

Representations and Officer's Comments

Representation - Support

002 Abbey Rec

I received a flyer through the door from the Tories highlighting this consultation, with the implied suggestion that I should object to the introduction of parking charges.

But I think it's a good idea, and support it. Merton is blighted by traffic congestion and one of the ways the Council can tackle this is through parking controls.

I see no reason for anyone other than the mobility impaired to drive to the Rec, and I see from the plans that they would be able to use their Blue Badge to park there for free, with disabled bays provided. Those coming some distance to play sports can come by public transport, local young families can walk or cycle, etc.

As for the impact on local residents and businesses - parking on the streets around Nursery Road and Wilmore End is, in my experience, always jammed full already, so this wouldn't create a new problem. And just how much trade do local businesses really get from people parking at the Rec?

Please – take a step towards encouraging better ways to travel than by car. Introduce charging, and spend the income on improving conditions for those walking and cycling.

I think the above comments are equally relevant to the four other sites in the consultation (in some cases, there are also resident's parking permit schemes in place to protect the interests of residents).

Officers comment

See section 5 of this report.

001 Revelstoke CP

Whilst I have no objection to the minimal charging proposed in Wimbledon Park Revelstoke Road car park, I would suggest that the enforcement of parking for residents in Zone P1 is amended to cover the equivalent hours and to include Saturdays. The weekend parking has become more congested and dangerous around the Home Park Road entrance particularly when the paddling pool attracts vehicles fighting for space outside the entrance.

004 Revelstoke CP

I'm responding to the consultation. It sounds an overdue and sensible move, for two main reasons:

- to stop long term parking by commuters
- mean out-of-borough drivers and park users pay for the upkeep of the park

010 Revelstoke CP

Please take this as our formal representation on this proposal. We comment only on the proposal for the above car park, as we have little knowledge of the others. We make our representation in the paragraph in bold, below. This is followed by the reasons for this representation.

We strongly support the introduction of charges at this car park, as this should promote sustainable travel. However, we consider that the current proposals would be insufficient to solve the problems with vehicular access to, and car parking in, Wimbledon Park. The proposed rate of charge is so low that it is unlikely to deter those parking for other than recreational visits to the park. Also, the days and hours that the charge would apply would not solve the greatest problems: those that occur on sunny weekends. As other car parking spaces in Wimbledon Park are not to have charges introduced, people would be allowed to subvert the reasons for the charge. The proposals also fail to cater adequately for those with special need to travel by vehicle. The proposals should be changed, so as to regulate all parking at Wimbledon Park, not just that at the Revelstoke Road car park. This provision should have ample facilities reserved to encourage disabled use and cycles. The charge for any remaining spaces should apply to the hours and days when a disincentive is most needed: including weekends and early evening hours and be significantly higher than the rate applying in nearby suburbia.

The problem:

At present, Wimbledon Park, although recognised for its heritage value, is compromised by having too much provision of ugly and intrusive, free car parking space. Travel to the park by private vehicle is encouraged by the free parking. As a

result, many of the existing spaces are occupied by those working in nearby suburbia or in the park itself, rather than by park users. Use by vehicles kept off the road for longer periods is only occasional and is not the main cause of over-use. Use for a recreational visit to the park is greatest on sunny weekends and school holiday times, when congestion continues into early evening hours, and it is then that there have been significant problems with shortage of space and congestion, with elective users in competition with those having special needs.

The proposed times and costs:

To deter use for other than a recreational visit to the park, the charge differential with nearby suburbia should be reversed. On weekdays (Mon-Fri): car parking is generally free in nearby LB Wandsworth (zone S3), but restricted to residents for one hour (13:30-14:30) each day. So, any charge might deter those visiting the park either side of that hour, but retain the strong incentive to use Wimbledon Park for times spanning the hour. The nearby parts of LB Merton (zone P2) have a car parking charge for the hours 11:00 to 15:00 which is four times that proposed in Wimbledon Park (£1.20 per hour, compared with the proposed 30p an hour), so there would remain a strong incentive to use Wimbledon Park for any visit overlapping those times. Only for those few visits wholly outside those times would the proposed charge deter such non-recreational parking. On weekends there are no residents' only restrictions in Wandsworth, nor charges in Merton. Despite this, it's proposed to charge the same as for weekdays on Saturdays, but not to charge at all on Sundays. The proposed charge on Saturdays is low, and so probably not a sufficient disincentive to over-use, but there remains no rationale for allowing a free-for-all on Sundays. In summary, the proposed rate of charge is so low that it is unlikely to deter those parking for other than recreational visits to the park. Also, the days and hours that the charge would apply to would not solve the greatest problems: those that occur on sunny weekends or school holidays and continue into the early evening.

Location of the proposals and consultation:

Wimbledon Park straddles two London Boroughs and attracts users predominantly from those two. The car park concerned lies largely within LB Wandsworth, but it appears that neither LB Wandsworth Council, nor residents there, have been consulted on the proposals. The sole notice advertising the proposals is displayed beside the tiny part of the car park that lies within LB Merton.

Sustainable travel and special needs:

The adopted policies of LB Merton's Local Plan identify the need to promote sustainable travel, including the discouragement of travel by private vehicle. Wimbledon Park is well provided with public transport, with two nearby Underground Stations and bus stops in Wimbledon Park Road and Durnsford Road. Most park users arrive by one or more sustainable mode: public transport, cycling or walking. Some groups arrive in a mini-bus. We welcome the proposals as they further these policies. However, the other side of the coin is that the proposals should give priority to those who are unable to use these more sustainable modes. Yet, there are only three disabled bays proposed and no reference to any other arrangement for those with special need to park close to their destination in Wimbledon Park. Also, although pedal cycles are named in the schedule as a class of vehicle permitted in the parking spaces, no special provision for pedal cycles is indicated on the plan. Cycles need such special provision.

Present provision at Wimbledon Park:

There are two main car parks in Wimbledon Park: only one of which is subject to this proposal. The other, off Wimbledon Park Road, is not proposed to be changed. Other parking occurs every day at the Watersports Base, Bowls Pavilion, and Cafe, and occasionally at the Stadium. We consider that action at Revelstoke Road alone is likely to exacerbate the existing problems in those other areas; to the extent that the proposals work, parking will be pushed out of the Revelstoke Road car park into other formal and informal provision elsewhere in Wimbledon Park.

The alternative:

The proposals should be amended to regulate all parking at Wimbledon Park, not just that at the Revelstoke Road car park. This provision should have ample facilities reserved to encourage disabled use and cycles. The charge for any remaining spaces should apply to the hours and days when a disincentive is most needed: weekends and early evening hours and be significantly higher than the rate applying in nearby suburbia.

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

Officers comment

See section 5 of this report.

COMMENTS

003 Abbey Rec

I'm writing with regards to the consultation of the above park. You state that it's 10p for every 20 minutes which is great. £2.40 a day for 8 hours. So will you be able to park for 8 hours straight as if this is the case people will never get a parking space for walking your dog or taking the children to the park for a couple of hour as commuters will park there at 8 pay £2.40 then they are fine because the charges stop at 4pm. I hope this is not the case it should be for 2 /3

hours max stay

Also when will the gate be fixed I haven't been able to park for ages.

Officers comment

See section 5 of this report.

002 Haydons

I am writing as Vice Chair of Friends of Haydons Road Recreation Ground (FOHRRG) to comment on these proposals.

The proposed hours of operation of the car park located in Haydons Road Recreation Ground and indeed other parks is until 11 pm at night. This car park is not isolated from the rest of the park and once access has been gained individuals can roam the whole park after it has been closed. The published hours for operation of this and other parks is until dusk. At that time (which will vary considerably during the year depending upon season) someone needs to lock the park gates. Both pedestrian and the car park gates to avoid breaching park security. At a minimum the 11 pm time should be replaced by dusk. Ideally the actual closing times for each month should be published to avoid car owners having vehicles trapped overnight in the park. Bromley website publishes monthly closure times varying from 4.30 pm in December to rather later in the Summer and this chart could be displayed at each car park. FOHRRG have other concerns over who will operate and police this scheme. Since responses are required to Traffic and Highways it would seem that they may be the main operators of this scheme. As it is idverde who are the park maintenance contractors (who are required under their contract to secure pedestrian gates at dusk each day) we are concerned that there will be confusion/inefficiency as to who will be responsible for locking the car park gates at close of business each day. Clearly there are cost implications and it is our view that they may exceed the revenue generated at Haydons Road Recreation Ground. It is our view that this proposal is not supported by adequate background information over how the scheme will operate.

It is our view that most local residents who use this park are local and so can and do walk to the park and so the proposed hours of charge and level of charge from 8 am until 4 pm are not a problem. Again it should be noted that the published hours for Haydons Road Recreation Ground opening is on some days after 8 am. FOHRRG have identified volunteers that are prepared to open pedestrian access to this park on a rota basis earlier than this time to allow access for dog walkers and others that like to exercise early in the day. They are awaiting keys to allow them to carry out this task.

FOHRRG are concerned that there is no provision for disabled blue badge holders in these proposals. It is our view that this car park is large enough to justify at least one parking spot for this category of park user. Concern has been expressed by some residents that allowing parking all day will encourage commuter car parking. suggest that a limit of 4 hours should be imposed to prevent this. Park users and shoppers are unlikely to use this car park for more than this length of time and it is better to prevent this possibility now than to have to run this process again at a later date.

Of course there has also been very limited time for consultation as many of our members have only just become aware of this consultation. At a minimum these proposals should have been displayed at the Haccombe Road entrance to the park. Has there been any direct consultation with other key park users such as the Colliers Wood Bowls Club or the football and cricket clubs that hire pitches? Certainly this consultation seems to have been hurried and flawed.

010 Haydons

I refer to your consultation on the above matter.

I welcome that parking is to be allowed Mondays to Fridays when it is now not available.

However it seems that the hours proposed are too late in the evening.

The problem is that allowing access to the car park also allows pedestrian access to the park when the gates are otherwise locked, allowing antisocial behaviour.

Hopefully you can find some reasonable compromise that is enforced in a fair and reasonable manner (no-one wants cars to be locked in the car park and fined when they miss the deadline by a few minutes).

Officers comment

See section 5 of this report.

005 Revelstoke CP

Re controlling parking in Wimbledon Park:

There should not be charges on park users - use of the park needs to be encouraged, not restricted.

To deter commuters, simply have signs stating 'four hours maximum stay'.

In 20 years, I have never seen a caravan or abandoned car in the car park so in practice I do not think these are real issues of concern.

007 Revelstoke

I am writing in response to the consultation on the proposal to raise car parking charges at the Revelstoke Road car park in Wimbledon Park. I am informed the deadline has been extended to 14 July.

Firstly, I should say that I fully support the Council's intent to develop policies and plans which prevent commuters and camper vans from clogging up our local area. The objective should be to do that in a way that does not unnecessarily disadvantage the residents. On that basis, I am totally against this proposal.

The park, like the common, is a resource to be enjoyed by people and the council has a duty to facilitate access. The jogger, the young sports devotee, the elderly seeking to keep their limbs moving and the dog walker should be encouraged to continue their healthy pursuits. The common has now become a pay-to-exercise area at the 'Village end' of the common, forcing local people to queue up at the windmill for free access to parking so as to use the amenity. [Filming days excepted, when waiting there is a waste of time and fuel whilst the engine is ticking over.]

There are easy ways to bar continued access to commuters and van parkers. Let me offer two obvious ones :

1) A partial pay scheme eg as per any residential roads which aim to exclude casual parking between 11am and 3pm. (Note that the common now operates a restriction from 0830hrs - WHY?) 0800-1600hrs Monday to Saturday is just punitive.

2) Only vehicles displaying a London Borough of Merton resident parking permit (and probably a Wandsworth permit) to be allowed to use the Revelstoke Road and Wimbledon Park Road car parks between say 11am and 3pm. No meters, no fees, no exceptions. Just periodic traffic warden inspections.

Both of these achieve the stated objective, option 2 does so without the capital cost of provision and installation of parking Machines and the ongoing cost of maintenance and coin collections. To glibly state that the costs will be covered by collections (which you will) completely misses the point.

There is a developing school of thought that the council is becoming ideologically fixated on bashing its council tax payers who own cars. Evidence as follows :

(a) Allowing planning applications for new housing, but only if the provision for parking spaces is limited to the point of being woefully inadequate.

(b) With virtually no warning, penalising drivers foolish enough to have been taken in by the exhortations to buy diesel because it is better for the environment.

(c) And now, introducing parking taxes at every opportunity for basic amenity access.

Or are Wimbledon Park users just pawns / collateral damage in the race to raise extra money for the council without the bad PR of raising council tax? If so, please cease this charade of claiming it has anything to do with commuters, camper vans etc.

Please, let us stick to sensible and proportionate answers to the problems we face.

011 Revelstoke CP

Representation against proposed control in Car Parks.

The intention to charge for parking in Merton's parks is unreasonable and should not be implemented:

1. The Council tax we pay includes the use and maintenance of the parks.
2. Having parking charges will discourage attendance by those who pay to play games (e.g tennis) and so will reduce income to the Council overall.
3. In Wimbledon Park, at least, other than at weekends, the car park is most usually sparsely used. It is questionable whether the income returns will outweigh the cost of controls equipment and policing.
4. Introducing payment for parking discriminates against those who :
 - don't live within easy walking distance and have to drive.
 - have children or equipment relating to time in the parks that can't be carried.
 - Organize events (such as team games) for the benefit of others and have to bring equipment. Many give their time freely for the benefit of the community.

I therefore urge the Council to reconsider its intention.

Officers comment

See section 5 of this report.

Representation against

001 Abbey Rec

I wish to object to the proposed parking controls in relation to Abbey recreation ground. Two reasons were put forward by means of justification yet neither appears valid:

- introducing charging cannot deter people from abandoning vehicles
- Abbey recreation ground car park has not been available for use by the public for several weeks due to the gates being locked – this does not demonstrate a desire to 'cater for the parking needs of the local community'

I therefore conclude that the motivation for introducing parking controls is driven by the desire to raise revenue.

I would add that I am disappointed that, having spent £3,500 installing a P&D machine in the car park of Abbey recreation ground several months ago, Merton Council appears once again to have made the decision to proceed prior to any consultation.

001 Haydons

I would like to make the following objections to the PROPOSED CONTROLS TO OFF-STREET PARKING PLACES IN PARKS - SCHEDULE 2 The park gates should open at sunrise and close at sunset as is normal for parks in the borough. Extending these hours in a park which is not intended for use in the dark, ie is not floodlit, will provide an unpoliced area for inappropriate use such as alcohol consumption, drug usage, sexual activity and loitering with or without intent, and the litter associated. Walking along the street passed park gates in the dark, where people are within the park near to the gates, leaves one feeling unsafe and vulnerable. If the park is open, the children's play are will also be open. Again, this could lead to inappropriate use of the area and injuries from use in the dark. The car park operating hours of 8am to 4pm are acceptable. However, I wish to object to the maximum stay being 8 hours. This would encourage commuters to park for the day. 4 hours parking should be a sufficient maximum for most park users. The car park should be for the use of park users. I wish to object to HGV's using the park. This is a hazard for park users especially being so close to the children's play area. In addition, it will add to the pollution in the park.

002 Haydons

I am writing to strongly object to the change for the PROPOSED CONTROLS TO OFF-STREET PARKING PLACES IN PARKS - SCHEDULE 2. The gates should be opened and closed as per the rest of the borough, sunrise to sunset. This then ensures that whichever park you use there is consistency as to the opening and closing times. The proposed times will lead to more people congregating or hanging around out of the current hours with misuse of the open area and playground which will attract yet more litter and abuse of this lovely park - and subsequently more cost to the council for dealing with the rubbish or damage that needs to be cleared or repaired. There is no need for the park to be opened in these extended hours and serves no purpose to the local community. The car park is currently not over used and this would imply that most people either walk or come by public transport. The busiest time is when there is some sports event taking place such as Cricket which is totally reasonable. As we are living in what has been described as one of the most polluted hotspots in the borough we should not be encouraging yet more vehicles to the area. We are located between 2 major stations - South Wimbledon & Wimbledon - the suggested charge of £4.80 for 8 hours parking will attract commuters seeing a cheap option to park their car all day and thus denying those that will genuinely be using the park. With regards to the HGV vehicles parking on Haccombe Road unless there is a dedicated space for say the large Sainsburys lorry for example to off load how can it be guaranteed that they will get a space. If this is allowed to proceed then it should at least be on the side nearest the store but this is a small road and entering and leaving will not be desirable or safe for either the driver or pedestrians.

004 Haydons

I am writing to object to your proposal to amend Schedule 2 of the Merton (Off Street Parking Places) (No. *) Order 201 - parking restrictions at Haydons Road Recreation Ground - as laid out in the 15-002 NOP site noticev3. i) I object to the provision to allow HGVs to use the car park at Haydons Road Recreation Ground as a loading area. It is an area constantly used by young and older children and would make it much less safe. iii) I object to the proposed hours of operation of the car park - 6am to 11pm. This will mean the gates of the park area left unlocked well outside their current hours. Almost all public parks around the country are in operation from sunrise to sunset. Currently, Haydons Road Rec is locked at all other times. As a resident whose garden backs on to the Rec, I am deeply concerned that Merton is proposing to allow anyone to access the park in the hours of darkness. It will provide an opportunity for people who wish to burgle the homes that border the park and could also increase the amount of any social behaviour in the park. As someone who has lived in a property that backs on to the Rec for five years (first at 19a Wycliffe and now at 7 Wycliffe), I can state that occasionally, in the summer, the fence is breached by people during the hours of darkness who use the Rec as somewhere to have a party late into the night, thereby disturbing the residents nearby. It is only by making sure the park is locked at sunset that this can be limited. iv) I object to the chargeable hours being from Monday to Saturday. Currently, the park is well used by sports people equally on both Saturdays and Sundays. Charging on one of those days and not the other will mean that one day remains popular for sports teams and not the other. Not only will this discourage teams to use the park - something unacceptable in the climate when we should be encouraging people to participate in exercise in Merton - it will also make the day when there are no charges even busier. This will make it harder for people who want to use the park for other purposes than team sports - the play area or general use for example - to do so. It is essential that parks like Haydons Road Recreation Ground are used as widely as possible, if they are to remain viable. While the park is already heavily used by those in the immediate area, others from further afield should be encouraged to use it as well. While this needs to be balanced with the increasing requirement for the council to gain revenue from its assets, it should not be achieved at the cost of the viability of such amenities. It should also not be achieved at the cost of making the living conditions for those in the surrounding area worse - something that allowing the gates to be open into the hours of darkness would be expected to do.

005 Haydons

I am resident of Quicks Road and I am writing to object to the following points as laid out in the Schedule 2 of ES/OFFSTREET Order 201, for the Haydons Road Recreation Ground. Notice as follow: (c) (iii) I object to the hours of operation stated to keep the park open up to 11pm Mondays to Sundays as the security of the park is of the utmost importance. The gates should be closed at sunset and in keeping with every other park in the Borough. Keeping the park open to this time attract anti-social behaviour. I have seen this happening on more than one occasion eg drunks, alcohol, noise, litter and potential drug abuse etc. (V) I object to the charge for parking of 20 pence. There should be no difference in our park compared to the other parks in Schedule 1. Charges should be consistent to other parks. 8 ours parking attract commuters and would defy the object to have this facility for park users. 4 hours maximum parking should be sufficient for most people.

006 Haydons

I am writing as Secretary of the Battles Area Residents Association on behalf of the Committee and our members to comment on the attached Notice regarding the Merton (Off-Street Parking Places) Order 201*. Particularly with regard to Schedule 2 which refers to Haydons Road Recreation Ground which is our local park.

Firstly, I would like to point out we only received a copy of this Notice on the morning of Tuesday, 4th July kindly forwarded to us by Councillor Neep. It was immediately circulated to all our members with a request to lodge Comments by 7th July or contact me with a note. I checked - no Notices were displayed on any of the Park gates or in the SWCA Noticeboard within the Park or on nearby lampposts. We consider the lack of proper notice of this important Order to local residents very upsetting. In the circumstances, please confirm you are happy to extend the period of notice for Comments for another week until 14th July.

In this connection, on your behalf, we are about to display copies of the Notice on all the Park gates and in the SWCA Noticeboard, extending the date to 14th July.

Our Comments are as follows:

1. The park gates should open at sunrise and close at sunset as is normal for parks in the borough. (As was the custom until earlier this year and then the park gates were only locked spasmodically and the car park gates were closed during the week.) Extending these hours to 11 pm in a park which is not intended for use in the dark, ie not floodlit, will provide an unpoliced area for inappropriate use such as alcohol consumption, drug use, sexual activity and loitering with or without intent, and associated litter. Possible drug use and discarded syringes anywhere in the park, but particularly in the children's play area, must be avoided at all cost. At this very moment, there are broken bottles in the play area which we will have to clear up.
2. If the park is open, the children's play area will also be open. Again this could lead to inappropriate use of the area and injuries from use of the equipment in the dark, and even harm to unaccompanied children from abusive adults.
3. In the last few weeks there has been a considerable increase in the amount of graffiti in the park. One of our Committee has re-painted some walls at her own expense, but the park gates should be locked at sunset to stop this very unsocial behaviour.
3. A considerable number of gardens back onto the Park all along three sides of the park and 30 houses along Quicks Road can be viewed from the park. Any prospective burglar can simply hide away in the park after dark to watch out for unoccupied houses or sheds that could be broken into, particularly when residents are on holiday.
4. It has also been said to me that walking along Quicks Road in the dark passing unlocked gates, and the possibility of people loitering in the park near to the gates, leaves women or young people feeling unsafe and vulnerable.
5. The car park chargeable operating hours from 8 am to 4 pm are acceptable for weekdays. We appreciate this would provide some revenue for the Council. However, the maximum period for parking should be limited to 4 hours. This would discourage commuter parking, also parking by the new owners and tenants of 1-3 Quicks Road/92-94 Haydons Road (who under their s106 agreement are not allowed resident parking permits and therefore could take advantage of the relatively cheap parking charges for the park to park their cars there on a daily basis). 4 hours maximum parking should be a sufficient maximum for most park users. The car park should be for the use of park users and not for shopping at Sainsburys or drinking at the pub or customers of the new businesses at 1-3 Quicks Road/92-94 Haydons Road. This is not to be unreasonable, but to make the car park entrance area as safe as possible for parents/carers and children using the play area and park.
6. However, we would suggest that there is free parking on Saturdays, as a large number of sporting activities take place in the park on a Saturday and this should be encouraged.
7. We have had a few comments that the car park should be free.
8. I have spoken to the Assistant Manager at Sainsbury's (the Manager was off today) regarding the so-called "loading area to the rear of the Sainsbury's store". There is no loading area to the rear of the store within the park. Also there is a height restriction at the entrance to the park. He showed me their small rear exit door which opens onto the pavement of Haccombe Road to the side of the store. (There is another side emergency exit only which opens into the carpark area of the block of flats above Sainsburys - this is for emergencies only, they have no right to use it for unloading). There are 5 parking bays in Haccombe Road for 3F permit holders or pay and display. There is no "loading bay" or signage regarding

loading. The Assistant Manager advised me they have only one HGV delivery a day at 7 am and they try always to unload at the front of the store. It is only very rarely that they unload in Haccombe Road. Rather they wait until the front of the store is clear and then unload there. The reason for this is obvious it would not be at all safe for pedestrians for a HGV to be reversing into Haccombe Road. And in particular it would not be safe for parents/carers and children using the park at other times of the day, for Sainsburys to have the right to use any loading bay (if there was one) at ANY time of the day. (Many years ago I witnessed a fatal accident when a pedestrian went under the wheels of a HGV and the memory will stay with me for ever). The Order relates to Off-Street Parking Places within the park, it is not relevant to parking in Haccombe road. Therefore for all these reasons, Schedule 2 should be revised to delete the reference to HGVs.

9. There should be at least one disabled parking space in the car park. Not to have one I imagine is discriminatory.

10. With regard to the opening and locking of all the gates, we would refer you to the Comments lodged by the Vice Chair of the Friends of Haydons Recreation Ground.

I would be most grateful if you could find the time to reply personally to these Comments at the very least to reassure local residents that the park gates will be locked at dusk with the opening times agreed with the FHRRG. In addition, please could you advise me if there will be an opportunity to listen to Councillors debating Comments regarding this Order at any public meeting before it is approved by the Council and the possible date of any such public meeting that I and other residents could attend.

008 Haydons

I would like to make the following objections to the PROPOSED CONTROLS TO OFF-STREET PARKING PLACES IN PARKS - SCHEDULE 2. The park gates should open at sunrise and close at sunset as is normal for parks in the borough. Extending these hours in a park which is not intended for use in the dark, ie is not floodlit, will provide an unpoliced area for inappropriate use such as alcohol consumption, drug usage, sexual activity and loitering with or without intent, and the litter associated. Walking along the street passed park gates in the dark, where people are within the park near to the gates, leaves one feeling unsafe and vulnerable. If the park is open, the children's play area will also be open. Again, this could lead to inappropriate use of the area and injuries from use in the dark. The car park operating hours of 8am to 4pm are acceptable. However, I wish to object to the maximum stay being 8 hours. This would encourage commuters to park for the day. 4 hours parking should be a sufficient maximum for most park users. The car park should be for the use of park users. I wish to object to HGV's using the park. This is a hazard for park users especially being so close to the children's play area. In addition, it will add to the pollution in the park

009 Haydons

We are writing as nearby residents, committee members of Friends of Haydons Road Recreation park (FOHRRG) and committee members of our local Battles Area Residents Association (BARA) to object to the following points as outlined in Schedule 2 of ES/OFFSTREET as follows:

3. © (i) With reference to HGVs I refer you to the Comments lodged by our Secretary Mrs Hilary Morris of "The Battles Area Residents Association" which she has researched and found that there is no "loading area to the rear of the Sainsbury' store" asking that Schedule 2 should be revised to delete the reference to HGVs.

(iii) The park gates should be opened at sunrise and closed at sunset and in-keeping with every other park in the Borough thus ensuring stability and consistency throughout the Borough. The security of the park is of the utmost importance and keeping the park open until 11pm is totally unacceptable and dangerous to the law abiding public as it attracts the inevitable anti-social behaviour which is happening on a continual basis i.e abuse of alcohol, drug abuse, sexual activity, rough sleepers, late night parties with shouting and screaming and the associated litter, and the total disregard for the children's playground with broken bottles, etc. and in a park which is not floodlit after dark, leaving people very vulnerable.

(iv) The chargeable car park hours of 8am to 4pm are acceptable but reservations with regard to charging on Saturdays as we would like to continue to see the park used and make it attractive for sporting activities as it is presently.

(v) Charges should be consistent with other parks in Schedule 1. 8 hours parking would attract commuters and other non-users of the park and would defeat the whole object of having this facility for park users, and would suggest 4 hours would be sufficient for most park users.

Officers comment

See section 5 of this report.

002 Revelstoke CP

I write with dismay at the new proposals to charge for parking in Wimbledon Park.

I live about 7 doors down from Revelstoke Road and will be very negatively affected if this should go ahead.

- I am a senior citizen and pay £65 pounds a year for the privilege of parking somewhere near my home. I also pay for visitors parking permits. Rarely do I get to park very close to my house even now. If this proposal

comes into being visitors to the park are going to take up any available spaces in Melrose Avenue and the situation for residents will become far worse. Congestion in the road will also increase which could lead to accidents and anger among drivers. How far will I need to carry my weekly shop??? Too far!!!! Will I then receive a reduction in my Parking Permit?? I guess the answer is 'NO'. Saturdays will become a total nightmare.

- I cannot see how these charges at £2.40 for 8 hours will deter anyone who commutes.
- I visit the park every day and can honestly say I have never seen caravans or abandoned vehicles. Anyone wishing to dispose of a vehicle would not be worried about whether they had purchased a ticket!!!
- As to the rule of no parking between 11pm and 6am I would ask does this indicate that parks would not be closed in the late evening any more. This would only lead to high jinks and noise.
- Surely the point of customers to local businesses parking for long periods just does not happen. I would point out that your proposal will only serve to harm our local shop – McCluskey's – and I really think that this point is a non-start.
- I do not think that this has been thought through and no primary consideration has been given to local residents. right to live in a quiet street and to park our vehicles nearby would disappear despite the amount of revenue raised by the price of our permits. It all smacks of yet another hit on motorists and simply another money making scheme.

003 Revelstoke CP

Would just like to say that most car parks allow the disabled dispensation to park for up to 4 hours. Why not allocate a dedicated bay [s] for this purpose?

Also I understand meters will be in operation on Saturdays. Surely this will cause a problem for residents near the Park. Do you intend to extend residents' parking to the six days?

While I am on the subject of roads and cars: Alexander Road is a rat run. Would it not be better to install down that road, a large and small arrow system for right of advantage?

006 Revelstoke CP

In the first instance let me express my disappointment at the fact that, as resident of Revelstoke Road, I have received NO notification of the consultation process from any of you. Had it not been for the WPRA (a volunteer group), I would not have known about the consultation process.

Secondly, I strongly object to the proposed plans to charge people to park at the Revelstoke Road car park at Wimbledon Park. The park is a facility that is accessed and enjoyed by a range of people from across the borough, many of whom would find it difficult to access the park without a car. As a local user of the park I do not believe there is a significant issue with "abandoned cars or long stays" in this car park. Additionally, as a resident of Revelstoke Road, I am very concerned about the knock on impact on the demand for car parking spaces on Revelstoke Road and surrounding roads in the grid as the proposed hours for charging at the park are much longer (and add Saturdays) than those in force in the surrounding roads (11-3 Monday to Friday pay for periods).

Officers comment

See section 5 of this report.