



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

**Direct Line: 0208 545 3357
Email: democratic.services@merton.gov.uk**

Date: 20 March 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 VSW1 CPZ Wool Road area – formal consultation.

and will be implemented at **noon on 23 March 2018** unless a call-in request is received.

Please note that this decision was originally published on 20 February 2018 – [details available here](#).

Owing to an administrative error the original decision was published with incorrect operating times for the CPZ. The hours of operation have been corrected in this version of the decision.

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

Yours sincerely

**Amy Dumitrescu
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)

Proposed VSW1 CPZ Wool Road Area – formal consultation.

2. Decision maker

Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Environment and Housing

3. Date of Decision

19/03/2018

4. Date report made available to decision maker

16/02/2018

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) A) Notes the results of the statutory consultation carried out between 4 December 2017 and 5 January 2018 on the proposal to introduce a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) to include Wool Road, McKay Road, Dunstall Road, Ernle Road, Peregrine Way, Strachan Place, Woodhayes Road, Crooked Billet, Copse Hill (between Nos 1 and 42) and West Side Common (Nos, 1 & 2 only).
- 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 VSW1 CPZ to include Wool Road, McKay Road, Dunstall Road, Ernle Road, Peregrine Way, Strachan Place, Woodhayes Road, Crooked Billet, Copse Hill (between Nos 1 and 42) and West Side Common (Nos, 1 & 2 only), operational Monday to Friday, between 11am and 3pm as shown in Drawing No. Z78-345-01Rev A in Appendix 1.
- D) Agrees to proceed with the making of the relevant Traffic Management Orders (TMO) to introduce electric charging points bays in Ernle Road as detailed in drawing No Z78-348- 01 Rev A attached as appendix 1.

- E) Agrees to proceed with the making of the relevant Traffic Management Orders (TMOs) to implement the proposed 'At any time' waiting restrictions (as consulted) in the Wool Road area as shown in Drawing No. Z78-345-01"A" attached as Appendix 1.
- F) Agrees to exercise his discretion not to hold a public inquiry on the consultation process.

7. Reason for decision


- 1) Support shown by local residents in the consultations.
- 2) The improvement to road safety which will result from the implementation of waiting restrictions at junction
- 3) To deal with demand for parking spaces to ensure priority for local residents.

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 informal consultation, as well as the Council's duty to provide a safe environment for all road users.
- 8.2 Not to introduce the proposed double yellow lines. In the event of an incident, however, this would put the Council at risk and the Council could be considered as failing in its duties by not giving safety and access priority
- 8.3 Consideration to exclude Woodhayes Road from the controlled parking following representations was rejected as it would result in displacement parking from other roads if implemented as the surrounding roads would be in the zone.

9. Declarations of Interest

None



Cllr Martin Whelton

Cabinet member for regeneration, environment and housing

19 March 2018

Committee: Cabinet Member Report

Date: 16th February 2018

Wards: Village

Subject: Proposed VSW1 CPZ Wool Road area – formal 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 3337

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

Recommendations:

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

- A) A) Notes the results of the statutory consultation carried out between 4 December 2017 and 5 January 2018 on the proposal to introduce a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) to include Wool Road, McKay Road, Dunstall Road, Ernle Road, Peregrine Way, Strachan Place, Woodhayes Road, Crooked Billet, Copse Hill (between Nos 1 and 42) and West Side Common (Nos, 1 & 2 only).
- 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 VSW1 CPZ to include Wool Road, McKay Road, Dunstall Road, Ernle Road, Peregrine Way, Strachan Place, Woodhayes Road, Crooked Billet, Copse Hill (between Nos 1 and 42) and West Side Common (Nos, 1 & 2 only), operational Monday to Friday, between 11am and 3pm as shown in Drawing No. Z78-345-01Rev A in Appendix 1.
- D) Agrees to proceed with the making of the relevant Traffic Management Orders (TMO) to introduce electric charging points bays in Ernle Road as detailed in drawing No Z78-348- 01 Rev A attached as appendix 1.
- E) Agrees to proceed with the making of the relevant Traffic Management Orders (TMOs) to implement the proposed 'At any time' waiting restrictions (as consulted) in the Wool Road area as shown in Drawing No. Z78-345-01"A" attached as Appendix 1.
- 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 introduce a VSW1 CPZ in Wool Road, McKay Road, Dunstall Road, Ernle Road, Peregrine Way, Strachan Place, Woodhayes Road, Crooked Billet, Copse Hill (between Nos 1 and 42) and West Side Common (Nos, 1 & 2 only).

1.2 It seeks approval to implement the above recommendations.

1.3 This decision was originally published on 20 February 2018 – [details available here](#).
Owing to an administrative error this decision was published with incorrect operating times for the CPZ. The hours of operation have been corrected in this version of the decision.

2. DETAILS

2.1 The key objectives of parking management include:

- Tackling of congestion by reducing the level and impact of traffic in town centres and residential areas.
- Making the borough's streets safer and more secure, particularly for pedestrians and other vulnerable road users through traffic management measures.
- Managing better use of street spaces for people, goods and services, ensuring that priority is allocated to meet the objectives of the strategy.
- Improving the attractiveness and amenity of the borough's streets, particularly in town centres and residential areas.
- Encouraging the use of more sustainable modes of transport.

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

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

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

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

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

2.5 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.

2.6 The Council received a petition from Wool Road, McKay Road, Dunstall Road, Ernle Road and Crooked Billet requesting the introduction of a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in their roads.

2.7 Electric Vehicle charging points

2.7.1 A key objective of the Mayor's Transport Strategy is to facilitate the delivery of a network of Electrical Vehicle Recharging Points (EVRPs) across London. This is reinforced by documents such as the Electric Vehicle Delivery Plan and the Ultra-Low Emissions Vehicles Delivery plan for London.

2.7.2 It is anticipated that the number of electric and hybrid vehicles is set to rise in Merton and neighbouring boroughs over the next few years and requests for EVRPs is likely to increase, as manufacturers bring more electric vehicles to the market each year.

2.7.3 Merton Council is committed to improving air quality and promoting sustainable modes of transport. EV charging bays and associated EV charging points are amongst a number of measures the Council is introducing to encourage motorists to switch to low carbon vehicles (including electric vehicles).

3. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

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


3.2 Not to introduce the proposed double yellow lines. In the event of an incident, however, this would put the Council at risk and the Council could be considered as failing in its duties by not giving safety and access priority.

4. Consultations undertaken

4.1 The Informal consultation was carried out between 7 and 29 September 2017 on the proposals to introduce a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) VSW1 to include Wool Road, McKay Road, Dunstall Road, Ernle Road, Peregrine Way, Strachan Place, Woodhayes Road, Crooked Billet, Copse Hill (between Nos 1 and 42) and West Side Common (Nos, 1 & 2 only) and associated yellow line restrictions.

4.2 The consultation resulted in a total of 141 questionnaires returned (after removing duplicates / multiple returns from some households representing a response rate of 48%). A detailed road by road analysis of the results show that of the 141 who responded 78% support a CPZ in their road, compared to 18% who do not and 4% who are unsure or did not comment. Residents were also asked which days / hours of operation they would prefer should the CPZ be introduced in their road. Results indicate that of the 141 who responded, 34% of respondents prefer 8.30am – 6.30pm, while 23% prefer 10am – 4pm and 40% prefer 11am – 3pm. Residents were also asked which days of operation they would prefer if a CPZ was introduced in their road. Results show that 71% of respondents prefer Monday – Friday and 28% support Monday – Saturday and 1% with no response.

4.3 The results of the consultation along with officers' recommendations were presented in a report to the Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Environment and Housing on 23 October 2017, after which the Cabinet Member approved the undertaking of the statutory consultation for the VSW1 CPZ to operate Monday – Friday, between 11am and 3pm.



4.4 **Statutory Consultation**

4.5 The statutory consultation on the Council's intention to introduce the VSW1 CPZ to include Wool Road, McKay Road, Dunstall Road, Ernle Road, Peregrine Way, Strachan Place, Woodhayes Road, Crooked Billet, Copse Hill (between Nos 1 and 42) and West Side Common (Nos, 1 & 2 only) was carried out between 4 December 2017 and 5 January 2018. 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, Appendix1, was also distributed to all those properties included within the consultation area.

4.6 The newsletter detailed the following information:

- The outcome of the informal consultation & subsequent Cabinet Member decision
- The undertaking of the statutory consultation
- A plan detailing the following:
 - Zone operational hours (Monday to Friday between 11am and 3pm)
 - Double yellow lines operating "at any time" without loading restrictions
 - The various parking bays
 - Zone boundary

4.7 The statutory consultation resulted in 95 representations received which include 52 representations in support; however, 6 of these 52 supporting representations support requested shorter hours; of the 95 representations, there are 11 comments and 32 representations against. Details of these representations along with officer's comments can be found in appendix 2.

4.8 Main residents' comments/concerns

4.8.1 Residents' main concern is the number of parking permits that would be made available to Kings College School (KCS), teachers and six form students. Some argue

that if KCS is to be allocated permits in the Wool Road area, they believe that it is only fair that KCS should also be offered spare parking capacity in other roads in the neighbouring CPZ. They also argue that KCS address is in Southside common as it is believed that the majority of the properties that make up KCS lies between The Ridgway and Woodhayes Road and the associated clubs and businesses buildings including entrances are in Woodhayes Road. Therefore, KCS apart from the address in Southside Common extends further into Woodhayes Road than any other road in the area. The Council can confirm that the six form students will not be allowed to purchase parking permits. With regards to teacher parking permits (which are similar to residents' permits) they are zone specific. The majority of the neighbouring zones have schools and the Council has already offered these schools permits for their teachers. In order for the Council to issue permits to a school, the school has to meet the following terms and conditions (set criteria).

- The Permits are zone specific. Only a school within the zone is entitled to a permit for that specific zone.
- Permits are only issued after the on-street parking capacity has been assessed. (in this case the spare parking capacity will be assessed within the first three months of the zone coming into operation)
- All permit applications must be made by the Head Teacher rather than individual teachers.
- The number of School permits to be issued are strictly limited particularly if the uptake of residents' permits is in excess of 75%; spare capacity is less than 25% and in cases where the numbers of permits outweigh the number of available spaces.
- Permits will be issued only to those schools with an up to date School Travel Plan and/or Green Travel plan.
- Renewal of permits would depend on the above criteria being met.
- The Council reserves the right to remove or reduce the number of permits pending on changes on parking capacity; any fraudulent act or abuse.

In terms of teachers permit cost, the Council approved the cost at £188 per permit in an academic year and only valid during term time. KCS will only be offered teacher permits if the school meet the above criteria.

4.8.2 Christ Church,

Some members of Christ Church contacted the Council and query the reason the Church was not included during informal consultation. The Church is already in an existing RPC1 CPZ and a property can only be listed in only one CPZ. The informal consultation is to find out from residents and businesses within the catchment area whether or not they are in favour of the scheme. Even if the church was included during the informal consultation, the church would have one vote (it is one vote per household or business) which would not have changed the outcome of the consultation. Residents of the area voted for the CPZ to operate Monday to Friday between 11am and 3pm. During a statutory consultation, however, members of the public are allowed to make representations to the consultation and there does not appear to be a change in opinion from the majority of the residents in terms of the proposed measures.

In terms of whether or not the council has given thought or consideration to the church during the design of the scheme, it is important to note that although every effort is made to consider the needs of the local community, priority is given to the residents. On this occasion, within the design a single yellow line is proposed in Copse Hill

outside the church. This will allow blue badge holders (disabled persons) to park during the hours of operation of the zone for up to three hours. Others visitors to the church would have access to pay and display bays in Woodhayes Road during the operating hours of the zone or they can use the parking bays in Cottenham Park Road outside the one-hour restriction of that zone.

With regards to funerals, the Council does allow this activity to take place outside Churches within CPZs. All that is needed is a phone call informing Parking Services of when the activity is due to take place. The hearse will be allowed to park as usual in Copse Hill on the single yellow lines between 11am and 3pm Monday to Friday. The single yellow line will work to the Church's advantage as it will keep the area clear of parked vehicles during the operating times and days of the CPZ.

- 4.8.3 With regards to reducing the hours of operation of the zone or part of the zone to one hour, a zone comes as a package and all elements that make up the zone should have the same days and hours of operation except double yellow lines. A legal notice which defines all the regulations that the Council intends to introduce in the form of a Traffic Management Orders (TMOs) was advertised at the statutory consultation stage. Making a road or part of a road to run different restrictions would cause confusion for residents and visitors alike and make the zone difficult to enforce. The Council no longer offers one hour CPZ as defined within the consultation documents. The proposed hours of operation was chosen by the majority of the residents during the informal consultation and as per representations received during the statutory (as detailed in appendix 2), majority of residents who made representations, do not want the hours of operation to be changed.

Woodhayes Road

- 4.9.1 Majority of residents who made representations to the statutory consultation still do not support a CPZ in their road; however, they would support a one hour CPZ. Due to operational issues, the council does not offer one hour CPZ and therefore it is not possible to adhere to this request. Majority of properties in this road have off street parking. Despite the introduction of 'At any time' waiting restrictions and the elongated 'H' bar road markings in 2012, it appears that the on-street parking congestion is not adversely affecting the residents. However, residents of Crooked Billet and Strachan Place have very limit on/off street parking due the narrowness of their roads. Currently, residents of these two roads park in Woodhayes Road when they can find a parking space or else park in Wool Road area.
- 4.9.2 The current parking conditions of these roads as described eloquently by a resident of the area is as follows "*The density of other parked vehicles in the area including Woodhayes Road, which are often parked bumper-to-bumper in an obstructive, inconsiderate and indiscriminate manner, currently has an adverse impact on traffic flows. The car density often reduces the width of the roads to a single lane, which causes further traffic congestion. The visibility at corners is often dangerously poor. During the peak periods, the traffic extends down Dunstall Road beyond the junction with McKay Road and towards Wool Road. On Woodhayes Road, the queue can extend back to the Ridgeway, and up past Kings College, sometimes creating a complete grid lock. The evidence shows that this is increasing the incidence of road rage and the number of minor accidents while drivers and pedestrians struggle with these hazardous conditions. The introduction of Residents Parking along Dunstall Road and Woodhayes Road would regulate the number of parked vehicles in the*

area, and make the environment safer for both motorists and pedestrians. It would make it easier to park for residents and their visitors alike. We believe that the congestion problems identified above will get progressively worse whilst this area remains almost the last zone in Wimbledon without parking restrictions of any type.”

With the neighbouring roads being subject to a CPZ and in the absence of a CPZ on Woodhayes Road, residents of Crooked Billet and Strachan Place will be adversely affected in that they will have nowhere to park whilst, if unrestricted, Woodhayes Road will continue to be used by commuters. Although as a rule the Council does not introduce a CPZ in a specific road that opposes a CPZ, on this occasion, it is considered that since Woodhayes Road residents will remain mainly unaffected by the CPZ (to a degree) whilst neighbouring residents would be unnecessarily and adversely affected, the Council feels compelled to introduce a CPZ in this road, as it could be alleged that the Council is failing in its duties if it does not give consideration to the plight of residents of those two roads.

It is, therefore, recommended that the Cabinet Member considers this recommendation and agree to include Woodhayes Road in the proposed VSW1 CPZ.

Electric Vehicles charging points

- 4.10 As part of the CPZ proposal, electric charging points are proposed in Ernle Road close to its junction with Copse Hill. The installation, operation, electricity costs and maintenance of any “open” electric vehicle charging point would be the sole responsibility of Bluepoint. The Council is only responsible for progressing the necessary Traffic Management Orders and highway maintenance with recoverable costs. Bluepoint’s investment costs would be recovered through fees and charges.

Ward Councillor Comments

- 4.11 The local Ward Councillors have been fully engaged during the consultation process. The Ward Members have been advised of the outcome of the consultation and officer’s recommendations. Officer’s received the following comment from one of the ward Councillors *‘I am happy for this to proceed as proposed’*.

5. PROPOSED MEASURES

- 5.1 Based on the statutory consultation responses, it is recommended that the Traffic Management Orders TMOs be made to implement a CPZ VSW1 to include Wool Road, McKay Road, Dunstall Road, Ernle Road, Peregrine Way, Strachan Place, Woodhayes Road, Crooked Billet, Copse Hill (between Nos 1 and 42) and West Side Common (Nos, 1 & 2 only), operational Monday to Friday between 11am and 3pm as shown in Drawing No. Z78-345-01 rev A and attached in Appendix 1.
- 5.2 It recommended that the relevant Traffic Management Orders (TMOs) is made and the implementation of the ‘At any time’ waiting restrictions (as consulted) in the Wool Road area as shown in Drawing No. Z78-345-01 and attached in Appendix 1.
- 5.3 It is recommended that the TMO is made to introduce 3 electric charging points in Ernle Road Close to its junction with Copse Hill.

5.4 The CPZ design comprises of mainly permit holder bays to be used by residents, businesses and their visitors with some pay and display and shared use facilities made available for pay & display customers. 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.

5.5 Permit issue criteria

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

5.6 In November 2016, the Council agreed to introduce a Diesel Levy to all those permit holders with a diesel vehicle. The Levy will be applied incrementally over the next 3 financial years with costs set at 2017/18 = £90, 2018/19 = £115 and 2019/20 = £150. The Diesel Levy will be in addition to the cost of permits. Permit holders will be advised accordingly when making their permit application. Those residents with all-electric vehicles will only have to pay a reduced rate of £25 instead of £65.

5.7 Visitors' permits

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

5.8 Trades permits

Trade Permits are priced at £900 per annum. Trades permits can also be purchased for 6 months at £600, 3 months at £375, 1 month at £150 and Weekly at £50.

5.9 Pay and display tickets

It is recommended that the charge for parking within the pay and display shared use/permit holder bays reflect the standard charges applied to these types of bays in the borough, at the time of consultation. The cost will be £1.20 per hour.

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 made 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.

7. **FINANCIAL RESOURCE AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS**

7.1 The cost of implementing the proposed measures is estimated at £30k. This includes the publication of the Made Traffic Management Orders, the road markings and the signs. The Environment and Regeneration revenue budget for 2016/17 currently contains a provisional budget for Parking Management schemes. The cost of this proposal can be met from this budget.

8. **LEGAL AND STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS**

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

9. HUMAN RIGHTS & EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY COHENSION IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 The implementation of new CPZs and the subsequent changes to the original design affects all sections of the community especially the young and the elderly and assists in improving safety for all road users and achieves the transport planning policies of the government, the Mayor for London and the Borough.
- 9.2 By maintaining clear junctions, access and sightlines will improve, thereby improving the safety at junctions by reducing potential accidents.
- 9.3 The Council carries out careful consultation to ensure that all road users are given a fair opportunity to air their views and express their needs. The design of the scheme includes special consideration for the needs of people with blue badges, local residents, businesses without prejudice toward 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 IMPLICATIONS

- 11.1 The risk of not progressing implementation would be against the majority of those who have demonstrated support. Not to progress the proposed measures will do nothing to address existing parking difficulties and will not assist the residents and the local business community. It will also do nothing to address the obstructive parking that has been identified.
- 11.2 The proposed measures may cause some dissatisfaction from those who have requested status quo or other changes that cannot be implemented but it is considered that the benefits of introducing the measures outweigh the risk of doing nothing.

12. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

- 12.1 When determining the type of parking places are to be designated on the highway, section 45(3) requires the Council to consider both the interests of traffic and those of the owners and occupiers of adjoining properties. In particular, the Council must have regard to: (a) the need for maintaining the free movement of traffic, (b) the need for maintaining reasonable access to premises, and (c) the extent to which off-street parking is available in the neighbourhood or if the provision of such parking is likely to be encouraged by designating paying parking places on the highway.
- 12.2 By virtue of section 122, the Council must exercise its powers under the RTRA 1984 so as to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic including pedestrians, and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway. These powers must be exercised so far as practicable having regard to the following matters:-
- (a) the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises.
 - (b) the effect on the amenities of any locality affected including the regulation and restriction of heavy commercial traffic so as to preserve or improve amenity.
 - (c) the national air quality strategy.
 - (d) facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and securing the safety and convenience of their passengers.
 - (e) any other matters appearing to the Council to be relevant.

13. APPENDICES

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

Appendix 1 – Drawing No. Z78-345-01 rev A

Appendix 2 – Representations

Appendix 3 – statutory consultation document.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Cabinet Member report titled Proposed VSW1 CPZ the Wool Road area – informal consultation dated 24 October 2017

Representations and Officer's Comments

Representation - Support

Ernle Road

| support the implementation of the CPZ scheme as regards Ernle Road with the controls being 11 am to 3 pm

015 Ernle Road

We support the introduction of a CPZ scheme in our road along the lines proposed in your circular to residents dated 30th November 2017. The use of the road for parking by long-distance commuters and by KCS teachers and pupils has made life very difficult for residents during the week in receiving guests, workmen or deliveries. The road is also now dangerous as there is no visibility when reversing out of driveways during the day whilst cars continue use the route as a cut through at inappropriate speeds.

There are, in our view, two ways in which the current scheme could be further improved:

1. The road is particularly busy during rush hour. Given the shortage of passing places, both ends of the road can become bottlenecks preventing cars from entering or exiting the road safely. In the circumstances, we believe you should extend the double yellow lines at either end of the road somewhat further into the road itself, sacrificing a couple of possible parking spaces on either side in the process.

2. There has been much discussion of the KCS issue both at the Residents' Meeting on 4 September and subsequently. If KCS are invited to apply for an allocation of residents' parking spaces in the Wool Road zone, we believe that it is only fair that they should also be offered spare parking capacity in other roads in the neighbourhood such as Clifton and Southside which are also adjacent to the school but already have CPZ schemes in place. There are plenty of unused parking bays in these streets throughout the day and it would only seem fair that any offer of teachers' parking permits to KCS should include an allocation from other adjacent or nearby zones as well as from ours. Our residents won't object to a few teachers taking up parking spaces in our road to the extent they were not otherwise used but it seems to us only reasonable that this principle should also apply to other areas around the school. Why should roads in the Wool Road zone be the only ones required to accommodate the KCS when the school abuts roads in other areas and, in fact, gives its address as Southside which is not in the designated Wool Road zone at all?

However, these two points are modest qualifications to a scheme that we otherwise fully endorse and support. Our most important concern is to have a CPZ scheme in operation in our road as soon as possible

Officer's Comment

Support noted - See section 4.8.1

084 Ernle Road

We support the introduction of CPZ restrictions into Ernle Road. It has become increasingly difficult to park in our road over the last few years, mainly as other CPZ close to us have been introduced. Even though we have a drive, getting in and out is often more complicated as cars increasingly park close to the edges and sometimes over the drive.

There are few spaces where one can pull in on Ernle Rd to allow a car coming from the opposite direction to pass as residents find they have to ask visitors to park across their own drives. On looking at the planned parking changes there are a few errors on Ernle Rd where drives are not indicated meaning that the number of proposed parking spaces will be slightly less. There also appears to be no planned parking restriction on Copse Hill outside Christ church which means that parking for congregation members attending week day services or funerals will be even more problematic. If the CPZ is agreed and goes ahead and parking permits are made available to School Employees and Tennis club members, could the place where parking is available to these be stipulated?

Officer's Comment

Support noted - See section 4.8.2

050 Ernle Road

We are writing to our support for the proposed CPZ on Ernle Road. We fully support the 5 day a week (Mon to Friday, 11.00 to 15.00) scheme as proposed. In addition, we feel the Council should give some thought to Kings College School (KCS) staff parking. We feel the fairest solution would be to allocate parking permits to the various CPZs in the area of the school, rather than concentrated in one CPZ, and hope this will be the case.

Officer's Comment

Support noted See section 4.8.1

085 Ernle Road

We approve in principle the establishment of a CPZ in the Wool - Ernle Road area and think it has been well designed on the whole. However, we would like to make some comments, and get some clarification on the following points.

1. On the map, the key for proposed double yellow line is shown as a hard double black line, with a notable space between the two lines. However, on the map itself all the corners between one road and another are shown as a single thick grey line, quite different from the double yellow line as shown in the key. Surely, this does not mean that it will be free to park on all these corners, which would be very dangerous – as it is today.?
2. Are visiting guests and visiting tradesmen allowed to park free of charge directly outside our gates, during the restricted period – with the permission of the resident?
3. Will King’s College School be the only non-resident body, other than visiting tradesmen, who will be allowed to get permits? The KCS permits should be only for teachers, not for pupils. We very much want to reduce the use of our parking spaces by KCS.
4. The positioning of the Electric charge points, on the corner where Ernle Road emerges onto Copse Hill seems to be dangerous. How long does it take to charge a car? What proportion of cars does the council expect to be electric by 2030?
5. We have difficulty getting in and out of our drive when cars are parked along our end of Ernle Road. We are both elderly and make many visits to hospitals. The bend in the road opposite our gate creates a pinch-point. A break in the parking bay, with a double yellow line outside no 27 Ernle Road, would help.
6. We are content with the four hour restricted parking time.

We are concerned that the poles and signs at each parking bay will disfigure what is now an attractive streetscape. Could the poles be better designed, or reduced in number?

Officer’s Comment

Support noted See section 4.8.1

The electric vehicle charging points are proposed 15 metres in Ernle Road from its junction with Copse Hill and we do not envisage any issues with this location. The charging times vary depending on the percentage left on the car battery before charging. This could vary from half an hour to 4 hours.

The parking spaces will be introduced as consulted and the scheme will be monitored during the first three months and any problems will be dealt with during that period.

With regards to signs and posts, these are legally required to ensure that the CPZ is in compliance with the regulations and facilitates enforcement of the scheme. All existing lamp columns located within the proposed parking bays will be used first before deploying additional posts.

028 Ernle Road

I am writing to support the installation of CPZ at Ernle Rd.

009 Ernle Road

This is to confirm that as residents of Ernle Road, my husband and I are firmly in favour of the proposed CPZ in the Wool Road Area.

115

Like most of our immediate neighbours, we are very strongly in favour of the proposed CPZ. We believe the very minimum hours of operation must be for the four hours between 11am and 3pm, Monday to Friday. (In our view a one hour restricted period would be wholly inappropriate). We have to say we would be outraged were the CPZ not implemented after the representations made to this point with such a clear majority in favour along with the overwhelming relief so many residents have expressed that finally, the areas intolerable parking problems are being addressed

Officer's Comment

Support noted - See section 4.8.2

063 McKay Road

I am resident at and the owner of McKay Road. I am wholeheartedly in favour of the proposed CPZ. The current situation is dire - especially during term time with all sides of the road full with parked cars that appear to be in a vast majority from pupils and staff at Kings College School. Cars park right up to driveways and on both sides of the road making it impossible sometimes to have access and egress to driveways. Visitors and trades people have nowhere to park, lots of litter seems to be dropped and it is very difficult to see around corners - especially at junctions. Can I just ask three questions:

1. Will King's staff or pupils be given access to any parking permits? I hope not as this would defeat one of the main issues at present. If this does happen then presumably this would be limited and all CPZs around the school should grant their fair share of resident permits so the burden is borne equally? I have to say that I think that the staff and pupils ought to do a much better job of using public transport.

2. I see from the proposed plan than the parking is intended to be permitted on both sides of McKay Road adjacent to No3 and No5. I would encourage your colleagues to see if that is compatible with being able to go in and out of driveways as the roadway is not wide. At the very least there needs to be a restriction on how close cars can park to driveways otherwise there is insufficient room to swing in or out - especially when moving backwards. I would suggest a couple of metres at least.

3. There is a bend in the road just after No 5 and I often observe near accidents as cars from each end of McKay Road drive along at speed without being able to see one another when cars are parked on both sides as they come around the bend; even more acutely when bicycles are travelling along the road. To my mind it would make more sense to extend the double yellow lines from the end of McKay Road (opposite No 1) along to the proposed double yellow lines on the bend itself (opposite No 7 McKay Road) so good visibility is preserved for all road users as the approach to/from the junction with Dunstall Road. I assume that these yellow lines were introduced with road safety in mind but I believe that they would work much better if they extended along further.

I look forward to hearing back from you. I am looking forward to the introduction of the CPZ hugely.

Officer's Common

Support noted - See section 4.8.1

The scheme is designed in such way that there is enough space for residents to turn in and out of their driveway.

031 McKay Road

Further to the current consultation for the above CPZ, as a resident of McKay Road, I would like to fully support the proposed CPZ and welcome the council's response to our application. Having lived here for 10 years, I have seen the rapidly increasing numbers of cars belonging to non residents that use this and the surrounding roads mostly during the week. I am optimistic that the proposed CPZ will overcome the following problems:

- Being unable to either park in or exit from my existing driveway as non residents park right up to or over the dropped kerbs on either side and park directly opposite the driveway which leaves no room to manoeuvre.
- Visitors being unable to park near the house or even in McKay Road.
- Non residents using the road in front of my house to store their cars while they go on holiday for up to 2 weeks which is especially inconvenient when driving elderly relatives who have mobility problems.
- Very limited visibility of oncoming cars on either side of the bend in McKay Road which is particularly dangerous if cars are travelling at more than 20 MPH
- Parked cars on the corners of McKay and Dunstall Roads which limits visibility when turning out of McKay Road and cars are coming down the Dunstall Road hill at speed.

I look forward to hearing of the next stage in the process and thank you for your prompt response to the residents in this area.

Officer's Comment

Within a CPZ (during the operational hours of the zone), parking activity is regulated along every inch of kerb space. Yellow lines are proposed where parking must not take place e.g. around junctions, outside schools, at crossovers which give access to properties. The design of the CPZ will remove inconsiderate and obstructive parking from the area.

109 Mckay Road

Many thanks for conducting the informal consultation survey and circulating the results in the leaflet to all residents on 30th November. Views on proposed measures. All residents at our above address in the area support the proposed measures. The weekday parking situation is one of nil or minimal vacant on-street capacity in school term time, and even out of term is still highly pressurised due to commuter parking. This situation arose out of progressive displacement occurring from nearby areas being declared CPZs, including Clifton Road area, The Causeway, West Side Common and

Camp Road, Chester Road, and all recent CPZs to the south of The Ridgway. This area is therefore the only significant "free" parking available in reasonable proximity to Wimbledon Village shops and offices, King's College and other Schools, the local pubs, tennis courts at Westside and King's, gym, playgroup and other local traffic-attracting facilities. It is also attractive to commuters seeking free parking before onward travel by the 200 bus, folding bikes or by walking to their destination at their workplace. King's College is particularly a contributor in term time, as the school is unwilling to prohibit 6th formers travelling to school by car and parking here. The only means of alleviating this extreme pressure is to introduce the CPZ to equalise to situation fairly to become in line with all neighbouring areas, consistent with Council policy. It is anticipated local businesses (eg pubs) and schools and clubs will oppose the CPZ. However we would urge that such representation be discounted, as the CPZ will merely equalise the parking situation with all nearby areas, and hence restore equality rather than reduce it. Views on allocation of Teacher Permits to King's College or other schools.

Some 8 schools already have Council-approved School Travel Plans or Green Travel Plans, and accordingly some bays in local CPZs (eg W7, H2, MP1) have been designated for use with Teachers Permits issued by the school Head. At present it is understood that King's College does not have such an approved Plan, although it is understood the Head could apply for Permits in the VSW1 Zone if the School gets a Plan. Our support for the Council's proposed measures anticipates if this happens the Council would fairly allocate any bays to be used with Teachers Permits also using all the neighbouring CPZs (such as Chester Road, The Causeway, Clifton Road, Common Southside, as identified above), recognising the large amounts of spare daytime capacity in some of these zones. A significant number of bays will be required in VSW1 to cater for visitors permits in addition to residents' own needs for their vehicles, especially those living in Crooked Billet, Woodhayes Road etc where there is insufficient off-street and on-street capacity for residents' needs. Views on Operational Hours of the CPZ. We support the proposed 11- 3 operating hours, justified by operational efficiency for the Council. However we note a number of the residents/establishments are keen on a one or two hour zone. We would be concerned if the period is too short to be efficient in deterring part time commuters, and we have noted a number of half-day parkers here, who presumably have part time employment locally. We would therefore urge at least a two-hour midday zone be adopted.

Officer's Comment

Within a CPZ (during the operational hours of the zone), parking activity is regulated along every inch of kerb space. Yellow lines are proposed where parking must not take place e.g. around junctions, outside schools, at crossovers which give access to properties. The design of the CPZ will remove inconsiderate and obstructive parking from the area. See section 4.8.1 of this report

024 McKay Road

I write to express my support for the Controlled Parking Zone VSW1. We live in McKay Road, and over the past couple of years the parking on our road has become very difficult. We have 4 young children and although we have a drive, it's not wide enough to open the car doors sufficiently wide to lift the children out. I think people probably assume residents of McKay Road can all park on their drives and therefore street parking shouldn't affect us, but unfortunately I think most residents of McKay Road experience similar problems to me. We are fortunate in that opposite our house is a driveway and therefore people don't often park across that, so if I do park in my drive, I can at least get out again. However I can see further down the road that if residents park in their drives, people park so close to the driveway and then opposite as well, so that it's actually impossible to manoeuvre out of the drive. I think a CPZ would help enormously - it would mean that when I come home I would be able to park near my house rather than having to park on Wool Road. (Delivery drivers often complain to me when they deliver parcels, saying they can't park or that they have to reverse down the entire street to get out again. Tradesmen frequently have problems trying to park.) But most importantly I think it would improve the safety on the street. At the end of McKay Road, where it meets Dunstall Road, cars park all around the bends, and it's absolutely impossible to see what's coming either way on Dunstall if you want to turn right up Dunstall Road. And travelling the other way, if you turn left from Dunstall Road into McKay Road, there are always cars parked on both sides up McKay road and as you go round the bend in McKay Road you can't see what's coming, and neither can cars coming the other way. A while ago I had a near miss with a car coming very fast the other way on what is basically a blind corner because of the parked cars. It's very dangerous in my opinion. Many thanks for reading my email in support of the CPZ

Officer's Comment

Within a CPZ (during the operational hours of the zone), parking activity is regulated along every inch of kerb space. Yellow lines are proposed where parking must not take place e.g. around junctions, outside schools, at crossovers which give access to properties. The design of the CPZ will remove inconsiderate and obstructive parking from the area. See section 4.8.1 of this report

112 Crooked Billet

We are writing IN SUPPORT of the proposed CPZ to include Crooked Billet where we are residents, and for the CPZ to operate from Monday to Friday and between 11am and 3pm as proposed. Although we appreciate that you have asked only for representations AGAINST the proposal, we wanted to reiterate the importance of the CPZ to residents of the Crooked Billet and our wholehearted support for its introduction.

Local residents including us have received a request from 3 residents of Woodhayes Rd asking for support to restrict the

operating time to ONE hour instead of FOUR. We are unable to support this as a single hour will not be sufficient discouragement for the students and teachers of Kings.

116 Crooked Billet

I note that Gemma was not copied into this – but Gemma and I live at number -- Crooked Billet and we certainly agree with everything that Nancy said. We also agree with a separate email from JS.

118 Crooked Billet

We are writing IN SUPPORT of the proposed CPZ to include Crooked Billet where we are residents, and for the CPZ to operate from Monday to Friday and between 11am and 3pm as proposed. Although we appreciate that you have asked only for representations AGAINST the proposal, we wanted to reiterate the importance of the CPZ to residents of the Crooked Billet and our wholehearted support for its introduction.

Local residents including us have received a request from 3 residents of Woodhayes Rd asking for support to restrict the operating time to ONE hour instead of FOUR. We are unable to support this as a single hour will not be sufficient discouragement for the students and teachers of Kings.

117 Crooked Billet

I agree and the whole thing would not work if it was only for one hour.

083 Crooked Billet

Is the view of the residents of -- Crooked Billet that:

- We fully support the implementation of the CPZ for the Crooked Billet and surrounding areas. We would have preferred longer hours to match the adjoining CPZ on South Side but accept the overall consensus of the residents.
- As residents of the Crooked Billet the parking situation has become impossible since the introduction of CPZ zones on all sides pushing commenters and local staff onto our roads. During school term time it has become very difficult to find any spaces before 3pm in any of the surrounding roads.

We would however suggest:

- The Council should implement traffic calming measures as part of this process on Woodhayes Road. The road is too narrow in many places for cars on both sides. Cars frequently speed down the hill and have hit our cars personally three times in six months. We no longer feel safe to park on that road.
- The staff and sixth formers of Kings College School use the free parking in great numbers and the school has been allowed to develop in size without providing adequate car parking in its plans. There has been an assumption in the consultation that staff should only park in our proposed CPZ. The school has entrances on Clifton Road, Ridgway and South Side and therefore their permits should be distributed within those zones. Clifton Road and South Side are particularly empty during the day as they either have off street parking or very few properties.
- A small point but the drop kerb on Woodhayes near the entrance to Dunstall that leads to nothing should be painted with a white line as the others are in the area. This is a source of very frequent confusion to motorists and therefore a source of illegal parking which the Council is trying to reduce.

Officer's comments

Traffic calming major scheme did not form part of the CPZ consultation and therefore cannot be considered at this time.

111 Crooked Billet

We are writing IN SUPPORT of the proposed CPZ to include Crooked Billet where we are residents, and for the CPZ to operate from Monday to Friday and between 11am and 3pm as proposed. Although we appreciate that you have asked only for representations AGAINST the proposal, we wanted to reiterate the importance of the CPZ to residents of the Crooked Billet and our wholehearted support for its introduction.

Local residents including us have received a request from 3 residents of Woodhayes Rd asking for support to restrict the operating time to ONE hour instead of FOUR. We are unable to support this as a single hour will not be sufficient discouragement for the students and teachers of Kings,

059 Crooked Billet

As residents of Crooked Billet we both are absolutely in favour of the proposed CPZ.

However, we would question why, with 55 properties in Crooked Billet, only 8 spaces are proposed when at present we are able to comfortably park 16 cars. We are disappointed with the proposed loss of the two spaces by 9 Strachan Place. One maybe but surely not both? And indeed the loss of a further three spaces where the Crooked Billet adjoins Woodhayes Road opposite Kings Sports Hall. Obviously, we need a disabled bay but surely it does not need to take up the whole area which at present is used to park up to three cars?

We feel it is necessary to have at least a four hour 'at any time' waiting restriction from Monday to Friday but would be happy to go with the majority if the wish is for a longer period.

We very much appreciate your reasoning for the inclusion of Woodhayes Road in the scheme thus enabling us in Crooked Billet and Strachan Place to be a part of and thus to benefit from the proposed CPZ.

Officer's Comment

Within a CPZ (during the operational hours of the zone), parking activity is regulated along every inch of kerb space. Yellow lines are proposed where parking must not take place e.g. around junctions, outside schools, at crossovers which give access to properties. The design of the CPZ will remove inconsiderate and obstructive parking from the area.

090 Crooked Billet

We would like to confirm that we feel VERY strongly that this particular area is in great need of a controlled parking zone - it is almost impossible to park during the day for all us residence and we are very much in favour of the proposed parking zone and look forward to this being completed ASAP.

048 Crooked Billet

Whilst being generally in favour of the proposal to implement a Controlled Parking Zone in this area, I feel strongly that a 10.00h to 16.00h restriction period would be more effective than the 11.00h to 15.00h period currently proposed, and would certainly go much further in addressing the problems which the introduction of the CPZ is designed to alleviate

Officer's Comment

The majority of residents who responded to the consultation support the hours of operation of between 11am and 3pm.

065 Crooked Billet

I am a resident within the above proposed CPZ ES/ VSW1 (Crooked Billet) and have already emailed in support of the 11.00-3.00pm hours Mon- Friday.

Last night a letter, from various church wardens, was delivered to the residents affected, asking for an hour restriction to be considered, citing a 4 hour slot to be unworkable for their visitors and church attendees. This has prompted me to email you again.

Can I reiterate my support for a minimum 4 hour restriction and make my strong objection to the alternative proposed by the church wardens. They may wish for their visitors to have the luxury of parking for various meetings, so too no doubt will other longer term visitors to the area, but as a genuine resident - so do I! Presumably most church activity takes place at the weekend, not affected by the proposed hours?

113 Crooked Billet

We are writing IN SUPPORT of the proposed CPZ to include Crooked Billet where we are residents, and for the CPZ to operate from Monday to Friday and between 11am and 3pm as proposed. Although we appreciate that you have asked only for representations AGAINST the proposal, we wanted to reiterate the importance of the CPZ to residents of the Crooked Billet and our wholehearted support for its introduction.

Local residents including us have received a request from 3 residents of Woodhayes Rd asking for support to restrict the operating time to ONE hour instead of FOUR. We are unable to support this as a single hour will not be sufficient discouragement for the students and teachers of Kings.

039 Copse Hill

I am writing to SUPPORT the proposal for double yellow lines outside houses Nos. 7 and 7A on the south side of Copse Hill. At present cars, and particularly vans, parked there make it extremely difficult for cars coming out of the lane leading to Holmhurst managed accommodation and houses Nos. 7B to 15F. They make it difficult to see traffic approaching from the right, and some of this traffic accelerates very fast leaving the mini-roundabout, travelling west along Copse Hill.

This difficulty would be avoided by not permitting parking on the right of the lane exit on to Copse Hill.

019 Dunstall Road

I am writing to give my full support to the above scheme. My reasons are - inconsiderate parking by non-residents, poor visibility at junctions and residents and visitors not being able to park nearby. I would also like the Council to seriously consider spreading any Teachers permits across other parking zones, for example Clifton Road and Southside.

Officer's Comment

Support noted - See section 4.8.1 of this report.

074 Dunstall

I would like to commend the adoption of the Controlled Parking Zone for the Wool Road area, it sorely needed.

May I make a couple of points?

First, I note that Kings School is deemed to be in our area. I suspect that this is because it wasn't considered when the other roads surrounding the school were granted controlled parking. As a result, BY DEFAULT, KCS is deemed to be in our area by dint of the fact that we are the last to be granted controlled parking. In fact the school primarily fronts onto Southside (which is its postal address and where its main entrance is sited) and Clifton Road (the main entrance for the Junior School) and Ridgway (where its car park entrance and coach access is located). It would be grossly unfair if the schemes relating to those roads were not altered to include KCS as falling partly within their schemes. Teacher permits, to the extent that they are granted, should be spread equally amongst all of the surrounding roads.

Second, I would like to underline the importance of granting the CPZ scheme - we have now had the same car parked outside our house for over three weeks - Ernle Road is regularly used by people who leave cars for weeks on end - I have seen them parking up and wheeling their suitcases away/getting an UBER to the station. We are genuinely being used as free long term car parking. Thank you for listening to the vast majority of residents in the Wool Road area who responded positively to the first consultation. We look forward to claiming our roads back.

Officer's Comment

Support noted - See section 4.8.1 of this report.

016 Dunstall Road

Thank you for the opportunity to make representations in relation to the proposal above.

We fully support the proposals overall, although we are disappointed that it is not proposed that the scheme operates from Monday to Saturday inclusive, and from 08.00 until 18.30. We have first-hand daily experience of the problems caused by the current arrangements. The parking on the corners and the density of other parked vehicles using Dunstall Road and Woodhayes Road for free parking have combined to represent a major safety issue, and create an adverse impact on the environment for both motorists and pedestrians. The density of other parked vehicles in Dunstall Road and Woodhayes Road, which are often parked bumper-to-bumper in an obstructive, inconsiderate and indiscriminate manner, currently has an adverse impact on traffic flows. The car density often reduces the width of the roads to a single lane, which causes further traffic congestion. The visibility at corners is often dangerously poor. During the peak periods, the traffic extends down Dunstall Road beyond the junction with McKay Road and towards Wool Road. On Woodhayes Road, the queue can extend back to the Ridgeway, and up past Kings College, sometimes creating a complete grid lock. The evidence shows that this is increasing the incidence of road rage and the number of minor accidents while drivers and pedestrians struggle with these hazardous conditions. The introduction of Residents Parking along Dunstall Road would regulate the number of parked vehicles in the area, and make the environment safer for both motorists and pedestrians. It would make it easier to park for residents and their visitors alike. We believe that the congestion problems identified above will get progressively worse whilst this area remains almost the last zone in Wimbledon without parking restrictions of any type. Whilst writing, we also express the hope that other zones near the school, for example Clifton Road and Southside, share the burden of Teacher Permits, so that Dunstall Road does not have to accommodate the entire Teacher Permit load.

Officer's comment

Support noted - See section 4.8.1 of this report.

032 & 054 Dunstall Road

We write to confirm our strong support for the proposed CPZ in the Wool Road area. Our reasons are as follows:

1. We have lived towards the bottom on Dunstall Road for 30 years. We have seen the parking situation deteriorate over that period, but the pace of deterioration has increased significantly and progressively over the past 2-3 years.
2. There are now many instances of inconsiderate and dangerous parking (eg parking at junctions on corners and blocking driveways). This makes it difficult for residents to enter and exit their own driveways and blocks visibility when reversing out of driveways.
3. The grass verges are being damaged by people squeezing into tight spaces and driving over the kerb and onto the grass in an attempt to park.
4. The congested parking makes it dangerous for pedestrians crossing the road because the sight lines of both pedestrians and drivers are significantly restricted by the unbroken lines of parked cars.
5. Assuming the CPZ is introduced, may we suggest that any parking spaces reserved for teachers at KCS should be shared equally by the other CPZs that abut the school (eg Clifton Road, Edge Hill, Ridgway Gardens and Arterberry Road). There is no reason why the burden should fall exclusively on us.
6. At the entrance to Dunstall Road (off Woodhayes Road) we suggest that the double yellow lines extend further down Dunstall Road. At present there is a bottleneck which sometimes results in cars backing up into Woodhayes Road - which is dangerous.

We hope that the CPZ will be implemented as soon as possible.

We should be grateful if you would kindly acknowledge safe receipt of this response.

Further to our response to the consultation (set out below) there are two additional comments we would like to make:

1. We understand that it is proposed to introduce double yellow lines on both sides of Copse Hill from the top of Drax Avenue to Melville Avenue. Although this does not form part of the statutory consultation, we believe that it will have a direct and adverse effect on the proposed Wool Road area CPZ. It will also have a negative impact on the Thurston Road CPZ and the Holland Avenue CPZ. We would urge you to consider introducing single rather than double yellow lines along this section of Copse Hill. This would allow parking for residents and their guests after 18.30 on weekdays and at weekends. It seems to us that this would strike the right balance between the need to allow a reasonable flow of traffic during busy periods and the legitimate needs of residents and their guests to park during the evening and at weekends.
2. Our other comment relates to the proposed four hour duration of the CPZ. We believe that a one or two hour duration would be sufficient to meet your objectives, without imposing unnecessary and expensive restrictions on residents. You mentioned at the meeting that this new policy was based on the practical difficulty of policing the various CPZs in an efficient way. But could you not make the restricted period follow on from that in the neighbouring CPZ?

Officer's Comment

Support noted - See section 4.8.1 of this report

021 Dunstall Road

I refer to the statutory consultation in respect of the proposed introduction of a CPZ in the Wool Road et al area. As a resident of the area (Dunstall Road) we are strongly supportive of the proposed introduction of the CPZ, including the extension to the Woodhayes Road area. As CPZs have spread out towards our area, we are now one of the closest free-parking areas to the Village, and in the 9 years we have lived in the area we have noticed a material increase in parking in the area from non-residents, with consequent issues for visibility, traffic flow and parking convenience for residents and their visitors. Personally we would have preferred a longer operational period than 11-3pm and Mon-Fri. In particular there is a lot of parking in the area either end of the school day due to Kings College, and while the 11-3pm would stop pupils/staff parking all day, it will not stop the excessive congestion caused by pick-up and drop-offs. However, we assume this can be revisited in future years. On the topic of Kings College, we have strong concerns about the allocation of permits to the school, given the school is one of the main causes of the congestion giving rise to the need for a CPZ. If this does go ahead, permits awarded to KCS should be spread amongst other CPZs in the area, e.g. Clifton Road and Southside.

Officer's comment

Support noted - See section 4.8.1 of this report

013 Dunstall Road

We had written on the 7th of December supporting the introduction of a Controlled Parking Zone in our street. However, it has come to our attention since that several permits are to be issued to King's College School. This to some extent defeats the object of the exercise, as most if not all of the present parking problems in our street is due to school personnel and pupils' cars. We therefore urge you to restrict the issue of permits to the school to a minimum, as the introduction of a CPZ would not have much effect on solving the parking crowding in our road, especially as the number of controlled parking bays is likely to be smaller than what is currently utilised

Officer's comment

Support noted -See section 4.8.1 of this report

020 Dunstall Road

I live at Dunstall Road SW20 0HR. I note the proposal to introduce CPZ parking in the area including Dunstall Road. I would like to register my full support for the proposal and look forward to its introduction next year.

003 & 030 Dunstall Road

I live in Dunstall Road with my young family. I approve of the proposed 11-3 scheme residents only. The road has become a car park. It is jammed up with staff and senior pupils from Kings parking at times very inconsiderately blocking my driveway and makes it unsafe for my 11 year old to cross to get her bus to school. There are also cars left parked for weeks on end that do not belong to residents, which I find unnerving. I do hope the council can introduce residents parking with the option for two vehicle permits to be bought per household, as well as guest permits which people can use for their builders, etc..

I live [in Dunstall Road](#) with my young family. I approve of the proposed scheme for restricted parking Monday-Friday. The road has become a car park. It is jammed up with staff and senior pupils from Kings parking at times very inconsiderately blocking my driveway and makes it unsafe for my 11 year old to cross to get her bus to school. There are also cars left parked for weeks on end that do not belong to residents, which I find unnerving.

I do hope the council can implement the proposed scheme. It seems well thought out with a fair balance. I presume that as this will have an effect on Kings school stakeholders, you will also afford them the opportunity to buy permits in neighbouring roads, such as south of Ridgway and Clifton Road. Over-selling such permits for Dunstall Road will simply result in no change.

Officer's comment

Support noted -See section 4.8.1 of this report

025 Dunstall Road

We would like to thank you and your colleagues very much for all the work you have put into this parking scheme. We are in favour of the parking proposals, although our preference was for all day restrictions Monday to Saturday inclusive. If Teacher Permits are to be issued we suggest that, whether or not Woodhayes Road is eventually included, preference should be given to those local schools (some very large) which have little or no onsite parking and little opportunity to create any. We have in mind the Ursuline High School, Hollymount, and Wimbledon College. Kings College School appears to have a significant amount of parking on its own property and plenty of space to create more if it so wished.

Officer's comment

Support noted See section 4.8.1 of this report

078 Dunstall Road

My wife and I live at Dunstall Road. We confirmed in an email on 2nd January that we are in favour of the parking proposals. We understand that there is a last minute objection to the proposed four hour parking restriction on the grounds that it is too long and it would cause severe inconvenience and cost to anyone holding a gathering at their house. We do not agree with that view. If anything the restriction period is too short. Anyone having visitors to their home during the four hour restriction period would simply have to provide a half day visitors permit for each car involved at a cost of £1.50 per permit. If the cost is considered excessive it would be good to encourage visitors to collaborate to reduce the number of cars involved. This would have the benefit of reducing road congestion and pollution, both matters which we believe are of concern to the Council. We understand the reasons why the Council finds it difficult to monitor very short parking restriction periods. It would presumably require the restriction periods in the various CPZ's to be staggered if wardens are to be capable of progressing from one CPZ area to the next and still carry out effective monitoring. That sounds too complicated to be practicable. We also take this opportunity to repeat the suggestion made in our email of 2nd January with regard to Teacher Permits. If Teacher Permits are to be issued preference should be given to those local schools (some very large) which have little or no onsite parking and little or no opportunity to create any. We have in mind the Ursuline High School, Hollymount and Wimbledon College. Once again we would like to thank all the Council staff involved for all the work which they have put into this parking scheme.

Officer's comment

Support noted
See section 4.8.1 of this report

012 Dunstall Road

We are writing to give our **support** to the proposed CPZ for the Wool Road area. I have had to call the Council a number of times over the past few years as there have been problems in the roads here caused by uncontrolled parking. This has increased by the year and we have become the only streets in the area without CPZ, therefore filled with commuter cars. All the following have been observed (and happened on a number of occasions):

1. Disabled person unable to cross road due to cars parked on corners and on hammerhead on Dunstall Road.
2. People with prams and young children unable to cross the road as mentioned above and also having to walk into the middle of the road with traffic approaching as cars have been parked so closely together people cannot see out to the road.
3. Very heavy traffic, particularly during rush hour as commuters look for a place to park. This has increased since the introduction of cpz's nearby to our area.
4. Vehicles parked for the week (or longer in some instances) as people use the road to park when going on holiday, away to work, etc.
5. On occasion, campers in the road.

I believe the situation will improve greatly and the roads will be much safer for all with the introduction of CPZ to the Wool Road Area.

001, 047 Dunstall Road

I am writing as the owner and occupier of Dunstall Road, to give our full support to the proposed CPZ vsw1 in the Wool Road area. I understand that the permits will be given as a priority to the residents of the area. This is key as to allow too many to be applied for by Kings College School would defeat the purpose. Residents are unable to park currently due to school parking. I am in favour of the proposed controlled parking zones in the road and surrounding area.

Officer's comment

Support noted

Within a CPZ (during the operational hours of the zone), parking activity is regulated along every inch of kerb space.

The kerb space may have

- Yellow lines where parking must not take place e.g. around junctions, outside schools, at crossovers which give access to property
- Parking spaces for permit holders e.g. residents, residents' visitors, businesses with an essential need to use a vehicle, doctors
- Pay and display parking spaces for people visiting the area e.g. shoppers.

See section 4.4.1 of this report

11 & 040 & 71 Wool Road

I confirm my request that one half day visitor's permit only should be required for the 4 hour period when permits are needed. Your proposals read that because this limited period straddles morning and afternoon two permits would be required. Otherwise I agree with your proposed CPZ for the Wool Road area. Further to my email below. In supporting your proposal I had been led to believe that a less than 4 hour control period was not practical. I now understand that this is not so and that such a long period will cause considerable difficulties to some residence. I would ask that the period of control be no longer than 2 hours and that the maximum charge for visitors in any one day be £1.50. I have viewed your proposal for a CPZ that will include Wool Road. I generally agree with the proposal but I notice that the four hours of operation, 1200 to 1500, are not the same as the four hours of half a day. I think they should coincide so that a visitor pays only once for a permit covering the 4 hours of operation.

Officer's comment

The 4-hour period of between 11am and 4pm will require residents' visitors to use one half day permit.

104 Wool Road

I would like to express our support for the proposed CPZ for the Wool Road area. This area, being currently uncontrolled, has become the parking lot of choice for the staff and pupils of Kings College School, users of its facilities, as well as those who work in and commute from the Village area and users of the pubs on Woodhayes Road. As such life has become intolerable for many residents- they are unable to park outside their homes exit their driveways safely and move around the streets at various times of day because of the extensive and often inconsiderate parking by those leaving their vehicles for the day or even longer. I would like however to express concern over the **very extensive use of double yellow lines** in the proposed layout. In Wool Road:

- opposite Mackay Road
- opposite Dunstall Road
- at the top outside number 1 Wool Road

in all these locations there is no obvious danger to safe movement of traffic and pedestrians, and the parking available is restricted and I would request a review of their use. Along Copse Hill:

traffic passes relatively safely along this street with parking on both sides at this time, but the proposed layout shows no obvious convenient parking options for users of the Christchurch, or the tennis club or at any point along Copse Hill (1 to 42). Would it not be possible to introduce 2 hour meters (**not** for Residents) along this stretch of road on the Church side?

In some areas the **double yellow lines may not be extensive enough** :

- The current layout has not taken account of traffic flows at the junction of Ernle Road and Copse Hill- a pinch point during peak periods
- also the corner of Woodhayes and Ernle Roads

Thank you for your attention to this ongoing problem

Officer's comment

With regards to Christchurch see section 4.8.2 of this report.

All junctions and pinch points will be treated with double yellow lines as per proposals.

017 Wool Road

With reference to the proposed CPZ about to be implemented in my area I wish to express my support of restrictions being enforced in this area due to the inconsiderate parking by non residents, also cars parking so close to junctions that it is

difficult to gauge oncoming traffic when trying to turn into the road. During the school hours it is almost impossible for residents and visitors to find a parking space. Now that Kings College has broken up for the Christmas Holiday Period it is remarkable how easy it is to park. If given the choice I would prefer morning restrictions this would then allow free parking for visitors and services to the area while restricting the parking of vehicles who leave and go for sometime one whole week at a time. With regard to the possibility of permits being offered to staff at Kings I think this would defeat the whole object of a CPZ if we are offering spaces to the main culprits.

Officer's comment

With regards to Christchurch see section 4.8.1 of this report.

036 Wool Road

We would like to register our support for your decision to include Wool Road in the above CPZ. The parking situation had become difficult and dangerous here. We would have preferred all day restrictions but you have probably achieved a good compromise.

026 Wool Road

Please would you give thought and attention to location of parking meter machines and parking advice signposts. Please avoid locating these directly outside the front of houses as these are unsightly and a steady flow of people visiting machines can be very annoying. Locating these in a thoughtful way, out of immediate line of sight of residents, between properties, would be preferable.

075 Wool Road

In response to the proposal for a four-hour slot from 11am to 3pm for 'At any time' waiting restrictions, our position is: We support a four hour slot. If a majority wanted the slot to be less than this, we would support two hours in preference to one hour. We are concerned that short slots could not be properly policed, in which case people from outside Wool Road parking there would not be adequately deterred.

052 Wool Road

We reside in Wool Road, in the area affected by the proposed CPZ, and we write to support the scheme as proposed, and ask that the restrictions be for the maximum daily hours.

Officer's comment

Support noted. With regards to Christchurch see section 4.8.2 of this report.

051 Wool Road

We have lived in Wool Road Conservation area for some 40 years. It has become a daytime free parking area for non-residents and has become very inconvenient for residents. We strongly support the proposal for a Residents only/CPZ area because :-

1. The roads concerned are currently reduced to one lane for traffic in both directions with no passing places because of such tight parking. The probability of accidents is significantly increased. This is particularly so when traffic is "hurrying". Also parking is indiscriminate and thoughtless, cutting sightlines from driveways and other roads.
2. Putting a stop to all day parking by non-residents will ease the situation.
3. Such close parking detracts considerably from the otherwise attractive Conservation Area.

We hope the proposal is authorised.

038 West side Common

This is to confirm that we are in favour of the proposals outlined in your Notice dated 30.11.17

In Support but want the hours of operation reduced.

103 McKay Road

We wish the Council to reconsider the hours at which parking will be restricted to vehicles displaying the appropriate permit. Four hours massively exceeds the time necessary to achieve the objective of residents who requested the CPZ, namely to prevent the all-day or long-term parking principally by commuters and those using King's College School. One hour, or two hours if the Council insists, is sufficient to make parking unviable for those people. Four hours would seriously impinge upon the normal activities of many of us. For instance, for well over ten years we have held in our house a fortnightly gathering – lasting for three hours – for a dozen or so people who travel considerable distances to be here; some are disabled; the proposed four-hour slot would cut right into it whether we held it in the morning or the afternoon. The four-hour slot would also cut right into, and be a new and considerable cost, to all those who have visitors for social or

medical reasons, especially if those visits include lunch. For Christ Church (we are members), the proposals are clearly going to have a destructive effect on the inevitable week-day functions (like weddings and funerals) because so many people will not be able to park near the church or church hall. Similarly the pubs (The Crooked Billet and The Hand in Hand) will suffer, as will the many people who will struggle to find anywhere to park if they are to use them during these hours. It would be unreasonable for the Council to claim that it is introducing the CPZ and its restricted hours for the benefit of the residents when so many of them clearly do not want the restriction to be four hours; the restriction will be the opposite of benefiting the currently-thriving community. Your email inbox is showing the extent of this anxiety. The purpose of the Statutory Consultation is to give residents the chance to reflect fully upon the terms published after the initial consultation, and to respond to those exact now-defined proposals. We urge you to consider with an open mind the arguments presented in this Statutory Consultation, and not to proceed on the present flawed course either because it is easier to do so, or because the Council would prefer not to be seen to change its mind. The change to one or two hours would be received with joy, relief, and respect.

Officer's comment

Support noted

With regards to Christchurch see section 4.8.1 of this report.

The hours of operation the Council advertised was chosen by the majority of residents who responded to the initial consultation. Many of the residents who responded to the statutory consultation have expressed their support for the proposed hours.

007 Mckay Road

We are strongly in favour of the proposed CPZ. The term time parking situation on McKay Road has become extremely fraught. Inconsiderate parking (particularly by King's College School pupils) has made it difficult for us to reverse out of our drive and there are no spaces for visitors or tradesmen. The sight lines at corners are non-existent and the bin lorry can no longer get round from McKay onto Dunstall Road. We just have 2 comments on the scheme as currently proposed. There is still, potentially, a lot of parking opposite our house (in McKay Road). If cars are also parked either side of the drive, access will still be difficult. We also note that King's College School will be able to buy permits for staff if the resident uptake is less than 75%. The school is actually mainly situated in a different CPZ so we hope that teacher permits will also be issued for Clifton Road and Southside. And we wonder why the teacher permits are so cheap at £198 whereas Wandsworth charge around £700. £198 is not a disincentive to drive.

Officer's comment

Support noted

With regards to Christchurch see section 4.8.1 of this report.

029, 073, 092 Ernle Road

I write in support of the implementation of the above scheme in Ernle Road, Mon - Fri between 11am - 3pm. Following my previous email regarding the proposed CPZ Restrictions for the Wool Road Conservation Area, and after further consideration with local residents, I wish to amend my request that the slot when parking will be restricted to one or two hours instead of the four hours proposed by the Council. It should be possible for the Council to efficiently manage a one-hour slot as our area can be walked easily in one hour, and it would enable many worthwhile community activities to take place which would otherwise be seriously compromised by the four-hour slot. I hope our requests will receive your sympathetic consideration.

077 Wool Road

We are residents of Wool Road and write to request that the proposed parking restriction on our road be reduced from 4 hours to 1 or 2 hours. This should effectively prevent the all day commuters and Kings College staff and pupils from parking on our road but will minimise the cost and disruption to residents. We bought our home based on its rural setting and the lack of parking issues. We accept that parking restrictions are now needed but would urge the Council to consider the shorter time slot.

Officer's comment

Support noted

With regards to Christchurch see section 4.8.2 of this report.

080, 081 Dunstall Road

We are in the main very pleased with the proposals that have been distributed in your leaflet of 30 November 2017 ; in particular it addresses our increasing concerns over the ever more difficult traffic situation in and around Dunstall, MacKay and Wool Roads in particular, most notably around school (KCS) arrivals. The increased parking from staff and students

over the last 10 years or so has been very significant as has the effect of introducing CPZ's elsewhere in the environs of Wimbledon Village creating a push out effect of the free parking. So reluctantly we moved from being against a CPZ to being wholly in favour of action such as you have proposed. We have 2 concerns :

- does the 4 hour period have to be so long? In our view a shorter period, 1 or 2 hours would have the desired effect of preventing all day parking and possibly bring parking across driveways (allowing vehicles to pull in and pass each other). Many of us have friends around over lunch or similar times and having a CPZ in force for 4 hours would disadvantage us and indeed other organisations such as our local church and 2 pubs.

- what are the rules for teachers and other staff at KCS? If they have parking rights SOLELY in the proposed CPZ this brings a totally unfair burden on this proposed zone. If this is the case, could the KCS employees have permits that access all local CPZ's (providing of course that the CPZ's have similar controlled hours to avoid Zone hopping.

Let me close on the positive - a CPZ is key to the future wellbeing of the area and we are broadly in favour providing the 2 caveats are addressed.

Officer's comment

Support noted
With regards to Christchurch see section 4.8.2 of this report.

060 Ernle Road

I am writing to confirm that I am in favour of a controlled parking zone each weekday excepting Public Holidays for the roads comprising the Wool Road Conservation area. Although you do not offer a 1 or 2 hour period for non parking, this is what I would prefer as a resident and rate payer in the conservation area. A 1 or 2 hour period would still prevent commuters, staff and pupils at Kings College and other schools in the area, from parking for the day and have the added advantage of being more palatable for residents. I am particularly concerned that Christchurch which hosts many events during the week including funerals, would suffer greatly with having a 4 hour period when parking is forbidden. Please would you reconsider offering a 1 or 2 hour period when parking is not allowed. I heard at the consultation meeting held in Christchurch Hall, that you do not find a short period of no parking manageable on account of the length of the roads involved - namely Durham and Pepys and Cambridge Roads. The area under consultation now involving the Wool Road Conservation Area is much smaller and easily walked in 15 minutes and so this should not be an issue.

If you absolutely will not consider a 1 or 2 hour period then reluctantly I would ask for no parking between 11am and 3 pm. The sooner work goes ahead the better for the situation in term time which is just about to start again is intolerable as parents, staff and pupils associated with King's College and the managers of the school have little or no regard for the residents of the area. Others leave their cars parked in the road for weeks on end.

Officer's comment

With regards to Christchurch see section 4.8.2 of this report.

Officer's comment

During the informal consultation, residents were offered a number of options and the majority of those who responded supported the propose hours of operation of between 11am and 3pm. The Council does not offer 1 or 2 hour restrictions as these are very difficult to manage and enforce.

With regards teacher parking permits see section 4.4.1 of this report

With regards to the Christ Church, see section 4.4.2 of this report

A zone comes as a package and all elements that make up the zone should have the same days and hours of operation except double yellow lines. A legal notice which defines all the regulations that the Council intends to introduce in the form of a Traffic management Orders (TMOs) is advertised at the statutory consultation stage. Making a road or part of a road to run different restrictions cause confusion for residents and visitors alike and make the zone difficult to enforce.

COMMENTS

044 Copse Hill

I gather the deadline for opinions on the proposed parking restrictions is up on Friday and despite various representations to you I have no clearer idea whether you propose to put parking restrictions on Copse Hill

We live at no Copse Hill and are constantly inconvenienced by people ignoring the white lines over our drive and parking over the driveway making it so difficult to exit our house

We have requested yellow lines at one side so we can have clear vision when leaving our property onto the fast moving traffic on Copse Hill

Officers Comment

The section of Copse Hill within the VSW1 CPZ, the proposal is to install double yellow lines apart from the single yellow line proposed for outside the Christ Church. This will remove inconsiderate and obstructive parking along this section of the road.

035, 094 Copse Hill

We are responding to the proposed scheme for CPZ VSW1; in particular in regards to both the availability of residents/mixed-use parking bays at the top of Copse Hill and the subject of traffic safety. You will be aware that the current proposal includes ample residents parking on the surrounding roads including Dunstall and Ernle Roads and that lower Copse Hill also benefits from staggered parking bays, which also act as traffic-calming measure by means of lateral traffic deviation. We would suggest that the scheme adopted at lower Copse Hill be broadly extended to upper Copse Hill within the proposed VSW1. This could usefully be achieved by including mixed-use bays outside the properties of 38-40, 15-17, 20 and Christ Church as indicated in the amended plan below (proposed additional bays in orange), without undermining safe traffic flow and permitting double-yellow lines on the remaining sections. In addition, simple additional traffic calming measure to improve safety for the school bus on/offloading could be implemented at the same time as VSW1, ideally by adopting (i) raised/coloured road sections outside nos. 38-50 and Christ Church (as highlighted in yellow - ahead of/coincident with the two bus stop locations) and (ii) radar speed reminder when entering the raised road sections outside nos. 3 and 42.

Officers Comment

The section of Copse between Nos 5 and 42 have crossovers as a result there is not enough kerb space to add parking bays without obstructing residents' driveways and visibility.

Traffic calming did not form part of this consultation.

022 High Cedar

We are writing in response to the consultation on making Wool Road and the surrounding roads controlled parking zones. We are residents of High Cedar Drive and, in a recent informal consultation of local residents, we suggested that the controlled parking zone should be extended to High Cedar Drive and Cottenham Drive, to avoid the proposed changes merely displacing vehicles from one side of Copse Hill to another. We note that High Cedar has become increasingly congested in the last 6 months with staff from KCS school parking, as well as builders from a range of developments working in the area. In some instances this has resulted in inconsiderate parking on both sides of what is a very narrow road, completely blocking access to the cul de sac. Introducing restrictions in the Wool Road area will only increase this congestion and move their problems to Cottenham Drive, High Cedar Drive and the surrounding roads on the other side of Copse Hill, unless steps are taken to prevent this. Furthermore, there is already significant congestion around this area of Copse Hill in the morning, with illegal pollution levels reported where many children wait for buses at the end of High Cedar Drive. More traffic moving to Cottenham Drive and High Cedar will increase the risk of accidents, as well as the risk to the health of children waiting at the bus stop. We would urge you to consider the traffic management of the area more widely than set out in the current consultation

Officer's Comment

During the consultations in 2014/15 on proposals to introduce CPZ in the Cottenham Park Road area, residents of Cottenham Drive and High Cedar rejected the scheme. Normally before the Council considers possible resident parking schemes, or returns to an area that previously rejected such proposals, it requires a demonstration of support from the residents for the concept of controlled parking. The residents must show support by means of an area wide petition that must be instigated and forwarded by the residents. Upon the receipt of such a petition your area will be added to our

program for investigation/consultation.

041, 042, 068 NAME OF ROAD

If the purpose of having a CPZ from the RESIDENTS point of view is to free our parking from Kings College School and the commuters, then we need to prevent them from parking from 9.00am. As I age my friends, and workmen, come to visit me in the middle of the day - rather than in the evening, so I am not keen on a blanket ban in the middle of the day, as this becomes an added expense, and frankly a stealth tax. I would suggest that a CPZ timing of 9 - 10 am would achieve the declutter we all seek so we can enjoy our peaceful roads again. The schoolboys and the commuters have to be settled well before 10 am, so they are unlikely to be able to come back later. At the meeting it was inferred that Merton only does 4 hour long CPZs but that is plainly not so when observing other areas around, and this is a way in which Merton can look after its residents. I vote firmly for 9 - 10 am or 10 - 11 am.

Officers Comment

The Council does offer 1 hour CPZ. Majority of the residents voted for the proposed hours of operation.

005 McKay Road

We live in McKay Road and I would like to make some points for consideration before final decisions are taken:

Parking rights in the road for non-residents should be of a very limited nature achieved as follows.

(a) We see no reason why Kings boys should be included since they have mostly been commuting to the school from 7 to 16 years without problems. Encouraging them to exacerbate the parking problem once they enter the Sixth is unnecessary and causes nuisance to residents and increased adds to traffic pollution on the roads;

(b) A further contribution to the parking problem is produced by school staff who also occupy the roads around for longer periods than the boys. We understand that the school itself is not situated in the Conservation area here so such applications should first consider options in nearby Clifton Road fronting the Junior School and Southside also has available parking. There is also some additional scope within the School grounds and the Headmaster should be encouraged to ban Sixth Formers from driving to the school;

(c).Residents (who pay your Council Tax) should have subsidised prices and preferential allocation of parking spaces. There are only a minority in roads in this area who have parking for two cars. In terms of income to the Council please bear in mind it has no present income from parking here so there would be no extra cost for this suggestion and an added income stream.

The number of parking spaces should be severely restricted to allow more room between meters for vehicles driving down the road to shelter from ongoing traffic

High density parking has unsighted residents reversing out of their drives since they are unable to see vehicles travelling along the road;

(d) The Council's own refuse collection lorries, though well driven, are forced to reverse up the road endangering people unsighted as they come out of their drives. More seriously, drivers who cut through in the vain hope of avoiding traffic build-up in Woodhayes cannot be relied upon to have such skills

as the professional driver. There are, of course, always a number of skips, builders lorries, grocery delivery vans and others who add to the problem;

(d) As the Council has seen fit to declare the Wool Road area as worthy of conservation the density of parking is no conducive to this status;

Hours of paid parking be sufficiently long-and sufficiently costly to dissuade long parking periods

Officers Comment

See section 4.8.1

Within a CPZ (during the operational hours of the zone) parking activity is regulated along every inch of kerb space.

The kerb space may have

- Yellow lines where parking must not take place e.g. around junctions, outside schools, at crossovers which give access to property
- Parking spaces for permit holders e.g. residents, residents' visitors, businesses with an essential need to use a vehicle, doctors
- Pay and display parking spaces for people visiting the area e.g. shoppers.

The Council does not subsidise or discount on permit prices.

097 Crooked Billet

Thank you so much for sorting out the parking problems by introducing permits. It had become impossible to park within the area also costing me an hour parking fee before 6,30 each evening after work. I am a resident at of Crooked Billet. Will also stop builders/ commuters arriving 6-6,30 every morning driving around fighting for spaces.

079, 081 Wool Road

I am one of the 60% of residents who have not expressed a wish for CPZ. It is a gross overreaction to a situation exacerbated by KCS pupils and staff, but who are in effect out of school for holidays, breaks, exam leave et al for more than half the Year , and then largely only there 5 days a week, yet if a CPZ is introduced it will affect our use and enjoyment of life by a totally unnecessary restriction on visitors and working people carrying out their daily jobs as carers, builders, gardeners and other valuable occupations. If a CPZ were to be introduced, it should be for the minimum period to deal with the perceived problem, and not to cause inconvenience to all the resident council tax payers in the area. This is a one hour a day restriction, strategically fixed to prevent daily parking by commuters of whatever persuasion. This is easily monitored In such a small area, but in any event , the reality is that it is self- monitoring , as no commuter is going to risk day parking and to find his car has been towed away, when he/she returns on a cold wet and dark evening. We have many visitors to our house at all different times : I do not want or need unnecessary restrictions or unnecessary cost and inconvenience

Turning NOW to Copse Hill: any CPZ will cause inconvenience to both regular and occasional users of Christ Church. This church is a major CENTRE of THE COMMUNITY for funerals, weddings, three or four Church services every Sunday, and regular users by groups or individuals of the Church Hall, many of whom are elderly, or families with young children and come from both in and out of the Borough, and need the ability to Park, or they will be forced away. The Church needs adequate parking facilities during the week [and taking the active Tennis Club user into account) but absolutely could not accommodate double yellow lines on Copse Hill, which would quite unnecessarily restrict the 200 or more people who come every Sunday to Church services

I therefore urge the Council to reconsider the proposals as a whole which have the expressed support of less than 50% of the affected population; were the proposals to be introduced, they be for One Hour per day, only, and that real thought is given to providing adequate parking in the vicinity of Christ Church, and NO double yellow lines be imposed that would unreasonably affect both Christ Church users, and other residents down Copse hill.

I did not vote for CPZ and would like to point out that only 48% responded to your questionnaire and consequently only 37.4 % of residents supported some form of CPZ. What is the purpose of this CPZ.

To stop all day parking of commuters and staff and pupils of Kings College School, so why does it have to be for 4 hours when a 1 hour slot would be sufficient and not take away the freedom of residents to socialise without having to pay for the privilege, watch the clock and the extra hassle.

I have an ecumenical study group that has met in my house for 34 years from 10-12pm.

The 11-3 pm slot would seriously affect this. Many have to drive as they are unable to climb the steep hill and also live a few miles away where there is no suitable transport.

Christ Church would also like a 1 hour slot so that it can continue its community activities, services and funerals during the day. The few parking bays in Woodhayes Road would not be enough for it and the tennis club.

Cooked Billet and the Hand in Hand are two very popular pubs. The restrictions which you propose would be detrimental to their business.

Copse Hill. Double yellow lines along both sides means that no one can park at weekends and evenings. This would not only affect immediate residents but also all the families, elderly etc who use the Church and Church Hall then. It would also enable the speed of traffic to increase.

Ernle Road . The entrance from Copse Hill into Ernle Road is very tight and narrow when parking is on both sides. To have the electric recharging bays so near the corner will exacerbate the problem which causes a back log of breaking of cars coming up Copse Hill. An accident waiting to happen.

I find it unreasonable that the Council say they cannot effectively manage the 1 hour slot as they do so in other areas .As local residents and rate-payers we will be paying for this service. Our area is very compact and can easily be walked in an hour. I sincerely hope the council will amend their proposals and give residents of the 1 hour option they were they were not offered if the CPZ goes ahead.

Officers Comment

In terms of KCS see section 4.8.1

With regards to Christ Church see section 4.8.2

The Council does not offer 1 hour CPZ. The proposed hours of operation was voted by the majority of residents. available.

The single yellow line proposed for Copse Hill will operate the CPZ times, outside of the operating hours anyone can park on the single yellow line.

086 Copse Hill

I write to request that the proposed 11am to 3pm four-hour parking restriction to be applied for the Wool Road Conservation area be reduced to one or possibly two hours. I believe that a four-hour slot would have a damaging impact on the area.

Officer's comment

With regards to Christ Church see section 4.8.2

110 Wool Road

I am writing regarding the proposed CPZ restrictions for the Wool Road Conservation Area.

I live at No. Wool Road, and believe that a 4 hour parking restriction between 11am and 3pm is unnecessary to restrict commuters and the Kings College influx (parking for residents is generally only an issue during term time). Much of the recent parking disruption has been caused by building contractors working on sites in Wool Road.

Similar parking restrictions nearby in Raynes Park (Amity Grove) run for 1 hour between 11am and Noon and appear to achieve their goal.

From the informal consultation report, it appears that a majority of respondents are in favour of a shorter restriction period.

Q6. IF A CPZ WAS INTRODUCED WHICH HOURS WOULD YOU LIKE THE CONTROLS TO OPERATE?

8.30am/6pm

34% of respondents in favour.

10am/4pm

23% of respondents in favour.

11am/3pm

40% of respondents in favour.

I would request that the council consider a shorter restriction period of either 1 or 2 hours, which would address the parking issue without causing undue difficulties for residents and their visitors, and the Local Church.

I would also request that the street markings, electric charging points and double yellow lines do not detract from the character or appearance of the area, which as a conservation area designated by Merton Council in 1990 should be "preserved or enhanced".

Officer's comment

With regards to Christ Church see section 4.8.2

The Council does not offer 1 hour CPZ. The proposed hours of operation was voted by the majority of residents.

088 Peregrine Way

I do not agree to a four hour residents only parking in the areas covered by ref ES/VSW1. An appropriate restriction would be for one hour as this would deter commuter and non resident all day parking without adversely impacting on local facilities and the lives of all residents. For example, if a 4 hour CPZ restriction were in force the Crooked Billet and the Hand in hand public houses which are both in the designated area would lose much lunch time restaurant trade; Christ Church would find it difficult with 4 hour parking restrictions to continue providing daytime clubs and facilities for local residents as well as religious services such as weddings and funerals. These venues provide an important framework to the character of our area and if they are not financially or practically viable, due to 4 hour parking restrictions, this would be a great loss to residents. Other areas in the borough have successful one hour restrictions so please reconsider and grant our area also a one hour residents only parking CPZ.

Officer's comment

With regards to Christ Church see section 4.8.2

The Council does not offer 1 hour CPZ. The proposed hours of operation was voted by the majority of residents. available.

066 Dunstall Road

I have already written to say that I support having a CPZ restriction in my area but I am writing again because I originally thought that the restriction could be for 1 or 2 hours as that would be sufficient to stop the excessive all day parking. It has come to my attention how damaging such a long restriction as the 11 to 3 would be to some people in the area and especially to Christ Church. I would like the council to think again about a 1 or 2 hour restriction.

Officer's comment

With regards to Christ Church see section 4.8.2

The Council does not offer 1 hour CPZ. The proposed hours of operation was voted by the majority of residents. available.

Representation Against

049 Woodhayes Road KCS

I am writing as Commercial Director for KCS Enterprises LTD, Woodhayes Rd, London SW19 4RJ. I am in receipt of your notice dated 30 November 2017 regarding the outcome of the informal consultation for the Proposed Controlled Parking Zone VSW1. I am very surprised and strongly oppose the decision of the council to proceed to a statutory consultation despite the fact that the residents of Woodhayes Road "do not support the principle of a CPZ in their road even if the neighbouring roads are included within a CPZ."

KCS Enterprises Ltd has been in operation since 1985 offering a number of services to the local community; including conferences, wedding receptions, educational holiday courses and children's sports camps. The primary service offered by KCS Enterprises Ltd is a health club with over 1,800 members which is primarily made up of families and senior citizens who rely on being able to park close to the club. The club and the office employs over 20 staff, the majority of which are instructors who have to bring equipment on site to carry out their work. Impact on the Business and Local Community. The introduction of VSW1 CPZ in Woodhayes Road will result in many members, predominantly families and the elderly in having to resign their membership to the club as the distance would be too far to travel without parking access. This would seriously damage the business and may result in the closure of the club.

The government and local governments encourage healthy active lifestyles which in turn reduce the financial and physical burden on the NHS. The introduction of this CPZ will put this seriously at risk for those who can no longer park near the club. In addition, the club offers reduced rates compared to other facilities which are too expensive for those with modest incomes. The CPZ will also have a direct negative effect on the staff, many of which will not be able to travel to work. The club has always prided itself on high calibre staff, however if this CPZ goes ahead I may be forced to employ a lower standard of instructor / administration personnel purely based on location and not ability to perform at the highest level.

Summary

As Commercial Director of KCS Enterprises Ltd, I strongly oppose the introduction of VSW1 CPZ in Woodhayes Road. Notwithstanding my preference, I have the following comments to the current proposal:

- Sufficient provision must be made for permits for business / instructor staff to allow the business to operate.
- I would oppose the introduction of pay-and-display bays; these should be permit bays to allow staff to park

I would respectfully ask that our position be given full consideration to enable our staff and clients to continue to operate efficiently on a day to day basis

Officer's comment

With regards to Christ Church see section 4.8.2

Due to operational issues, the Council does not offer 1 hour CPZ. The zone is being progressed because majority of consultees support the proposals and the majority opted for the proposed hours of operation.

KCS properties have off street parking and therefore the impact should not be as severe as suggested.

There will be some shared use bays that can be used by permit holders and those visiting the area.

When the first few CPZs were introduced in the Village, the Council put in place long term pay and display parking spaces that operate between 7 and 10 hours. Charges are not imposed on some of the parking spaces until 9.30am which means that commuters who drive to the Village, park and use public transport to continue their journey are unable to pay and display on those shared use parking spaces. The Council introduced a new type of permit Pre Pay Ticket (PPT) which staffs of businesses in the village can pre purchase to use in those long stay parking spaces without going back to their vehicles when the parking spaces become operational. The ticket is only valid in the bays indicated with a 'PPT – Pre Paid Ticket' sign in the following roads:-

Belvedere Avenue; St. Mary's Road; Southside Common; Murray Road; Ridgway Place; Marryat Road; Parkside Avenue; Calonne Road; Parkside Gardens; and Burghley Road. Currently there are many available parking spaces in the above roads.

According to our record there are very few PPT tickets purchased. This could be attributed to motorists seeking out free parking spaces in the Village. This is the issue that has caused residents to opt for a CPZ. Vehicles are crammed into these roads obstructing residents' driveways and parking close to junctions obstructing visibility.

The Council does not tolerate residents obstructing the public highway; however, some residents resort to the extreme measures to secure a parking space for themselves or their visitors by placing objects on the public highway. Currently parking spaces in this area are taken up before 9am and those residents who do school run return with nowhere to park. This is true of those residents from Crooked Billet who do not have any off street parking nowhere to park except in roads that petition and supported the proposed CPZ.

The Council did not initiate the proposals for parking controls in the area. This was initiated by the residents who find it difficult to find a parking space in their road during the day or find it difficult to exit their driveways because of obstructive and inconsiderate parking. The parking congestion happening in these roads, the residents attribute to KCS teachers and students taking up all the available space.

102 Woodhayes Road

I continue to be against the inclusion of Woodhayes Road in the proposed Wool Road Area CPZ. The CPZ would seriously inconvenience residents who desire the flexibility of the current arrangements for themselves and their visitors, regardless of minor difficulties currently caused by non-resident parking.

096 Woodhayes Road KCS

I am responding to this statutory consultation as a resident of 6 Woodhayes Road

1. In summary, I am still very much AGAINST the proposal to create a local CPZ, and specifically against the proposal to include Woodhayes Road in any such CPZ. I have various comments on the consultation process and, notwithstanding my opposition to the proposal generally, some suggestions for your consideration.

2. I am disappointed that the period for response to the consultation is as little as 5 weeks, including as it does the Christmas and New Year holiday. This 5 weeks contrasts with the plan in the Cabinet Member report to carry out the consultation in November and December i.e. nearer 9 weeks. There has been minimal time to consider the implications fully with neighbours and, if considered necessary, to seek legal advice or review.

3. This concern is amplified by the changing tone in relation to the possible inclusion of Woodhayes Rd. This process has, frankly speaking, been disingenuous, and leads me to the conclusion that the opinions of the residents of Woodhayes Rd may have no weight whatsoever in the consultation.

4. Ahead of the informal consultation in September 2017, we were informed that residents of Woodhayes Rd had petitioned for a CPZ; this was UNTRUE (and subsequently acknowledged as such). I was then told that we were included in the consultation in order to give us an opportunity - if so desired - to join the CPZ sought by some other roads.

5. However, the tone then changed again to imply that Woodhayes Rd would be included in the CPZ regardless. In the document referred to in the statutory consultation ("Non-key Decision taken by a Cabinet Member"), section 8 ("Alternative options considered and rejected") includes the following statement in 8.2 in relation to what would happen if Woodhayes Rd was not part of the CPZ:

"Although Woodhayes Road residents may be unaffected (as they all have off-street parking) the residents of Crooked Billet will be unable to park in Woodhayes Road as this Road will attract free non-resident parking". This statement is UNTRUE and/or SERIOUSLY MISLEADING on several counts.

6. First, not all Woodhayes Rd residents have off-street parking. Your plan of the roads and residences pictures my residence 6 Woodhayes Rd as having an on-site off-street parking space and cross-over. This is UNTRUE. Your plan ignores the existence (since the 1960s) of the two other residences 6a and 6b; I understand that the forecourt in question is associated with 6a, leaving 6b also without contiguous off-street parking.

7. Second, even residents who do have off-street parking will be affected directly, as they (or their visitors or tradesmen) will not be able to park within their cross-overs during the period of operation of the CPZ. This is a serious inconvenience, a gross waste of potentially available parking space, and every reason why, if a CPZ is implemented, it should have a one hour period of restriction only. This is what has been implemented in Durham Road, and is manifestly sufficient to prevent all-day commuter parking in the Wool Road area (there is no serious evidence of the roads in question being blocked by shoppers!).

8. Third, it is a gross exaggeration to claim that Crooked Billet residents will be severely disadvantaged if Woodhayes Rd is not included within the CPZ. Crooked Billet residents currently park on Woodhayes Rd by virtue, for example, of parking there overnight and being in place prior to any potential early morning commuter parking. This would continue to be an opportunity for those residents even if Woodhayes Rd was outside the CPZ. Furthermore, I understand that Dunstall Rd (for example) will have a total of 76 on-street spaces designated in the CPZ, notwithstanding that the vast majority, if not all, of the residences have off-street parking. Crooked Billet residents would be able to access what is likely in practice otherwise to be a substantial excess of spaces provided within the roads seeking a CPZ.

9. Amongst my other practical concerns are issues relating to the proliferation of street furniture within the Conservation Area by way of a multitude of signposts relating to the CPZ (contrary to one of the key objectives of parking management, to improve the attractiveness of the borough's streets), and my understanding that, absent any other measures, the traffic flow in the CPZ is likely to be even faster than at present (contrary to the objective to make the borough's streets safer). In relation to the latter issue, I suggest that, as a matter of priority, Woodhayes Rd is included in the 20mph limit zone (allowing the 20mph signs at the top of Dunstall Rd/Woodhayes Rd junction to be removed) and an electronic speed indicator to measure the speed of vehicles travelling from the Common towards the Ernle Rd junction, is sited just beyond the Peregrine Way junction in order to inhibit the tendency of many drivers to accelerate at high speed away from the Common towards the lowest point of Woodhayes Rd.

10. SOME SUGGESTIONS

I have already indicated (in para 7 above) the desirability of limiting the CPZ operating period to one hour only e.g. 12.00-13.00, which is ample to address any problems caused, as is said to be the case in some of the roads, by all-day commuter parking. I suggest that consideration also be given to investigating either:

(i) initially not including any of Woodhayes Rd in the CPZ, pending a further review in due course of the opinions of Woodhayes Rd residents as to the impact experienced on Woodhayes Rd of the implementation of a CPZ in the other roads; or

(ii) splitting Woodhayes Rd into "North Side" (i.e. the Crooked Billet side between Dunstall Road and Westside Common) and "South Side" (i.e. the rest of Woodhayes Rd), and seeking to implement a CPZ on the North Side only.

11. Finally, whatever form a CPZ might take and however it operates for 50 weeks a year, I am interested as to what is proposed to solve the reduction in the availability of residents' and visitors' parking spaces created each year by the two

week all-day parking ban in Woodhayes Rd during Wimbledon Tennis fortnight. Further to para 9 above, I note that this ban on parking further encourages Woodhayes Rd to be treated as a speed track.

I am happy to clarify any of the above e-mail.

I would appreciate confirmation of receipt of this response to the consultation.

Officer's comment

The period of statutory consultation is normally 21 days. The statutory consultation on this occasion was extended due to the Christmas holidays. The wording used in the informal consultation report stated that the majority of properties in Woodhayes Road have off street parking.

The petition was from Wool Road, Ernle Rd, Crooked Billet, McKay and Dunstall Rds. If Woodhayes Road is not included, it would mean the exclusion of Cooked Billet due to the geographical linkage between the 2 roads. The reality is once residents leave in the morning, they are unable to find a parking space when they return, hence the statement in the previous report.

Street furniture are required for the compliance and enforcement of a CPZ. Street furniture are equally required for one hour zone. Majority of schemes mentioned in the objection would also require street furniture and those roads in a conservation area are not exempt.

The suggestion to include Woodhayes Road in a 20mph does not form part of the consultation.

Woodhayes Road is one of the emergency routes during the Championship fortnight and parking will not be permitted on the road during this period.

108, 114 Woodhayes Road

I am writing in response to the parking and traffic proposals, particularly as they affect Woodhayes Road.

I have a number of comments on your 5 'Key Objectives': [p 4 "VSW1CPZDecision...report" doc]

1. I do not believe that your proposals will help congestion of traffic in Woodhayes Road to any great extent. If there is improved traffic flow, the cost could be an increase in speed, which is in conflict with Objective 2.

2. *Safer and more secure [see below]. The new section of Double yellow lines in Woodhayes Road opposite The Sycamores [just east of the Dunstall Road junction] will I suspect increase the speed of traffic coming from the common, and compromise safety.

3. Better use of street space. With the current proposals the various electricians, builders, plumbers and others that come to help residents, as well as postal and delivery drivers, will find parking more difficult.

4. Improving attractiveness and amenity. These qualities are not enhanced by the imposition of parking information poles, single and double yellow lines and by the presence of parking meters and parking attendants.

5. As regards sustainable forms of transport, increasing traffic speed [an inevitable consequence of removing vehicles] would I suggest, if anything, deter cycling. However, provision of electric car charging points does support this aim.

*Safety [Item 2 above]. In Woodhayes Road, traffic speeds can sometimes be alarmingly high and well above the speed limit. This occurs particularly when cars are travelling from the common in a south-westerly direction. The speeding up seems to begin somewhere before the Dunstall Road junction; vehicle speeds seem to fall just before the Ernle Road corner, where I have sometimes seen very hurried braking/turns.

Suggestions

1. If the proposals go ahead I think the Council should consider installing a camera to monitor the speed of traffic travelling in a south-westerly direction in Woodhayes Road. Although the highest speeds seem to occur at the bottom of the downslope, sometimes visibility is good enough to start speeding much earlier. Consideration should be given to installing a digital camera showing vehicle speed [mph]. 'Smiley' faces and exhortations to slow down seem to me to be just irritating; do they do anything for safety? The benefit of real figures [green if OK and red if too fast?] is that residents can see the speed for themselves.

2. Woodhayes Road should in my view become a 20 mph limit zone just as Ernle, Dunstall, McKay and Wool roads already are. In my opinion, Woodhayes Road has a greater need for a 20 mph limit than those already have one. Of course, Peregrine Way and the Crooked Billet area would necessarily be included.

To summarise my views

I am against a scheme for 2 reasons.

1. The increased speed.

2. The drawbacks of the scheme outweigh any advantages. Parking has been a manageable challenge in Woodhayes Road ever since 1995 [to my knowledge], and in my view hasn't changed much since. [But the extent of parking has spread into the Wool Road area in an inexorable way - giving rise now to petitions].

The 5 stated Key Objectives

The lack of convincing outcome for FOUE of the Key Objectives - seems to me to justify neither:

a) the expense of installing a scheme, nor

b) overriding the views of those living in roads not wanting a scheme.

If there is to be scheme, I would opt for a 1 hour period Monday to Friday.

Officer's comment

The period of statutory consultation is normally 21 days. The statutory consultation on this occasion was extended due to the Christmas holidays. The wording used in the informal consultation report stated that the majority of properties in Woodhayes Road have off street parking.

The petition was from Wool Road, Ernle Rd, Crooked Billet, McKay and Dunstall Rds. If Woodhayes Road is not included, it would mean the exclusion of Cooked Billet due to the geographical linkage between the 2 roads. The reality is those once residents leave in the morning, they are unable to find a parking space when they return, hence the statement in the previous report.

Street furniture are required for the compliance and enforcement of a CPZ. Street furniture are equally required for one hour zone. Majority of schemes mentioned in the objection would also require street furniture and those roads in a conservation area are not exempt.

The suggestion to include Woodhayes Road in a 20mph does not form part of the consultation.

Woodhayes Road is one of the emergency routes during the Championship fortnight and parking will not be permitted on the road during this period.

118 Woodhayes Road

I am writing on behalf of King's College School, Wimbledon. We are in receipt of your notice dated 30th November 2017 regarding the outcome of the informal consultation for the Proposed Controlled Parking Zone VSW I.

We are surprised by the extraordinary decision of the council to proceed to a statutory consultation despite the fact that the residents of Woodhayes Road "do not support the principle of a CPZ in their road even if the neighbouring roads are included within a CPZ."

The King's community represents 7 resident staff who will be severely and negatively impacted by a CPZ, as well as over 350 staff who commute daily to educate over a thousand students from the local area. It is extremely disappointing that the views of this significant body of people have not been given due regard in the fair process of consultation.

To reiterate: King's College School and its resident staff strongly oppose the introduction of VSW I CPZ in Woodhayes Road.

Background

A significant proportion of King's College Wimbledon school land sits within the controlled parking zone. The school has been on its current site since 1897 and provides important services to the community; not only do we educate a large number of children from local families, our staff also make a significant contribution to the education of pupils in Merton through our partnership programme and via community projects.

King's responsible actions to date

We already provide 81 parking spaces on site for our staff. We are looking to provide shuttle services to local stations to encourage use of public transport where we can. We also provide some on site (or nearby) accommodation to help alleviate staff commute pressure; equally we provide as many parking spaces as possible on site without reducing the green, open spaces available to our pupils. We have recently conducted a staff travel survey in order to better understand the impact of our staff travel on the local community. 43% of our staff use alternative means of transport (bike, bus, train/tube/ walk). We provide a full coach programme for students. However it is the case that 71% of our staff who currently drive have no option but to drive; living in or around London is increasingly expensive and teachers have no option but to live further out and to commute. The busses between school & Wimbledon Station are frequently overcrowded & do not take additional passengers. Consequently staff cannot rely on the buses to arrive at work on time in the morning or catch a specific train in the evening. Local roads are hostile for cyclists who do not feel safe using them. Hostile roads include Parkside (in Merton & Wandsworth), Copse Hill, The Ridgeway & the roundabout at the top of Wimbledon Hill.

Serious impact on productivity at King's

Staff currently park on site, in Woodhayes Road and in the adjoining roads. The current proposals to curb parking will have a significant negative impact on our staff. Our staff are some of the best in the UK. Some staff will simply not be able to commute to work at the school any longer if they are unable to secure parking and some have expressed the view that they may need to leave the employment of King's. King's has recently been awarded the Sunday Times Independent School of the Year 2017 accolade as well as being the top performing IB school in the world; it would be a travesty if this jewel in the Wimbledon crown were adversely affected by an exodus of staff for whom the commute to Wimbledon is simply impossible without parking spaces. This is causing severe anxiety within the staff body and it has been necessary to hold a number of staff meetings to try and handle staff concerns about how they will now manage their commute to work.

Consequences of a CPZ

The calibre and reputation of this Wimbledon school as one of the leading schools in the world is predicated on attracting top staff from a catchment beyond the local area; and as such it is imperative that they have the means of parking when they come into work. This CPZ imperils this delicate eco system,

Staff are already deeply concerned about the proposals and this is causing severe anxiety. Summary

King's College School and its resident staff strongly oppose the introduction of VSWI CPZ in Woodhayes Road.

Notwithstanding our preference, we have the following comments the current proposal:

- Sufficient provision must be made for teaching permits and for staff/business permits for King's College School staff to allow the school to operate
- we would oppose the introduction of pay-and-display bays outside the school; these should be permit bays to allow staff to park
- it is imperative that thought is given to loading bays in Woodhayes Road to allow for daily catering and school supply deliveries- this is currently missing from your proposals
- Monday-Friday 11-3pm as potential controlled hours to be the only ones to be given consideration- this will have the least impact on part-time staff, parents dropping off and picking up and any visitors for fixtures or open mornings etc
- we would oppose the proposed double yellow lines in Crooked Billet which will result in a significant displacement of cars from households in that area who will not be able to park

Timings

Finally, the school operates on an academic year basis. Because our staff are employed September-September and this proposal may result in some staff having to leave employment, we would ask that any changes are not effected before September in any given year and that we are given at least a term's notice to allow staff to gain employment elsewhere. We would respectfully ask that our position be given full consideration to enable our staff and parents to continue to operate efficiently on a day to day basis

Officers comment

Please see section 4.8.1.

From feedback received from majority of local residents, majority of the parking problems in the area are caused by KCS staff and students.

The parking spaces referred to in the objection are pay and display shared use bays. Those who have a permit within the zone can use them and visitors to businesses will be able to pay and display. Parents of students and all other visitors to all the businesses within the CPZ catchment area will be able to purchase a ticket from the pay and display machines when visiting.

Loading and unloading can take place on the proposed double yellow lines across the school entrance for up to 40 minutes, as long as this activity is observed.

034 Woodhayes Road KCS

I am writing on behalf of King's College School Wimbledon (International). We are in receipt of your notice dated 30th November 2017 regarding the outcome of the informal consultation for the Proposed Controlled Parking Zone VSW1. I am very disappointed and immensely surprised by the extraordinary decision of the council to proceed to a statutory consultation despite the fact that the residents of Woodhayes Road "do not support the principle of a CPZ in their road even if the neighbouring roads are included within a CPZ."

A potential introduction of VSW1 CPZ in Woodhayes Road would have a detrimental impact on our business as we frequently receive visitors. It would also severely impact our staff who have already expressed their anxiety about a potential loss of parking spaces. As a business director, I am concerned that we will lose staff, as some have no other option but to drive to work.

To reiterate: King's College School Wimbledon (International) and its staff strongly oppose the introduction of VSW1 CPZ in Woodhayes Road.

Notwithstanding our preference, I have the following comments regarding the current proposal:

- Sufficient provision must be made for staff/business permits for King's College School Wimbledon (International) staff to allow the business to operate successfully.
- We would oppose the introduction of pay-and-display bays outside our business; these should be permit bays to allow staff to park.
- Monday-Friday 11-3pm as potential controlled hours to be the only ones to be given consideration- this will have the least impact on part-time staff.
- We would oppose the proposed double yellow lines in Crooked Billet which will result in a significant displacement of cars from households in that area who will not be able to park.

We would respectfully ask that our position be given full consideration to enable our business to continue to operate successfully.

Officers comment

Please see section 4.8.1.

From feedback received from majority of local residents, majority of the parking problems in the area are caused by KCS staff and students.

082 Woodhayes Road

I write to object to the imposition, in its currently proposed form, of a new CPZ ref VSW1 - Wool Road conservation area. Ideally I should prefer to see no CPZ of any kind in Woodhayes Road. However, if your department is determined that a

CPZ be introduced in the Wool Road conservation area, it would be greatly preferable and cause less hardship if the controlled period were limited to one hour of each day on Mondays to Fridays only. Merton is perfectly able to control and discourage commuter parking on a one hour per day basis in neighbouring streets which form existing CPZs: RPC from 11 am to 12 noon on Mondays to Fridays and RPC1 from 12 noon to 1 pm on Mondays to Fridays. Therefore Merton has no case to suggest that it could not control and discourage commuter and schools parking on a one hour per weekday basis in a new CPZ ref VSW1. In the interests of efficiency, the one hour chosen for VSW1 could be either 10 am to 11 am Mondays to Fridays only OR 1 pm to 2 pm Mondays to Fridays only.

Officer's comment

See section 4.8.3 of this report.

013 Woodhayes Road KCS

I am writing to object to the proposed CPZ in the Wool Road area. I teach the cello at Kings College School one/two days a week, and need to drive to school because I live a long way from a station, and also because my cello and teaching materials are too heavy to carry on public transport. There is no parking for visiting music teachers at KCS, and the street pay parking is limited to 5 hours, which is not long enough as I frequently teach 7.45-4.35. If the proposed CPZ is introduced I will not be able to park near enough to the school to walk. The current difficulties experienced by residents of the Wool Road area have mainly been caused by CPZs from neighbouring roads pushing the non-resident parking into this one remaining pocket. For example, Clifton Road and Southside Common, or The Downs, where frequently there are large areas of residents parking empty during the day, in an area where lots of houses with their own off street parking anyway. (This can clearly be seen on Googlemaps Streetview). I would suggest a more holistic approach to the parking arrangements of the whole area, catering for the needs of the school and businesses as well as residents. I suggest removing some of the residents' parking zones in some of these neighbouring areas, and replacing them with free parking and/or long-term meter parking, so that there will be at least some long term parking available for non residents. The school where I teach, KCS, is a nationally important school, and an asset to the area, boosting local business, and should be given more priority than in your current policy.

Officer's comment

See section 4.8.1 of this report

From feedback received from majority of local residents, majority of the parking problems in the area are caused by KCS staff and students.

023 Woodhayes Road

I am writing as a resident Flat One Woodhayes Road, Wimbledon. We are in receipt of your notice dated 30th November 2017 regarding the outcome of the informal consultation for the Proposed Controlled Parking Zone VSW1. We are very disappointed by the decision of the council to proceed to a statutory consultation despite the fact that we the residents of Woodhayes Road "do not support the principle of a CPZ in their road even if the neighbouring roads are included within a CPZ." We strongly oppose the introduction of VSW1 CPZ in Woodhayes Road. We are content with the current arrangements; We do not wish there to be restrictions to parking on Woodhayes Road which will impact and inconvenience visitors, deliveries etc; We anticipate a detrimental effect from Crooked Billet displaced parking.

Officer's comment

See section 4.9.1, 4.8.2

061 Woodhayes Road

I continue to be totally opposed to a CPZ in Woodhayes Road. Much of the congestion in this road is caused by parking from King's College School. They are on holiday for about 12 weeks of each year and the road is relatively quiet at these times, so I see no reason to have a CPZ forced upon us just because surrounding roads want it. Despite the fact that not all houses in this road have off-street parking we are perfectly happy with the status quo - the residents of Dunstall, Wool and Mackay roads have plenty of driveways in which to park. I find it totally unacceptable that family, friends and workmen visiting my house should have to pay to park. If the scheme should be finally forced upon us, a one hour restriction from, say, 11 am to 12 noon would be ample to deter the all-day parking commuters. This works perfectly well in places like Durham Road, SW20, and in other areas such as Clapham which I visit. With pubs all around the country closing down I think it is vitally important to support our own hostleries, The Crooked Billet and the Hand in Hand, and not to restrict their business by clamping down on the parking.

Officer's comment

See section 4.9.1 & 4.8.2 of this report.

076 Woodhayes Road

I live on Woodhayes Road and have heard about the decision to make Woodhayes Road a CPZ zone. As a Woodhayes

Road resident, I am very disappointed by the decision of the council to proceed to a statutory consultation despite the fact that the residents of Woodhayes Road “do not support the principle of a CPZ in their road even if the neighbouring roads are included within a CPZ.”

Officer’s comment

See section 4.9.1 & 4.8.2 of this report.

062 Woodhayes Road

I would point out, in relation to your statistics about consultation results, that simple numbers of respondents are unlikely to do justice to opposition to your proposals for Woodhayes Road, since the response from Westside Tennis Club is speaking for the membership of the Club, rather than a single household.

We, who are not members of the Club, are opposed to the introduction of parking meters in Woodhayes Road, particularly in the section opposite our house, adjacent to Westside Tennis Club, unless:-

- (1) The metered hours are restricted to, say, 0800-1200, thereby deterring commuters while limiting the inconvenience to visitors to the tennis club (typically today there have been three “white vans” parked there all day) and
- (2) A voucher system for use at the meters is provided to residents of Woodhayes Road for the use of their visitors.

Officer’s comment

See section 4.9.1 & 4.8.2 of this report.

098, 099 Woodhayes Road

We would like to register our concern over the proposed CPZ Ref: ES/VSW1. Whilst we recognise the difficulties of residents parking in the area, as with many other areas of the Borough, we are concerned about the possible significant impact on the ability of both our members and visitors to attend the club. A reduction in the proposed four-hour slot to one or two hours, would, we believe, serve the purpose of preventing those members of the public who wish to park for the whole day, but would not significantly impact on our members and visitors who invariably park in the area for shorter time periods.

Officer’s comment

See section 4.8.2

107 Crooked Billet

Whilst we are in favour of the introduction of a CPZ In Strachan Place we object to the proposal to introduce double yellow lines outside numbers 7 and 8 Strachan Place. There is already very limited parking in the road with CPZ. Why can’t this space outside numbers 7 and 8 also be allocated to residents parking as opposed to double yellow lines with no parking at all? There is no obvious justification for imposing double yellow lines here.

Officer’s comment

The Council will only introduce parking spaces where it is safe and convenient to do so. Safety and access take priority over parking

072 Copse Hill

I strongly object to the proposal for the introduction of a CPZ. While I understand the residents annoyance at being inundated with parked cars generated by Kings School staff and boys, by commuters working in the town and village and by commuters catching the 200 bus to take trains from Wimbledon Station, no evidence or even guesstimate has been provided by the Council of how many and to where the cars will now relocate following any introduction of the CPZ nor of the impact of the new Berkeley Homes development at the old hospital site on local parking. The impact is likely merely to cause further parking on Copse Hill, which is a busy, difficult and sometimes dangerous road, and on other residential roads in the vicinity which are already well populated with parked cars. This may solve the problem in Wool Road etc but will just exacerbate the problem elsewhere. This is short term thinking and no CPZ should proceed until the effect of the CPZ’s introduction has been properly assessed with an Impact Assessment and then considered by all of those likely to be affected – not just those within the CPZ area.

Officer’s comment

Copse Hill in general is part of various CPZs proposed in in the area. Berkeley Homes is a private estate, and cannot be included in any of the proposed CPZs, therefore, the residents of this estate will not be eligible for a parking permit. There is limited parking capacity in any area and motorists like to park with their vehicles in view of their homes. However, as London population grows, public transport, car clubs and other demand responsive travel solutions offer the best way

forward in managing our streets and increasing demand to travel. The alternative is that the road network will become more gridlocked. CPZ is a tool use to help discourage private car long distance commuting to place of work and manage parking in favour of residents.

053 Copse Hill

The scheme that has been proposed as a result of a request to be included into the CPZ by a small Crooked Billet section is unnecessarily stringent, far reaching and unfair on the surrounding area. I live on Copse Hill and strongly feel the new double yellow lines in the stretch of road between numbers 16 to 38 is far too heavy handed. Other areas of Wool Road have apparently been provided parking solutions and we have been given a new parking problem outside our front doors. How can this be fair? This has created a parking problem for us when previously there was none. Where are workman supposed to park, delivery drivers and guests and other visitors? A better solution to handle the displacement of parking onto Copse Hill needs to be sought. Double yellow lines in residential areas are not appropriate. There are certainly other alternatives that could be explored and applied. There are plenty of examples of this in neighbouring road to the south of Copse Hill. Please re-evaluate the proposed double yellow lines on the Copse Hill segment.

Officer's comment

The scheme is proposed as a result of a petition received from Wool Road, McKay Road, Dunstall Road Ernle Road and Crooked Billet. Over the years residents of Copse Hill have requested the implementation of double yellow lines to remove inconsiderate and obstructive parking that causes reduced visibility when exiting their driveway. The Council has proposed some double yellow lines along sections of Copse Hill. This has provided some relief to those residents. However, the Council continues to receive more requests for further yellow lines to be implemented. The Council is using this opportunity to control parking issues along the whole road. Copse Hill was evaluated some time ago and parking has been provided where possible.

037/067 Copse Hill

I refer to your letter of 30 November detailing the proposals for implementing a controlled parking zone(CPZ) for the Wool Road area. I set out below my objections to the proposals. The proposals include the imposition of double yellow lines for the whole length of the top end of Copse Hill on both sides of the road. No explanation has been provided to justify such a major change to the current position. The effect of the proposals will be to inconvenience seriously the residents of Copse Hill. Whilst it may be assumed that all residents have space for off street parking and so they will not be inconvenienced, this is not so. Many residents have only one space available - i.e. for their own car. Even in the case of this household which can accommodate probably two extra cars, the proposals will seriously inconvenience us. For example, I regularly host a lunch club for elderly and infirm members of St. Marys church; this involves 20/25 people who are transported in cars. Prevention of parking at any time will make the continuation of this lunch difficult if not impossible. It is, regrettably, impractical to insist they all use public transport to attend. In effect your proposals will significantly impact on all residents of Copse Hill who may wish to welcome daytime guests - or indeed receive deliveries at home. The availability of alternative parking is quite distant (assuming such parking is to be allowed for us - see below).

No doubt you have realised that the proposals will also impact the parishioners of Christ Church, West Wimbledon. The imposition of double yellow lines will make the attendance at all services difficult. The proposals may be thought to improve safety for the users of Copse Hill, although no evidence has been provided to suggest that the current uncontrolled arrangements are dangerous. I believe it will do exactly the opposite. At present the parking of cars - uncontrolled though it may be - has the effect of slowing traffic speeds. Removal of all parking will increase speeds. I can accept that there needs to be some reduction in parking levels on Copse Hill so that sight lines for crossing points and drive exits are protected; however the proposals to prevent all parking are an overreaction. It is perfectly possible to introduce some degree of residents parking on quite large areas of Copse Hill without causing danger. A greater degree of imagination on the Council's part is needed.

Officer's comment

Over the years residents of Copse Hill have requested the implementation of double yellow lines to remove inconsiderate and obstructive parking that causes reduced visibility when exiting their driveway. The Council has proposed some double yellow lines along sections of Copse Hill. This has provided some relief to those residents. However, the Council continues to receive more requests for further yellow lines to be implemented. The Council is using this opportunity to control parking issues along the whole road. Copse Hill was evaluated some time ago and parking has been provided where possible.

For comment on Christ Church (CC) see section 5.4.2

ERNLE ROAD

The proposals for Ernle Road introduce residents parking for much of its length including both sides of the road near its junction with Copse Hill. The passage for cars is quite narrow at that point if cars are parked on both sides of the road. Whilst this issue might be alleviated to some extent by the provision of electric charging points, which may be under-

utilised initially, I believe the proposals as written will cause some difficulties and should be amended. The proposals do not make clear whether residents of Copse Hill will be eligible for parking permits in the proposed CPZ; it would be logical to assume so. If that is not to be the case then the proposals are even more objectionable. I note that, in an email to the North West Wimbledon Residents Association, your senior parking engineer, listed the respective households and parking spaces proposed. In doing so he omitted the statistics for Copse Hill, which may suggest that residents are not to be permitted to purchase parking permits

HOURS OF OPERATION

The proposed hours of operation are 11.00 am to 3.00pm. I consider this to be unnecessarily long. It contrasts with the neighbouring zones (RPC and RPC1) where a one hour restriction is in force. Furthermore I note that the proposed times would involve use of a full day's permit rather than a half day permit. This smacks of a revenue raising proposal rather than a parking based proposal.

SUMMARY

I have listed above my objections to the proposals. Please note this letter is written on behalf of all four members of this household. I have copied this objection notice to my local councillors and to the relevant Cabinet Member. I trust you will take the objections seriously and look to amend what are the most egregious aspects of the proposals. In my letter of 2 January (copy attached) I noted my objection to the proposed four hour time slot in the scheme. I understand from other residents that the Council wishes to maintain this slot because it cannot efficiently manage a one hour slot and because residents voted for the proposed four hour slot in the informal consultation carried out earlier. These arguments are ridiculous. First the neighbouring CPZ zones (RPC and RPC1) both operate for one hour and seem to be perfectly satisfactory. Second the residents were given three time slot options in the informal consultation. The 11.00 - 3.00 option was the shortest one available; the other two were far more intrusive. Like many others I voted for the four hour slot as the "least worst" option and noted in the comments that it was an unnecessarily long period. To argue that the Council is now carrying out what I voted for is at best disingenuous.

Officer's comment

Copse Hill is part of the zone therefore residents are eligible to purchase permits.

See section 4.8.3

The electric vehicle charging points are proposed 15 metres in Ernle Road from its junction with Copse Hill and we do not envisage any issues with this location. The charging times vary depending on the percentage left on the car battery before charging. This could vary from half an hour to 4 hours. The parking spaces will be introduced as consulted, the scheme will be monitored and problem will be dealt with during that period.

089 Dunstall Road

We oppose the introduction of the proposed CPZ. We think that the scheme as proposed will provide no benefit to residents living closest to Kings College School because those with school permits will try to park as near as possible to the school, maintaining the pressure on a reduced number of spaces.

If the scheme is to go ahead we would like to see the following amendments.

- Kings College School to be excluded from the scheme completely.
- Parking restrictions to be imposed for no more than one hour during the day – this will be sufficient to exclude commuters, which seems to be the objective.
- The diesel levy to be waived for existing cars until they are replaced.

Officer's comment

Please see section 4.8.1 of this report.

058, 070 Dunstall Road

I am strongly opposed to your proposed CPZ VSW1 in Dunstall Road and the Wool Road conservation area generally. 38% of the residents in favour of the CPZ does not represent a majority, and further effort needs to be put in place to understand why the response rate to your informal consultation was only 48%.

It seems obvious that the parking problem in the area is caused by staff and pupils at local schools - there is no problem during school holidays and weekends - and the frustration caused by these inconsiderate car owners needs to be tackled in ways other than introducing a CPZ.

I specifically object to the following:

- The number of parking places proposed (76 in Dunstall Road for 29 residents) is ludicrous. There will be street markings and pay machines everywhere, further destroying the character of Wool Road Conservation Area. Please reduce the number of parking bays significantly.
- None of the local schools should be allocated parking spaces. KCS needs to accommodate the parking of its staff in its own grounds. That issue should have been a condition of planning consent by Merton Council for all the

recent (and current) building works undertaken by KCS. KCS needs to take responsibility for the problem, and should certainly not be allowed any permits.

- Your proposal will force more local residents to convert their front gardens into off street parking, further adding to the problem of controlling storm water during inclement weather. Many storm water drain cover grids are blocked with debris because you no longer bother to sweep the streets.
- The proposed parking restriction from 11am to 3pm is illogical, given the parking problem is caused by local schools. If parking control is really necessary it should be for 1 hour, from 9am to 10am or 10am to 11am. This is done in other areas. The residents pay for the service so they should decide.
- The proposed parking levy for diesel vehicles is insufficient. Air quality on occasions is extremely poor and diesel exhaust fumes are mainly responsible. Owners of diesel vehicles should pay at least £500pa, rising each year until these vehicles are eventually banned from our roads. Additionally, owners of large 4WD vehicles should pay a similar amount.

Officers comment

See sections 4.8.1 and 4.8.3

057 Peregrine Way

We write in response to the proposed CPZ in Peregrine Way,

We wish to register our unhappiness with the introduction of paid parking the 3 spaces in our road, which at present regulate themselves quite well leaving space for visitors and tradespersons to park.

Our concern is the expense and the inconvenience, and that it is totally unnecessary.

The parking policy in Merton seems to be reactionary and impractical. Parking needs to be provided for visitors to our local shops, schools, green areas and homes, and it seems that Merton Council is intent on steadily removing all of these facilities. For revenue raising reasons no doubt.

We further object to the time suggested for the restrictions - 11-3 is an absurdly long time. Many areas locally have restricted parking between 12-1 which seems suffice to deter those wanting to park all day.

Officer's comment

Some time ago Peregrine Way residents petitioned the Council for parking restrictions. At the time, officers attended meetings arranged by residents during which time residents were asking for help to remove congestion and inconsiderate parking. The proposed measures address the issues raised by the residents.

See section 4.8.2 and 4.8.3 of this report.

093 Peregrine Way

I am writing to express concern over the proposed 4 hour restricted parking slots for the WRCA reference ES/VSW1. I would request a consideration be made to reduce this to either a 1 hour or 2 hour slot. My principal concern is the impact this will have on the local community particularly Christ Church West Wimbledon, located at 2 Cottenham Park Road, SW20 0RZ. <http://www.christchurch-westwimbledon.org/> It has been disclosed by the Church Wardens that the 4 hour slot would make it impossible to serve their local congregation and community. From my own personal experience I have witnessed the valuable and essential work Christ Church delivers, and this must not be disrupted. A reduction in the proposed 4 hour slot to 1 or 2 hours would allow the local community to function whilst still preventing all day parking in the area. Please register my concerns and consider this change.

Officer's comment

Some time ago Peregrine Way residents petitioned the Council for parking restrictions. At the time, officers attended meetings arranged by residents during which time residents were asking for help to remove congestion and inconsiderate parking. The proposed measures address the issues raised by the residents.

See section 4.8.2 and 4.8.3 of this report.

Outside the area

045 Merton resident

I would like to register my objection to the introduction of the proposed new CPZ in the Wool Road area for a number of reasons:

1. Your own website states that CPZ's in residential roads are intended to allow residents, and their visitors, to park near their homes. The area this proposed zone covers contains properties, almost without exception, that have garages and substantial driveways. So I fail to see why these residents require additional street parking.
2. If residents additional street parking is provided, is this not encouraging multi car ownership.
3. As only 48% of residents replied to the initial consultation, and not all of those were in favour of the CPZ, then far less than 50% of residents will be inflicting these restrictions on the rest of the community.

4. The Wool Road area is close to a number of schools, both private and state, some of which have been in existence for over 100 years. Public transport to these schools is not ideal, namely the 200 bus route. The buses are over crowded and too infrequent at the beginning and end of the school day. Hence the reason that many staff drive to work and park locally

Officer's comment.

The proposed parking controls were initiated by the residents who find it difficult to find a parking space in their roads during the day or find it difficult to exit their driveways because of obstructive and inconsiderate parking. The majority of the residents attribute the parking congestion in these roads to KCS teachers, students and other business taking up all the available space.

See section 4.8.1 of this report.

010

I am not in favour, The proposed CPZ which will include Wool Road, McKay Road, Dunstall Road, Ernle Road, Peregrine Way, Strachan Place, Woodhayes Road, Crooked Billet, Copse Hill (Nos. 1-42) and West Side Common (Nos. 1 and 2).

106

I am writing to object to the proposed introduction of a CPZ in the Wool Road area. While I am sympathetic to local residents (and their visitors) being able to park near their homes if they do not have off-street parking, and also understand that some local residents may be frustrated by the volume of people parking in their streets, I think Merton Council need to review:

- the approach it takes to parking across the borough;
- the wider impact and consequences of introducing so many CPZs;
- the cost of introducing and policing CPZs;
- balancing the competing requirements for parking from local residents and other people who live and work in the borough and need to go about their daily business/employment ;
- how parking policies and public transport provision sit with achieving Merton's Sustainable Transport Strategy and Local Implementation Plan (LIP2).

Personal background

I currently live in Morden but work part-time in a school near Wimbledon Village. As it is a 2 mile walk to my place of employment (and I am often carrying heavy bags) walking to/from school daily is not a realistic option – particularly in bad weather. (Also Lower Downs railway arch only allows pedestrians walking in different directions to use the pavement alternately and the footpath right on to Worple Road from Lower Downs was 'out of bounds' for several months due to property development recently.) I do not drive to work, but I am generally a passenger in a work colleague's car. The main reason for us choosing to travel by car is that the journey is much quicker than using public transport and because, even leaving home just around 7.00am, there is no guarantee that buses have the capacity to get us to our destination in time to start work at 8.00am. On a recent journey, I boarded a 164 at 7.10am (standing room only), then was almost refused boarding of the 200 in Cyril Black Way at 7.30am due to the volume of schoolchildren travelling at this time. I imagine that later buses would have been equally, if not more, busy and I may not have been able to catch the first bus. Coming home by bus at any time between about 3.00pm-4.30pm is even more difficult given the staggered finishes of schools in the area (and even some lunch times due to schools using public bus services to reach sports pitches for games). When my own children were at secondary school, I raised the issue of there being separate school and public bus services at peak times, but TfL and the council seemed uninterested in this idea. As my colleague and I have a Freedom Passes our bus travel is free (so this should be an incentive!), but to make public transport an attractive and reasonable alternative when travelling to work, we need it to be reliable, have sufficient capacity and run at a frequency that allows us to make the journey from home to work in a reasonable time and guarantee we are not late!

History

I believe the parking problems in the Wool Road area have been exacerbated by the progressive extension of CPZs in

roads off Worple Road, the Ridgway and near Wimbledon Common, displacing people who have previously parked in these streets to Ernle Road, Woodhayes Road, Wool Road etc. I believe there would not be parking problems in these roads if the council had taken a more analytical approach to parking issues in the past rather than simply counting responses for/against CPZ proposals. In introducing previous CPZs, the council has sometimes allowed a minority of residents (but who submitted the majority of responses to a consultation supporting CPZ) to secure a CPZ, even though people might already have off-street parking in many houses in those streets or large parts of the roads did not have residential properties (e.g. outside schools/the church in Edge Hill; outside schools in The Downs). By introducing residents bays (which are often vacant during the day) and restricting staying times for visitors, the council has in effect given residents in some of these roads 'ownership' of the kerbside, and reduced the number of parking spaces available to other people who work or need to visit the area. This has had a direct impact on parking in the Wool Road area, because it is now the only area which is not a CPZ. Had better solutions been found south of the Ridgway, I doubt people in Wool Road would feel parking was becoming more difficult.

Current position

I do not believe there is an overall shortage of parking in the Wimbledon Common, Ridgway, Southside area (although the existing CPZs have possibly reduced the number of spaces available to non-residents and road markings for bays may also have reduced kerbside spaces). When I walk to Wimbledon during the day time (during term-time) I see a large number of unoccupied spaces, particularly in Edge Hill. (It would be interesting to know how many residents permits have been purchased in some roads, particularly those with off-street parking, compared with the number of residents parking bays provided? Also how much revenue is collected from streets with meters?). This suggests that parking problems are possibly being caused by:

- people with off-street parking either parking on the road or owning a number of cars that exceeds the space on their drive;
- a large number of vehicles in the area associated with temporary building work either relating to redevelopment of residential properties or projects at schools;
- residents/non-residents either seeking out free parking (because parking charges are unaffordable, particularly for those employed in some school support roles, or limited waiting times are incompatible with hours of employment) or because resident's bays mean parking is not readily available (the top of The Downs, being an example).

If the council actually monitored what was happening in these roads or was better informed about parking demand versus roadside space, I believe the council could find a better solution to meeting the needs of both residents and workers/visitors e.g. by changing the balance of residents only/metered bays or making them all multi-use; charging more reasonable parking fees; changing the duration people may park for; or having a programme for reviewing CPZs at regular intervals (and being prepared to withdraw them). It would be very interesting to see what happened if all the CPZs were rescinded!

Assuming that most CPZs have been prompted by residents being unhappy with the number of people associated with local schools parking in their streets, the other point I would make is that for term-time staff at schools such as King's their working days actually amount to no more than about 35 weeks a year, so parking issues are not necessarily an all-year round concern and these people are parking in the area less than 50% of the year.

Objection to VSW1

- Only 48% (141) questionnaires were received in response to the informal consultation. This suggests only a minority of people in the area are bothered about parking, yet any decision to introduce a CPZ will impact on a much larger number of people, including other residents, people who work in the area, local businesses in the village, customers of pubs/restaurants and users of the common for leisure.
- If the potential number of responses was 294, and 78% of the 141 responses supported the CPZ, this means only 110 respondents (37% - a minority - of all potential respondents) actually favour the CPZ. It would be interesting to know if those in favour of the CPZ actually have a genuine need for on-street parking in the day or simply dislike the amount of parking on their streets? If residents already have sufficient off-street parking, the council needs to

question if it may be allowing residents who have no need for on-street parking to make their streets 'car-free' zones. While we all know we should try to be 'more green', realistically people across the borough own and use cars for a variety of reasons and parking is always going to be a sensitive topic in the modern world. However, there must be a better way of balancing the competing interests of residents and the economic/transport needs of people who work in the area?

- By carrying out this consultation over the Christmas/New Year period, it is likely that many people affected by the proposals may not be aware of this consultation and miss the 5 January deadline for comments.

It seems that the proposals for this CPZ are for part-time controls from 11.00am-3.00pm, so they are deliberately intended to prevent people who work in the area being able to park all day (regardless of the affordability of the charge), as I assume the maximum stay will be 4 hours. This seems deliberately biased in favour of residents, who will secure 'car-free' streets – apart from their own vehicles, short-term visitors – regardless of whether they have a genuine need for on-street parking in the middle of the day. I believe the council has a responsibility to all its residents (and businesses) to enable them to pursue their occupations, but in the absence of adequate public transport to/from this destination this CPZ is potentially going to have a detrimental impact on peoples' work/life balance and financial situation (e.g. those who rely on having a car because they need to drop off/pick up their own children around their job; care for elderly relatives or come/go to other jobs/activities before or after work). It may also cause some people to have to reconsider their employment. If free parking in this area is not an option, I would appeal to the council to consider allowing longer staying times in this (or other) local CPZs, as it is clear that there is the capacity for streets around the Ridgway, The Downs, Arterberry Road, Wimbledon Common, Wool Road etc. to accommodate both residents and local workers during the day without out effectively 'banning' non-residents from the area.

Officer's comment

The petition instigates the consultation process and an informal consultation determines the level of support from the residents for the proposals. The response rate to the informal consultation was 48% which is considered to be reasonable for this type consultation in this area and the majority have opted for the proposed measures

When the Council stated that statutory consultation would be undertaken in November/December, it does not mean the consultation will run for two months. This was an indication of time frame the Council intended to start the consultation. The period of statutory consultation is 21 days as per legislation. The statutory consultation on this occasion was extended due to the Christmas holidays at Council's discretion.

When the first CPZs were introduced in the Village, the Council put in place long term pay and display parking spaces allowing parking between 7 and 10 hours. Charges are not imposed on some of the parking spaces until 9.30am which means that commuters who drive to the Village, park and use public transport to continue their journey are unable to pay and display on those shared use parking spaces. The Council introduced a new permit called Pre Pay Ticket (PPT) which staffs of businesses in the village can pre purchase to use in those long stay parking spaces without having to return to their vehicles when the parking spaces become operational. The ticket is only valid in the bays indicated with a 'PPT – Pre Paid Ticket' sign in the following roads:- Belvedere Avenue; St. Mary's Road; Southside Common; Murray Road; Ridgway Place; Marryat Road; Parkside Avenue; Calonne Road; Parkside Gardens; and Burghley Road. Currently these parking spaces are often underutilised for the majority of the time. Therefore, there are parking facilities for long term parking in the Village. The council will only reconsider changing some of the short stay shared use if the existing empty long term parking spaces are used at full capacity.

According to our records there are very few PPT tickets purchased. This could be attributed to motorists seeking out free parking spaces in the Village which contributes toward residents' parking difficulties. Vehicles are currently crammed into these roads obstructing residents' driveways and parking close to junctions obstructing visibility.

The KCS also has a relatively large car park that can accommodate a minimum of 30 vehicles, which could accommodate more vehicles than it currently does. It is considered that if these spaces are managed properly by double parking for example. This will ease the on street congestion to some extent. Also KCs has Ridgway which is a private road at their disposal.

The proposed measures were initiated by the local residents who find it difficult to find a parking space in their road during the day or find it difficult to exit their driveways because of obstructive and inconsiderate parking, a problem many residents believe is caused by KCS. The Council does consider the needs of the local community and different users, however, priority must be given to residents who experience inconvenience and obstructive parking directly.

101

I am dismayed to learn about the proposal to introduce yet more CPZs in the Wimbledon area. Whilst I am not resident in Wimbledon (I commute from Croydon), I work between 3 and 4 days a week at King's College School. This is a major part of my income as a peripatetic music teacher. As such, I am required to travel between schools of varying sites. This is

becoming increasingly difficult to do as more councils introduce parking restrictions and public transport simply does not facilitate travel in the same way that a car does. If yet another CPZ is introduced, I will personally have to seriously consider the nature of my employment as I cannot see how my current schedule will be possible without a car. This will mean that I don't bring my personal needs to local Wimbledon businesses. On many of the roads in the proposed CPZ areas, the vast majority of houses have plentiful driveways for at least two, if not three cars so I genuinely cannot see how this would be a benefit to local residents for a CPZ to be introduced. Clearly with the introductions of CPZs in areas around Ridgway over the last five years, there has been increasing parking displacement to the few remaining free roads whilst the CPZ roads continue to remain largely empty. This is frustrating to see. Whilst I acknowledge the roads have become significantly more busy this academic year, no-one seems to take into consideration that there has been an enormous building project at King's College School itself (due to finish in March) and a considerable number of residential building projects in the area. If residential building projects involved just 3 extra vans/cars, in just one road that has been adding 12 extra vehicles alone. I personally see a huge number of builders parking their own vehicles in the free parking areas. Whilst this is inconvenient - it is clearly going to be a temporary issue of congestion as these building projects draw to a close. Could the consultation not be postponed to see what the impact is of these various building projects coming to a close? When looking at alternative travel option to driving, the Ridgway/Wimbledon Common area is unbelievably poorly served by TfL buses. Along Ridgway, despite the number of schools 20 minutes walk from Wimbledon station, there is still only one bus route, the 200. This is at times exasperating when you do take public transport - without reliable and regular buses the travel time and cost simply does not compare to a car. I don't like to moan as clearly Wimbledon is a lovely area to work and the council is part of making this borough attractive. However, the ongoing desire to push us all out of our cars when life over the last 30-50 years has encouraged exactly the opposite is really very tricky to deal with, hence this email.

Officer's comment

The petition instigates the consultation process and an informal consultation determines the level of support from the residents for the proposals. The response rate to the informal consultation was 48% which is considered to be reasonable for this type consultation in this area and the majority have opted for the proposed measures

When the Council stated that statutory consultation would be undertaken in November/December, it does not mean the consultation will run for two months. This was an indication of time frame the Council intended to start the consultation. The period of statutory consultation is 21 days as per legislation. The statutory consultation on this occasion was extended due to the Christmas holidays at Council's discretion.

When the first CPZs were introduced in the Village, the Council put in place long term pay and display parking spaces allowing parking between 7 and 10 hours. Charges are not imposed on some of the parking spaces until 9.30am which means that commuters who drive to the Village, park and use public transport to continue their journey are unable to pay and display on those shared use parking spaces. The Council introduced a new permit called Pre Pay Ticket (PPT) which staffs of businesses in the village can pre purchase to use in those long stay parking spaces without having to return to their vehicles when the parking spaces become operational. The ticket is only valid in the bays indicated with a 'PPT – Pre Paid Ticket' sign in the following roads:- Belvedere Avenue; St. Mary's Road; Southside Common; Murray Road; Ridgway Place; Marryat Road; Parkside Avenue; Calonne Road; Parkside Gardens; and Burghley Road. Currently these parking spaces are often underutilised for the majority of the time. Therefore, there are parking facilities for long term parking in the Village. The council will only reconsider changing some of the short stay shared use if the existing empty long term parking spaces are used at full capacity.

According to our records there are very few PPT tickets purchased. This could be attributed to motorists seeking out free parking spaces in the Village which contributes toward residents' parking difficulties. Vehicles are currently crammed into these roads obstructing residents' driveways and parking close to junctions obstructing visibility.

The KCS also has a relatively large car park that can accommodate a minimum of 30 vehicles, which could accommodate more vehicles than it currently does. It is considered that if these spaces are managed properly by double parking for example. This will ease the on street congestion to some extent. Also KCs has Ridgway which is a private road at their disposal.

The proposed measures were initiated by the local residents who find it difficult to find a parking space in their road during the day or find it difficult to exit their driveways because of obstructive and inconsiderate parking, a problem many residents believe is caused by KCS. The Council does consider the needs of the local community and different users, however, priority must be given to residents who experience inconvenience and obstructive parking directly.

046, 068 Crooked Billet

I am writing to object to the principle of introducing a CPZ of any form in the Wool Road Area. It is unnecessary as the vast majority of the residents in the area (especially Wool Road, Dunstall Road, McKay Road and Ernle Road) have private off-street parking. Apparently, the residents of these roads object to cars being parked in such a way as to make manoeuvring out of their private drives difficult. The proposed bays, if fully used, would make no difference to this. Extension of double yellow lines at junctions would also deal with another problem they raise, which is turning around

corners at, for example, McKay Road into Dunstall Road. I have the following specific objections to the proposed plan:

- 1) The residents of Woodhayes Road made it clear they did not want a CPZ. Although my postal address is Crooked Billet, I overlook Woodhayes Road and therefore consider myself to be a resident of it. It appears Merton wants to ride rough shod over the opinions of residents because they do not suit the purposes of Merton. How will Merton determine whether or not to introduce a CPZ in Woodhayes Road through the statutory consultation process?
- 2) In respect of shared use bays, I was told by the engineer for the project that Merton is not interested in the impact of CPZ's on businesses (in this case, the 2 pubs and the 2 sports clubs). I asked how the numbers of shared use bays is calculated. There was no response. Although the numbers in the latest document are higher than the previous version, I still consider them to be inadequate.
- 3) In respect of operational hours, there is absolutely no need for these to be 11am to 3pm. If there is to be a CPZ, then much shorter hours would achieve the apparent objective and there would be a corresponding reduction in the cost of permits. I also object to the apparent flat charge for permits regardless of the operational hours. This is effectively a tax introduced in an underhand way, for example if Merton ignores the wishes of residents in Woodhayes Road.
- 4) I see that, as usual, Merton is proposing to reduce valuable parking capacity by introducing yet more double yellow lines in Woodhayes Road. There is no need to extend the double yellow lines to outside 47 Crooked Billet. Just after the totally unnecessary dropped kerb that your engineer and your traffic wardens are so obsessed about would be sufficient. If the argument is to smooth traffic flow, my response would be that anything that calms the traffic would be useful. In that email, I pointed out that I was informed by the engineer that Merton does not care about the impact of CPZ's on businesses. I had in mind the impact of the CPZ on the pubs (Crooked Billet and Hand in Hand) and the sports clubs (Kings and Westside).

I have now been informed that this lack of regard applies also to Christ Church, whose work with the elderly and the local community generally will be gravely put at risk. This is intolerable and the Council should be ashamed of itself for putting Christ Church in this position. At the very least, the time slot should be one hour maximum, should the CPZ proceed. I believe the whole process concerning the possible introduction of the CPZ has been bungled and could well be open to legal challenge. First, we had the misleading information that residents in roads had petitioned for a CPZ when in fact they had not. Second, the residents of Woodhayes Road said they did not want a CPZ but Merton ignored their views and included Woodhayes Road in the proposed CPZ, presumably to earn more money from permits. This is against all the principles of democracy.

Officer's comment

Please see section 4.8.2, 4.8.3 and 4.9 of this report.

033, 55 Ernle Road

In response to your formal consultation, my wife and I live in Ernle Road London, and we wish to object to the hours of operation of the proposed CPZ. 11 am to 3 pm is disrupts the opportunity for visitors in the morning and the afternoon. We have many visitors and the cost and inconvenience of visitors parking permits will be excessive. Currently visitors can park across our two driveways, this will be forbidden by the CPZ rules. May we plead for afternoon only restrictions 1pm to 3pm or 4pm would be just as effective and would allow us to welcome visitors and tradesmen in the mornings without needing to send them away at 11am. We realise that you have many issues to balance, but if the main point of the CPV is to stop the commuter parking, afternoon restrictions will be just as effective as a restriction that straddles morning and afternoon. May I add my objections to the proposed 4 hour CPZ restrictions, when one hour would be just as effective in dealing with commuter parking. I understand that it may be difficult to patrol the entire zone in one hour, but surely it's possible just to issue a few parking tickets once a month; this would deter the vast majority of commuter parking. The patrols can visit a different street each time and cover the whole CPZ over a few visits, which need not be frequent nor costly. If you really cannot accept a one hour restriction, then two hours could be acceptable, in the afternoon, to avoid disrupting social visitors and necessary contractors in the mornings. I do hope that the council will amend the proposals accordingly, so that a more satisfactory solution can be found.

Officer's comment

The Council does not offer one CPZ

The hours of operation between 11am and 3pm was supported by majority of consultees. Visitors permit would be a half for the duration of the scheme which is £1.50. Those who do not want to pay for their visitors could refer their visitors to use the shared use parking spaces available within the zone.

056, 57

In connection with these proposed parking restrictions, I am writing to register my objection to the proposed 4 hour waiting restriction slot, in favour of a 1 hour slot, which should be sufficient to achieve the proposed scheme's objectives, is significantly more user friendly to residents, and could easily be managed by the Council. Given that we would be funding it, I believe it is appropriate that the views of the residents of the area should be taken into account.

Officer's comment

The Council does not offer one CPZ. Majority of residents who responded to the informal consultation still support the proposed 4 hours restrictions. 1 hour poses operational and enforcement difficulties and would not be sufficient in discouraging commuters

105

It is disappointing that further parking restrictions are to be introduced in Wimbledon Village. I would like to express the concern that it is causing the staff at Stone Lion Veterinary Hospital. Stone Lion has served the community for over 100 years, providing high levels of general practice care and referral expertise to the pets of local residents. The hospital is an integral part of the Village community providing help and support to pet owners as well as their animals. Stone Lion employs 49 staff with up to 25 being on site at any one time. Many of the staff drive to work. They do so because they travel long distances, work shifts which start very early or finish very late, or have health issues restricting their use of public transport. It is more economical, convenient and safer for them to drive. Like many employees who work in the Village, such as hairdressers, stable hands, shop, café and restaurant workers, our nurses and receptionists do not earn large amounts of money. Why are Merton Council penalising people who choose to drive to work? Are they not providing an important service to those who visit the Village?

Topps Tiles and Costa Coffee have recently closed on the High Street. Merton Council ought to be concerned about the effect enforcing further parking restrictions could have on local businesses and visitors to Wimbledon Common.

It was highly disappointing and frankly unjustified when the initial restrictions were introduced along The Causeway, Camp Road and North View siting unreasonable parking as causing a danger. In the 15 years I have worked in the Village I can recall seeing only 2 cars given penalty charges for inappropriate parking next to the Common. Vans and caravans were allowed to sit in these roads unchallenged for long periods of time. Regular patrolling and dispensing of PCNs along these roads, and perhaps the introduction of parking bays and yellow lines, could have curtailed inappropriate parking. Instead, you have cracked the nut with a sledgehammer and forced people to park elsewhere. As a result, unsurprisingly, you are now having to introduce further restrictive measures. These roads are now virtually unoccupied with perhaps 4-5 cars parked there at a time. Local residents apparently previously unable to fully utilise the Common are not doing so now either despite the vast availability of parking spaces.

Clifton Road also now has only a handful of cars parked in it since restrictions were introduced to this road too.

Many of the pay and display options have a maximum stay, such as 2 hours on Cannizaro Road, meaning that staff cannot even pay to leave their car in one place but have to keep moving it. In a busy hospital environment, it is just not possible to leave to move your car. Restrictions in Woodhayes Road and the surrounding roads will see drivers competing for spaces once their allotted time has run out elsewhere. This will be disruptive to business.

The infuriating fact is that nearly all the houses on Woodhayes Road, Dunstall Road, McKay Road, Wool Road and Ernle Road have driveways with room enough to park to 2-3 cars and another on the road in front of the driveway. The idea that they are having trouble parking is nonsense. They simply do not want people parking in 'their' road. This has been evident from early on with some residents leaving plastic chairs in the road outside their house to stop people parking.

Whilst each household was entitled to one vote during the consultation, one vote per business does not represent the number of employees that will be affected by the restrictions, and the number of employees it takes to run a business. The inability to drive to work will create difficulty recruiting staff and could result in the loss of staff. Of course the one vote per address ratio heavily tips the scales in favour of the residents.

The Council claim they want to 'reach a balance between the needs of the residents, businesses and the safety of all other road users'. I fail to see how removing all free parking for those who earn a living working in the Village is providing a balance.

Officers comment.

The petition instigates the consultation process and an informal consultation determines the level of support from the residents for the proposals. The response rate to the informal consultation was 48% which is considered to be reasonable for this type consultation in this area and the majority have opted for the proposed measures

When the first CPZs were introduced in the Village, the Council put in place long term pay and display parking spaces allowing parking between 7 and 10 hours. Charges are not imposed on some of the parking spaces until 9.30am which means that commuters who drive to the Village, park and use public transport to continue their journey are unable to pay and display on those shared use parking spaces. The Council introduced a new permit called Pre Pay Ticket (PPT) which staffs of businesses in the village can pre purchase to use in those long stay parking spaces without having to return to their vehicles when the parking spaces become operational. The ticket is only valid in the bays indicated with a 'PPT – Pre Paid Ticket' sign in the following roads:- Belvedere Avenue; St. Mary's Road; Southside Common; Murray Road; Ridgway Place; Marryat Road; Parkside Avenue; Calonne Road; Parkside Gardens; and Burghley Road. Currently these parking spaces are often underutilised for the majority of the time. Therefore, there are parking facilities for long term parking in the Village. According to our records there are very few PPT tickets purchased. This could be attributed to motorists seeking out free parking spaces in the Village which contributes toward residents' parking difficulties. Vehicles are currently crammed into these roads obstructing residents' driveways and parking close to junctions obstructing visibility.

The KCS also has a relatively large car park that can accommodate a minimum of 30 vehicles, which could accommodate

more vehicles than it currently does. It is considered that if these spaces are managed properly by double parking for example. This will ease the on street congestion to some extent. Also KCs has Ridgway which is a private road at their disposal.

The proposed measures were initiated by the local residents who find it difficult to find a parking space in their road during the day or find it difficult to exit their driveways because of obstructive and inconsiderate parking. The Council does consider the needs of the local community and different users, however, priority must be given to residents who experience inconvenience and obstructive parking.

It is considered that the proposed measures addresses the needs of the residents and the local business community

006 Dunstall Road

I wish to object

Residents cannot park over their own drive number of spaces will be reduced by 30%. All KCS will park in our road. Get KCS to build a car park this is madness Get KCS to bus people in Enforce double yellow lines around KCS. Stop delivery lorries blocming the roads around KCS

At 8.00 you cannot move around here for KCS mums

Officer's comment

A CPZ is an area where, during the operational hours of the zone, parking activity is regulated along every inch of kerb space. The kerb space may have

- Yellow lines where parking must not take place e.g. around junctions, outside schools, at crossovers which give access to property
- Parking spaces for permit holders e.g. residents, residents' visitors, businesses with an essential need to use a vehicle, doctors
- Pay and display parking spaces for people visiting the area e.g. shoppers.

The current number of parking bays proposed in the area are believed to be sufficient for residents and their visitors.




KEY

PROPOSED

- PERMIT HOLDER BAY
- SHARED USE BAY
- ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGE POINT
- SINGLE YELLOW LINE
- DOUBLE YELLOW LINE
- SIGNPOST
- PAY AND DISPLAY MACHINE
- OPZ BOUNDARY

EXISTING

- CROSSOVERS
- DISABLED BAY
- SINGLE YELLOW LINE
- DOUBLE YELLOW LINE
- LAMP COLUMN
- PRIVATE ROAD



NOTES
Do not scale from this drawing

No.	Revisions	Drawn	By	Check	Date	Scale	Author	Drawn	By	Check	Date	Scale	Author

Sustainable Communities
environment & regeneration

TRAFFIC & HIGHWAYS

Reference provided on the Planning Application Form and the Provision of the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) Form completed and signed by the London Borough of Merton (LB Merton)

Author	Drawn	Check	Date	Scale

TITLE
CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE
VSW1
PROPOSED LAYOUT

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

Contract No. **Z87-345-01**

Contract Title **CONSULTATION**

Scale **1:1000**

Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ)

Proposed Zone VSW1 - Wool Road Area



ISSUE DATE : 30TH NOVEMBER 2017

Dear Resident/Business

The purpose of this leaflet is to let you know of the outcome of the informal consultation carried out in September 2017 on the proposal to introduce a controlled parking zone (CPZ) in your road.

VSW1 CPZ CONSULTATION RESULTS

The consultation resulted in a total of 141 questionnaires returned (after removing duplicates/multiple returns from households, staff and members of businesses), representing a response rate of 48%. Of the 141 who responded, 78% support a CPZ in their road, compared to 18% who do not and 4% who are unsure or made no response.

Further analysis of the results on a road-by-road basis revealed that majority of the roads are in favour of the proposed controls except Woodhayes Road. The results show that residents of Woodhayes Road do not support the principle of a CPZ in their road even if the neighbouring roads are included within a CPZ. However it has been decided that Woodhayes Road be included within the statutory consultation to give residents a further opportunity to air their views. For further details please refer to the report online for consultation results and officers recommendations. www.merton.gov.uk/cpzvsw1.

The results of the consultation along with officers' recommendation were presented in a report to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Regeneration and Housing on 23 October 2017. The report and the decision sheet can be viewed on our website. www.merton.gov.uk/cpzvsw1. The following recommendations which were made to the Cabinet Member have now been agreed:

- To proceed with a statutory consultation to include Wool Road, McKay Road, Dunstall Road, Ernle Road, Peregrine Way, Strachan Place Woodhayes Road, Crooked Billet, Copse Hill between Nos 1 and 42 Nos (44-60 fall within proposed VSW2 CPZ) and West Side Common (Nos, 1 & 2 only) within the proposed VSW1 CPZ, operational Monday to Friday between 11am and 3pm.
- To proceed with statutory consultation to introduce electric charging points in Ernle Road.
- To proceed with the statutory consultation of the relevant Traffic Management Orders (TMOs) and the implementation of the 'At any time' waiting restrictions within the proposed zone.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

A Notice of the Council's intention to introduce the above measures 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 5 January 2018 quoting reference ES/VSW1. 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

www.merton.gov.uk

is also available on Merton Council's website www.merton.gov.uk/cpzvsw1 and at Wimbledon Library.

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.

The Council is required to give weight to the nature and content of your representations and not necessarily the quantity. Your reasons are, therefore, important to us.

Further information on how CPZs work, details of permit costs can be found in our Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ's) at www.merton.gov.uk/cpzvsw1

VILLAGE WARD COUNCILLORS

Cllr Hamish Badenoch

Phone - 020 8545 3396

Email: hamish.badenoch@merton.gov.uk

Cllr John Bowcott

Phone - 020 8946 1011

Email: John.bowcott@merton.gov.uk

Cllr Najeeb Latif

Phone - 020 8545 3396

Email: najeeb.latif@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)

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