won't repeat them here. However I would like to formally lodge my anger at the lack of consultation on installing this pay and display meter. If there had been plans to introduce a CPZ in the street next to ours then we would have received months of consultations on the matter, and controls would only have been introduced with approval by residents. I cannot see how this should be any different, as the affect on Marina Avenue will be as bad as if a neighbouring CPZ had been introduced.

I look forward to hearing your response.

Kind regards,

cc: Stephen Hammond MP
cc: West Barnes councillors
cc: Friends of Merton
cc:

From:
To: Mary-Jane.Jeanes@merton.gov.uk; brian.lewis-lavender@merton.gov.uk; gilli.lewis-lavender@merton.gov.uk; stephen.alambritis@merton.gov.uk; chief.executive@merton.gov.uk
CC: stephen.hammond.mp@parliament.uk;
Subject: Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing Fields pay and display parking scheme.
Date: Fri, 10 Jun 2016 11:29:45 +0000

Dear Mr Curran and Mr Alambritis

I will preface this email by saying that Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing field is an excellent community facility and that the council should continue to invest in it for the future. As a resident, I appreciate the recent investment in the new gates etc.

Notwithstanding the above, I would like to express my disappointment at the way pay and display (P&D) parking is being implemented by the council at the Joseph Hood Memorial playing fields in Motspur park/West Barnes.

As residents of , immediately adjacent to the park, we object to the implementation of pay and display (hours of operation currently unknown) in the park for the following reasons :-

- 1) This scheme will undoubtedly place additional parking pressure onto Marina Avenue and the surrounding residential streets.
- 2) The current arrangement of opening the gates at 9:30 AM already successfully deters commuters. Additional P&D measures will not improve the situation.
- 3) The impact on park users could be significant. The park is well used by members of the public and P&D could dissuade families and recreational users from using the facilities. As a resident I would like to see the park used to its full potential.
- 4) Rascals may be impacted. In our view a viable business in the pavilion is of benefit to the park. additional parking costs will deter customers.

in addition to the above, we are dissappointed that:-

- 1) As a resident that will be directly impacted by this proposal we have been provided no formal notification about the details of the controls or the scheme.
- 2) We have not been consulted on our views on the suitability of P&D at this location
- 3) We have not been consulted about the timings of the proposed control hours.

Further questions that have been raised:-

- 1) Has a cost benefit analysis been carried out on the scheme. When is it expected to break even?
- 2) what is the expected revenue generation projection of the scheme?
- 3) confirmation that the funds will be ring fenced for reinvestment in the park.

A straw poll of the local residents in Marina Avenue indicates that there is concern about this scheme as the details are a complete unknown at this point in time.

Please can the deployment of this scheme be suspended until residents are consulted?

Thank you

cc: Stephen Hammond MP
cc: West Barnes councillors
cc: Friends of Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing Fields
cc: n

Yours sincerely

From:
Sent: 03 June 2016 12:06
To: Councillor Mary-Jane Jeanes
Subject: Re: Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing Fields

Hi Mary Jane,

thanks for inquiring about this.

The current arrangement to deter commuter parking in the SJHMPF car park is to open the gates at 9:30 am. This measure is very effective and does mean that the car park is not really used by commuters, who instead park in Marina and the surrounding streets.

The parking is pretty bad in Marina already on weekdays. our concern is that depending on the timings of the scheme, placing pay and display in the park will compound the effect on weekends as well, as recreational park users will try and park in Marina instead of in the JHMPF car park at all times.

Are the council are going to consult the residents on this please?

Thanks

From: Councillor Mary-Jane Jeanes <Mary-Jane.Jeanes@merton.gov.uk>
Sent: 03 June 2016 10:05
To: . . .
Subject: Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing Fields

Dear . . .

I asked about the bases which were being built and have been told that they are for pay and display parking to deter commuters. I have pointed out that this will make the parking worse in Marina Avenue, and possibly Arthur Rd as well.

Kind regards

Mary-Jane

Please help to reduce waste and do not print this message unless you really need to. This message, including any attached files, is intended just for the use of the individual or organisation to whom it is addressed. Any opinions expressed are those of the sender, not Merton Council. Email is not secure, and the council accepts no responsibility for any inaccuracy, corruption or virus which has occurred during transmission. This email may be subject to monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation and may be disclosed in response to a request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. The message may contain information that is confidential or sensitive; you should handle it accordingly. If you have received this email message in error, you must not copy, disclose or make any further use of the information contained within it. Please notify the system manager

Doug Napier

From: Chris Lee
Sent: 29 June 2016 18:38
To: Doug Napier
Subject: RE: Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing Fields pay and display parking scheme.

I have encouraged them to petition for cpz . its down to them

From: Doug Napier
Sent: 29 June 2016 13:40
To: Chris Lee
Subject: FW: Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing Fields pay and display parking scheme.

As I mentioned when we discussed this matter, there is a wider parking issues in that area that the park is the victim of and not the cause of.

I believe that we have a duty to ensure that the car parking in the park is available to legitimate park users. Doing nothing in the park will not fix the problems in the wider neighbourhood.

Doug

From: Councillor Gilli Lewis-Lavender
Sent: 24 June 2016 08:25
To: " " Chris Lee
Cc: Doug Napier; Sophie Jones-Lisa Barwell; , Councillor Brian Lewis-Lavender
Subject: RE: Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing Fields pay and display parking scheme.

I agree with everything has said

Sent with Good (www.good.com)

-----Original Message-----

From:
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2016 10:13 AM GMT Standard Time
To: Chris Lee
Cc: Doug Napier; Sophie Jones-Lisa Barwell; ; Councillor Gilli Lewis-Lavender
Subject: Re: Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing Fields pay and display parking scheme.

Chris

Thank you for this clear explanation. I have copied it to Gilli Lewis-Lavender as the Councillor who took up the cudgels on this one. I have also copied this who initially raised the issue with Councillors.

I understand the justification for the charges and of itself they are not objectionable. But I take the strongest issue with you about the effects on the residents of Marina Avenue of the charges and commuter parking. You do not live in this Avenue and you have not directly experienced the effect on residents of commuter parking. People drive to this area so they can benefit from the considerably lower fares available from TfL zone 4. We see it every day with our street getting

clogged with commuters cars from 7 am. The problem will only be made worse by charging for the car park. That is just how it will be. We shall not fail to make the point clear in the public consultation.

--

From: Chris Lee
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2016 9:51 AM
To: |
Cc: Doug Napier ; Sophie Jones-Lisa Barwell
Subject: RE: Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing Fields pay and display parking scheme.

Dear | , Thank you for your recent enquiry of the matter of pay and display parking at Sir Joseph Hood Recreation Ground.

This scheme is being reluctantly introduced at a small number of key parks across the borough in order to help drive out a number of persistent parking abuses, principally, commuter and local business parking, which is having an adverse impact upon the use and enjoyment of some of our most popular open spaces by park users.

The proposals for the parking scheme are:

30p per hour is the standard charge. Mobile phone payments will be possible, as well as coins.

The proposal is that parking charges will apply from 8am to 4pm. Charges will apply between Monday and Saturday, not Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Parking will not be permitted between 11pm and 6am. Sanctions can therefore be applied to vehicles left overnight and we will also enjoy new powers to address issues in relation to untaxed and abandoned vehicles that are currently unavailable to us.

There will imminently be a local consultation exercise on the scheme in line with normal Council procedures for such traffic management initiatives with an opportunity for local people to submit their views.

The income secured from the new parking scheme will be retained within the Greenspaces' accounts and will support the service's on-going revenue costs and new developments, particularly in those key parks where the parking scheme is being introduced. We expect that the overall capital costs of the scheme will be recovered during the second full operational year and on that basis consider this to be a worthwhile investment.

Whilst we recognise that we have recently employed a scheme whereby the park gates are left locked until 9.30am in order to deter parking that it is unrelated to the park's use, that scheme has not been universally popular amongst park users, and understandably so, considering that our parks formally open at 8am in the midweek and at 9am at weekends. We also consider that this arrangement has not successfully addressed the issue as we hoped that it would; our Greenspaces Manager has reported, for example, that on a recent midweek visit to the park, he struggled to find a parking space during the second half of the morning when the park was quiet and that the car park was entirely full when he departed site at around 11am.

We certainly recognise that there are some historical parking pressures in the Marina Avenue area but consider that these are adversely and unnecessarily affecting the park, and not vice versa, and that it is not unreasonable that we now seek to ensure that the benefits that the car park was designed to secure continue to be enjoyed by those that they were intended for, including customers of the commercial enterprises that operate within the park.

Regards

From: _____
Sent: 22 June 2016 12:27
To: Councillor Mary-Jane Jeanes; Councillor Brian Lewis-Lavender; Councillor Gilli Lewis-Lavender; Councillor Stephen Alambritis; Chief Executive
Cc: stephen.hammond.mp@parliament.uk;
Subject: Re: Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing Fields pay and display parking scheme.

As a resident of Marina Avenue, in the same part of the road as _____ we entirely support and endorse the comments made by _____ about the implementation of pay parking in the Sir Joseph Hood memorial Playing Fields. Whatever the economic justification for such charges the impact on residents in Marina Avenue and our ability to park our cars close to home, and the need to stop the Avenue from becoming clogged with daily long term commuter parking seems to have been ignored.

The Council needs to think again.

--
From: _____
Sent: Friday, June 10, 2016 12:29 PM
To: Mary-Jane.Jeanes@merton.gov.uk ; brian.lewis-lavender@merton.gov.uk ; gilli.lewis-lavender@merton.gov.uk ; stephen.alambritis@merton.gov.uk ; chief.executive@merton.gov.uk
Cc: stephen.hammond.rmp@parliament.uk ; _____
Subject: Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing Fields pay and display parking scheme.

Dear Mr Curran and Mr Alambritis

I will preface this email by saying that Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing field is an excellent community facility and that the council should continue to invest in it for the future. As a resident, I appreciate the recent investment in the new gates etc.

Notwithstanding the above, I would like to express my disappointment at the way pay and display (P&D) parking is being implemented by the council at the Joseph Hood Memorial playing fields in Motspur park/West Barnes.

As residents of _____, immediately adjacent to the park, we object to the implementation of pay and display (hours of operation currently unknown) in the park for the following reasons :-

1) This scheme will undoubtedly place additional parking pressure onto Marina Avenue and the surrounding residential streets.

- 2) The current arrangement of opening the gates at 9:30 AM already successfully deters commuters. Additional P&D measures will not improve the situation.
- 3) The impact on park users could be significant. The park is well used by members of the public and P&D could dissuade families and recreational users from using the facilities. As a resident I would like to see the park used to its full potential.
- 4) Rascals may be impacted. In our view a viable business in the pavilion is of benefit to the park. additional parking costs will deter customers.

in addition to the above, we are dissapointed that:-

- 1) As a resident that will be directly impacted by this proposal we have been provided no formal notification about the details of the controls or the scheme.
- 2) We have not been consulted on our views on the suitability of P&D at this location
- 3) We have not been consulted about the timings of the proposed control hours.

Further questions that have been raised:-

- 1) Has a cost benefit analysis been carried out on the scheme. When is it expected to break even?
- 2) what is the expected revenue generation projection of the scheme?
- 3) confirmation that the funds will be ring fenced for reinvestment in the park.

A straw poll of the local residents in Marina Avenue indicates that there is concern about this scheme as the details are a complete unknown at this point in time.

Please can the deployment of this scheme be suspended until residents are consulted?

Thank you

cc: Stephen Hammond MP
cc: West Barnes councillors
cc: Friends of SJHMPF
cc: Raynes Park and West Barnes residents association

Yours sincerely

From: ...
Sent: 03 June 2016 12:06
To: Councillor Mary-Jane Jeanes
Subject: Re: Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing Fields

Hi Mary Jane,

thanks for inquiring about this.

The current arrangement to deter commuter parking in the SJHMPF car park is to open the gates at 9:30 am. This measure is very effective and does mean that the car park is not really used by commuters, who instead park in Marina and the surrounding streets.

The parking is pretty bad in Marina already on weekdays. our concern is that depending on the timings of the scheme, placing pay and display in the park will compound the effect on weekends as well, as recreational park users will try and park in Marina instead of in the JHMPF car park at all times.

Are the council are going to consult the residents on this please?

Thanks

From: Councillor Mary-Jane Jeanes <Mary-Jane.Jeanes@merton.gov.uk>

Sent: 03 June 2016 10:05

To:

Subject: Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing Fields

Dea

I asked about the bases which were being built and have been told that they are for pay and display parking to deter commuters. I have pointed out that this will make the parking worse in Marina Avenue, and possibly Arthur Rd as well.

Kind regards

Mary-Jane

Please help to reduce waste and do not print this message unless you really need to.

This message, including any attached files, is intended just for the use of the individual or organisation to whom it is addressed. Any opinions expressed are those of the sender, not Merton Council. Email is not secure, and the council accepts no responsibility for any inaccuracy, corruption or virus which has occurred during transmission.

This email may be subject to monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation and may be disclosed in response to a request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

The message may contain information that is confidential or sensitive; you should handle it accordingly. If you have received this email message in error, you must not copy, disclose or make any further use of the information contained within it. Please notify the system manager (postmaster@merton.gov.uk) or the Head of Information Governance (data.protection@merton.gov.uk), and delete the message.

postmaster@merton.gov.uk

<http://www.merton.gov.uk>

Please help to reduce waste and do not print this message unless you really need to.

This message, including any attached files, is intended just for the use of the individual or organisation to whom it is addressed. Any opinions expressed are those of the sender, not Merton Council. Email is not secure, and the council accepts no responsibility for any inaccuracy, corruption or virus which has occurred during transmission.

This email may be subject to monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation and may be disclosed in

response to a request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

The message may contain information that is confidential or sensitive; you should handle it accordingly. If you have received this email message in error, you must not copy, disclose or make any further use of the information contained within it. Please notify the system manager (postmaster@merton.gov.uk) or the Head of Information Governance (data.protection@merton.gov.uk), and delete the message.

postmaster@merton.gov.uk

<http://www.merton.gov.uk>

Doug Napier

From: Chris Lee
Sent: 18 July 2016 11:13
To: Doug Napier
Subject: RE: Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing Fields pay and display parking scheme.

Good response . thanks

From: Doug Napier
Sent: 18 July 2016 09:53
To: Councillor Mary-Jane Jeanes
Cc: Chris Lee; Member Enquiry
Subject: RE: Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing Fields pay and display parking scheme.

Dear Mary-Jane,

I can't say that we have had complaints very recently, but I suspect that too many people have now become resigned to the situation.

The proposal is not new, nor is the problem, but this is the very worst site for parking abuses and it's clearly a nonsense that we cannot open the park gates to all users at 8am when the park opens formally.

It was more than two years ago that the concept first hit Members' radar when this was proposed as a budget saving contribution for my service area, albeit it was the commuter issue that was the primary focus, including in terms of selecting pilot sites.

I met with the Friends late last week and they seemed understanding and supportive of the broad aims, but concerned about the impacts upon the playgroup. The fee structure is not onerous, irrespective.

The consultation has, in effect, already started informally and we've had communications from about 3 of the 4 pilot sites already; but there is a formal process to go through that will take six weeks, but we've become rather ensnared by the informal comms in advance of that occurring. It's a case of now confirming the details, I feel, and not the principle - others have been pressing for this, looking at the big picture.

Kind regards,

Doug

Doug Napier
Greenspaces Manager
Environment & Regeneration
Merton Council

Tel: 020 8545 3657

Intimate outdoor picnic concerts, Live at Wimbledon Park
August 26-29, find out more at merton.gov.uk/live



From: Chris Lee
Sent: 18 July 2016 07:36
To: Councillor Mary-Jane Jeanes; Doug Napier
Subject: RE: Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing Fields pay and display parking scheme.

Dear Mary Jane , thanks for your email . I shall leave to Doug the answering of the finer points.

Regards

Chris

From: Councillor Mary-Jane Jeanes
Sent: 16 July 2016 16:13
To: Chris Lee; Doug Napier
Subject: FW: Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing Fields pay and display parking scheme.

Dear Chris and Doug

As you can imagine, I have been contacted by a number of residents about the proposed Pay and Display scheme for Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing Fields in Motspur Park. I am grateful that Mr Ahmed forwarded your reply to me and I apologise for the delay in replying - I have just finished my batch of A level marking.

I am unsure why this scheme was first proposed. Have any complaints been received from park users and, if so, how many? Before deciding to install Pay & Display machines councillors were not consulted; were the Friends of SJHMP consulted?

What exactly are the "persistent parking abuses" mentioned in Chris's email to [redacted] Local people who have spoken to me say they were happy with opening the park gates at 9.30 am to deter commuters; has the council received any complaints about this policy?

You mention the visit to SJHMP on a midweek morning. but my guess is that many of whose cars were in the car park would have been with their small children in the playgroup in the Pavilion. Parents and carers can combine a visit to the playgroup with a walk or visit to the playground, so the car park may have been full for the right reason. Has the proposal to have Pay and display just been based on one visit?

I am pleased that a local consultation is going to be carried out. Please can you tell me how, and when, this is going to be carried out. I do think it would have been better to carry out the consultation before spending money on installing Pay and Display machines.

I appreciate the council's need to generate income but, if this is the reason for introducing Pay and Display, it would have been better to say so up-front at the start of a consultation process.

I look forward to hearing from you

Best wishes

Mary-Jane

From:
Sent: 23 June 2016 12:37

To: Councillor Gilli Lewis-Lavender; Councillor Brian Lewis-Lavender; Councillor Mary-Jane Jeanes
Subject: Fw: Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing Fields pay and display parking scheme.

FYI,

I have received the following communication from the council greenspaces team.

Kind regards

From: Chris Lee <Chris.Lee@merton.gov.uk>

Sent: 23 June 2016 08:54

To: ↓

Cc: Doug Napier

Subject: RE: Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing Fields pay and display parking scheme.

Dear i

Thank you for your recent enquiry of the matter of pay and display parking at Sir Joseph Hood Recreation Ground.

This scheme is being reluctantly introduced at a small number of key parks across the borough in order to help drive out a number of persistent parking abuses, principally, commuter and local business parking, which is having an adverse impact upon the use and enjoyment of some of our most popular open spaces by park users.

The proposals for the parking scheme are:

30p per hour is the standard charge. Mobile phone payments will be possible, as well as coins.

The proposal is that parking charges will apply from 8am to 4pm. Charges will apply between Monday and Saturday, not Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Parking will not be permitted between 11pm and 6am. Sanctions can therefore be applied to vehicles left overnight and we will also enjoy new powers to address issues in relation to untaxed and abandoned vehicles that are currently unavailable to us.

There will imminently be a local consultation exercise on the scheme in line with normal Council procedures for such traffic management initiatives with an opportunity for local people to submit their views.

The income secured from the new parking scheme will be retained within the Greenspaces' accounts and will support the service's on-going revenue costs and new developments, particularly in those key parks where the parking scheme is being introduced. We expect that the overall capital costs of the scheme will be recovered during the second full operational year and on that basis consider this to be a worthwhile investment.

Whilst we recognise that we have recently employed a scheme whereby the park gates are left locked until 9.30am in order to deter parking that it is unrelated to the park's use, that scheme has not been

universally popular amongst park users, and understandably so, considering that our parks formally open at 8am in the midweek and at 9am at weekends. We also consider that this arrangement has not successfully addressed the issue as we hoped that it would; our Greenspaces Manager has reported, for example, that on a recent midweek visit to the park, he struggled to find a parking space during the second half of the morning when the park was quiet and that the car park was entirely full when he departed site at around 11am.

We certainly recognise that there are some historical parking pressures in the Marina Avenue area but consider that these are adversely and unnecessarily affecting the park, and not vice versa, and that it is not unreasonable that we now seek to ensure that the benefits that the car park was designed to secure continue to be enjoyed by those that they were intended for, including customers of the commercial enterprises that operate within the park.

Regards

Chris Lee | Director of Environment & Regeneration
London Borough of Merton

Merton Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, Surrey SM4 5DX

Direct: 020 8545 3050 | Switchboard: 020 8274 4901

chris.lee@merton.gov.uk

www.merton.gov.uk

Intimate outdoor picnic concerts, Live at Wimbledon Park
August 26-29, find out more at merton.gov.uk/live



From:

Sent: 10 June 2016 12:30

To: Councillor Mary-Jane Jeanes; Councillor Brian Lewis-Lavender; Councillor Gilli Lewis-Lavender; Councillor Stephen Alambritis; Chief Executive

Cc: stephen.hammond.mp@parliament.uk; stephen.hammond.mp@parliament.uk

Subject: Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing Fields pay and display parking scheme.

Dear Mr Curran and Mr Alambritis

I will preface this email by saying that Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing field is an excellent community facility and that the council should continue to invest in it for the future. As a resident, I appreciate the recent investment in the new gates etc.

Notwithstanding the above, I would like to express my disappointment at the way pay and display (P&D) parking is being implemented by the council at the Joseph Hood Memorial playing fields in Motspur park/West Barnes.

As residents of _____, immediately adjacent to the park, we object to the implementation of pay and display (hours of operation currently unknown) in the park for the following reasons :-

- 1) This scheme will undoubtedly place additional parking pressure onto Marina Avenue and the surrounding residential streets.
- 2) The current arrangement of opening the gates at 9:30 AM already successfully deters commuters. Additional P&D measures will not improve the situation.
- 3) The impact on park users could be significant. The park is well used by members of the public and P&D could dissuade families and recreational users from using the facilities. As a resident I would like to see the park used to its full potential.
- 4) Rascals may be impacted. In our view a viable business in the pavilion is of benefit to the park. additional parking costs will deter customers.

in addition to the above, we are disappointed that:-

- 1) As a resident that will be directly impacted by this proposal we have been provided no formal notification about the details of the controls or the scheme.
- 2) We have not been consulted on our views on the suitability of P&D at this location
- 3) We have not been consulted about the timings of the proposed control hours.

Further questions that have been raised:-

- 1) Has a cost benefit analysis been carried out on the scheme. When is it expected to break even?
- 2) what is the expected revenue generation projection of the scheme?
- 3) confirmation that the funds will be ring fenced for reinvestment in the park.

A straw poll of the local residents in Marina Avenue indicates that there is concern about this scheme as the details are a complete unknown at this point in time.

Please can the deployment of this scheme be suspended until residents are consulted?

Thank you

cc: Stephen Hammond MP
cc: West Barnes councillors
cc: Friends of SJHMPF
cc: Raynes Park and West Barnes residents association

Yours sincerely

From: _____
Sent: 03 June 2016 12:06
To: Councillor Mary-Jane Jeanes
Subject: Re: Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing Fields

Hi Mary Jane,

thanks for inquiring about this.

The current arrangement to deter commuter parking in the SJHMPF car park is to open the gates at 9:30 am. This measure is very effective and does mean that the car park is not really used by commuters, who instead park in Marina and the surrounding streets.

The parking is pretty bad in Marina already on weekdays. our concern is that depending on the timings of the scheme, placing pay and display in the park will compound the effect on weekends as well, as recreational park users will try and park in Marina instead of in the JHMPF car park at all times.

Are the council are going to consult the residents on this please?

Thanks

Balal Ahmed

From: Councillor Mary-Jane Jeanes <Mary-Jane.Jeanes@merton.gov.uk>

Sent: 03 June 2016 10:05

To:

Subject: Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing Fields

Dear

I asked aboput the bases which were being built and have been told that they are for pay and display parking to deter commuters. I have pointed out that this will make the parking worse in Marina Avenue, and possibly Arthur Rd as well.

Kind regards

Mary-Jane

Please help to reduce waste and do not print this message unless you really need to.

This message, including any attached files, is intended just for the use of the individual or organisation to whom it is addressed. Any opinions expressed are those of the sender, not Merton Council. Email is not secure, and the council accepts no responsibility for any inaccuracy, corruption or virus which has occurred during transmission.

This email may be subject to monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation and may be disclosed in response to a request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

The message may contain information that is confidential or sensitive; you should handle it accordingly. If you have received this email message in error, you must not copy, disclose or make any further use of the information contained within it. Please notify the system manager (postmaster@merton.gov.uk) or the Head of Information Governance (data.protection@merton.gov.uk), and delete the message.

postmaster@merton.gov.uk

<http://www.merton.gov.uk>

Please help to reduce waste and do not print this message unless you really need to.

This message, including any attached files, is intended just for the use of the individual or organisation to whom it is addressed. Any opinions expressed are those of the sender, not Merton Council. Email is not secure, and the council accepts no responsibility for any inaccuracy, corruption or virus which has occurred during transmission.

This email may be subject to monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation and may be disclosed in

Doug Napier

From: Mitra Dubet
Sent: 13 June 2016 09:25
To: Doug Napier
Cc: Chris Lee; Traffic And Highways; Chief Executive
Subject: RE: Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing Fields pay and display parking scheme.

Doug

I know that we have designed the scheme and agreed to do the statutory consultation and works, the below correspondence is one for you to respond. Can you also copy us in too

Also, as a gentle reminder we are still awaiting Cabinet Member approval and any associated report so that we can complete the works

Regards
Mitra Dubet



From: Chief Executive
Sent: 10 June 2016 14:14
To: Mitra Dubet
Cc: Chris Lee; Traffic And Highways
Subject: FW: Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing Fields pay and display parking scheme.

Hi Mitra

Please respond to copying in all those they have sent the email to.

Many thanks,
Sophie

Sophie Jones
Executive Assistant to Ged Curran, Chief Executive
(Wednesday to Friday)
Merton Council
020 8545 3332
sophie.jones@merton.gov.uk
www.merton.gov.uk

From: t
Sent: 10 June 2016 12:30
To: Councillor Mary-Jane Jeanes; Councillor Brian Lewis-Lavender; Councillor Gilli Lewis-Lavender; Councillor Stephen Alambritis; Chief Executive
Cc: stephen.hammond.mp@parliament.uk;
Subject: Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing Fields pay and display parking scheme.

Dear Mr Curran and Mr Alambritis

I will preface this email by saying that Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing field is an excellent community facility and that the council should continue to invest in it for the future. As a resident, I appreciate the recent investment in the new gates etc.

Notwithstanding the above, I would like to express my disappointment at the way pay and display (P&D) parking is being implemented by the council at the Joseph Hood Memorial playing fields in Motspur park/West Barnes.

As residents immediately adjacent to the park, we object to the implementation of pay and display (hours of operation currently unknown) in the park for the following reasons :-

- 1) This scheme will undoubtedly place additional parking pressure onto Marina Avenue and the surrounding residential streets.
- 2) The current arrangement of opening the gates at 9:30 AM already successfully deters commuters. Additional P&D measures will not improve the situation.
- 3) The impact on park users could be significant. The park is well used by members of the public and P&D could dissuade families and recreational users from using the facilities. As a resident I would like to see the park used to its full potential.
- 4) Rascals may be impacted. In our view a viable business in the pavilion is of benefit to the park. additional parking costs will deter customers.

in addition to the above, we are disappointed that:-

- 1) As a resident that will be directly impacted by this proposal we have been provided no formal notification about the details of the controls or the scheme.
- 2) We have not been consulted on our views on the suitability of P&D at this location
- 3) We have not been consulted about the timings of the proposed control hours.

Further questions that have been raised:-

- 1) Has a cost benefit analysis been carried out on the scheme. When is it expected to break even?
- 2) what is the expected revenue generation projection of the scheme?
- 3) confirmation that the funds will be ring fenced for reinvestment in the park.

A straw poll of the local residents in Marina Avenue indicates that there is concern about this scheme as the details are a complete unknown at this point in time.

Please can the deployment of this scheme be suspended until residents are consulted?

Thank you

cc: Stephen Hammond MP
cc: West Barnes councillors
cc:
cc:

Yours sincerely

From: F
Sent: 03 June 2016 12:06

To: Councillor Mary-Jane Jeanes
Subject: Re: Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing Fields

Hi Mary Jane,

thanks for inquiring about this.

The current arrangement to deter commuter parking in the SJHMPF car park is to open the gates at 9:30 am. This measure is very effective and does mean that the car park is not really used by commuters, who instead park in Marina and the surrounding streets.

The parking is pretty bad in Marina already on weekdays. our concern is that depending on the timings of the scheme, placing pay and display in the park will compound the effect on weekends as well, as recreational park users will try and park in Marina instead of in the JHMPF car park at all times.

Are the council are going to consult the residents on this please?

Thanks

From: Councillor Mary-Jane Jeanes <Mary-Jane.Jeanes@merton.gov.uk>
Sent: 03 June 2016 10:05
To: [redacted]
Subject: Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing Fields

Dear Mr [redacted]

I asked aboput the bases which were being built and have been told that they are for pay and display parking to deter commuters. I have pointed out that this will make the parking worse in Marina Avenue, and possibly Arthur Rd as well.

Kind regards

Mary-Jane

Please help to reduce waste and do not print this message unless you really need to.
This message, including any attached files, is intended just for the use of the individual or organisation to whom it is addressed. Any opinions expressed are those of the sender, not Merton Council. Email is not secure, and the council accepts no responsibility for any inaccuracy, corruption or virus which has occurred during transmission.

This email may be subject to monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation and may be disclosed in response to a request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

The message may contain information that is confidential or sensitive; you should handle it accordingly. If you have received this email message in error, you must not copy, disclose or make any further use of the information contained within it. Please notify the system manager (postmaster@merton.gov.uk) or the Head of Information Governance (data.protection@merton.gov.uk), and delete the message.

postmaster@merton.gov.uk
<http://www.merton.gov.uk>

12/11/13

Doug Napier

From: Councillor Andrew Judge
Sent: 13 November 2013 20:26
To: Redirector For Cllr Janice Howard;
Subject: RE: Wimbledon Park

Dear I

With reference to your e.mail to Cllr Howard: there is no expectation that parking charges will be introduced immediately.

However, I believe that there is support amongst local residents, the Friends and Heritage Group for parking charges and we could contemplate the introduction of charges in the future if that support continued.

In respect of the balance between car park abusers and park users, the Council's view is that on any day there are *a/ways* people using the facilities: the park is never deserted in day time. The commuter/misuse issue certainly exists, though it is possible to overstate it.

It is true that the existing car park will often be found to be full, though many of those parked will be using the Park and its facilities. The main car parking issues are at weekends when there are no commuters or tradespeople. The problem is seasonal certainly, but unfortunately we can't develop an additional car park when the parking pressure builds and then roll it back up again in the winter time.

Today at lunch time the only commercial vehicle in the Revelstoke Road Car Park was a chap parked up to have his lunch – enjoyed with a reasonably calm, green and pleasant view. He was certainly not parked up all day as he left the park at around 12.45pm. There were several vacant parking spaces at that time, irrespective of whether there were some abusers – but it is out of season now.

With only 35 spaces now available at RR, some 10-15% of parking capacity is typically and immediately lost to the park's staff. Some of the all-day and early parkers will be staff.

I hope this clarifies the Council's understanding of the issue.

Regards,

Andrew Judge

From: ...
Sent: Monday, November 11, 2013 6:13 PM
To: ...
Cc: Councillor Andrew Judge
Subject: RE: Wimbledon Park

Dear

Thank you for copying me into your email to LB Merton. I have copied in the Cabinet Member responsible, Cllr Andrew Judge as I believe he is indeed looking at introducing parking charges to ensure that the car park in Revelstoke Road is used by Park customers and not commuters.

Best wishes

Councillor Janice Howard
London Borough of Merton
Wimbledon Park Ward
janice.howard@merton.gov.uk

From _____
To: leisure@merton.gov.uk
CC: _____ janice.howard@merton.gov.uk; _____
parking@merton.gov.uk; planning.representations@merton.gov.uk
Subject: Wimbledon Park
Date: Mon, 11 Nov 2013 17:58:15 +0000

Hi,

I write again to bring to your attention the every day occurrence of cars and commercial vehicles being left all day in the, Revelstoke Road entrance to Wimbledon Park car parking facility.

Since the rejection of the recent planning application and the subsequent barrier installed at the once proposed extension area car park facility, it is once again very obvious that the cars that park in the said car park are not all owned by park users.

On a daily basis between 08.00hrs & 10.00hrs, I have observed cars drive in to the park, park in the existing car parking spaces and the drivers/owners exit the park. There have been commercial vehicles use the facility for hours on end. It is an every day occurrence, as I said.

During very heavy rainfall on two days, a week or two ago, the car park was actually full. Nobody was using the park. It was not practical anyone could do so.

This situation has existed for many, many years. I live in Revelstoke Road and pay for a parking permit, plus visitors permits. I put it to you and ask, why should others be allowed to park free within this area?

I could save the costs of the permits, each year, by parking in the park during the permit hours. It would not be difficult for me to do so.

If I never had to pay for permits to park in the road, I would never be concerned with what happens in Wimbledon Park car parking facilities.

I do consider this car park situation requires attention. A solution has to be reached and acted upon to halt the misuse of this car parking facility.

Sincerely,

NJK

Doug Napier

From: Doug Napier
Sent: 11 October 2012 08:38
To:
Subject: RE: Wimbledon Park

We did surveys into the alleged commuter issue very recently and also a couple of years ago in the midweek for an entire week, noting car registration numbers in the morning and then again in the later afternoon. On both occasions there were 1-2 cars only that appeared consistently suggesting commuters and even then we did not entirely eliminate the fact that this/these were cars belong to policemen based in the station in the park.

In our view, tackling this issue in isolation will do very little to relieve the very real and significant parking issues that exist. Introducing parking fees might, but the administration has not yet fully embraced that concept.

Regards,

Doug

From:
Sent: 02 October 2012 17:15
To: Doug Napier
Cc:
Subject: RE: Wimbledon Park

Doug,

Thank you for your prompt response.

I appreciate that the weekends may be the busiest time for the park, and that therefore the car parking demands at that time are greatest for users. But also at that stage, there are no park restrictions in any of the roads around the park whether it be Revelstoke Road, Home Park Road or Wimbledon Park Road or other surrounding roads, that can readily be used with a modest walk. Surely the Park should not be hostage to the requirements of week-end users. We have managed every other year to date!

As regards your survey of users, it would be good to know over what period and what times of day this survey was done. Given the usage of the Park on some days, eg yesterday morning when it was rather drizzly and there were few people around, you would be hard pushed to explain why there were so many cars parked, other than use by non-park users.

Regards,

--- On **Mon, 1/10/12**, **Doug Napier** <Doug.Napier@merton.gov.uk> wrote:

From: Doug Napier <Doug.Napier@merton.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Wimbledon Park
To:
Date: Monday, 1 October, 2012, 13:27

Dear

Thank you for your enquiry. The temporary car park is indeed normally closed at or about this time of year. However, the demands for parking are still substantial currently and we have to take a balanced view and recognise the wishes

and needs of our users too.

I was present in the park last Saturday (29th) morning when the core parking area at Revelstoke Road was entirely full and the overflow contained a further 48 cars. I don't imagine that the situation was very much better in the afternoon and it has been much the same throughout September from my own observations.

We have undertaken surveys on the alleged use of the car park by commuters but have not found this to be a significant issue. Weekends are the time of peak parking demand and, of course, commuters and tradesmen are few and far between then.

Regards,

Doug Napier

Greenspaces Manager

From: ;
Sent: 01 October 2012 12:48
To: Doug Napier
Cc:
Subject: Wimbledon Park

Doug,

I gather that you are the right person to contact with regard to the winter closure of the temporary car park extension.

Of course I am well aware of the existing Planning Application relating to the Revelstoke Car Park, but without pre-judging the outcome of that application, and since summer is now sadly well past, is it not time to close off the rather unsightly car park extension as has been done in previous years? Not only does it present an unnecessarily and unpleasantly long vista of cars from the Southfields entrance, but it also extends the opportunity for commuters and tradesmen to make use of the free parking; a long term habit of which can only be to the detriment of genuine park users.

Regards,

By copy to . . . well done!. Very good to have another independent local resident letting Doug Napier know what we think. Its a pity we can't persuade our local councillors and MP (who no doubt takes his views from Oonagh Moulton) to see the point.

Very good news to hear about possible car-parking charges. Merton Council ought to introduce them before they even contemplate expanding the parking facility. If they were to do it the other way round, they would probably have a white elephant on their hands, and a spoiled park as well!

Regards,

From:

To:

CC:

Sent: Sunday, 11 August 2013, 11:04

Subject: Fw: Wimbledon Park

Dear All

You should find exchange with Doug of interest. Looks as though he's thinking of car parking fees. We raised this, but as an extension of CPZs, a long time ago.

regards

Nick

From:

Sent: Friday, August 09, 2013 3:57 PM

To:

Cc: HAMMOND, Stephen ;

Subject: RE: Wimbledon Park

Hi

They have received it, it is on the site.

I have tried to analyse the report that LBM commissioned regards park usage. It is very heavily biased towards the LBM application. As you are aware, you can do anything with numbers and this company have certainly produced a report of loaded numbers.

It reports that 17 park workers use the car park, 5 community officers and 5 café workers, plus some other people, who, I think live in the lake!

On a brief recce, only one café worker has a car and he parks outside the café, the community officers travel by public transport on passes, two park workers come by car and the ones from the lake don't drive!

So, why do the council wish to press ahead with this extension? The park operated quite happily before this hard standing became available. There may be increased park use with children's activities, do the children all drive themselves to the park???? No, of course not, they are dropped OFF.

The damage to the park far out ways the requirement for any increased car parking facilities. The green space will be lost for ever, until more of it is weaselled away.

I counted 17 drivers leave their vehicles one day last week between 07.00hrs and 09.00hrs and disappear out of the park, none of them were using the park. This goes on all day into the late afternoon, especially with contractors working locally.

We all pay for parking permits and for visitors parking permits, each year, well, I'm parking in Wimbledon Park between 11 & 3 next year and no visitors permits, what say you?

best regards,

Date: Fri, 9 Aug 2013 14:11:27 +0100
Subject: RE: Wimbledon Park
From:
To:

Hi
Another great letter.
I have a feeling that the council don't need to count or display a letter if it doesn't have your address on it. Also, it's always good to try to put the reference number on. Definitely an address though for them to know you live in the vicinity.
Maybe resend both letters using an address/phone number 'signature' at the end.
Well done for keeping on at them though!

Sent from Samsung mobile

wrote:

Dear Mr Napier,

Thank you for taking the time to respond to my mail.

I have read the planning report and taken cognisance of the content. My first reaction is to the figures that have been compiled through survey, by whoever, are not representative of the vehicles using the present temporary hard standing. I have observed over three mornings last month, between 06.30hrs & 08.00hrs, cars being parked and the owners (drivers) walking out of the park, either down through Revelstoke Road, or out to Wimbledon Park tube station.

During the afternoon many other cars in the temporary hard standing area are parked by people who leave the park area. You really need to conduct a professional survey over a long period of time to ascertain what is actually happening.

Also, I dispute your figures given for car park spaces being required for park work staff, café staff, community officers and other ancillary workers and users of the park. The bowling facility has been there for over 70 years, they have survived without any extra car parking being required. It appears to me that you are deliberately manufacturing numbers to justify your ideas.

Park visitors do not have to travel by car and if they do so, there are parking facilities in Home Park Road & elsewhere.

Your philosophy that for everyone who is using the park requires a car parking space, borders on the absurdity. Keep cars off the road where possible, walk, exercise, keep healthy, that should be the philosophy.

Also, I do not see my representation within the councils listing. I sent by mail as an attachment. Shall I post it, or resend?

I do not wish to see the application go forward. It is against everything that the park is for. There will still be people using the park without the extra car park facility, they will benefit from walking, there will be less traffic on the road, the park will return to it's original beauty and the green space will be saved.

Sincerely,

From: Doug.Napier@merton.gov.uk
To:
Subject: RE: Wimbledon Park
Date: Fri, 9 Aug 2013 07:31:17 +0000

Dear [redacted],

The "core" parking needs I refer to are the year-round, currently tarmaced area at the Revelstoke Road entrance. The proposed overflow area is a seasonal facility and is currently marked out by the area with the hard-core surface edged with railway sleepers.

Our parking plans for the park were discussed at a well-attended public meeting held in the park over 2 years ago now and these plans are now in the formal planning domain and can be viewed on the planning application pages of the Council's website <http://planning.merton.gov.uk/mvm/online/dms/DocumentViewer.aspx?pk=1000076956&SearchType=Planning%20Application>, reference 12/P1181. This captures all the current documents and submissions going back more than 12 months.

Any comments that you have may have on the scheme can be directed to the Development Control team as this project has yet to be considered by the planning committee. The design was put together by professional colleagues in our Traffic & Highways team who have considered pedestrian needs too in arriving at their current design.

I agree that there is some abuse of the free car parking in the park by some commuters and trades people working for local residents but we have conducted local studies on this and are satisfied that numbers are low and tackling this matter alone will not resolve the current parking issues in the park, and not least because the greatest parking issues occur at weekends when commuter and trades use will be at or close to zero.

Irrespective, the Council is currently considering introducing car parking fees in a number of its parks, Wimbledon Park amongst these. If adopted, this would undoubtedly adversely affect commuter-type parking on site.

Finally, in respect of my words 'no extraordinary or exceptional means of controlling the actions of individual drivers'. This is simply a reference to the need for restraint and respect for other users by car drivers. Ultimately it is they who have control, irrespective of what traffic calming measures or signage may be introduced.

Regards,

Doug Napier
Greenspaces Manager

From:
Sent: 13 July 2013 11:31
To: Doug Napier
Cc:
Subject: RE: Wimbledon Park

Dear Mr Napier,

Thank you for your reply to my mail.

I find your points somewhat confusing. first, what are the historical car parking arrangements ? You then say the council proposals go beyond actual core parking needs, but address the wider issues of traffic flow and pedestrian movements too.

You say if your plans were implemented you would have no means of controlling the individual actions and behaviours of individual drivers. Surely any plans that you say you have should provide definitive safety for pedestrians entering and leaving the park. Your reference to the notice stating a 5mph limit, can I tell you it is in such a position that it is very difficult to read at any position and it is also positioned very poorly.

I wish to point out to you that the pedestrian entrance to the park at Revelstoke Road has historically provided access directly onto the park. This additional parking that appears to exist now to the left of the park entrance provides for vehicles to cross the old and existing pedestrian walkway. This is where your direct responsibilities lie to ensure that the people wishing to use the park can do so safely.

You also say that the pedestrian walkway provides for all, or any access to the park facility, AROUND THE CAR PARK AREA. This is not a supermarket, it is a park and the entrance should immediately provide to the people using the park exactly what all parks are for and not an immediate view of parked vehicles, which in many cases belong to owners who are NOT utilising the park facilities.

The park was bequeathed by the Spencer family for the enjoyment of all and to give what is expected of a park to the people, not to walk into a dangerous place comprising of vehicles moving from opposite directions.

I have visited the park early in the morning, on numerous occasions and observed drivers depositing their vehicles and walking off to Wimbledon Park tube station. I have asked some of these people if they are using the park, the answers have varied in tone, I'll leave you to imagine!!

Yesterday the car park was full along with the area now being used as a second car park. I counted over 50 vehicles.

The safety of people entering this park is paramount. Any altered facility that the council implement will be their total responsibility, be fully aware of this. The historical entrance to the park gave pedestrians direct access onto the park without having to consider vehicles moving from two opposing directions. Whilst you say that you are not responsible for how drivers behave, agreed, by providing vehicle access in two directions, you are increasing the RISK of accidents.

I would be happy to view the proposals that go beyond actual core parking needs, please advise.

Also, as a final comment, this mail, I do not fully understand your paragraph which states 'you have no extraordinary or exceptional means of controlling the actions of individual drivers'. Is this some form of 'council speak'? I fail to agree with what you state. The **dual** car parking facility is an eyesore and promotes a grave danger to pedestrians, especially children, walking into the park, as we have all done so for many, many years.

As I have advised, the car park(s) are used by none park users, how do you propose to control this? I pay for my parking permit, plus visitors permits. Maybe I could use the car park inside of the controlled hours and save myself the cost of these permits.

I have observed many people including builders and contractors vehicles being parked in the park all day. How will you control this?

The second hard standing should be removed and the park returned to the original state.

Those are my practical suggestions!

I put it to you and the council that the local residents have a voice. Please, do not dismiss it in the way that you have attempted to do so.

Sincerely,

Subject: RE: Wimbledon Park
Date: Tue, 18 Jun 2013 14:15:20 +0100
From: Doug.Napier@merton.gov.uk
To:
CC:
Dear

Thank you for your enquiry below.

Our plans to redevelop the historical car parking arrangements in the park are very much alive still and our proposals go beyond the actual core parking needs but address the wider issues of traffic flows and pedestrian movements too.

Were this not such a contentious local issue - not so much from a safety point of view, but from the perspective expressed by some local residents that improved parking provisions are unnecessary - then our scheme would very probably already be constructed and operational.

That said, and assuming that our plans are implemented, then we would still have no extraordinary or exceptional means of controlling the actions and behaviours of individual drivers and certainly no more controls than currently apply to either highways or to other off-street parking facilities.

There is, of course, an existing dedicated pedestrian pavement at the Revelstoke Road park entrance which is quite separate from the vehicular route into the park and with clear access around the car park area which is clearly demarcated. There is also advisory 5 mph signage displayed at the park entrance.

If you have some practical suggestions on how you feel that we should be tackling the issue then we would be pleased to receive them.

Kind regards,

Doug Napier
Greenspaces Manager
Environment & Regeneration
Merton Council

From:
Sent: 28 May 2013 16:36
To: Leisure
Cc:
Subject: Wimbledon Park

Hello,

I have previously been in consultation with the council people looking into the proposed new parking facility at Wimbledon Park, Revelstoke Road entrance.

It appears that whatever is being planned, or discussed has come to a halt. Kindly advise if I am wrong.

The situation that presently exists at the Revelstoke Road entrance to Wimbledon Park is such that any pedestrian entrance is compromised by the vehicle traffic entering and exiting the park.

As you are surely aware, there are now two vehicle parking areas after the entrance to the park. Because of this bi-directional movement of vehicles it presents a potentially dangerous situation for pedestrians entering the park.

The traffic shows no concern, as such, for people at these points and is not guided in any way. The traffic moves as it so wishes, depending upon whoever is in control of each vehicle. There is no adherence to a

safe speed, the vehicles move at a speed that the driver decides upon as it moves in, or out. There is nothing to indicate that a safe speed is mandatory in the area.

I have witnessed vehicles exiting the park at speeds far beyond what is necessary.

Vehicles enter at speeds well in excess of what would be indicated as safe & sensible.

What does it require for the council authorities to address this matter? The consultations have dragged on for a number of years. Do you require someone to help you?

If injury, or a fatality occur in this area, and lets hope and trust that it will not, how will the council regard their responsibility at that time?

You really must proceed to address this matter at your earliest.

Sincerely.

Please help to reduce waste and do not print this message unless you really need to.

This message, including any attached files, is intended just for the use of the individual or organisation to whom it is addressed. Any opinions expressed are those of the sender, not Merton Council. Email is not secure, and the council accepts no responsibility for any inaccuracy, corruption or virus which has occurred during transmission.

This email may be subject to monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation and may be disclosed in response to a request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

The message may contain information that is confidential or sensitive; you should handle it accordingly.

If you have received this email message in error, you must not copy, disclose or make any further use of the information contained within it. Please notify the system manager (postmaster@merton.gov.uk) or the Head of Information Governance (data.protection@merton.gov.uk), and delete the message.

Postmaster@merton.gov.uk

<http://www.merton.gov.uk>

Please help to reduce waste and do not print this message unless you really need to.

This message, including any attached files, is intended just for the use of the individual or organisation to whom it is addressed. Any opinions expressed are those of the sender, not Merton Council. Email is not secure, and the council accepts no responsibility for any inaccuracy, corruption or virus which has occurred during transmission.

This email may be subject to monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation and may be disclosed in response to a request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

The message may contain information that is confidential or sensitive; you should handle it accordingly.

If you have received this email message in error, you must not copy, disclose or make any further use of the information contained within it. Please notify the system manager (postmaster@merton.gov.uk) or the Head of Information Governance (data.protection@merton.gov.uk), and delete the message.

Postmaster@merton.gov.uk

<http://www.merton.gov.uk>

Doug Napier

From: Redirector For Cllr Janice Howard
Sent: 22 June 2016 09:18
To: Doug Napier
Cc: Councillor Janice Howard; Member Enquiry; Ann Page
Subject: Re: Cllr enquiry ER16M1321 Cllr Howard fr ... due 4 July 2016

Hi Doug

Thanks for your prompt response, I will pass on to my resident .

Best wishes

Councillor Janice Howard

Sent from my iPhone

On 22 Jun 2016, at 08:53, Doug Napier <Doug.Napier@merton.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Janice,

I am responding to the email below - despite the fact that I am somewhat unclear about the points that are being made.

Yes, we are proposing to introduce Pay & Display parking in the park later this year at the Revelstoke Road entrance. This has been in the pipeline for more than two years now and an attempt to recover some vitally needed parking spaces from some local parking abuses. You will recall that plans to extend the park's car parking capacity were refused a little before that timeframe.

All of our parks open officially at 8am in the midweek period (9am at weekends). In reality, Wimbledon Park typically opens before this (and usually soon after 7am) as a member of the parks team lives in the park and opens up as he leaves the site for work. We have, by exception, permitted some exercise classes to enter the park earlier in order to accommodate pre-commute fitness demands in the area. This is a commercial arrangement and one that other users may indirectly be benefitting from in access terms, but to be clear, if these activities stopped, the opening times would revert too. It is a variation on the situation in a number of other Merton parks where, stakeholder groups, typically Friends groups, open the park. We could of course insist that the fitness classes lock the park gates behind them but that approach has not been especially popular amongst those looking in when it's been tried in the past. This could, of course, be reintroduced on the grounds of predictability if that is considered more important than enabling additional access to the park above the norm, albeit at random times.

Kind regards,

Doug Napier
Greenspaces Manager
Environment & Regeneration
Merton Council

Intimate outdoor picnic concerts, Live at Wimbledon Park
August 26-29, find out more at merton.gov.uk/live

<image001.png>

From: Ann Page
Sent: 20 June 2016 16:37
To: Member Enquiry
Cc: Councillor James Holmes
Subject: FW: Wimbledon Park Opening Hours

Dear Christine

Please see below member enquiry.

Could officers kindly respond and cc me in

Thank you

Ann

Sent: 20 June 2016 16:05
To: janice.howard@merton.gov.uk
Subject: Fwd: Wimbledon Park Opening Hours

Dear Janice,

Please see email I sent to council recently for which I haven't had a reply to.

I therefore thought I would contact you directly to take this matter up. I left a message with a colleague of yours this afternoon, but she mentioned it might be a good idea to forward this email directly to you.

To add to my email below, I have noticed that on certain mornings the pedestrian gates do open earlier as there are personal trainers that conduct classes, but that seems to be pretty arbitrary when it happens.

I have also noticed that parking meters have been installed in the carpark (previously free to park), which means there will be more income/funding at the parks disposal.

I look forward to your response and discussing the matter with you.

Regards

----- Forwarded message -----

From: "

Page 386

Date: 7 June 2016 at 11:50
Subject: Wimbledon Park Opening Hours
To: leisure@merton.gov.uk

Dear Merton Council,

I am a resident of Merton council, and live close by Wimbledon Park. This is a park our family love and use a lot especially as we have kids and a dog.

I would like for someone to explain the rationale behind why the park does not open until after 7am (8am I believe is the official time) and after 9am at weekends.

I have to say this seems like a very strange time as there are many people who would like to use the park early in the mornings especially in the summer. There are many people who walk there dogs early in the morning, that like to exercise and to be able to do this before work it means the park needs to open earlier. It's even crazier that we have to wait until later at the weekends.

What compounds the problem is the fact that the times the park doors are opened are very inconsistent. As a local resident I'd even be happy to go on a rota to be responsible for opening the gates in the morning if its a case of staffing the opening.

Would you mind explaining? I do look forward to your response.

Please help to reduce waste and do not print this message unless you really need to. This message, including any attached files, is intended just for the use of the individual or organisation to whom it is addressed. Any opinions expressed are those of the sender, not Merton Council. Email is not secure, and the council accepts no responsibility for any inaccuracy, corruption or virus which has occurred during transmission. This email may be subject to monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation and may be disclosed in response to a request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. The message may contain information that is confidential or sensitive; you should handle it accordingly.

If you have received this email message in error, you must not copy, disclose or make any further use of the information contained within it. Please notify the system manager (postmaster@merton.gov.uk) or the Head of Information Governance (data.protection@merton.gov.uk), and delete the message.

postmaster@merton.gov.uk
<http://www.merton.gov.uk>

Please help to reduce waste and do not print this message unless you really need to. This message, including any attached files, is intended just for the use of the individual or

organisation to whom it is addressed. Any opinions expressed are those of the sender, not Merton Council. Email is not secure, and the council accepts no responsibility for any inaccuracy, corruption or virus which has occurred during transmission.

This email may be subject to monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation and may be disclosed in response to a request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

The message may contain information that is confidential or sensitive; you should handle it accordingly.

If you have received this email message in error, you must not copy, disclose or make any further use of the information contained within it. Please notify the system manager (postmaster@merton.gov.uk) or the Head of Information Governance (data.protection@merton.gov.uk), and delete the message.

postmaster@merton.gov.uk

<http://www.merton.gov.uk>

ink

Doug Napier

From: Doug Napier
Sent: 30 July 2014 11:57
To:
Subject: RE: Car park complaint

Yes, we've been having some issues with all disabled bays being occupied due to the park being busy and there being limited parking overall.

The park is not part of the highway and therefore normal enforcement means are not available to us.

Regards,

Doug

-----Original Message-----

From: Doug Napier
Sent: 30 July 2014 09:41
To: Doug Napier
Cc: Councillor Ian Munn; I
Subject: Re: Car park complaint

Doug

Thanks for this as it's useful to know about complaints. Parking matters are almost guaranteed to raise a discussion.

One member has a disabled badge but it appears all 3 disabled bays were in use. Are these bays advisory

-----Original Message-----

From: Doug Napier
Sent: Thursday, July 24, 2014 2:45 PM
To:
Cc: Councillor Ian Munn
Subject: FW:

This is just the latest in a series of complaints about the car parking at Wimbledon Park received this summer.

This event occurred on a Saturday when, of course, there would have been no commuters or tradesmen or teachers or such like to complicate matters. I expect to receive several more complaints before the summer is over.

Regards,

Doug

Please help to reduce waste and do not print this message unless you really need to. This message, including any attached files, is intended just for the use of the individual or organisation to whom it is addressed. Any opinions expressed are those of the sender, not Merton Council. Email is not secure, and the council accepts no responsibility for any inaccuracy, corruption or virus which has occurred during transmission.

This email may be subject to monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation and may be disclosed in response to a request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

The message may contain information that is confidential or sensitive; you should handle it accordingly.

If you have received this email message in error, you must not copy, disclose or make any further use of the information contained within it.

Please notify the system manager (postmaster@merton.gov.uk) or the Head of Information Governance (data.protection@merton.gov.uk), and delete the message.

Postmaster@merton.gov.uk

<http://www.merton.gov.uk>

PJK

Doug Napier

From: Doug Napier
Sent: 12 September 2014 09:55
To:
Subject: RE: Parking

Thank you! Some observations and comments from me are below.

Regents,

Doug

From: N
Sent: 11 September 2014 17:22
To: Doug Napier
Cc: I
Subject: Re: Parking

Doug

1. We're not proposing that the car park be supervised other than a check on the disabled bays from time to time. I'm glad to hear it, but on busy days I suspect that the scope for checking individual cars will be limited.
2. Disabled bays should be controlled and this can be done by signs and warnings which should refer to the Bye Laws. We don't consider a painted sign on the ground is sufficient. Well it ought to be if people had any common sense and decency. I'm not sure, moreover, how the clutter of additional signs squares with the arguments about preserving view across the historical landscape upon arrival in the park that were prevalent about 1 year ago. Nevertheless, we will explore this but its akin to adding braces when you already have a belt on and you will have to forgive me if I'm cynical about the benefits of signs but its based on many years of experience.
3. With regard to your request for volunteers to help with supervision we could consider its feasibility. Do you have in mind the provision of some windscreen notices to put on cars that are abusing these disabled bay spaces? Yes, by all means, but it might also useful for all to understand why these people are doing this.
4. Charging should make a start on discouraging non park users from using the parking space. We look forward to discussing your proposals. I am still keen to do this but don't yet have approval.
5. We're not proposing that the car park be closed! You will recall that we explained our ideas for improvements to you when we walked round the park. Those proposals, which don't change the number of parking spaces, are with the leaders of the two councils. It was one of your members who suggested that (and I paraphrase): "If you can't manage it, then close it".
6. The removal of the unauthorised car park extension has been a huge benefit. It has restored a sense of relative calm and safety to the Revelstoke Road entrance, I don't agree. It's been chaotic at times this past summer. got rid of an ugly view and further pollution and opened up green space which is once again being used for recreation. Whether or not you consider that further parking spaces are needed in the park, the limited width of the Revelstoke Road entrance means it is entirely unsuitable to take the extra traffic the car park extension encouraged. I agree about the width but this has benefits in terms of slowing traffic down entering the park. But the chaos is mainly caused by the minimal parking capacity combined with the demand.
7. We've received many positive comments for the return of the grass. Yes, we like what we have achieved, but we have done so against our better instincts in terms of the needs of the park overall, and because, in effect, we were forced to. We've had our very first complaints this year about the lack of parking capacity, as you know, and so it would not be true to say that only positive complaints have been received.

Without getting into a long debate our view on parking is guided by:

1. London's road system is congested and our air seriously polluted in large part because of vehicle emissions (exceeding national and international guidelines for health by a fair margin). Travel by private vehicle also causes greenhouse gas emissions. There are recognised health benefits from walking and cycling. As a result, there are several policies adopted locally to discourage travel by private vehicle in favour of walking, cycling and public transport. Provision of free car parking acts

against such policies. Appreciated but the nature of Wimbledon Park and its customer base means that public transport options are not especially good and I don't believe that one single person who lives more than half a mile from the park has ever complained to us about our overflow parking. 35 spaces at RR is not reasonable for such a busy park and I can't name a park of this popularity and typology around outer London that has a smaller parking capacity.

2. **The argument that full car parks are evidence of an unfulfilled and reasonable need, which we should consider meeting, ignores precedent elsewhere (for example the absence of car parking provision in many prime open spaces, such as the central Royal Parks)** I'd suggest that central London Royal Parks are not a good comparator as we are an outer borough - but having said that Hyde Park has at least 2 car parks with capacity for around 150 cars in total I reckon and Regents Park has an enormous car park. Richmond Park is probably the best Royal Parks comparator; it has 8 car parks and parking capacity in excess of 1,500 cars **and the effects of charging and proper regulation (for example as at Battersea Park).** I'd like to do this too **It also ignores the fact that there is plenty of car parking available in nearby streets, most especially at popular times for visiting the park (for example in Home Park Road).** There are local street parking controls locally that adversely affect users, for example, families using the water play area who come for many hours during the summer and other holiday periods, Monday to Sunday. **Free car parking near to a popular place will always be preferred by those who are presented with the alternative of charged parking further from the place. Any unfulfilled general need can only be demonstrated once the existing car parks are both charged for and regulated; Battersea Park suggests that the "need" then disappears.** A key point that this overlooks is that Battersea Park has 3 car parks and almost 300 spaces, almost 10x what RR has for a park that has a similar range of facilities. I've certainly struggled to park there on occasions and so I'd suggest that the need has not necessarily gone away as you suggest.
3. **We all agree that there may be special cases, notably disabled park users, including some users of the water sports facilities. The abuse of provision for disabled parking is evidence, not of a reasonable need, but of selfish behaviour.** I agree with the selfish behaviour point but can't say for sure that these are not drivers with a car load of small kids exercising the "rights" that some supermarkets offer, for example. I still say this illicit parking is symptomatic of the lack of capacity overall and would not have occurred had parking capacity been reasonable compared to the demands.
4. regards
- 5.
- 6.

From: [Doug Napier](#)

Sent: Friday, August 29, 2014 1:26 PM

To: ...

Subject: RE: Parking

The point is that parking capacity overall at this location is not reasonable and so people are taking unilateral and selfish decisions and I am very disappointed by your suggestion below that I might think that this behaviour is acceptable.

The lack of parking capacity also applies to the number of disabled bays on offer in such a busy park I would suggest, irrespective of the abuses encountered recently.

We do not have the resources to be supervising this car park for hours on end throughout the year unless we sacrifice some other activity in the park - litter picking is just about the only option nowadays and I would be extremely loathe to do that.

The parking does not (yet) sustain an income and only when fees are introduced will there a practical opportunity to have this activity supervised and a degree of enforcement applied. Unless, of course, some volunteers would like to come forwards to help supervise matters given the level of local interest in the parking issues at Revelstoke Road?

We will investigate signs, but the bays are already clearly marked-up and, in any case, this will only deal with one symptom and not the fundamental problem and so you will have to forgive us if we don't propose to close the car park altogether as that will merely compound existing matters.

Regards,

Doug

From: [redacted]
Sent: 10 August 2014 18:43
To: Doug Napier
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Re: Parking

Doug

Are you really suggesting that if a driver gets frustrated it's alright to park in a disabled space? These spaces are provided for blue badge holders and steps should be taken to keep them free from opportunists.

Felix's mother is clearly asking for the bays to be kept free for blue badge holders. Your linking it to the decision to close the extension to the car park misses the point.

offered a solution, at least in the short term, and I'm at a loss to understand why you've rejected this!

At least make an attempt at controlling these bays. A notice is a start and warnings can be given. If this doesn't work then use the Bye Laws. Evidence is easily obtained and I anticipate this evidence being readily accepted in a Magistrates Court with costs being awarded.

From: [Doug Napier](#)
Sent: Friday, August 08, 2014 10:37 AM
Subject: Parking

The problem is not nearly so simple as an additional sign. It's the very poor parking capacity overall that is the root cause of this. The disabled bays are clearly marked up as disabled bays already. It's the lack of space overall that's forcing/persuading people to take up these opportunities out of frustration I strongly suspect.

This is one symptom of a very much bigger problem that some extra signs will not remedy.

Our rejected parking extension proposals did, of course, have 8 dedicated disabled parking bays, as opposed to the current 3, and so we did anticipate this problem.

Regards,

Doug

From: ...
Sent: 08 August 2014 00:12
To: Doug Napier
Cc: ...
Subject:

Doug

The problem with this as well as the disabled bowler is the control of the disabled bays. Can I suggest a small but easily seen notice be placed at the head of each bay to emphasize the fact that they are for blue-badge holders only. Reference to section 7(ii) of the Bye Laws may be helpful.

regards

From: [Doug Napier](#)
Sent: Thursday, August 07, 2014 8:01 AM
To: [me](#)
Subject:

Another regrettable consequence created by the lack of parking capacity in the park FYI.

Doug

From:
Sent: 01 August 2014 08:47
To: Doug Napier
Subject:

Dear Mr Napier, I was given you email address by the lovely people at the sailing school in Wimbledon Park where both my children are enjoying a weeks sailing (good weather for it!)

My youngest son, Felix, who is 12 has Cerebral Palsy and cannot walk, it has been fabulous to find an activity that he can join in with but there is a major problem! Since the extra carpark has disappeared (since last year) the parking is unbelievably bad and there has not been a single day when the Disabled Bays are not full of cars without Blue Badges, I have taken a few photos - just a selection of the many(!) I am wondering if something can be done to stop this, it is proving incredibly difficult for me and I'm sure other people with special needs who cannot get anywhere near the park!

Please could you let me know your thoughts, I would be most grateful, many thanks.

Please help to reduce waste and do not print this message unless you really need to.
This message, including any attached files, is intended just for the use of the individual or organisation to whom it is addressed. Any opinions expressed are those of the sender, not Merton Council. Email is not secure, and the council accepts no responsibility for any inaccuracy, corruption or virus which has occurred during transmission.
This email may be subject to monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation and may be disclosed in response to a request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.
The message may contain information that is confidential or sensitive; you should handle it accordingly. If you have received this email message in error, you must not copy, disclose or make any further use of the information contained within it. Please notify the system manager (postmaster@merton.gov.uk) or the Head of Information Governance (data.protection@merton.gov.uk), and delete the message.

Postmaster@merton.gov.uk
<http://www.merton.gov.uk>

Please help to reduce waste and do not print this message unless you really need to.
This message, including any attached files, is intended just for the use of the individual or organisation to whom it is addressed. Any opinions expressed are those of the sender, not Merton Council. Email is not secure, and the council accepts no responsibility for any inaccuracy, corruption or virus which has occurred during transmission.

This email may be subject to monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation and may be disclosed in response to a request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

The message may contain information that is confidential or sensitive; you should handle it accordingly. If you have received this email message in error, you must not copy, disclose or make any further use of the information contained within it. Please notify the system manager (postmaster@merton.gov.uk) or the Head of Information Governance (data.protection@merton.gov.uk), and delete the message.

Postmaster@merton.gov.uk

<http://www.merton.gov.uk>

Please help to reduce waste and do not print this message unless you really need to.
This message, including any attached files, is intended just for the use of the individual or organisation to whom it is addressed. Any opinions expressed are those of the sender, not Merton Council. Email is not secure, and the council accepts no responsibility for any inaccuracy, corruption or virus which has occurred during transmission.

This email may be subject to monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation and may be disclosed in response to a request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

The message may contain information that is confidential or sensitive; you should handle it accordingly. If you have received this email message in error, you must not copy, disclose or make any further use of the information contained within it. Please notify the system manager (postmaster@merton.gov.uk) or the Head of Information Governance (data.protection@merton.gov.uk), and delete the message.

Postmaster@merton.gov.uk

<http://www.merton.gov.uk>

AK

Doug Napier

From: Doug Napier
Sent: 15 November 2013 08:27
To:
Subject: RE: Wimbledon Park

As you may already know, the park's car park does not fall within the realms of the public highway and at present we are not able to apply the same parking regulations that apply in the streets nearby.

As you are also aware, I am keen to introduce parking charges to the park. This should drive out some of the issues that concern you - albeit that I do not agree that it is as significant a problem as you portray and certainly not so severe that it will resolve all of our summer parking headaches on its own. The matter has become something of a political football however, and its course has not been smooth, despite my sense that there is much immediately local support for it. Work continues nevertheless.

Regards,

Doug

From:
Sent: 11 November 2013 17:58
To: Leisure
Cc:
Subject: Wimbledon Park

Hi,

I write again to bring to your attention the every day occurrence of cars and commercial vehicles being left all day in the, Revelstoke Road entrance to Wimbledon Park car parking facility.

Since the rejection of the recent planning application and the subsequent barrier installed at the once proposed extension area car park facility, it is once again very obvious that the cars that park in the said car park are not all owned by park users.

On a daily basis between 08.00hrs & 10.00hrs, I have observed cars drive in to the park, park in the existing car parking spaces and the drivers/owners exit the park. There have been commercial vehicles use the facility for hours on end. It is an every day occurrence, as I said.

During very heavy rainfall on two days, a week or two ago, the car park was actually full. Nobody was using the park. It was not practical anyone could do so.

This situation has existed for many, many years. I live in Revelstoke Road and pay for a parking permit, plus visitors permits. I put it to you and ask, why should others be allowed to park free within this area?

I could save the costs of the permits, each year, by parking in the park during the permit hours. It would not be difficult for me to do so.

If I never had to pay for permits to park in the road, I would never be concerned with what happens in Wimbledon Park car parking facilities.

I do consider this car park situation requires attention. A solution has to be reached and acted upon to halt the misuse of this car parking facility.

Sincerely,

A very faint, illegible signature or stamp, possibly a name in a cursive or stylized font, located below the word 'Sincerely,'.

NK

Doug Napier

From:
Sent: 09 November 2016 21:19
To: Doug Napier
Cc:
Subject: Re: BATTLES AREA RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION - Proposed Contract regarding Maintenance of Haydons Road Recreation Ground

Dear Mr Napier

I am writing in I absence as Vice-Chair of the above Residents Association to acknowledge receipt of your e-mail and confirm it will be discussed at our next committee meeting.

Yours sincerely

Vice-Chair Battles Area Residents Association

Sent from my iPad

On 4 Nov 2016, at 11:14, Doug Napier <Doug.Napier@merton.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear I

Further to your email below and over and above the more specific issue concerning the formal disposal notices for the operational yards and staff mess room facilities in relation to the pending out-sourcing of the parks grounds maintenance service, I write to you now in order to address some of the more general issues that relate to the current operations and policy at the Haydons Road Recreation Ground raised in your submission on behalf of BARA.

I will deal with each of your two key issues in turn under their appropriate headings below. To clarify, these matters relate specifically to this one site and, whereas the new service provider will generally be responsible for parks security and the management of ball courts in the future, the contract currently in development does not outline specific details on a site by site basis, but deals with service obligations more generally. Matters of policy and strategy, such as where significant investment occurs and which parks are secured, will remain with the Council:

1. Park Gates

The car park vehicle access gates have indeed been closed for some time. We undertook a trial period when the park gates remained closed until mid-morning in order to prevent some on-site parking abuses by rail commuters, but this failed to satisfactorily resolve the parking issues on site in that the car park was still commonly full when the park was empty (or nearly so) of visitors.

We do not consider that the park's car park is provided for the convenience of local shoppers. The car park is provided to serve the sports facilities on site first and foremost and, since the majority of sports activities there occurs on the weekends, the current access arrangements for vehicle access have been designed around that

need specifically. With the exception of competitive league-based club sports, we consider that the park mainly caters of a local/neighbourhood audience who mainly live within walking or cycling distance of the park.

The current vehicle access arrangements will be reviewed and amended at the point at which our proposals for pay-and-display parking on site are formally adopted, however.

The pedestrian gates on Quicks Road are opened by local volunteers under a long-standing arrangement of several years now with the Friends group.

2. Ball court

The Council has no plans to renovate these courts at the present time. The cost of doing so to the specifications that you suggest would be very significant and with little prospect of a return on that investment that might justify such.

The use by the motorcycle training enterprise has occurred at this location over a period of about 10 years now and the Greenspaces service benefits considerably from the income that it receives from this regular hire. There is no lease with this organisation. Their current hire arrangements are Monday to Sunday from 8am until 2pm.

The training classes occurred in the first instance due to the under-use of this facility. By 2009 the formal sports bookings at this venue had declined to one booking per week at which point the facility had in effect become unsustainable as a pay-to-play ball court.

There is only one motorcycle training facility in the Wimbledon area to the best of our knowledge, but more than 60 tennis courts, 20 located nearby at Wimbledon Park and others at Colliers Wood Rec and Nursery Road Playing Fields too. With multi-use games courts at Garfield Rec, Colliers Wood Rec and Durnsford Rec too there is no shortage of opportunities for informal court-based ball play in that quarter of the borough, over and above those times when Advantage Wimbledon is not using the Haydons Road Rec court.

I trust that this note clarifies the Council's current position on these two issues.

Kind regards,

Doug Napier
Greenspaces Manager
Environment & Regeneration
Merton Council

From: Mrs H M
Sent: 05 October 2016 11:44
To: Paul Evans; Fabiola Hickson

Subject: Re: BATTLES AREA RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION - Proposed Contract regarding Maintenance of Haydons Road Recreation Ground

Dear I

Thank you for your prompt acknowledgements to my email on behalf of the Residents Association.

We look forward to receiving a Response to our email.

Please note I am travelling to Australia to visit family from 25th October until 22nd November. I would be grateful if you would ask Mr Mcginlay to reply to my email address and copy in the other Committee members as below. Our Vice-Chair F will reply to all emails in my absence.

Many thanks

-----Original Message-----

From: P

To: 'Mr M' <[redacted]>

From: [redacted]

Sent: Fri, 30 Sep 2016 12:02

Subject: RE: BATTLES AREA RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION - Proposed Contract regarding Maintenance of Haydons Road Recreation Ground

Dear M

Thank you for your e mail and the points you raise.

I have copied to my contracts team manager F and property lead T so they can advise on the current status of the contract preparation and ensure that the points are brought to the attention of the relevant instructing officers for their consideration.

They will ensure a full response is provided to you.

Paul Evans

Assistant Director of Corporate Governance and Head of Legal Service

South London Legal Partnership

Gifford House, 67c St Helier Avenue, Morden, SM4 6HY

DX 161030 Morden 3

Tel: 020 8545 3338

Mobile: 07539 891766

Fax: 020 8545 3244

From:
Sent: 26 September 2016 16:43
To: Paul Evans;
Cc:

Subject: BATTLES AREA RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION - Proposed Contract regarding Maintenance of Haydons Road Recreation Ground

For Attention Paul Evans, Assistant Director of Corporate Governance

Dear Mr

My name is [redacted] opposite Haydons Road Recreation Ground. I am Secretary of the Battles Area Residents Association and I am writing on behalf of the Committee of the Residents Association.

We are writing regarding the proposed contract for Maintenance of Parks and Greenspaces in Merton and Sutton between Merton Council and Sutton Council and the appointed contractor(s). And in particular our concerns that the terms of contract will cover certain issues in respect of Haydons Road Recreation Ground.

[redacted] Vice-Chair of the Friends of Haydons Road Recreation Ground has copied me in to his email of Representations to you dated 16th September regarding a Notice re disposal of open space in the Haydons Road Recreation Ground by the creation of a 24 year lease with an option to break the lease after 8 years. (The Notice specifies a Lease of the mess room and yard comprising an area of 257.43 square metres and forming part of the open space land that forms the Recreation Ground). I have already emailed you on behalf of the Committee of the Residents Association regarding the proposed lease.

The detail of the proposed contract has not yet been published. We wish to be reassured that the contract will cover the following issues:

1. The vehicle gates to the car park from Haccombe Road have been closed and padlocked during the week for nearly a year, in spite of the installation of a height restriction barrier (to prevent unauthorised use by tradesmen vans and caravans). This is preventing park users, both local and from other parts of the borough, from easily accessing the park facilities by car. (There are limited pay and display meters in Quicks Road). In particular, it prevents parents with young children who live locally but not within easy walking distance from parking in the car park if their children wish to play in the playground or walk and play in the park. Locking the gates also prevents residents using the local shops from parking in the car park for a short time. This results in some congestion in Haccombe Road which can be dangerous to pedestrians and particularly mothers and their children. I myself nearly got hit by a 4WD car reversing unexpectedly as I was crossing the road. In addition, motor cycles attending training on the old asphalt tennis courts (which may take place in the afternoon as well as up to 1.30 pm in spite to the notice displayed on the entrance to the Courts) have to use the pedestrian gate for access. There can be a class of up to 10 or so large motorbikes.

Therefore firstly, please can you arrange for these vehicle gates to be opened daily. The issue over who should lock or unlock these gates (and also the two pedestrian gates on Quicks Road) should be resolved prior to granting the new contract and be a term of the contract. Mr Gunn has made some suggestions as to how you might manage the locking/unlocking of all the gates.

2. The Residents Association re-formed a year ago. Over the year at various times and meetings, we have been approached many times by members or residents who would like to see the tennis courts available as a sports/play area for children, young people and adults too. The courts are currently leased and used by Advantage Wimbledon for motorbike training. The Notice displayed there states Advantage Wimbledon have the use of the courts from 7.30 am to 1.30 pm. However, they are also seen using the courts in the afternoons and sometimes at the weekends. We would be pleased if you would advise us briefly regarding the terms of their lease particularly the duration and times of use and whether there is a break clause.

The Residents Association and local people who use the park would like to see the courts available for their intended purpose of recreation. At the very least, the court lines should be re-painted and basic equipment supplied. We have had requests for 5-a-side football (goal nets and a substitute bench with shelter), basketball and short-tennis/tennis. If short tennis was a possibility, then the short-tennis nets could perhaps be moveable to allow for football games. At present, the courts have very faded lines for a football pitch and two full-size tennis courts. There might have to be a booking system. However, the optimum solution would be for the courts to be upgraded and an astro type surface laid as has been done in Battersea Park.

Unfortunately this would mean Advantage Wimbledon could no longer have the use of the courts. It is a health and safety issue as motorbikes leaking engine oil should in our opinion not be using an asphalt area also used for sports and recreation purposes.

We look forward to hearing from you regarding the matters raised. We have discussed our concerns detailed in this email with Councillor Neep. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you would like any further comments or we would be happy to meet with you.

Yours sincerely

Secretary, Battles Area Residents Association

Please help to reduce waste and do not print this message unless you really need to.

This message, including any attached files, is intended just for the use of the individual or organisation to whom it is addressed. Any opinions expressed are those of the sender, not Merton Council. Email is not secure, and the council accepts no responsibility for any inaccuracy, corruption or virus which has occurred during transmission.

This email may be subject to monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation and may be disclosed in response to a request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

The message may contain information that is confidential or sensitive; you should handle it accordingly.

If you have received this email message in error, you must not copy, disclose or make any further use of the information contained within it. Please notify the system manager (postmaster@merton.gov.uk) or the Head of Information Governance (data.protection@merton.gov.uk), and delete the message.

postmaster@merton.gov.uk

<http://www.merton.gov.uk>

DNK

Doug Napier

From: Doug Napier
Sent: 09 December 2013 16:51
To:
Subject: RE: Wimbledon Park Car Park Extension

The precise details of the parking fee arrangements have not been determined, but we are mindful not to deter legitimate park users unreasonably. The fee structure may include free parking periods and rates that rise steeply over time. But at the present time we have not had the green light to implement the scheme at all as some members have raised concerns.

Regards,

Doug

From: [redacted]
Sent: 09 December 2013 16:35
To: Doug Napier
Subject: RE: Wimbledon Park Car Park Extension

Doug,

Thanks for your response. I take cognisance of what you say.

My main point is, I buy parking permits to park in the road, why should others park locally for free??

I have been up to the park again today where I witnessed the usual people parking then exiting the park. 14 cars in total, before 0900hrs!!!!

I fully understand how this is a impossible situation to monitor/control. However, I do not believe that parking meters should be the complete and fair answer. This would penalise regular park users who have probably used the park for many years. Maybe a very low charge/hour would work?? This would initiate the necessity for car park users to display a ticket at all times!! If commuters wished to park there could be a time limit. This would not deter contractors, however!!

Best Regards.

[redacted]

From: Doug.Napier@merton.gov.uk
To: r
CC: Chris.Lee@merton.gov.uk
Subject: RE: Wimbledon Park Car Park Extension
Date: Mon, 9 Dec 2013 16:11:00 +0000

Dear

If cars are parking on the extension area then this is not being done with our approval or encouragement as the extension is closed for the winter. It appears that people may be helping themselves to this opportunity.

The orange plastic fencing is, of course, a temporary measure, but the more long term fix of new perimeter bollards is already in motion and simply awaiting a contractor's diary opportunity to complete. In the meantime I will ask that the temporary barriers are restored insofar as possible.

The other issues we have discussed via mail on several occasions and I have nothing more to add at this stage. As you know, we would like to install pay & display parking meters at this location. This would serve as a disincentive to any "commuter" or tradesmen parking.

Regards,

Doug

From: Chris Lee

Sent: 09 December 2013 13:55

T

Doug Napier

Subject: RE: Wimbledon Park Car Park Extension

Dear Mark, thank you for your email.

I am asking Mr Napier to look into this matter and respond directly to you.

Regards

Chris Lee | Director of Environment & Regeneration
London Borough of Merton

Merton Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, Surrey SM4 5DX

Direct: 020 8545 3050 | Switchboard: 020 8274 4901

chris.lee@merton.gov.uk

www.merton.gov.uk



Best
Achieving
Council

From:

Sent: 08 December 2013 22:33

To: Chris Lee

Subject: RE: Wimbledon Park Car Park Extension

This mail is primarily to bring to the attention of **Chris Lee** the fact that the said 'extension' car park area is once again being used to park vehicles. It has not been very difficult for vehicles to drive over the very fragile orange coloured mesh netting and to park in that area.

Immediate action is required to deter people from parking their vehicles, illegally, upon the 'extension'

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Chris Lee <Chris.Lee@merton.gov.uk>

To: Sophie Jones-Lisa Barwell <SophieJones-LisaBarwell@merton.gov.uk>; Chief Executive <Chief.Executive@merton.gov.uk>

Cc: Doug Napier <Doug.Napier@merton.gov.uk>

Sent: Thursday, 24 October 2013, 10:56

Subject: RE: Wimbledon Park Car Park Extension

Dear Sophie, further to your recent enquiry on the above matter and the decision of the planning committee on 10th October then we can confirm that we will be removing the hard-core that has formed the basis of the temporary parking area and, furthermore, will restore this area to the best of our ability, recognising it has been subject to previous episodes of disturbance and use as a works compound and is not, therefore, pristine ground.

I can also confirm that we will soon be undertaking some improvements to the existing hard-standing car park at Revelstoke Road, including reinstating the perimeter barriers and remarking the parking bays.

Regards

Chris Lee | **Director of Environment & Regeneration**
London Borough of Merton

Merton Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, Surrey | M4 5DX

Direct: 020 3545 3050 | Switchboard: 020 3374 4901

chris.lee@merton.gov.uk

www.merton.gov.uk



From: Sophie Jones-Lisa Barwell

Sent: 23 October 2013 22:02

To: Sophie Jones-Lisa Barwell; Chris Lee; Chief Executive

Subject: Re: Wimbledon Park Car Park Extension

Please may I receive a reply to my email of 11 October.

From: Sophie Jones-Lisa Barwell

To:

Cc: Chris Lee <Chris.Lee@merton.gov.uk>

Sent: Monday, 14 October 2013, 11:42

Subject: RE: Wimbledon Park Car Park Extension

Dear

Thank you for your email addressed to the Chief Executive.

Mr Curran has asked me to let you know that Chris Lee, Director of Environment and Regeneration will respond to the substantive points you have raised.

Kind regards

Lisa

Lisa Barwell
Executive Assistant to Ged Curran, Chief Executive
(Monday and Tuesday)
Merton Council

area.

There were some wooden sleepers placed across the access to this extension preventing vehicles from driving onto the extension area, however, they have disappeared??

Surely there is somebody within the park, on a daily basis, who can look towards this problem and take the necessary actions to prevent the vehicles from crossing the entrance and parking on the said area.

Also, I have recorded over the last two weeks, the number of vehicles entering the park early in the morning, and then the vehicles being parked in the existing car park and the drivers exiting the park to go elsewhere. Most days this car park is half full of vehicles by 08.00hrs and is used by people who are very evidently not using the park.

There are, also, always a number of commercial vehicles being left in the park for a considerable amount of time.

Action is required by whosoever is responsible for this facility within the park.

Sincerely,

Date: Sun, 8 Dec 2013 17:11:13 +0000
Subject: Re: Fw: Wimbledon Park Car Park Extension
From: [redacted]
CC: [redacted]

De: [redacted]
Thanks for forwarding these e-mails.
Yet another reason to warrant a park keeper to monitor parking (especially to deter unauthorised parking by those who have no intention of visiting the amenities in the park). LBM seem to disregard any enforcement issues arising from the car park extension decision.

Martin

On 24 October 2013 13:08, Janet Mullane wrote:
FYI. I note no timescale has been given for the removal of the hard core and reinstatement of the grass but let's hope it's a move in the right direction!

020 8545 3332

lisa.barwell@merton.gov.uk

www.merton.gov.uk



Best
Achieving
Council

From: .

Sent: 11 October 2013 16:24

To: Chief Executive

Subject: Wimbledon Park Car Park Extension

Dear Mr Curran

I was delighted with the decision at last night's planning committee meeting to reject the application to extend the Revelstoke Road car park in Wimbledon Park. After 18 months of campaigning against the application there are many people rejoicing today at the result. Can I please have your assurance that the hard core on the site will be removed as quickly as possible and the area returned to grass? The hard core is an eyesore and has been there too long and it has deprived the public of a large area of green open space. Furthermore, can you please confirm that the disabled parking bays which were removed from the existing car park some time ago will be reinstated.

Many thanks

S

Please help to reduce waste and do not print this message unless you really need to.

This message, including any attached files, is intended just for the use of the individual or organisation to whom it is addressed. Any opinions expressed are those of the sender, not Merton Council. Email is not secure, and the council accepts no responsibility for any inaccuracy, corruption or virus which has occurred during transmission.

This email may be subject to monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation and may be disclosed in response to a request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

The message may contain information that is confidential or sensitive; you should handle it accordingly.

If you have received this email message in error, you must not copy, disclose or make any further use of the information contained within it. Please notify the system manager (postmaster@merton.gov.uk) or the Head of Information Governance (data.protection@merton.gov.uk), and delete the message.

Postmaster@merton.gov.uk

<http://www.merton.gov.uk/>

Please help to reduce waste and do not print this message unless you really need to.

This message, including any attached files, is intended just for the use of the individual or organisation to whom it is addressed. Any opinions expressed are those of the sender, not Merton Council. Email is not secure, and the council accepts no responsibility for any inaccuracy, corruption or virus which has occurred during transmission.

This email may be subject to monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation and may be disclosed in response to a request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

The message may contain information that is confidential or sensitive; you should handle it accordingly.

If you have received this email message in error, you must not copy, disclose or make any further use of the information contained within it. Please notify the system manager (postmaster@merton.gov.uk) or the Head of Information Governance (data.protection@merton.gov.uk) and delete the message.

Postmaster@merton.gov.uk
<http://www.merton.gov.uk>

--
--
--
--

Please help to reduce waste and do not print this message unless you really need to.
This message, including any attached files, is intended just for the use of the individual or organisation to whom it is addressed. Any opinions expressed are those of the sender, not Merton Council. Email is not secure, and the council accepts no responsibility for any inaccuracy, corruption or virus which has occurred during transmission.
This email may be subject to monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation and may be disclosed in response to a request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.
The message may contain information that is confidential or sensitive; you should handle it accordingly. If you have received this email message in error, you must not copy, disclose or make any further use of the information contained within it. Please notify the system manager (postmaster@merton.gov.uk) or the Head of Information Governance (data.protection@merton.gov.uk), and delete the message.

Postmaster@merton.gov.uk
<http://www.merton.gov.uk>

NK

Doug Napier

From: [redacted]
Sent: 24 February 2014 16:42
To: Doug Napier
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Wimbledon Park

Doug,

Thanks again for your response.

It is because I value WP that I do not wish it to be blighted with an array of motor vehicles all along it's periphery.

Up grade the car park at the Revelstoke entrance to increase capacity, do the same at the Wimbledon Park Road entrance car park, and you will achieve more car spaces!!!!

Shall make contact, as I suggested, later into the year.

Cheers.

From: Doug.Napier@merton.gov.uk
To: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Wimbledon Park
Date: Mon, 24 Feb 2014 14:47:06 +0000

Received now, but I don't intend to reply in detail as we have spent more than enough time debating this matter already and I have a full inbox to attend to as you know. We can reserve further debate for our proposed site visit later in the year.

The scheme that we proposed last year outlined in broad terms what we aspired to and believed to be the optimum solution, balancing the various needs of the site.

Battersea Park, I concede, is a larger park but we have not and never would argue for 300 spaces at WP but, like that venue, WP supports a broad range of popular attractions.

My core point is that 30 odd spaces at the main park entry point to a popular park is not sufficient and not reasonable and the locations mentioned as comparators are simply a yardstick to gauge what others in the recreation business, including a nearby and comparatively small health centre, regard as reasonable for this area.

I do not believe, for example, that MHP attracts twice as many people, offers twice as many attractions and/or is two times more important as a recreational open space as Wimbledon Park which is what its car parking capacity would suggest.

With the greatest respect, I think that you under-estimate the value and status of WP. It is this borough's premier park in virtually all key user criteria. It serves a good proportion of Wandsworth too and has services and facilities that attract users from further afield, some of whom cannot easily get there by public transport.

Regards,

Doug

From:
Sent: 24 February 2014 13:37
To: Doug Napier
Subject: FW: Wimbledon Park

Trying to send ???? You have a full Inbox, yes??

From:
To: doug.napier@merton.gov.uk
CC: councillor.lindataylor@merton.gov.uk; oonagh.moulton@merton.gov.uk;
janice.howard@merton.gov.uk;
Subject: RE: Wimbledon Park
Date: Wed, 19 Feb 2014 18:59:35 +0000
Doug,

In answer to your last mail I wish to relate the following;

- How many car park spaces do you believe would be required for the number of 'visitors' you consider use the park?
- How much of the available park would be transformed into a car park?
- Where would car parking stop and the park remain?
- You have used the word 'comparators' in relation between WP, Battersea Park & Morden Hall Park. To make comparison with Battersea Park is not valid. The comparative park areas are vastly different. Battersea Park is at the least five times larger than WP, and has designated roadside & internal car parks c/w charges and do not offend the eye. Battersea Park is visited by a diverse public, to include for both national & international tourism. There is NO comparison with WP whatsoever.
- Morden Hall is at least three times larger than WP, it has always had dedicated car parking spaces and those car parks do not blight the landscape. They are inside a walled park and are hardly visible. There are more visitor amenities catered for at Morden Hall than WP, such as the National Trust Centre and the museum.
- Nuffield Leisure Centre is a purpose built facility which included for car parking. The parked cars do not infringe upon the other park facility. The park on either side are not affected, in any way, by the cars that are parked for the leisure centre users.
- You say the play area water feature is very popular and used by 100's, so, how many car park spaces would you like to see? Where would they be accommodated, so as not to infringe upon the park area?

- As I have previously stated, the existing car park areas need to be upgraded. This would/could increase the car park spaces then available. It would then provide a measured amount of spaces, say 100, which would be reasonable & adequate for the size and amenities available at WP.
- To continue to focus on car users is truly defeating the objective of park space.
- From how you have stated your view, it can only be a view that is focusing on providing never ending car park spaces in WP.
- Upgrade the existing car parks.

There will be plenty of available car park spaces in Wimbledon Park, when the timed charges are introduced, at both car parks, I trust??

Sincerely,

From: Doug.Napier@merton.gov.uk
 To: ne
 CC: Councillor.LindaTaylor@merton.gov.uk; Oonagh.Moulton@merton.gov.uk;
 Janice.Howard@merton.gov.uk
 Subject: RE: Wimbledon Park
 Date: Wed, 12 Feb 2014 18:59:28 +0000

My reference to sports clubs was specifically to address your apparent scepticism about people travelling from afar to the park and my point was that these clubs are engaged in competitions in which their opponents may come from Surrey, North or West London, etc.

AFC Wimbledon's kids coaching sessions in the park attract participants from across a wide geographical area: Wandsworth, Kingston, Hammersmith and Sutton, as well as all parts of Merton.

Hercules WAC has made use of additional temporary parking space on the grass field for their competition days for more years than I have been here (5).

Over and above that we have a very popular water play facility that attracts young families from far and near and often measured in the 100s throughout the summer because it is a good and comparatively rare facility.

Comparators:

Whereas Wimbledon Park is our most popular and diverse park by far, it does not even have the largest car parking capacity in the Merton parks portfolio.

Others:

Morden Hall Park	159 parking spaces
Battersea Park	298 parking spaces; 3 car parks
Nuffield Leisure Centre, Wandsworth	82 parking spaces
Wimbledon Park	75 parking spaces

I'd suggest that we make a diary date for some weekend in the forthcoming spring or summer time to look at the parking situation in Wimbledon Park simultaneously and compare notes.

Regards,

Doug

From: [redacted]
Sent: 12 February 2014 16:33
To: Doug Napier
Cc: Councillor Oonagh Moulton; Councillor Janice Howard; Councillor Linda Taylor;
Subject: RE: Wimbledon Park

Doug,

First thanks for your response.

Can you state what are the comparative recreational facilities in the area?

Who is denying anyone access to the park? Upgrade the car parks, control the parking and there will be spaces available for genuine park users.

The bowls club & the athletics club have performed their related activities in the park, for many, many years, long before the Tfl hard standing area appeared and cars from all and sundry suddenly started to park up on that working area. They managed without any additional car park spaces??

We could go on talking backwards & forwards for ever. As Oonagh has stated fast track the restating of the said area.

I suggest that the existing car parks are UPGRADED, introduce some form of parking regulation and we should sit back and review at a later time.

Best regards.

Oonagh.Moulton@merton.gov.uk; Janice.Howard@merton.gov.uk;
Councillor.LindaTaylor@merton.gov.uk

From: oonagh.moulton@me.com

Subject: Re: Wimbledon Park

Date: Wed, 12 Feb 2014 13:54:30 +0000

To: Doug.Napier@merton.gov.uk

Dear [redacted] & Doug

I think the arguments for & against the extension to the car park have been well stated but the concern of residents and councillors is for an improvement to the mess that this saga has resulted in.

Delays in resolving the dispute and to resolution of the planning application have resulted in the pile of rubble left on the site of the extension for far too long.

We appreciate that the weather has caused further delay in its removal but it is an eyesore and a shame to have at an entrance of such a wonderful park that we all love and enjoy.

I do believe that once the rubble is removed further improvements need to be made to this entrance and to the car park. Also what is missed by some of the correspondence are the improvements that were proposed to the extension and existing car park.

Furthermore reverting to using the original car park all year long will not be satisfactory for either users of the park or for residents. I hope that some contingency plans can be made before the busy Easter and Summer periods.

I hope the Council officers will monitor the affect not only in the park but on our local streets.

Best wishes

Oonagh

Cllr Oonagh Moulton
Wimbledon Park Ward

Sent from my iPhone

On 12 Feb 2014, at 13:30, Doug Napier <Doug.Napier@merton.gov.uk> wrote:

:

I simply suggest that we agree to differ and I would simply say that the Council's view is that Wimbledon Park is a destination park with facilities, other than parking, that reflect that vision.

It is Merton's premier park and users and potential users from Mitcham and Morden, for example, who contribute to its upkeep, should not be unreasonably denied access to it and forced, in effect, to take 2-3 buses or walk to the park. That is not to say that we would expect nor cater for all users to be arriving by car, but the current capacity for cars is not reasonable and compares very poorly with comparative recreational facilities in the local area and beyond.

Neither the bowls club nor the athletics club, for example, would be very effective if they could not hold competitions with similar clubs in the south-east of England and I think that you and I, if ~~were~~ honest, would struggle to find many parents of young children or older people with access to a car who would walk for 30 minutes to get to the park, irrespective of how beneficial that might be. Nor was local opinion unanimously stacked up against the extension proposal of course.

Regards,

Doug

From: ...
Sent: 12 February 2014 12:40
To: Doug Napier
Cc: Councillor Janice Howard; ...
Subject: RE: Wimbledon Park

Doug,

Thanks for taking your time to respond. It is appreciated.

You either have a park, or a car park. How large do you wish the car park provision to be for the park? Where would you stop?

I would be very interested in evidence to support your points that there are so many visitors coming from as far away as Richmond parts of Surrey and Kingston -U -Thames to

utilise the park facilities???. Would these visitors use the Revelstoke Road park entrance or the Wimbledon Park Road entrance?? How many are there each day? Would car park spaces be made available for all?

The existing car park facilities need to be upgraded at both park entrances before any further park land is removed.

With the correct planning and design this upgrading would provide more spaces and also provide a more sustainable car parking facility.

Don't you agree that the more car park spaces that are made available the more they will be used by all and sundry. The park space will be lost forever. These car parks would be full each day with commuters vehicles, commercial vehicles, care workers vehicles, cleaners vehicles, school teachers vehicles, local residents who refuse to pay the residents parking fee, tradesmen's vehicles and more. I have the evidence of this over many months and years, for that matter

I visited the park yesterday early PM, at the Revelstoke Road entrance car park, five commercial vehicles were present, other drivers came, parked and left the park. The car park was full, as was the Wimbledon Park Road car park?? There were not enough people actually in the park to fill all the cars & vehicles that were parked.

I am beginning to consider that your understanding of what a park is for are becoming confused. Why do you believe that car park spaces should be provided for anyone and everyone? Where would you stop?

The park has provided for visitors over many years, before any of us were around. Visitors are not being denied the facilities, as you allude to.

There are parks all over Surrey, Richmond, Kingston-T-Thames Chessington, Morden, Mitcham Streatham & Tooting etc..... What tells you that the many people who reside in these areas need to drive to use Wimbledon Park facilities?

Your commentary states that by *not* having an unlimited amount of car park spaces in Wimbledon Park. visitors from outside a mile radius of the park. and elsewhere in SW London & Surrey are being denied the use of the park facilities.

By the way a 30 minute walk is good for us and children.

Upgrade the existing car parks, bring in parking restrictions for a certain amount of time on week days, and all will run smoothly and I shall stop annoying you.

One last point. The views of local residents, a stones throw, or two away from the park, expressed their views when the car park planning application was held, twice!!

Best regards.

From: Doug.Napier@merton.gov.uk
To: [\[redacted\]](#)
Subject: RE: Wimbledon Park
Date: Tue, 11 Feb 2014 17:59:54 +0000
Neil:

I feel that an appropriate balance has to be struck between encouraging sustainable transport usage and the legitimate needs of park users. The provision of 33 parking spaces at the main park entrance is inadequate in my view and unreasonable given the nature of the park and the range and popularity of the facilities that it supports.

I would be very surprised to find any parking spaces at R.Road in the second half of *any* Saturday morning even at this time of year.

And whilst I would agree that some of the transport options are convenient for users based in the Wimbledon Town Centre, Putney and Fulham areas, these are not so very great for the residents of Mitcham and Morden, most especially those with young families. I lived in Wandsworth for many years and it's not even a great option from there - the drive was 4 minutes and the walk 30 minutes by comparison even without kids in tow.

Some of the facilities in the park are of regional significance and attract users from far-afield, including parts of Surrey, Richmond and Kingston. Relatively few recreational users who travel more than a stone's throw or two to the park have expressed similar views to your own about the parking capacity; indeed quite the reverse.

Regards,

Doug

From: [\[redacted\]](#)
Sent: 11 February 2014 13:06
To: Doug Napier
Cc: Councillor Janice Howard; Councillor Linda Taylor; Councillor Oonagh Moulton;
Subject: RE: Wimbledon Park

Doug,

Thanks again for a reply.

I find some of your points rather muddled.

The facts are that the car park is used every day by non park users, almost 90%.

I have monitored this situation over a much longer period of activity than I believe you can afford time wise. Each day as the park opens the vehicles enter the park and the drivers exit the park, come and see for yourself, any week day morning.

At week ends the car park is never full at this time of the year. The summer months will be different.

People using the park do so for recreation, they do not need to use a vehicle to reach the park. Public transport is adequately available and furthermore people should use it, or walk, exercise, exercise and more exercise!!

The park does not require any more car parking facilities. Where would a line be drawn. The Wimbledon Road entrance car park requires attention to provide a proper car parking facility.

If you pander to car users you are defeating all objectivity to stop people making unnecessary car journeys. If you provide free car parking people will run in like ducks to water.

If we followed your reasoning all the park would provide is car parking. One massive car park to rival that provided by the major supermarkets.

Sincerely,

From: Doug.Napier@merton.gov.uk

To: ...

CC: Janice.Howard@merton.gov.uk; Councillor.LindaTaylor@merton.gov.uk;

Oonagh.Moulton@merton.gov.uk

Subject: RE: Wimbledon Park

Date: Tue, 11 Feb 2014 11:01:02 +0000

This mail has come to me, as you might expect, and so I'll refrain from replying in great detail as I would simply be covering old ground.

I have been in the park a couple of time recently myself, including last week. The Revelstoke Road car park was indeed busy then, but then so was the park and I'd be very surprised if most of the cars present were long-stay commuters or off-site workers as cars were coming and going throughout the morning.

On my last two visits to the park I made a particular point of noting that there were no commercial or trades vehicles in the Revelstoke Road car park and only one van (both unmarked and different vehicles on the two occasions) in the Wimbledon Park Road car park.

Of course, all of this is irrelevant at weekends when the on-site parking demands in the park are at their most acute. The current parking provisions are simply inadequate for a park of this size and popularity and will remain so irrespective of whether there are some residents, or others, taking advantage of the free parking in the midweek period. As you know, the aspiration is to introduce parking fees in the park.

There are some very large notices at the park gates which specifically state that the car park is for park users only.

Regards,

Doug

From:
Sent: 10 February 2014 16:49
To: Leisure
Cc: | Councillor Janice Howard; Councillor Oonagh Moulton; Councillor Linda Taylor;
| : Doug Napier; HAMMOND, Stephen
Subject: Wimbledon Park

To Whom It Concerns.

Whilst the reinstating of the grass to the 'old hard lay down area' at the park Revelstoke Road entrance is still to be completed, the existing car park is still being fully utilised by non park users.

Why is it that the work required for the grass to be reinstated appears to be causing 'concern' for our local councillors, I cannot remember certain councillors voicing their support for the efforts that were carried out by the WPRAs and others to *oppose* the council planning application to have the area established as a permanent car park!

Also, on enquiry, our local MP advised me that he was in favour of the planning application to have a permanent car park established. Now, we have certain conservative councillors publicising leaflets to inform us of their wishes for the area to be 'quickly' returned to a grass area?? Is there a local election imminent? One might ask

However, such is life and to continue with the main reason for this mail.

I have monitored the type and number of vehicles that are present on a daily basis in this car park over many, many months. The car park is always, if not full, 90% full on any given week day. This will be the status no matter what the season, or weather.

Most vehicles arrive between park opening and 10.00hrs, with the drivers exiting the park. Then as time proceeds, through each day, various commercial vehicles park up for certain lengths of time. On one particular day, when it had been raining heavily since day break and continued for most of the day light, the car park was actually 'overflowing', with vehicles, I might add. There was nobody actually in the park, apart from myself.

Some of the people that I have spoken with, who use the car park and leave the park are; local cleaners, home helps, school teachers??, health workers, commuters, visitors to local residents and tradesmen. In most cases they tell me that they have been advised, by whoever, that the car park exists and therefore they can use it.

This scenario has continued for years, unabated. It is time for positive action

I have spoken with *two* local residents who have quite openly informed me, that they use the car park between the hours of 11.00 & 15.00, so as to avoid paying the residents parking permit charge. This is only two that I am positively aware of. All us residents should do the same. I have stated this to you in many previous mails.

If regulatory control of this car park is not implemented, genuine car park users, during the fairer months, will never have a car park space available. I fully appreciate and understand the problems involved with car park control in the park and that is not easy to implement. However, non park users should be deterred from abusing the car park spaces.

It is also worth relating, that the other car park at Wimbledon Park Road is also full each day.

Free parking for all and sundry.

I, like most other residents, pay for a parking permit each year!!

Kindly revert as required.

Sincerely

Please help to reduce waste and do not print this message unless you really need to.

This message, including any attached files, is intended just for the use of the individual or organisation to whom it is addressed. Any opinions expressed are those of the sender, not Merton Council. Email is not secure, and the council accepts no responsibility for any inaccuracy, corruption or virus which has occurred during transmission.

This email may be subject to monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation and may be disclosed in response to a request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

The message may contain information that is confidential or sensitive; you should handle it accordingly.

If you have received this email message in error, you must not copy, disclose or make any further use of the information contained within it. Please notify the system manager (postmaster@merton.gov.uk) or the Head of Information Governance (data.protection@merton.gov.uk), and delete the message.

Postmaster@merton.gov.uk

<http://www.merton.gov.uk>

Please help to reduce waste and do not print this message unless you really need to.

This message, including any attached files, is intended just for the use of the individual or organisation to whom it is addressed. Any opinions expressed are those of the sender, not Merton Council. Email is not secure, and the council accepts no responsibility for any inaccuracy, corruption or virus which has occurred during transmission.

This email may be subject to monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation and may be disclosed in response to a request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

The message may contain information that is confidential or sensitive; you should handle it accordingly.

If you have received this email message in error, you must not copy, disclose or make any further use of the information contained within it. Please notify the system manager (postmaster@merton.gov.uk) or the Head of Information Governance (data.protection@merton.gov.uk), and delete the message.

Postmaster@merton.gov.uk

<http://www.merton.gov.uk>

Please help to reduce waste and do not print this message unless you really need to.
This message, including any attached files, is intended just for the use of the individual or organisation to whom it is addressed. Any opinions expressed are those of the sender, not Merton Council. Email is not secure, and the council accepts no responsibility for any inaccuracy, corruption or virus which has occurred during transmission.

This email may be subject to monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation and may be disclosed in response to a request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

The message may contain information that is confidential or sensitive; you should handle it accordingly.

If you have received this email message in error, you must not copy, disclose or make any further use of the information contained within it. Please notify the system manager (postmaster@merton.gov.uk) or the Head of Information Governance (data.protection@merton.gov.uk), and delete the message.

Postmaster@merton.gov.uk

<http://www.merton.gov.uk>

Please help to reduce waste and do not print this message unless you really need to.

This message, including any attached files, is intended just for the use of the individual or organisation to whom it is addressed. Any opinions expressed are those of the sender, not Merton Council. Email is not secure, and the council accepts no responsibility for any inaccuracy, corruption or virus which has occurred during transmission.

This email may be subject to monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation and may be disclosed in response to a request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

The message may contain information that is confidential or sensitive; you should handle it accordingly.

If you have received this email message in error, you must not copy, disclose or make any further use of the information contained within it. Please notify the system manager (postmaster@merton.gov.uk) or the Head of Information Governance (data.protection@merton.gov.uk), and delete the message.

Postmaster@merton.gov.uk

<http://www.merton.gov.uk>

Please help to reduce waste and do not print this message unless you really need to.

This message, including any attached files, is intended just for the use of the individual or organisation to whom it is addressed. Any opinions expressed are those of the sender, not Merton Council. Email is not secure, and the council accepts no responsibility for any inaccuracy, corruption or virus which has occurred during transmission.

This email may be subject to monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation and may be disclosed in response to a request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

The message may contain information that is confidential or sensitive; you should handle it accordingly.

If you have received this email message in error, you must not copy, disclose or make any further use of the information contained within it. Please notify the system manager (postmaster@merton.gov.uk) or the Head of Information Governance (data.protection@merton.gov.uk), and delete the message.

Postmaster@merton.gov.uk

<http://www.merton.gov.uk>
