

Q13 What are your thoughts on the Transport policies?

Answered: 28 Skipped: 137

#	RESPONSES	DATE
---	-----------	------

Merton new Local Plan

1

I'm struggling to understand how this section is a "sound basis for planning decisions", as described in the consultation introduction, as it does not cite any specific initiative beyond Crossrail 2 and the Sutton Tram/Bus link. As you acknowledge elsewhere, especially the Wimbledon section, Crossrail 2 is beyond the lifetime of this plan. I'm disappointed by this section, as it demonstrates a dire lack of imagination. > Section 6.4 – congratulation on the cover photo – it sums up Merton's approach to cycling and active travel quite well: the cycle path on Kingston Road stops half-a-mile from anywhere useful (like tube and railway stations) and, after crossing via the toucan shown in the picture, it then ends with a "CYCLIST DISMOUNT" sign. These signs are the most common form of cycling infrastructure across the borough, and demonstrate the attitudes, policies and design philosophy stuck in the 1980s. > Policy T6.4 (e) why is Mitcham omitted from this list of town centres for "good" development, especially as the whole Mitcham policy section is aimed at demolishing and rebuilding the centre? > Para 6.5.2: LIP document will describe how the council will deliver the MTS: shouldn't this policy document describe, at a strategic level, what outcomes the council is trying to achieve? This document is quite vague. > Para 6.5.3: the Healthy Streets framework should apply to public developments too e.g. the new secondary school at High Path. There was next to nothing in the planning documents about better travel, other than to cite the existing bus routes and tube stations. If the council wants high quality submissions from private developers, it should really role-model the desired standard on its own developments. > Para 6.5.4/ para 6.7.3: freight – this policy statement is limp. Given the impact that courier deliveries are having, shouldn't the council be bold and copy what the City of London is doing with freight consolidation centres, with low-carbon final mile deliveries? This would reduce traffic and improve air quality. > Policy T6.5 (d) – what is the Wandle Beverley Brook Link? It doesn't appear elsewhere in these plan documents. It has never been documented in a council committee paper. Why does so much of this stuff appear by magic? This is an example of a trend over recent years from Merton Council and its committees: there has been no substantive statement by the council about its active travel aims for several years (in terms of specific, funded initiatives), compounded by the Communities Committee's disinterest (cycling was dropped in 2017/18 from the committee's work programme, and not resurrected since). Initiatives such as the Beddington Lane shared-use pavement were never presented to committee or public consultation. The council's approach is opaque, almost to the point of paternalistic secrecy. > Map "Potential cycling infrastructure improvements" – what is this map intended to portray? Is it supposed to show *new* initiatives, or ones in progress? If *new*, then why is Croydon Road across Mitcham Common shown, when the shared-use pavement was built two years ago? If *in-progress*, then where are the quietway schemes? The Colliers Wood-Morden-Sutton quietway route is missing – or has the council dropped it? What's the line from Morden to the north-west of Raynes Park – it looks like it follows the Thameslink railway line? What's the purpose of this? If this is the council's intended cycling developments – then please think again. In the east of the borough, you need to work on north-south links across Streatham Vale to link with Quietway 5 running from Norbury across Lambeth and into Wandsworth? Is network planning too difficult? Similarly, you need to include north-south links across Mitcham Common via Beddington Lane to run into Sutton. The council has blown 2 years capital building 600m of shared-use pavement on Beddington Lane – why not make something of it? Again, east-west links are missing between Rose Hill – Raynes Park – Motspur Park. Sadly, this feels like the council is recycling the failed mini-holland bid from a few years ago. There are lots of good reasons why the bid failed. > Para 6.8.7: "town based cycle hubs (Morden, Colliers Wood and Wimbledon) – what are these? What is the council hoping to achieve? What's the planning policy/ies to deliver them? Why are these hubs not mentioned in the plans sections relating to Colliers Wood, Morden and Wimbledon? Why are Merton's other centres – Raynes Park and Mitcham left out? Given the council's investment – with Kingston – in the Raynes Park to New Malden cycle way, why isn't Raynes Park worthy of a hub? And why is Mitcham and the east of the borough left out? The east of the borough has poor PTAL and public health – wouldn't a strategic investment in active travel be of benefit? > Electric vehicles - charging points should *not* be on the pavement - they should be in the carraigeway in protected parking spaces. It is not acceptable for pedestrians (especially mobility/ visually impaired) to be hindered by yet more street furniture.

1/28/2019 10:54 PM

2

After review MCC are concerned that Merton's draft Local Plan 2020 does not demonstrate the necessary determination or assertiveness to significantly increase the number of people cycling in the borough or improve the current position of cyclists and other vulnerable road users. The Policy offers no Borough-initiated action, except in the new (yet to be published) LIP. Section 6.4.2 states that the LIP will be the means by which the Draft London Plan's Policy T5 requirement will be met; based on the experience of the previous LIP in which cycling was largely ignored by the Borough, MCC have little confidence in this as a means to achieve the objectives of the Plan. The 'contented cycling' cover photo of the Transport Section 6.4 is an example of the only time Merton has shown the necessary determination and assertiveness; however this was implemented in the mid 1990s. This now-vintage example of segregated

1/27/2019 6:35 PM

Merton new Local Plan

infrastructure has not been repeated, and is now is very poorly maintained. Not only has this visionary approach not been repeated in 20 years, it is an example of a piece-meal approach to cycling infrastructure that does not truly encourage cycling across the borough – just outside of shot the cyclist has ridden through a forest of bollards, and is approaching a give way sign that will see her potentially join a line of cars. Policy 6.4 The Potential cycling improvements map, page 6-21, has lines whose meaning is unclear superimposed on a map of Merton. The map needs to demonstrate clearly the routes, connections and type/quality of infrastructure that the Plan's policies aim to deliver, and explanatory text should be added. Ideally it would be integrated into the map setting out the transport options in the Borough, placing it on an equal footing with other modes. 6.4.2 states that the policy "Specifically ... sets out our approach and proposals for encouraging increased travel by sustainable modes", however it needs to be acknowledged that the only proven way to increase cycling is to provide safe, Continental-standard cycle routes and this should be a key policy objective of this document. 6.4.4 states that the "services people need are more likely to be available close by and within walking and cycle distance" but it does not acknowledge that without safe cycle routes (of which there are very few in Merton) people won't cycle - so the wording should be "services are connected to people by safe, Continental-standard cycle routes". 6.4.5 Freight: the policy does not address the need for freight consolidation or moving to cycle or electric delivery vehicles as means to achieve the sustainable transport objectives. Policy T6.5 says that Merton will work in partnership with development proposals and TfL, to deliver high quality links or the enhancement of existing pedestrian and cycle routes/networks, for which it refers to shared-use facilities like the Wandle Trail. For pedestrians these are a small part of their pavement 'network', whilst for cyclists existing routes of acceptable quality are few and far between, so in order to achieve the aims of the policy it will be necessary to broaden the ambition to achieving continental-style dedicated cycling infrastructure. Whilst we welcome Merton acting in partnership with the initiatives of other parties when it comes to cycling, we do not believe this will be sufficient to make cycling a favoured travel choice. In addition to this, Merton should have a stated policy to initiate transformative strategies and implementation programmes. The continuous and well-connected cycling routes described in Justification 6.5.2 offer connection between local attractors, but this does not lead cyclists to them from their homes. If, as in Justification 6.6.3, 80% of all trips are to be made on foot, by cycle or on public transport while incorporating 20 minutes of active travel a day, then homes in Merton must all be near to safe (i.e. low-traffic, low speed, segregated) cycle routes. For anyone in Merton an urban centre is no more than 10 minutes away by bicycle. The policy proposal at b. is unclear in its meaning, and the apparent focus on cycle parking rather than infrastructure in general will not in isolation make any significant difference to cycle modal share. We suggest the following changes are made to the wording: "Making sure that cycle infrastructure meets or preferably exceeds the minimum standards set out in the London Plan. Cycle parking and cycle routes must be designed to accommodate the needs of disabled cyclists and the dimensions of non-standard cycles. A proportion of cycle parking spaces should accommodate non-standard cycles. In particular, the policy must be to remove all chicane barriers and install no new ones, as even one will make an entire route unusable for a non-standard cycle. Instead, where poor sight lines or other factors could lead to conflict with other modes, alternative designs must always be adopted in accordance with Continental best-practice." At d. "High-quality links" should specifically refer to "Continental-quality links". The ambition expressed in Section T6.5 is high and one that MCC welcomes: "To make Merton a place where walking, cycling and public transport are the favoured travel choice when planning a journey". However almost nothing in the Plan gives any concrete, workable, measurable indication of what the council will actually do to bring this about. The nearest the Plan comes to a concrete proposal is in para 6.5.2, however the proposals are not measurable. We suggest the following altered wording: "This can be delivered by providing and completing safe, legible, continuous and well-connected walking and cycling routes to places where people wish to travel, accessible to users of all abilities, segregated where the presence and/or speed of vehicular traffic would inhibit their wide use; in particular, between local centres, transport interchange's and community facilities. We will also provide green chains and links to and between open spaces, adopt a predisposition to allow cycling in all green spaces and on public rights of way, remove prohibitions of cycling, and enhance the quality and accessibility of existing public rights of way, as well as opening up new access to open/green spaces and nature." 6.5.4 This section should set out how cycle hire/rental will be used to contribute to the achievement of the sustainable transport goals. The meaning of the policy statement at d. is unclear and we propose the following wording: "Developments should be car-free where possible as new parking spaces will generate more car journeys. To ensure that parking is not displaced onto the street, development proposals must also demonstrate a positive impact on the use of public transport, cycling and walking. This will include the use of S106 obligations to fund new cycle routes, pedestrian facilities, and public transport services." At f. Proposals for schools should include provision for safe cycle routes to the school to Continental standards. 6.6.4 should acknowledge that almost all parts of the borough have poor accessibility for cycles due to low-quality, poorly-

Merton new Local Plan

designed, poorly-maintained or non-existent cycle infrastructure, as well as the poor access to public transport which is acknowledged. The policy at c. should ensure that electric vehicle charging infrastructure should be provided in a way that minimizes street clutter, ideally located by existing telecom "green boxes" or street furniture, and should not occupy space that could now or in the future be used for active travel purposes (cycle routes, cycle parking etc.). 6.7.5 – should mention how cycle hire/ cycle share can contribute to the achievement of the sustainable transport objectives. This focuses on the need to "protect existing public transport infrastructure". It needs to also consider the need to protect existing and future cycle routes, both in terms of their existence, and ensuring that conditions (traffic levels, speeds, parked vehicles) do not deteriorate. Para 6.6.3 references the Mayor of London's target of 80% of journeys by foot, cycle or public transport by 2041. However this target is largely ignored in Sections 6.6, 6.7 and 6.8 which are almost all directed towards accommodating motor traffic.

3	I would like there to be more cycling lanes, but it needs to be accompanied with a cycling to work and school scheme. If young people feel safe riding their bikes to school they will do so to do their everyday activities. Curently cars take too much space in towncentres and it can be scary for novice cyclists.	1/24/2019 3:24 PM
4	How do the increased buildings and their occupiers get serviced?	1/15/2019 5:28 PM
5	n/a	1/7/2019 2:54 PM
6	The policy is short on detail on how active travel will be encouraged. The cycling route map is welcome, but more detail on how this will be achieved and a timeline for implementation would be welcome, and make it appear that the Council is serious about improving cycling rates.	1/7/2019 10:38 AM
7	6.4 - more work must be done with TfL to improve the air quality in wimbeldon, much of which is damaged by smokey buses (bizarrely the single deck buses are much more heavily polluting than the double deckers, no doubt because they are older). 6.7b - greater focus must be placed on controlled parking zones. There is so much abuse of the system that simply ordering permit free development is useless- every day I see abuse of the system, most notably through the visitor permit scheme, which I believe numerous residents buy and then sell on at a high profit as we have cars come to our street every day using a visitor permit and the driver then goes to the town centre and comes back again at the end of the working day.	1/6/2019 11:05 PM
8	Up until Friday 4 January (two days before the Consultation closed) this chapter was described online as the section that addressed "schools, healthcare, cycling, streets, travel"; after reviewing the document and noting that there was only one passing reference to cycling. (6.2.5) and very little on transport in general, MCC queried this with Merton Officers who confirmed that the Transport Chapter had not been published to the website. It was provided by email to MCC and an extension of two weeks offered to comment on this chapter, and the website was updated. We are therefore unable to comment on this section at this time and will submit our comments by the revised deadline of 20 January. Whilst MCC appreciate the extension, we are concerned that no other resident, group or organisation has been granted the same extension to comment on a crucial chapter of the draft Local Plan which interfaces with so many other policies and is in fact referenced explicitly as a means by which other objectives will be achieved.	1/6/2019 10:12 PM
9	There should be additional emphasis on management of the burden on traffic created by ride-hailing and delivery services. Currently these seem to operate with little management and they do not internalise the cost of the traffic they create.	1/6/2019 9:50 PM
10	-	1/6/2019 4:36 PM
11	This simply captures the schemes that are already in place. What are the plans for the next 20 years? This Plan is supposed to look at what Merton will look like in the future.	1/6/2019 4:34 PM

Merton new Local Plan

12	Currently while shops suffer and we still have a dependency on cars, relax restrictions on parking and allow cars to stop and buy things - create income and thriving shops from a 30 min parking ability so that people can actually buy things on way home rather than take the car out again to go to savacentre or tesco petrol station - where they can actually take the car. People are frequently exhausted by their working day - the thought of having to walk to a shop can be too much. Think it through. Stop penalising W3 and W4 at Christmas and bank holidays.	1/5/2019 8:20 PM
13	Not had time to consider. However, I use transport daily so vitally important to me (and may become more so as I get older and may not be able to walk such long distances). Would like better bus links from Morden to Kingston and also more direct bus service to Wimbledon Village from Martin Way area.	1/5/2019 2:34 PM
14	Ensure all transport is accessible and disability friendly.	1/5/2019 1:35 PM
15	Support in general but younger and older people can't use buses and bikes as much as mid life active adults so they have to be catered for too. This never seems to be taken into account. All policy maker should be made to take a day out with two toddlers and an elderly person, just to experience what its really like. Public transport has steps and stairs everywhere and long walks between one interchange and another which just can't be done with little or old legs.	1/5/2019 10:26 AM
16	crossrail 2 and tramlink 2 have to be supported.	1/4/2019 2:02 AM
17	lots of bicycle parking and cycle lanes, remove bus station, have zero facilities for cars. Build dedicated cycle lanes, CPZ borough wide	1/3/2019 3:26 PM
18	Insufficient emphasis on what measures there will be to aggressively reduce personal / commercial vehicle use - especially heavily polluting vehicles and thus improve air quality which is dire. More needs to be made on improvements to cycle / walking / public transport provision and resources. There is a real opportunity to make this a borough where people get out of their cars including lazy and over protective parents who insist on driving their kids to school -- please take this opportunity!	12/30/2018 10:57 PM
19	not linked on main page	12/30/2018 6:22 PM
20	We are utterly spoilt in Wimbledon. Couldn't be better!	12/28/2018 6:08 PM
21	no comment	12/27/2018 4:32 PM
22	Ok	12/25/2018 11:54 PM
23	It is not clear what is planned for Wimbledon Chase but great if the Wimbledon-Sutton link has a much more frequent service. At 3.4.14 - "Wimbledon Chase Neighbourhood Parade is served by a rail station, but could benefit from environmental improvements. Transport improvements for the Wimbledon Chase ... areas have already been identified, including widening roads to ease traffic flow and provide better facilities for buses, pedestrians and cyclists, with planting to improve the quality of the environment". The physical impact of these two statements is not stated? But as regards the pavements, it is to hoped that they remain as is. It is the Borough who installed a pinch point of the pedestrian crossing outside Tesco's. Surely it is not intended to incur costs removing it in order to widen the road - again? Most times of the day traffic flows freely through the Chase; there are build ups during the rush hour but in the main these are caused in the morning by the Hartfield Road level crossing backing traffic up as far as Wimbledon Chase! Closing off the exit from Dorset Road, near the crossing, would help. The pedestrian crossing in the Chase may cause some slowing in the opposite direction in the evenings but this could be improved somewhat by reconfiguring the frequency of the pedestrian crossing availability.	12/24/2018 11:29 AM
24	see section 20	12/20/2018 12:17 PM
25	Not available on the website	12/13/2018 12:21 PM
26	Very supportive of attention to areas that are poorly served by public transport such as Shanon Corner, and also of developing cycling infrastructure.	12/12/2018 9:17 PM

Merton new Local Plan

27	Crossrail 2 is crucial, but plans are needed even if this doesn't happen	12/12/2018 6:26 AM
28	Improving Wimbledon's already excellent transport links will further improve the vibrancy of the wider area.	12/10/2018 3:04 PM
