



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

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

Date: 2 September 2015

Dear Councillor

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

The attached **Non-Key** decision has been taken by the Cabinet Member for Environmental Sustainability and Regeneration, with regards to Proposed RPC CPZ (Melbury Gardens, Laurel Road and Coombe Lane), Raynes Park - Statutory Consultation and will be implemented at noon on **Monday, 7/9/15** unless a call-in request is received.

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

Yours sincerely

**M.J.Udall
Democracy Services**

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

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

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

Proposed RPC CPZ (Melbury Gardens, Laurel Road and Coombe Lane), Raynes Park – statutory consultation

2. Decision maker

Councillor Andrew Judge, Cabinet Member for Environmental Sustainability and Regeneration

3. Date of Decision

1st September 2015

4. Date report made available to decision maker

4th August 2015 but accessed on return from holiday 1st September

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

6. Decision

To proceed with the proposed scheme for a CPZ in Melbury Gardens, Laurel Road and Coombe Lane

Reason for decision

As being in accordance with consultation responses in favour and officer advice on the yellow lines proposed. This should address issues of congested parking by non-residents.



7. Alternative options considered and why rejected

To do nothing, would not meet the concerns of residents

8. Documents relied on in addition to officer report

9. Declarations of Interest

10. Publication of this decision and call in provision

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

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

Notes

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

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

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

Note on exempt information in reports

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

(Constitution part 4B Section 10)

2 Decision maker

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

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

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

(Constitution Part 4B Section 22.1).

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

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

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

(Constitution Part 4B Section 22.2)

6 Decision

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

0

Reason for decision

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

7 Alternative options considered and why rejected

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

8 Documents relied on in addition to officer report

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

9 Declarations of Interest

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

(Constitution Part 5A)

10 Publication of this decision and call in provision

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

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

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

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

(Constitution Part 4E Section 17)

Cabinet Member for Environmental Sustainability and Regeneration:

Date: 24th July 2015

Agenda item:

Wards: Raynes Park

Subject: Proposed RPC CPZ (Melbury Gardens, Laurel Road and Coombe Lane), Raynes Park – statutory consultation

Lead officer: Chris Lee, Director of Environment & Regeneration

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

Forward Plan reference number: N/A

Contact Officer: Paul Atie, Tel: 020 8545 3214

Email: paul.atie@merton.gov.uk

Recommendations:

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

- A) Notes the result of the statutory consultation carried out between 14 May and 12 June 2015 on the proposals to extend the existing Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) RPC to include Melbury Gardens, Laurel Road and Coombe Lane (between 184 Coombe Lane and its junction with Coombe Gardens for the purpose of permit eligibility only), operational Monday to Friday between 11am and 12pm.
- B) Notes and considers the representations received in respect of the proposals as detailed in **Appendix 3**.
- C) Considers the objections against the proposed measures.
- D) Agrees to proceed with the making of the relevant Traffic Management Orders (TMOs) and the implementation of a proposed extension to 'RPC' CPZ to include Melbury Gardens, Laurel Road and Coombe Lane (Coombe Lane for the purpose of permit eligibility only), operational Monday to Friday between 11am and 12pm as shown in Drawing No.Z78-212-01 in **Appendix 2**.
- E) Agrees to proceed with the making of the relevant Traffic Management Orders (TMOs) in Coombe Lane for the implementation of single yellow lines operational Monday to Friday between 8.30am and 6.30pm as shown in Drawing No.Z78-212-01 in **Appendix 2**.
- 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 result of the statutory consultation carried on the Councils' proposals to extend RPC CPZ to include Melbury Gardens, Laurel Road and Coombe Lane.

- 1.2 It seeks approval to proceed with the making of the relevant Traffic Management Orders (TMOs) to include Melbury Gardens, Laurel Road and Coombe Lane (Coombe Lane for the purpose of permit eligibility only), into the existing RPC CPZ, operational Monday to Friday between 11am and 12pm (1 hour) as shown in Drawing No.Z78-212-01 in **Appendix 2**.
- 1.3 It seeks approval to proceed with the making of the relevant Traffic Management Orders (TMOs) in Coombe Lane for the implementation of single yellow lines operational Monday to Friday between 8.30am and 6.30pm as shown in Drawing No.Z78-212-01 in **Appendix 2**.

2. DETAILS

- 2.1 The key objectives of parking management include:
- Tackling 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.
- Pay and display only bays: - For use by pay and display customers only.
- 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 where parking impedes the flow of traffic or would create an unacceptable safety risk e.g. obstructive sightlines or unsafe areas where pedestrians cross.
- 2.4 Within any proposed CPZ, the Council aims to reach a balance between the needs of the residents, businesses, visitors and all other users of the highway. It is normal practice to introduce appropriate measures if and when there is a sufficient majority of support or there is an overriding need to ensure access and safety. In addition the Council would also take into account the impact of introducing the proposed changes in assessing the extent of those controls and whether or not they should be implemented.
- 2.5 The CPZ design comprises mainly of permit holder bays to be used by residents, their visitors or business permit holders and a limited number of pay and display shared use bays, which are mainly located near businesses. The layout of the

parking bays are arranged in a manner that provides the maximum number of suitable parking spaces without jeopardising road safety and the free movement of traffic.

- 2.6 As part of parking management, waiting restrictions are proposed at key locations such as at junctions, bends and passing gaps. 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.

3.0 HISTORICAL INFORMAL CONSULTATION

- 3.1 In 2012 after the implementation of the extension to RP CPZ, the Council received numerous emails from Cambridge Road residents requesting a CPZ in their road. Additionally, representations were collated and submitted to the Council as a petition by one of the Cambridge Road residents.
- 3.2 The informal consultation on proposals to introduce parking controls in the Raynes Park area commenced on 29 August and concluded on 27 September 2013. 1720 premises were consulted via documents containing a newsletter explaining the proposals; an associated plan showing the proposed parking layout; a pre-paid questionnaire reply card and a sheet of frequently asked questions. The consultation document was posted to all households and businesses within the catchment area. Notification of the proposals along with an online questionnaire (e-form) was also posted on the Council's website. An exhibition was held on Saturday 14 September 2013 at Raynes Park Library allowing residents and businesses to discuss the proposed measures with officers. It was attended by approximately 67 local residents.
- 3.3 The consultation resulted in a total of 683 questionnaires returned, representing a response rate of 39.7%. Of the 683 who responded, 39.2% supported a CPZ in their road, compared to 54.2% who did not and 6.6% who were unsure or had no response. Further analysis of the results on a road-by-road basis revealed that there were many roads in favour of the proposed controls and therefore these roads were recommended for inclusion within a CPZ subject to a statutory consultation. There were 378 returned cards from these roads.
- 3.4 Of the 378 responses, 55.3% supported a CPZ in their road, compared to 38.4% who did not and 6.3% who were unsure or had no comments. It was, therefore, recommended that Amity Grove, Cambridge Close, Cambridge Road, Conway Road, Coombe Gardens, Devas, Durham Road, Durrington Park Road, Hunter Road, Panmuir Road and Pepys Road be considered for a new CPZ subject to a statutory consultation. Residents were also asked which days and hours of operation they would prefer should a CPZ be introduced in their road. The results indicated 78.8% of respondents were in favour of Monday-Friday, compared to 9.8% who supported Monday-Saturday and 5.6% in favour of Monday-Sunday. 40.2% preferred the one-hour option, compared to 28.6% in favour of the 8.30am-6.30pm and 25.1% opted for 10am-4pm.
- 3.5 The results of the informal consultation were reported to the Street Management Advisory Committee and the Cabinet Member on 29 July 2014, after which the Cabinet Member approved the undertaking of the statutory consultation.

4. HISTORICAL INFORMAL CONSULTATION

- 4.1 The statutory consultation on the Council's intention to introduce the proposed parking controls in Amity Grove, Cambridge Close, Cambridge Road, Conway Road, Coombe Gardens, Devas, Durham Road, Durrington Park Road, Hunter Road, Panmuir Road and Pepys Road into the proposed RPC CPZ, commenced on 19 June and ended on 17 July 2014. 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, attached as Appendix 1, was also circulated to all those properties included within the consultation area.
- 4.2 The statutory consultation resulted in a total of 158 representations; after removing duplicates, the actual numbers of representations received were 149, 30 of which were in support of the proposal, 43 against and 50 comments. There were 16 representations and a petition containing 18 signatures from Melbury Gardens requesting inclusion. 12 representations were also received from Lambton Road, 2 from Laurel Road and 1 from Cottenham Park Road who wished for their roads to be included in the scheme. These representations are detailed in Appendix 3. A representation was also received by the Metropolitan Police with no comment or observation.
- 4.3 Approval was given to the making of the relevant Traffic Management Orders (TMOs) and the implementation of the proposed 'RPC' CPZ to include Amity Grove, Cambridge Close, Cambridge Road, Conway Road, Coombe Gardens, Coombe Lane (between Lambton Road and Durham Road), Devas, Durham Road, Durrington Park Road, Hunter Road, Panmuir Road and Pepys Road, operational Monday to Friday between 11am and 12pm. The scheme was introduced in February/March 2015 and became operational on 23 March 2015.
- 4.4 During the statutory consultation 16 representations were received from Melbury Gardens in support of being included in the CPZ, and also a petition containing 18 signatures in support of being included was received. The Council also received 2 representations from Laurel Road and a petition was also received from Coombe Lane to be included in the CPZ. Officers recommended and sought approval to carry out a statutory consultation to include Melbury Gardens, Laurel Road and Coombe Lane (Coombe Lane, yellow lines operating Monday to Friday between 8.30am and 6.30pm) into the RPC CPZ, operational Monday to Friday between 11am and 12pm. In the Cabinet Member decision for RPC CPZ, approval was given to carry out a statutory consultation to include the following roads into the RPC CPZ.

5. Statutory Consultation - Melbury Gardens, Laurel Road and Coombe Lane.

- 5.1 The statutory consultation on the Council's intention to introduce the proposed parking controls in Melbury Gardens, Laurel Road and Coombe Lane (Coombe Lane for the purpose of permit eligibility only) into the existing RPC CPZ, commenced on 14 May and ended on 12 June 2015. 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, attached as **Appendix 1**, was also circulated to all those properties included within the consultation area.

- 5.2 The newsletter detailed the following:
- Cabinet Member decision
 - The undertaking of the statutory consultation
 - A plan detailing the following:
 - Hours of operation of the zone (Monday to Friday, between 11am and 12pm)
 - Double yellow lines operating "At any time" without loading restrictions
 - Single yellow lines (mainly between parking bays and across dropped kerbs)
 - Single yellow lines in Coombe Lane operational Monday – Friday between 8.30am and 6.30pm
 - The various parking bays
 - Zone boundaries
- 5.3 The statutory consultation resulted in a total of 18 representations; 11 of which were in support of the proposal, 5 against and 2 comments. These representations are detailed in Appendix 3. A representation was also received by the Metropolitan Police with no comment or observation.
- 5.4 Originally, officer's proposal was to introduce yellow line restrictions Monday to Saturday. However, due to an error on the consultation newsletter, residents were formally consulted on Monday to Friday. It is, therefore, proposed that the single yellow lines in Coombe Lane operate Monday to Friday between 8.30am and 6.30pm as advertised.
- 5.5 Three representations came from Coombe Lane objecting to the timing of the single yellow lines because residents want footway to be available for residents to park after the one hour CPZ restriction. In accordance with the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1974, parking on any part of a footway is illegal; although there are occasions parking on footway can be permitted via an Exemption Order, provided there is sufficient footway width (minimum 1.5m). This exemption, however, does not apply where the footway comprises of a grass verge. Residents have requested single yellow lines to remove the illegal footway parking that is being caused by commuters. Although the single yellow line restrictions are being proposed, it is important to note that footway parking is banned in London and therefore illegal to all motorists, residents and commuters alike.

Ward Councillor Comments

- 5.6 Officers presented the results of the statutory consultation to local ward Members for comment. Ward Members e mailed the following: *'Thank you for confirming the operating times. We have no comments to make'*.

6. PROPOSED MEASURES

6.1 Based on the Statutory consultation responses, it is recommended that the Traffic Management Orders (TMOs) be made to extend the existing RPC CPZ to include Melbury Gardens, Laurel Road and Coombe Lane (Coombe Lane for the purpose of permit eligibility only) hours of operation Monday to Friday between 11am and 12pm and Single yellow lines in Coombe Lane operational Monday to Friday 8.30am – 6.30pm as shown in Drawing No.Z78-212 01 in Appendix 2.

6.2 The CPZ design comprises of mainly permit holder bays to be used by residents, businesses and their visitors with some 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.

Hours of Operation:

6.3 The proposed extension to RPC will adopt the same hours of operation of the zone, which is currently Monday to Friday between the hours of 11am and 12noon.

Permit Issue Criteria:

6.4 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.

Visitors' permits:

6.5 This zone will be the first zone that would be subject to a one-hour control and it is considered unreasonable to apply the current visitor permit tariff of £1.50 for half a day. A recommendation was put forward within the previous report (Street Management Advisory Committee report dated 29 January 2014) to create a new visitor permit for this particular zone at a cost of £1 for the 1 hour which was approved. The allowance of visitor permits per household shall be 50 permits.

Business permits:

6.6 It is proposed that the business permit tariff be the same as per zones elsewhere in the borough, with the charges of £331.50 per 6 months, with a maximum of only two permits per business without off- street parking facilities.

Teachers Permits:

6.7 For all schools located in CPZs the cost of the Permit will be £188 per annum.

Trades Permits:

6.8 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.

Pay & Display tickets:

6.9 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 £1.10 per hour.

7. TIMETABLE

7.1 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.

8. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

- 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 Being mindful of enforcement difficulties and expense involved, consideration could be given not to introduce a one-hour zone. However, this would be against the wishes of the majority who have opted for the proposed one-hour option.

9. FINANCIAL RESOURCE AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 The cost of implementing the proposed measures is estimated at £27k. This includes the publication of the made Traffic Management Orders, the road markings and the signs.
- 9.2 The Environment and Regeneration revenue budget for 2015/16 currently contains a provision of £260k for Parking Management schemes. The cost of this proposal can be met from this budget.
- 9.3 There will be additional Civil Enforcement Officer costs in terms of the need for additional 1 post at the cost of approximately £37k. Apart from enforcing the 1 hour zone, the officer would carry out other enforcement duties as required. This CPZ is likely to generate an estimated gross income of approximately £45k per annum. Legislation states that any 'surplus' revenue generated must be used in accordance with section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

10. LEGAL AND STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 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.
- 10.2 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 Cabinet Member in reaching a decision.

11. HUMAN RIGHTS & EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY COHENSION IMPLICATIONS

- 11.1 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.

- 11.2 By maintaining clear junctions, access and sightlines will improve, thereby improving the safety at junctions by reducing potential accidents.
- 11.3 The Council carries out careful consultations to ensure that all road users are given a fair opportunity to air their views and express their needs. The design of the scheme includes special consideration for the needs of people with blue badges, local residents, businesses as well as charitable and religious facilities. The needs of commuters are also given consideration but generally carry less weight than those of residents and local businesses.
- 11.4 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.

12. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATION

- 12.1 N/A

13. RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

- 13.1 The risk of not introducing the proposed parking arrangements is that the existing parking difficulties would continue and it would do nothing to assist the residents and the local business community.
- 13.2 The risk in not addressing the issues from the consultation exercise would be the loss of confidence in the Council. The proposed measures may cause some dissatisfaction from those who have requested status quo or other changes that cannot be implemented but it is considered that the benefits of introducing the measures outweigh the risk of doing nothing.
- 13.3 The risk of introducing a one-hour zone is that effective enforcement may not take place due to the size of the zone and limited available resource. Effective enforcement is likely to prove cost ineffective.

14. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

- 14.1 Before reaching a decision to make the necessary Traffic Management Order to implement a CPZ scheme, the Council must follow the statutory consultation procedures pursuant to the Road Traffic Regulation Act ("RTRA")1984 and the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure)(England and Wales) Regulations1996. All objections received must be properly considered in the light of administrative law principles, Human Rights law and the relevant statutory powers.
- 14.2 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.
- 14.3 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.
- 14.4 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.

15. APPENDICES

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

Appendix 1 – Statutory Consultation Documents


Appendix 2 – Drawing No.Z78-212-01

Appendix 3 – Representations and officers' comments

Statutory Consultation

Proposed Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) RPC - Melbury Gdns, Laurel Road & Coombe Lane.

ISSUE DATE : 14 MAY 2015



Councillor Andrew Judge
Cabinet Member for Environmental Sustainability and Regeneration
T: 020 8545 3425
E: andrew.judge@merton.gov.uk



the Cabinet Member for Environmental Sustainability and Regeneration. 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.

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. A copy can also be inspected at Raynes Park Library. This information is also available on Merton Council's website www.merton.gov.uk/cpzrpc. If you require further information, please contact Paul Atie directly on 020 8545 3214.

Dear Resident / Business

The purpose of this leaflet is to offer residents of Melbury Gardens, Laurel Road and Coombe Lane, between 184 and its junction with Cambridge Road, a further opportunity to comment on proposals to include these roads in the RPC CPZ that has recently been implemented. This is due to representations and petitions received from some residents during the consultation carried out in June/July 2014 requesting that these roads are included in this CPZ.

All representations received during the consultation for RPC CPZ along with officers' recommendations were presented in a report to the Cabinet Member for Environmental Sustainability and Regeneration in November 2014. After careful consideration it has been agreed to proceed with a statutory consultation to include your roads into RPC CPZ. The CPZ operating hours for Melbury Gardens and Laurel Road are proposed to be between 11am and 12pm while the single yellow line in Coombe Lane would operate between 8.30am and 6.30pm. This is in line with the rest of Coombe Lane which currently operates these hours.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

A Notice of the Council's intentions 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 to the **Head of Sustainable Communities, Merton Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, Surrey, SM4 5DX or email trafficandhighways@merton.gov.uk** by no later than **12 June 2015** quoting reference **P006 - 15**. Objections must relate only to the elements of the scheme that are subject to this statutory consultation.

All representations along with Officers' comments and recommendations will be presented in a report to

RAYNES PARK WARD COUNCILLORS

Cllr Adam Bush
Tel - 020 8545 3396
Email: adam.bush@merton.gov.uk

Cllr Stephen Crowe
Email: stephen.crowe@merton.gov.uk

Cllr Jill West
Email: jill.west@merton.gov.uk

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

Request for document translation

☐ RAYNES PARK TC PARKING AMENDMENTS

If you need any part of this document explained in your language, please tick box and contact us either by writing or by phone using our contact details below.

☐ Albanian

☐ Bengali

☐ French

☐ Korean

☐ Polish

☐ Portuguese

☐ Somali

☐ Spanish

☐ Tamil

☐ Urdu

අපි මෙම ලේඛන ඔබේ භාෂාවේ දෙසට පරිවර්තනය කිරීමේ සේවාව සැපයීමට සූදානම් වෙමු. (සියලුම පිටපත්වල පිටපත් සඳහා)

Si vous avez besoin que l'on vous explique une partie de ce document dans votre langue, veuillez cocher la case correspondante et nous contacter par écrit ou par téléphone à nos coordonnées figurant ci-dessous.

만일 본 자료의 일부를 본인이 이해할 수 없는 언어로 설명받으시려면, 상자에 표시된 언어를 선택하시고 전화나 팩스로 연락하십시오.

Aby otrzymać część tego dokumentu w polskiej wersji językowej proszę zaznaczyć odpowiednie pole i skontaktować się z nami drogą pisemną lub telefoniczną pod poniżej podanym adresem lub numerem telefonu.

Caso você necessite qualquer parte deste documento explicada em seu idioma, favor assinalar a quadricula respectiva e contatar-nos por escrito ou por telefone usando as informações para contato aqui fornecidas.

Haddii aad u baahan tahay in qayb dukaumentigan ka mid ah laguugu sharxo luuqaddaada, fadlan sax ku calaamadee sanduuqa oo nagula soo xiriir warqad ama telefoon adigoo isticmaalaya maciiumaadka halkaan hoose ku yaalla.

Si desea que alguna parte de este documento se traduzca en su idioma, le rogamos marque la casilla correspondiente y que nos contacte bien por escrito o telefónicamente utilizando nuestra información de contacto que encontrará más abajo.

අපි මෙම ලේඛන ඔබේ භාෂාවේ දෙසට පරිවර්තනය කිරීමේ සේවාව සැපයීමට සූදානම් වෙමු. (සියලුම පිටපත්වල පිටපත් සඳහා)

اگر شما نیاز دارید که بخشی از این سند را به زبان خودتان توضیح داده شود، لطفاً در کادر مربوطه علامت بزنید و با ما از طریق ایمیل یا تلفن یا از طریق پستی با آدرس یا شماره تلفن درج شده در پایین تماس بگیرید.

☐ Large print

☐ Braille

☐ Audiotape

Your contact:

Name.....

Address.....

.....

Telephone.....

Paul Atie, Merton Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, SM4 5DX

Drawing No.Z78-212-01

Representations and Officers' Comments

Representation - Support
Melbury Gardens
I am replying about the proposed CPZ in Melbury Gardens SW20. Yes please I want one. Since the last extension into Cambridge Road and Durham Road, Melbury gardens have been completely flooded with cars. As the road is not very wide or at least not as wide as Cambridge Road, when travelling up and down it becomes very difficult to pass because of the parked cars. Parents who bring their children by car from some distance away to the successful playgroup in the pavilion at Cottenham Park are unable to safely park due to the volume of already parked cars. There is the possibility of small children running between cars; an accident waiting to happen. In addition because commuter cars park so close to our drive it makes it very difficult to come out of the drive and turn either right or left.
I am writing to yourselves to state how in favour we are of the introduction of the CPZ in Melbury Gardens. With cars parked either side of the road all day long I witness every day mothers with young children edging their buggies in-between the parked cars trying to cross to the park. Also Wimbledon College boys on the way to tennis in the park dodging cars as they mount the pavement trying to turn round as there are no turning points. The introduction of the 1 hour a day control will bring back the pleasant residential community road we once had rather than the Raynes Park commuter parking we now have.
I am writing to you with regards the proposed extension of the Raynes Park CPZ (Melbury Gdns, Laurel Rd & Coombe Ln). I have already written following the introduction of the Cambridge Rd CPZ having seen first-hand the knock on effect of the restrictions on the residents parking on Melbury Gardens (see attached). I would like to point out that I am in favour of the extension of the scheme to include Melbury Gardens in the PRC CPZ as parking for residents has become extremely difficult as both commuters and park visitors have been swamping the road and the lack of restrictions have also made passing oncoming traffic very difficult due to the lack of yellow lines / restricted passing areas. Whilst this appears to have been taken into consideration on the proposed RPC extension drawing I would personally like to see restricted parking / yellow lines introduced around the park entrance adjacent to #61 Melbury Gardens. I also believe that there are not sufficient passing zones (yellow line exclusions) on Laurel Road which is a narrow road. The leaflet dated 14/5/15 explains that the proposed restrictions would be in place between 11am and 12pm though does not explain whether this will be Mon – Fri only or will include weekends. I would also like to add that I believe the Traffic & Highways department at Merton Council need to lend serious consideration to extending the CPZ to include Cottenham Park Rd as experience has shown that any 'overflow' (by way of displaced commuters) from the inclusion of Melbury Gardens in the CPZ would end up parking on Cottenham Park Rd / Oakwood Rd.
I support the CPZ proposals as listed above, we have one car and need it to get to emergency services work and are often unable to park anywhere near our home because others park up to four vehicles outside on the road, including a fleet of business vans that should be parked elsewhere.
Re the proposed CPZ in Laurel Road between 11-12 noon Monday to Friday, I believe that this would be a good thing as people who do not live here do leave their cars on this street for long periods. Please take this as agreement to the proposals.
Although we note that you only require people to contact you if they are opposed to the proposed CPZ for Melbury Gardens, we would like to affirm our strong support for the proposals for the CPZ.
With regard to the above CPZ proposal P006-15 I write to say I am totally in support of the proposal. Having been blocked in my drive this week and resorting to call the Police to try and have the vehicle removed the current situation has become untenable. Yes Please!
I would like to confirm that I am in favour of the installation of a RPC CPZ for Melbury Gardens. Since the implementation of the recent CPZ in surrounding roads, Melbury Gardens has been very severely affected by displacement of commuter and other vehicles. Melbury Gardens is a quite narrow road and very high density parking of vehicles, often with very close positioning on/over drive entrances causes great vexation to residents. This is a pretty intolerable situation. I very much hope that this situation can be quickly rectified.
I am a home owner - Melbury gardens - and would like to confirm that I am in agreement with Melbury Gardens becoming part of the RPC CPZ. The impact of adjacent roads having recently been included has meant a huge influx of commuters using Melbury Gardens to park their cars which has made driving and parking in Melbury difficult for residents.
I am writing to give my support to parking controlled zone in my road
Coombe Lane
As a resident on the north side of Coombe Lane I not only support the proposal of a single yellow line restriction 08:30-18:30 operational Monday-Saturday but would wish to see this extended to include

<p>Sundays. On Sundays (and occasional Saturdays) in particular from late August - April, we experience kerbside and 'two wheels on' pavement parking (and sometimes all four on the verges) as a result of sporting activities taking place at the sports field opposite. Parking invariably partially obstructs dropdowns posing a hazard for residents wishing to exit and enter their driveways. There have also been numerous instances of thoughtless parking adjacent to the bollarded refuge outside 234-238. In the process, for pedestrians crossing here (lots of children as well as adults) there is no clear pathway due to vehicular obstruction. Also, on occasions, eastbound buses have had to cross to the westbound carriageway at this point as they have been unable to squeeze past the parked vehicles. In any event, I would like to see double yellow lines or other appropriate road markings at this location. I see no reason why a seven day restriction would cause an issue. Parking for visitors to the sports ground would be freely available in Cambridge Road, Coombe Gardens, Avenue Road etc. on Sundays. And for visitors to residential properties, the same arrangement could apply but as most of the houses can accommodate at least two or three vehicles such a facility may be unnecessary.</p> <p>Officers Comment</p> <p>In accordance with the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1974, parking on any part of a footway is illegal; although there are occasions where provided there is sufficient footway width (minimum 1.5m) parking on footway can be permitted via an Exemption Order. This exemption, however, does not apply where the footway comprises of a grass verge. The proposed yellow lines and parking bays will better manage demand would remove majority of the illegal footway.</p>
--

Comments	Appendix 3
Melbury Gardens	
<p>In January this year I received notification that the CPZ in the Cambridge Road area would come into force in April this year and within that document paragraph 4 stated that Merton could "proceed with a statutory consultation to include Melbury Gardens and Laurel Road into the RPC CPZ, operational Monday to Friday between 11am and 12pm. This consultation will start soon. All affected residents will received [sic] leaflet at that time." The new CPZ actually came into operation on 30th March but in the meantime absolutely nothing was received at 7 Melbury Gardens until a document dated 14th May stating that the council was giving residents an opportunity to comment on proposals to include Melbury Gardens, Laurel Road and part of Coombe Lane within the existing CPZ. Is this your "consultation"? I am still fundamentally against the idea of CPZs which just seem an easy way of collecting extra money from residents for no extra services. But I expect that because of the number of cars arriving from other streets in the area to park for up to a fortnight at a time plus some commuters each day filling up the road, residents of the road will on the whole not object to being included in the CPZ and paying to park their cars in the road where they live.</p> <p>Office's Comment,</p> <p>Due to constraints, the council could not consult residents of Melbury Gardens and Laurel Road immediately after the implementation of Cambridge Road CPZ. These include resources availability and a ban on consultation for six weeks due to the election. The Council consulted residents almost immediately after the election. Concern against the CPZ is noted. Council tax revenue is not used to implement CPZ. CPZ's must be self-funding, any surplus is ring fenced for transport related issues.</p> <p>We are very concerned that the proposed parking restrictions, 8.30-6.30 would make it impossible for any visitors to park anywhere close to our house. The present pavement parking is often a nuisance, but we and our visitors can be part of it. If further restrictions are felt to be needed, we would prefer something similar to the 11-12 system, and some sort of residents permit. In any case the Saturday restrictions seem unnecessary.</p> <p>Officer's Comment.</p> <p>See section 5.5</p>	

Representations Against	Appendix 3
-------------------------	------------

<p>Melbury Gardens</p> <p>I am writing on behalf of Robert Baker, of the above address, who, being currently in hospital is unable to correspond in person. (his daughter)who wishes to object to the above proposals for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are sufficient parking spaces currently available for residents as a large part of Melbury Gardens has houses on only one side of the road, the park railings being on the other, properties up to nos. 64 are predominately houses rather than flats or divided front/back, and there are off road spaces and garages for the properties on Laurel Road. I counted the number of available spaces at 10am on a Monday morning(1st June) and there were 34 on Melbury Gardens and 16 on Laurel Road, see also attached photos. 2. The park is not open until 8am therefore, with no "short cut" route to the station the road is not particularly convenient for commuters 3. The method of consultation is unfair and insufficient. Unlike proposals for planning permission residents have not been individually notified, relying solely on small notices on telegraph poles or lampposts. Details are only available by visiting your offices or local library which is not practical for working people and no email address is given. Further if you study the map of CPZs on the Merton Council website it is out of date with the applicable roads not shown as a zone under consideration, and areas such as Cambridge Road which are now controlled, are only shown as under consideration. 4. The proposed measures also prevent local people needing to drive from visiting Cottenham park between 11am and 12pm preventing the use of a valuable public amenity (childrens playground, tennis courts, dog walkers), particularly affecting young families and older people unable to walk far. <p>Please would you therefore drop these proposals as unnecessary.</p>
<p>Officers Comment.</p> <p>During the statutory consultation some residents of Melbury Gardens petitioned the council to be included into the proposed RPC CPZ. If Laurel Road was to be excluded, it would be sandwiched between two roads with CPZ thereby causing parking problems for residents. Following the receipt of the petition, the Council consulted residents to find out if majority of residents of the road support the requested scheme. when an officer visited Melbury Gardens and Laurel Road, the parking was found to be bumper to bumper with some vehicles obstructing private driveways. The Council has received numerous complaints from the residents asking for the situation to be addressed. All residents of Melbury Gardens were sent a consultation leaflet including a plan of the proposed restrictions explaining the restrictions and what happens next. Notices were posted on street and also in the local newspaper (Guardian) and London Gazette. The controlled zone will remove commuters that park all day preventing those who want to use the amenities of the park from doing so. There will pay and display shared use bays along the park that can be used by people who want to park between 11am and 12 noon. All other times the bays will remain free Raynes Park residents use.</p>
<p>Laurel Road</p> <p>I am writing in response to a letter dated 14th May 2015 that proposes now including my road in the RPC CPZ that was recently implemented in the surrounding area. I am a resident of Laurel Road SW20 and I strongly object to the proposal to operate a controlled parking zone between the hours of 11am and 12pm. I have lived here for 4 years, with 2 cars in our family, and I have never had an issue with parking outside my property. I doubt I ever will. There are always plenty of spaces in which residents may park. A CPZ was implemented around the corner, in Cambridge Road and Durham Road (unnecessarily in my view), but this has in no way affected residents' ability to park in Laurel Road, or Melbury Gardens for that matter. In other words, it cannot be said that people without a permit, or those wishing to access local shops or even Raynes Park Station, are resorting to parking in Laurel Road; they are not. I therefore cannot see any justification whatsoever for proposing a CPZ. I can see though that Merton would value a CPZ as a money-making opportunity, through forcing residents to buy a parking permit for the sake of one hour per day. I objected to the proposal back in June 2014 and I object again.</p> <p>Officers Comment.</p> <p>During the statutory consultation some residents of Melbury Gardens petitioned the council to be included into the proposed RPC CPZ. If Laurel Road was to be excluded, it would be sandwiched between two roads with CPZ thereby causing parking problems for residents. Following the receipt of the petition, the Council consulted residents to find out if majority of residents of the road support the requested scheme. when an officer visited Melbury Gardens and Laurel Road, the parking was found to be bumper to bumper with some vehicles obstructing private driveways. The Council has received numerous complaints from the residents asking for the situation to be addressed. The controlled zone will remove commuters that park all day preventing those who want to use the amenities of the park from doing so. There will pay and display shared use bays along the park that can be used by people who want to park between 11am and 12 noon. All other times the bays will remain free Raynes Park residents use. The recommendation is based on majority support received.</p>
<p>Coombe Lane</p>

I have some grave concerns about the proposed new CPZ on Coombe Lane. I fear that the restrictions to allow no parking at all between 8:30am to 6:30pm on this road would make it very difficult for residents to call out tradesmen who require a place to park their vans while fixing or doing some work on our properties. Also it would cause difficulties for residents guests who are visiting during these hours. I realise there is a problem with commuters parking on this road in order to use the train station, and it is a nuisance, but I believe the new restrictions would be even more of a nuisance. The problem of commuters can be better dealt with by having parking restrictions between say 12noon and 1pm for example as I have seen elsewhere around the Raynes Park. This would effectively deter commuters and at the same time allow residents to have tradesman and guests park their cars outside our properties.

Officer's Comment.

See section 5.5

We would like to object to the proposed single yellow line on Coombe Lane operating between 8.30am and 6.30pm from Monday to Saturday. This is NOT in line with the rest of Coombe Lane, as stated in your publication - on our side of the road three houses up from us is "on-curb residential parking". We are the residential part of Coombe Lane and cannot be compared to closer into Raynes Park which becomes commercial area. We do have some off-road parking however not enough space for workmen, visitors (especially disabled), deliveries and people coming and going to pick up/drop off children, etc. There is no metered parking in close proximity to our house. We would however like to stop the commuters who park on-curb every day on Coombe Lane and would request you impose a time restriction, as per the rest of the area, of 11am till 12pm from Monday to Friday only. The commuters do not park on Coombe Lane on a Saturday and we therefore strongly object to any Saturday parking restrictions.

Officer's Comment.

See section 5.5

Merton Council - call-in request form

1. Decision to be called in: (required)

--

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

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

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

3. Desired outcome

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

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

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

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

5. Documents requested

6. Witnesses requested

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

8. Notes

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

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

The form and/or supporting requests must be sent **EITHER** by email from a
Councillor's email account (no signature required) to
democratic.services@merton.gov.uk **OR** as a signed paper copy
(Part 4E Section 16(c)(a)(iv)) to the Assistant Head of Democracy, 8th floor,
Civic Centre, London Road, Morden SM4 5DX.

For further information or advice contact the Assistant Head of Democracy on
020 8545 3361