

CORPORATE SERVICES DEPARTMENT
Director – Caroline Holland



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

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

Date: 15 February 2018

Dear Councillor

**Notification of a Decision taken by the Cabinet Member for
Regeneration, Environment and Housing**

The attached non-key decision has been taken by the Cabinet Member for
Regeneration, Environment and Housing, with regards to:

- Proposed MP1 CPZ extension Watery Lane – Statutory
Consultation

and will be implemented at **noon on Tuesday 20 February** unless a call-in
request is received.

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

Yours sincerely

**Lisa Jewell
Democracy Services**

NON-KEY DECISION TAKEN BY A CABINET MEMBER

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

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

MP1 CPZ ex. – Watery Lane – Statutory consultation

2. Decision maker

Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Environment and Housing

3. Date of Decision

14-02-201

4. Date report made available to decision maker

07-02-2018

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

N/A

6. Decision

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

- A) Notes the results of the statutory consultation carried out between 9 November and 1 December 2017 on the proposal to extend MP1 Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) to include Watery Lane.
 - B) Notes and considers the representations received in respect of the proposal as detailed in Appendix 2.
 - C) Agrees to proceed with the making of the relevant Traffic Management Orders (TMO) and the implementation of the proposed MP1 CPZ extension to include Watery Lane operational Monday to Friday, between 10am and 4pm as shown in Drawing No. Z78-218-01A in Appendix 3.
 - D) Agrees to proceed with the making of an Exemption Order to allow footway parking in Watery Lane to maximise the number of parking spaces.
 - E) Agrees to proceed with making of relevant Traffic Management Orders (TMOs) for the implementation of the proposed 'At any time' waiting restrictions in Watery Lane.
 - F) Agrees to exercise his discretion not to hold a public inquiry on the consultation process.
-

7. Reason for decision

Support shown in the consultation for the implementation of an extension to the controlled parking zone.

The introduction of waiting restrictions will improve road safety in the area.

8. Alternative options considered and why rejected

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

Statutory consultation documents, drawings and representations

9. Declarations of Interest

None

10. Publication of this decision and call in provision

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



Councillor Martin Whelton

14 February 2017

Committee: Cabinet Member report

Date: 07 February 2018

Wards: Merton Park

Subject: Proposed MP1 CPZ extension Watery Lane – Statutory Consultation

Lead officer: Chris Lee, Director of Environment & Regeneration

Lead member: Councillor Martin Whelton, Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Environment and Housing

Contact officer: Paul Atie, Tel: 020 8545 3214

Email: <mailto:paul.atie@merton.gov.uk>

Recommendations:

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

- A) Notes the results of the statutory consultation carried out between 9 November and 1 December 2017 on the proposal to extend MP1 Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) to include Watery Lane.
 - B) Notes and considers the representations received in respect of the proposal as detailed in Appendix 2.
 - C) Agrees to proceed with the making of the relevant Traffic Management Orders (TMO) and the implementation of the proposed MP1 CPZ extension to include Watery Lane operational Monday to Friday, between 10am and 4pm as shown in Drawing No. Z78-218-01A in Appendix 3.
 - D) Agrees to proceed with the making of an Exemption Order to allow footway parking in Watery Lane to maximise the number of parking spaces.
 - E) Agrees to proceed with making of relevant Traffic Management Orders (TMOs) for the implementation of the proposed 'At any time' waiting restrictions in Watery Lane.
 - F) Agrees to exercise his discretion not to hold a public inquiry on the consultation process.
-

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report presents the results of the statutory consultation carried out on the Councils' proposals to extend MP1 CPZ to include Watery Lane.
- 1.2 It seeks approval to implement the above recommendations.

1 DETAILS

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

- managing better use of street spaces for people, goods and services, ensuring that priority is allocated to meet the objectives of the strategy,
 - improving the attractiveness and amenity of the borough's streets, particularly in town centres and residential areas and
 - encouraging the use of sustainable modes of transport.
- 2.2 CPZs aim to provide safe parking arrangements, whilst giving residents and businesses priority access to available kerbside parking space. It is a way of controlling the parking whilst improving and maintaining access and safety for all road users. A CPZ comprises of yellow line waiting restrictions and various types of parking bays operational during the controlled times. These types of bays include the following:
- Permit holder bays: - For use by resident permit holders, business permit holders and those with visitor permits.
- Pay and display shared use/permit holder bays: - For use by pay and display customers and permit holders.
- 2.3 A CPZ includes double yellow lines (no waiting 'at any time') restrictions at key locations such as at junctions, bends and along certain lengths of roads (passing gaps) where parking impedes the flow of traffic or would create an unacceptable safety risk e.g. obstructive sightlines or unsafe areas where pedestrians cross. These restrictions will improve access for emergency services; refuse vehicles and the overall safety for all road users, especially those pedestrians with disabilities and parents with prams. Any existing double yellow lines at junctions will remain unchanged.
- 2.4 Within any proposed CPZ or review, the Council aims to reach a balance between the needs of the residents, businesses, visitors and all other users of the highway. It is normal practice to introduce appropriate measures if and when there is a sufficient majority of support or there is an overriding need to ensure access and safety. In addition the Council would also take into account the impact of introducing the proposed changes in assessing the extent of those controls and whether or not they should be implemented.
- 2.5 The CPZ design comprises of yellow line restrictions and permit holder bays to be used by residents and their visitors. The layout of the parking bays are arranged in a manner that provides the maximum number of suitable parking spaces without jeopardising road safety and the free movement of traffic.

2 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

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

3 CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN

INFORMAL CONSULTATION

- 3.1 In 2013 as part of the redevelopment of Nelson Hospital there was an allocation of S106 funding to investigate and consult on parking management measures to mitigate the impact of the closure of the hospital car park and the development of residential dwelling on a neighbouring site. The Ward Councillors asked officers to investigate the possibility of a parking management scheme e.g. Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in anticipation of the completion of the Nelson

Hospital redevelopment and possible parking displacement into the uncontrolled roads behind the hospital.

- 3.2 The informal consultation on proposals to introduce parking controls in the Cannon Hill Lane area commenced on 22 September and ended on 14 October 2016. 383 premises were consulted via documents containing a newsletter explaining the proposals; an associated plan showing the proposed parking layout and a sheet of frequently asked questions. Residents were directed to the Council's website to fill in the online questionnaire.
- 3.3 The consultation resulted in a total of 192 online questionnaires returned (after removing duplicates / multiple returns from some households), representing a response rate of 50%. Of the 192 who responded, 42.7% supported a CPZ in their road, compared to 51.6% who did not and 5.7% who were unsure. The roads that voted against the principle of a CPZ namely Aylward Road, Manor Gardens and Watery Lane also voted *No* to the question "*would you be in favour of a CPZ in your Road if the neighbouring road/s or part of your road were included in a CPZ?*"
- 3.4 Further analysis of the results on a road-by-road basis revealed that there were some roads that supported the proposed controls which formed a logical geographical boundary and therefore these roads were recommended for inclusion within the proposed CPZ. Of the 85 responses from the reduced proposed MP2 CPZ area, 62.4% supported a CPZ in their roads, compared to 30.6% who did not and 7% who were unsure. Of the 85 who responded, 68.2% supported a CPZ in their road if their neighbouring roads were included in a CPZ, compared to 21.2% who did not, 10.6% who were unsure or who made no response. Residents were also asked which days of operation they would prefer if a CPZ was introduced in their road. It concluded in a majority of 79.2% of respondents opting for Monday – Friday with a majority of 43% of respondents opting for 8.30am – 6.30pm.
- 3.5 The results of the consultation along with officers' recommendations were presented in a report to the Cabinet Member for Environmental Sustainability and Regeneration on the 1 December 2016, after which the Cabinet Member approved the undertaking of the statutory consultation for a MP2 CPZ to operate Monday – Friday, between 8.30am – 6.30pm. A statutory consultation was carried out between 9 February and 10 March 2017. Following Cabinet Member decision, the CPZ was implemented in August 2017.
- 3.6 In 20 September 2017 Merton Park ward Councillors organised a meeting for Watery Lane residents to discuss the proposed double yellow lines for this road and invited officers to attend. During the discussion among other issues, the residents informed officers and ward Councillors that due to the minimal number of free parking spaces that would be available in the road if the yellow lines were implemented, the existing MP1 CPZ (Monday – Friday, between 10.00am and 4.00pm) should be extended to include Watery Lane. This would give residents opportunity to park in other roads when there is no parking space in Watery Lane. This suggestion was agreed by majority of those who were present at the meeting. In agreement with the Ward councillors and Cabinet member a statutory consultation was programmed.

4. STATUTORY CONSULTATION

- 4.1 The statutory consultation on the Council's intention to extend parking controls in MP1 CPZ to include Watery Lane commenced on 09 November and ended on 1 December 2017. The consultation included the erection of street Notices on lamp columns in the vicinity of the proposals and the publication of the Council's intentions in the Local Guardian and the London Gazette. Consultation documents were available at the Link, Merton Civic Centre and on the Council's website. A newsletter with a plan, see Appendix 1, was also distributed to all those properties included within the consultation area.
- 4.2 The newsletter detailed the following information:
- Watery Lane to be included as an extension to MP1 CPZ operating Monday to Friday between 10am and 4pm.
 - The proposed parking space on the north side between Nos 18 and 26 to be relocated to the south side partially on the footway and introduce double yellow lines on the north side.
 - Relocation of the disabled Parking bay opposite No. 36 Watery Lane to allow 4 parking spaces (perpendicular parking). The disabled parking bay be located to opposite No.18 Watery Lane.
 - Removal of the proposed footway parking space opposite Nos 38/ 40 Watery Lane.
 - Reduction of the proposed double yellow lines at the Cul De Sac end to single yellow lines to operate CPZ times.
 - Zone boundary
- 4.3 The statutory consultation resulted in 11 representations with 10 representations in support and 1 comment requesting additional parking spaces in the road. The Council also received a petition (with 5 signatures) requesting that the cul De Sac section of the road be remove from the scheme. Details of these representations along with officer's comments are detailed in Appendix 2.

Petition

- 4.4 The Council received one petition against the scheme containing 5 signatures. It would be prudent to note that a petition received during a statutory consultation against a proposed scheme is reported but does not override the consultation results. The Council carries out consultations to determine if there is support for the proposed scheme or not. The Council believes that residents should make an informed decision regarding a proposed scheme in the comfort of their home without outside influence. It is, therefore, recommended that the Cabinet Member notes the petition but make a decision based on the consultation results.
- 4.5 Previously noted in MP2 report, Watery Lane has a road width of 5.5 metres and from No 18 Watery Lane it becomes progressively narrower with 3.7 metres at property No 32 Watery Lane. The minimum running width required by a fire engine to access residential road is between 3 and 3.5 metres. With cars parked fully on the carriageway on one sides of the road, the average available road width for access at No 18 Watery Lane would be 3.5 metres and reduced to 1.7 metre at No 32. Residents have requested that footway parking should be allowed on the south side (school side) from opposite Nos 18 to 30 (this is the way residents are currently parking in the road). In view of this it has been agreed with the local ward Councillors that parking be transferred to the north side (outside the residential properties) between nos. 18 and 26 Watery Lane.

The space on the south side will be treated with double yellow lines. The previously proposed double yellow lines between nos.36 Watery Lane and the Cul De sac end is proposed to be changed to single yellow line operating between 10am and 4pm. The road width at this section of the road is 5 metres which is reduced to 4 metres toward the Cul de sac end. The changes were approved for a statutory consultation and implementation.

- 4.6 As detailed in section 3.6 above a meeting was held on 20 September 2017 with majority of residents in attendance. At the meeting it was agreed MP1 CPZ be extended to include Watery Lane instead of MP2. However, during the statutory consultation, the Council received a petition from some residents at the Cul De Sac end requesting their section of the road be removed from the scheme. They feel that they have live in the road for many years and are better place to understand the parking pattern of motorists in the road. The current proposal agreed at the September meeting is to keep the Cul de sac clear of parked vehicles during the hours of operation of the scheme. This would help footfall especially during term time as the pupils are expected to use the new school gate. This would help alleviate parking problem of visitors to the school who may want to park here if there are no restrictions. Not to address obstructive parking once it has been investigated by the Council could be considered as a failure by the Council in its duty to provide clear access and in the event of an incident, the council can be held responsible. Where possible, the Council works with all emergency services to ensure that any unnecessary delay to their emergency call is addressed effectively. Although residents are of the opinion they have lived in these roads for many years and no such incident has occurred, this is a mute point when considering safety and access. The Council also has photographic evidence of inconsiderate and obstructive parking that is taking place in this road at various times of the day which include the Cul de sac end. To ensure access and safety are maintained at all times, it is recommended that the Cabinet Member approve the MP1CPZ extension to include the whole of Watery Lane.
- 4.7 Recently it has come to our attention that the school require access to their premises through the gate at the "D" section in Watery Lane adjacent to an existing dropped kerb. This is an area where previously a parking bay was proposed. To facilitate access it is now necessary to create a 1.6m hatched area in front of the gate to maintain access at all times. This will reduce the number of previously proposed perpendicular parking spaces from 4 to 3. Also the footway in front of the gate will be reconstructed with pram ramps. The plan is attached in appendix 1.
- 4.8 When considering road safety, S.122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 places a duty on the Council "to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway "when exercising any of its functions under the 1984 Act. Road safety is therefore a matter that the Council should have proper regard to when considering whether to make an Order under S.6 of the 1984 Act.
- 4.9 In accordance with the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1974, parking on any part of a footway is illegal; although there are occasions where provided there is sufficient footway width (minimum 1.5m) parking on footway can be permitted via an Exemption Order. This exemption, however, does not apply where the footway comprises of a grass verge. With the above approved footway works, this section of the section of Watery Lane between property Nos 18 & 32 have sufficient footway width to allow partial footway parking (two wheels on the footway). See plan attached as Appendix 1.

Ward Councillor comments

- 4.10 The Ward Councillors have been engaged during the consultation process and they are supportive of the recommendations in this report.

5. PROPOSED MEASURES

- 5.1 It is recommended that the Traffic Management Orders TMOs be made to extend MP1 CPZ to include Watery Lane, operational Monday to Friday between 10am and 4pm as shown in Drawing No. Z78-218-01 rev A and attached in Appendix 1.

- 5.1.2 The making of an Exemption Order to allow footway parking in Watery Lane to maximise the number of parking spaces

- 5.1.3 The making of relevant Traffic Management Orders (TMOs) on the proposed 'At any time' waiting restrictions.

5.2 Permit issue criteria

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

- 5.2.2 In November 2016, the Council agreed to introduce a Diesel Levy to all those permit holders with a diesel vehicle. However, it has been agreed not to apply this new Diesel levy to the first year of permits of those zones that were consulted on (but not implemented) prior to the introduction of this levy. The levy will be applied to renewals i.e. the second year of the CPZ. Permit holders will be advised accordingly when making their permit application. Those residents with an all-electric vehicle will only have to pay a reduced rate of £25 instead of £65.

Visitors' permits

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

6 TIMETABLE

- 6.1 If a decision is made to proceed with the implementation of the proposed CPZ, Traffic Management Orders could be made within six weeks after the decision. This will include the erection of the Notices on lamp columns in the area, the publication of the made Orders in the Local Guardian and the London Gazette. The documents will be made available at the Link, Civic Centre and on the Council's website. A newsletter will be distributed to all the premises within the consulted area informing them of the decision. The measures will be introduced soon after.

- 6.2 If agreed the statutory consultation for the proposed parking restrictions in Watery Lane will take place soon after.

7. FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 The cost of implementing the proposed measures is estimated at £7k. This includes the publication of the made Traffic Management Orders and the appropriate road markings and signage. This will be met by the Environment and Regeneration revenue budget for Parking Management schemes. This will be met partly by the S106 allocation for Parking Management scheme for this area.

8. LEGAL AND STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 The Traffic Management Orders would be made under Section 6 and Section 45 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended). The Council is required by the Local Authorities Traffic Order (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 to give notice of its intention to make a Traffic Order (by publishing a draft traffic order). These regulations also require the Council to consider any representations received as a result of publishing the draft order.
- 8.2 The Council has discretion as to whether or not to hold a public inquiry before deciding whether or not to make a traffic management order or to modify the published draft order. A public inquiry should be held where it would provide further information, which would assist the Council in reaching a decision.
- 8.3 The Council's powers to make Traffic Management Orders arise mainly under sections 6, 45, 46, 122 and 124 and schedules 1 and 9 of the RTRA 1984.
- 8.4 The Exemption Order for the footway parking will be made under section 15 of the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1974.

9 HUMAN RIGHTS, EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY COHESION IMPLICATIONS

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

10. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 N/A

11. RISK MANAGEMENT AND HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

- 11.1 The risk of not introducing the proposed parking arrangements is that the existing parking difficulties would continue and it would do nothing to assist the residents.

10.2 The risk in not addressing the issues from the consultation exercise would be the loss of confidence in the Council. The proposed measures may cause some dissatisfaction from those who have requested status quo or other changes that cannot be implemented but it is considered that the benefits of introducing the measures outweigh the risk of doing nothing.

11 APPENDICES – THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS ARE TO BE PUBLISHED WITH THIS REPORT AND FORM PART OF THE REPORT

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

- a) Appendix 1 – Drawing No.Z78-218-01 Rev A (Revised scheme layout)
- b) Appendix 2 - Representations with officer's comments
- c) Appendix 3 – Statutory Consultation Documents

12. BACKGROUND PAPERS

12.1 Informal consultation report MP2.

Representations and Officer's Comments

Representation - Support

009

We are responding to the Statutory Consultation above which you have opened between 9 November and 1 December 2017, your reference ES/MP1EXT/WL.

We agree with the proposals as set out by Mr & Mrs Johnson as set out below:

We agree in general to the 5 main propositions set out in the documentation, and the accompanying drawing Z78-218-04.

We welcome the inclusion of Watery Lane into MP1 CPZ as indicated, the part footway parking on the south side of the lane, the relocation of the disabled space, the provision of more spaces in the D, and the restriction on parking on the north side of the Lane.

We have the following detailed observations for your further consideration, which would make for a slight addition to the number of parking spaces in the Lane, without, in our view, compromising issues of safety or access for emergency vehicles.

1. *There is room for 5 perpendicular spaces in the D, rather than the 4 as shown on the plan. The footway around the western curve of the D is little used since the new gates to the Cricket Ground were installed, and a further perpendicular parking space could be added at this end using much of the (redundant) pavement. In any event, the proposed double yellow lines round the curve do not need to reach so far into the D. There are no safety issues here to do with sight lines or cornering, and the footway is more than 2 mètres wide.*

2. *The overall width of the Lane, plus its two footways, should make it possible to extend the footway parking on the south side of the Lane to opposite no 32. At this point, with a standard sized car parked partly on the footway, there is 2.9m of road carriageway, plus 1.2m of footway on the north side of the Lane to allow a large vehicle to pass. Please also note that no vehicle wider than 3 metres can gain access to the Lane because of its narrowness outside nos 12-14., and that the provision of parking spaces in Manor Road (in MP2) in places leaves less than 3 metres between a much tighter road edge and the parked cars. We believe that Watery Lane should be treated with the same flexibility.*

Officer's comment

With regards to the D section, See section 4.7 of this report. With regards the footway opposite property number 32, the section is too narrow for a regulated parking space.

006

Thank you for your Statutory Consultation leaflet Issue Date : 9th November 2017 and drawing no. Z78-218-04 regarding the above. The leaflet confirms a number of points discussed at the 20th September meeting organised by the Merton Park Ward Councillors, and we now submit our representation commenting on each of those points as follows:

- Watery Lane to be included as an extension to MP1 CPZ operating Monday to Friday between 10.00am and 4pm – we fully support this proposal.
- We also support the proposed parking spaces on the north side between nos 18 and 26 being re located to the south side partially on the footway. The proposed spaces terminate opposite no 30 but we feel this could be extended to no 32, given that the risk of obstruction has been overcome by the proposed provision of double yellow lines on the houses side of the highway, this would provide one further space.
- The relocation of the disabled parking bay from opposite no 36 to a new space opposite no 18 (where the resident affected lives) has to be a good idea and has our full support.
- We feel the 4 parking spaces in the "D" outside the western end of the school could accommodate 5 spaces if they are allowed to lap the footpath on the western side which is rarely used, this arrangement would not obstruct the new pedestrian access to the recreation ground and would compensate for the loss of a parking space opposite nos 38 / 40 Watery Lane.

In general we support these proposals and thank you for the effort that your department has put in to this process, however, it would be appreciated if car parking numbers proposed could be modestly increased (2 spaces) along the lines suggested here.

Officer's comment

With regards to the D section, See section 4.7 of this report . With regards the footway opposite property number 32, the section is too narrow for a regulated parking space.

010

Further to your communication of 9th November 2017 about extension of CPZ (Controlled Parking Zone) MP1 to Watery Lane, I am generally in favour of having controlled parking in this street (where I live, at number 18). I have the following observations to make:

- 1) It is not clear from your diagram (on an A4 sheet) exactly where the new double yellow lines are to be applied, nor is it much clearer from a larger copy (on computer screen) of this diagram obtained from your website at www.merton.gov.uk/cpzmp1ex.
- 2) While I understand that 10:00-16:00 is the standard operating time for the rest of CPZ MP1, given the special

conditions that apply in Watery Lane (i.e. the presence of Rutlish School and all of its associated activities), would it be possible, please, to have an extension of this operating time to the Watery Lane "enclave" from 08:00 (at the latest) to 18:00 (at the earliest)? This will make life a lot easier for those of us who actually live here, causing less disruption due to people dropping off pupils at the school in the morning and people attending school events (e.g. parents' evenings, etc.) in the early evenings. The school seems to make no attempt to provide parking facilities for people attending such events, which is a source of great discontent amongst the local residents.

3) From what I can make out from your diagram, it looks as if you are only allowing 4 parking spaces in the "D" at the western end of the school frontage. If partial width pavement parking is allowed and the outer vehicles are "staggered" slightly northwards (and progressively more so the further they are away from the centre vehicle), it will be possible to get 5 vehicles in that part (and you can see 5 vehicles parked there, leaving room for pedestrians to pass, on most days). This is shown in the attached (hand-drawn!) diagram (not drawn to scale). **If this diagram is not clear (I was never much good at Art at school!) I can either provide the original or I can take it to you so that I can explain it (I can be contacted by phone on 07918 088712 or (020) 8540 7013, or by e-mail at clarke.nick@btinternet.com). Or we can even discuss it "on the ground".**

4) With suitable road/pavement marking to show the allowed extent of parking on the pavement (and also the parking spaces in the "D") it will probably be possible to remove the proposed double yellow lines opposite numbers 32 and 34 (which takes up the space of 1/2 to 1 vehicle). Parking spaces are at a premium here in this street, so we need all the parking spaces that we can wring out of this scheme (especially since there will now be no potential space[s] opposite 38-40)!

5) To facilitate my suggestion for the "D" in item (3) above, I would propose relocating the waste bin from its current location just inside the eastern end of the "D", to the pavement opposite numbers 38-40 (where it should be out of the way). This will allow partial width pavement parking in the "D", while still allowing pedestrians to pass.

6) Finally, could we have a dropped kerb somewhere in the pavement section opposite numbers 38-40, please? This would allow ramp/level access between the pavement and Watery Lane for people with prams/wheelchairs, etc. going into or coming out of the Recreation Ground. Similarly, the stretches of pavement between the two new gateways (to the Park and the Recreation Ground) should also be checked for level access for prams and wheelchairs (and remedial action taken where necessary).

Overall, we are generally in favour of extending the MP1 CPZ to Watery Lane, but the above suggestions would and could get more out of your proposal. Please get back to me if you require any further clarification.

Officer's comment

With regards to the D section, See section 4.7 of this report. With regards the footway opposite property number 32, the section is too narrow for a regulated parking space.

Majority of residents who attended the meeting did not want all day CPZ in the road. that is the reason they opted for MP1 CPZ with shorter hours

005

Thank you for your Statutory Consultation leaflet Issue Date: 9th November 2017 and drawing no. Z78-218-04 regarding the above. The leaflet confirms a number of points discussed at the 20th September meeting organised by the Merton Park Ward Councillors, and we now submit our representation commenting on each of those points as follows:

- Watery Lane to be included as an extension to MP1 CPZ operating Monday to Friday between 10.00am and 4pm – we fully support this proposal.
- We also support the proposed parking spaces on the north side between nos 18 and 26 being re located to the south side partially on the footway. The proposed spaces terminate opposite no 30 but we feel this could be extended to no 32, given that the risk of obstruction has been overcome by the proposed provision of double yellow lines on the houses side of the highway, this would provide one further space.
- The relocation of the disabled parking bay from opposite no 36 to a new space opposite no 18 (where the resident affected lives) has to be a good idea and has our full support.
- We feel the 4 parking spaces in the "D" outside the western end of the school could accommodate 5 spaces if they are allowed to lap the footpath on the western side which is rarely used, this arrangement would not obstruct the new pedestrian access to the recreation ground and would compensate for the loss of a parking space opposite nos 38/40 Watery Lane.

In general we support these proposals and thank you for the effort that your department has put in to this process, however, it would be appreciated if car parking numbers proposed could be modestly increased (2 spaces) along the lines suggested here.

Officer's comment

With regards to the D section, See section 4.7 of this report. With regards the footway opposite property number 32, the section is too narrow for a regulated parking space.

Majority of residents who attended the meeting did not want all day CPZ in the road. that is the reason they opted for MP1 CPZ with shorter hours.

012

I would firstly like to thank you and Merton Borough Council for running the Statutory Consultation and incorporating the views of the Watery Lane residents in the proposed controlled parking zone changes, reference ES/MP1EXT/WL. The parking situation has worsened considerably in recent weeks, as the impact of other controlled parking changes bed-in in surrounding streets, and the proposed changes are most appreciated. I especially welcome the removal of the proposal for footpath parking opposite Nos 38/40, and the introduction of a double yellow line. The recent practice of footpath parking, here, has caused considerable problems for myself (No 38) and No 40 in accessing our driveways, which are opposite. This footpath area should revert to its historic no-parking status.

As regards the other proposed changes the one area I would draw your attention to is the proposal for 4 perpendicular parking bays in the 'D'. The current practice is for 5 perpendicularly parked cars in this space, without any inconvenience for pedestrians using the school entrance or the new entrance to the cricket field. With the relocation of the disabled parking bay, which currently takes up one oversized space, I believe the 'D' can continue to accommodate 5 perpendicularly parked cars without issue, and suggest this should be incorporated in the final plan.

Officer's comment

With regards to the D section, See section 4.7 of this report. With regards the footway opposite property number 32, the section is too narrow for a regulated parking space.

Majority of residents who attended the meeting did not want all day CPZ in the road. that is the reason they opted for MP1 CPZ with shorter hours

008

We are responding to the Statutory Consultation above which you have opened between 9 November and 1 December 2017, your reference ES/MP1EXT/WL.

We agree in general to the 5 main propositions set out in the documentation, and the accompanying drawing Z78-218-04. We welcome the inclusion of Watery Lane into MP1 CPZ as indicated, the part footway parking on the south side of the lane, the relocation of the disabled space, the provision of more spaces in the D, and the restriction on parking on the north side of the Lane.

We have the following detailed observations for your further consideration, which would make for a slight addition to the number of parking spaces in the Lane, without, in our view, compromising issues of safety or access for emergency vehicles.

1. *There is room for 5 perpendicular spaces in the D, rather than the 4 as shown on the plan. The footway around the western curve of the D is little used since the new gates to the Cricket Ground were installed, and a further perpendicular parking space could be added at this end using much of the (redundant) pavement. In any event, the proposed double yellow lines round the curve do not need to reach so far into the D. There are no safety issues here to do with sight lines or cornering, and the footway is more than 2 metres wide.*

2. *The overall width of the Lane, plus its two footways, should make it possible to extend the footway parking on the south side of the Lane to opposite no 32. At this point, with a standard sized car parked partly on the footway, there is 2.9m of road carriageway, plus 1.2m of footway on the north side of the Lane to allow a large vehicle to pass. Please also note that no vehicle wider than 3 metres can gain access to the Lane because of its narrowness outside nos 12-14., and that the provision of parking spaces in Manor Road (in MP2) in places leaves less than 3 metres between a much tighter road edge and the parked cars. We believe that Watery Lane should be treated with the same flexibility.*

We are grateful for the time and effort you and your team have put in to resolving the problems of parking that have arisen in the Lane.

Officer's comment

With regards to the D section, See section 4.6 of this report. With regards the footway opposite property number 32, the section is too narrow for a regulated parking space.

Majority of residents who attended the meeting did not want all day CPZ in the road. that is the reason they opted for MP1 CPZ with shorter hours

003

I had a look at the plans attached and extract below I counted 11 spaces. Given that there are 12 households that do not have usable drives to park their car, and some households having two cars to maintain modern family life. Merton's plan to provide 11 parking spaces is **not** enough. The minimum we requested during our consultation on the 20th September was **14**.

001, 002 and 003

I am emailing as part of the consultation of the proposed introduction of parking restrictions on Watery Lane.

We are in favour of parking restrictions but feel that the views of our household are being ignored. We have made the same point numerous, and we are not being listened to. Our views are valid too and I would challenge the council to explain why our opinion seems to be less important than that of other residents.

We would like parking restrictions from 8-6pm. We need, and have the right to, access to our house for us and our young children. We need be able to get out of our house for work and school in the early morning, and into the house in the evening. We often find cars parked outside the property at these times, which will not be addressed by a 10-4 restriction. For example, this would allow people to block access to our home when late afternoon events occur at the Rutlish school. Please find attached some evidence of the issues that we are facing. The car in the image arrived at 5pm this evening. My husband was already at home but I struggled to get into the house. A 10-4pm would not prevent this from happening.

Officer's comment

In the original MP2 consultation, residents of the area voted for between 8.30am and 6.30pm. Watery lane did not support the CPZ at that time. Majority of residents who attended the September 2017 meeting did not want all day CPZ in the road that is the reason they opted for MP1 CPZ that has shorter hours to be extended to include Watery Lane. In any scheme and associated consultation, the Council must make its decision based on majority views and that is what has happened here. All opinions count and are considered; however, as a rule decisions are made on majority vote except in cases where safety and access are of concern.

COMMENTS**011**

Our neighbour passed on your above leaflet as we didn't receive one directly.

As per your plan, we have no objections to the 3 'free parking' bays in our road becoming permit holder spaces under a CPZ, retaining the current yellow line restrictions which have been immensely beneficial in alleviating the parking congestion issues we used to encounter.

However, we thought we should point out that your map does not show the crossovers outside our house No. 3 (and our neighbour at No.1) which serve as our driveways. It does not look like any additional street furniture would be included if the scheme goes ahead, but we wanted to ensure our driveways were noted so nothing goes across them.

Officer's comment

Noted. This part of the road already has double yellow lines. The crossover not marked on the plan does not add or reduce parking space.

Representation against**012**

On receipt of the Proposed Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) MP2 as owners of Watery Lane, we strongly object to the double lines and would very much prefer to have a single line (preferably operating from 10am-4pm) running along side properties 18-36 (on the left hand side only. Leaving room for the residents to park on the other side. However, would like there to be a double line on the corner (as on the plan, opposite our drive no. 38), as when vehicles park on the pavement directly opposite our drive, it is then tricky to get out of our drive. Sometimes we are blocked into our drive. Double yellows stipulated on the plan wouldn't allow the residents to park or enable tradesmen or visitors to visit! A single line would help alleviate the access problem and allow much more flexibility. I do hope that you will take on board our comments.

Officers comment.

See section 4.9 of this report.

Proposed Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) MP1ext - Watery Lane



ISSUE DATE : 9 NOVEMBER 2017

Dear Resident

The purpose of this leaflet is to let you know the outcome of the informal consultation carried out during September /October 2016 on the proposal to introduce a controlled parking zone (CPZ) MP2 in your road. Residents of Watery Lane did not support a CPZ or the proposed double yellow lines. The local ward Councillors requested that the statutory consultation for Watery Lane be suspended to allow further discussions with residents to find a resolution that best suits parking measures for the road.

Following a meeting organised by the Merton Park Ward Councillors held on 20 September 2017 to discuss parking measures proposed for Watery Lane, the following measures were agreed:

- Watery Lane to be included as an extension to MP1 CPZ operating Monday to Friday between 10am and 4pm.
- The proposed parking space on the north side between Nos 18 and 26 to be relocated to the south side partially on the footway and introduce double yellow lines on the north side.
- Relocate the disabled Parking bay opposite No. 36 Watery Lane to allow 4 parking spaces (perpendicular parking). the disabled parking bay be located to opposite No.18 Watery Lane.
- Remove the proposed footway parking space opposite Nos 38/ 40 Watery Lane.
- Reduce the proposed double yellow lines at the Cul De Sac end to single yellow lines to operate CPZ times.

Please see plan overleaf.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

A Notice of the Council's intention will be published in a local newspaper (The Guardian), London Gazette and posted on lamp columns in the vicinity. Representations against the proposals described in this Notice must be made in writing **or** email to trafficandhighways@merton.gov.uk by no later than **1 December 2017** quoting reference **ES/MP1EXT/WL**. Objections must relate only to the elements of the scheme that are subject to this statutory consultation.

A copy of the proposed Traffic Management Orders (TMOs), a plan identifying the areas affected by the proposals and the Council's

Statement of Reasons can be inspected at Merton Link, Merton Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, Surrey, SM4 5DX during the Council's normal office hours Monday to Friday, 9am to 5pm. This information is also available on Merton Council's website www.merton.gov.uk/cpzmp1ex

All representations along with Officers' comments and recommendations will be presented in a report to the Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Environment and Housing. **Please note that responses to any representations received will not be made until a final decision is made by the Cabinet Member.**

MERTON PARK WARD COUNCILLORS

Cllr Edward Foley

phone: 020 8542 5824

Email: edward.foley@merton.gov.uk

Cllr John Sargeant

Phone: 020 8542 9361

Email: john.sargeant@merton.gov.uk

Cllr Peter Southgate

Phone: **020 8542 2053**

Email: peter.southgate@merton.gov.uk

Cllr Martin Whelton Tel: 020 8545 3425


Cabinet Member for Environment,
Regeneration and Housing.

Email: martin.whelton@merton.gov.uk

(The contact details of ward councillors are provided for information purposes only)

CPZ KEY

- CROSSOVERS
- PERMIT HOLDER BAY
- DISABLED PARKING BAY
- LAMP COLUMN
- CPZ BOUNDARY
- SINGLE YELLOW LINE
- DOUBLE YELLOW LINE
- EXISTING YELLOW LINE



Notes
See final version from this drawing

Rev	Revision	Date	By	Check	App	Sp	Sp	Sp	Sp	Sp

Street Scene & Waste
government & regeneration

TRAFFIC & HIGHWAYS

Category	AM	PM	Sp	Sp	Sp	Sp

PROJECT
Controlled parking Zones
MP1

TITLE
Watery Lane
Proposed Layout

merton
Merton Civic Centre
London Road
Merton SM4 5DX
www.merton.gov.uk

Drawing No.
Z/8-2/8-04

Revision
-

Classification
DRAFT

Scale
1:1000

Merton Council - call-in request form

1. Decision to be called in: (required)

--

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

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

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

3. Desired outcome

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

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

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

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

5. Documents requested

6. Witnesses requested

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

8. Notes – see part 4E section 16 of the constitution

Call-ins must be supported by at least three members of the Council.

The call in form and supporting requests must be received by 12 Noon on the third working day following the publication of the decision.

The form and/or supporting requests must be sent:

- **EITHER** by email from a Councillor’s email account (no signature required) to democratic.services@merton.gov.uk
- **OR** as a signed paper copy to the Head of Democracy Services, 7th floor, Civic Centre, London Road, Morden SM4 5DX.

For further information or advice contact the Head of Democracy Services on 020 8545 3864