

Committee: Street Management Advisory Committee

Date: 30th September 2009

Agenda item:

Wards: Village, Hillside and Wimbledon Park

Subject: Wimbledon Area Traffic Model

Lead officer: Chris Lee, Director of Environment & Regeneration

Lead member: Councillor William Brierly Cabinet Member for Planning & Traffic Management

Contact Officer: Waheed Alam (020 8545 3200)

Key decision reference number: N/A

Recommendations:

That the Street Management Advisory Committee note and considers the content of this report and recommend that the Cabinet Member:

- 1) Note the results and comments received from the informal consultation carried out during August and September 2009.
 - 2) Note that a 7-day volume and speed surveys for the Wimbledon Area has been programmed to commence on 25 September 2009.
 - 3) Note that the traffic speed results obtained for Woodside will be reported to the Cabinet Member and the Street Management Advisory Committee, together with officer recommendations.
 - 4) Note that the proposed experimental width restriction in Belvedere Grove be changed to 7'00" to bring it in line with other restrictions in the area.
 - 5) Agree, that if the speed cushions in the Belvedere area are approved, they would be constructed in tarmac material.
 - 6) Consider the results and officer comments as set out in section 4 of this report and make the appropriate decision based on the options detailed within the section.
-

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND PURPOSE OF REPORT

This report has been produced with the purposes of:

- a) Reporting the results of the informal consultation carried out between August and September 2009.
- b) Seeking approval from the Cabinet Member for Planning & Traffic Management on which elements of option 8 should be taken forward for statutory consultation and possible implementation.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Over the last one and half year, various traffic management proposals have been investigated and tested for their ability to deal with the complex traffic problems, in particular for the Belvedere area and in general for the wider surrounding area. A milestone was reached with the detailed reporting of this work to the 'Street Management Advisory Committee' meeting of 3 March 2009.
- 2.2 Having considered the results of the work, the Street Management Advisory Committee concluded that a pre-consultation to seek views of Resident Associations and residents should take place. The pre-consultation took place during March/April, ending on 17 April 2009. Initial assessment of responses received showed that whilst two Resident Associations believed that road closures (as suggested by them) should be included as part of any final solution, others were of the view that 'road closures' should not be considered as they would limit the choice of routes for everyone and ultimately push traffic to other roads. There was some consensus on other traffic related matters such as speeding issues within Burghley & Calonne Roads, and the need for traffic-calming and speed reduction to 20mph throughout Wimbledon. The council investigated these suggestions and on the 10th of June 2009 the Street Management Advisory Committee (SMAC) considered an officer report on the 'Wimbledon Area Traffic Study' detailing a number of recommendations.
- 2.3 On 19 June 2009, the Cabinet Member gave his approval to all recommendations amongst which one was to proceed with an informal consultation on the latest set of proposals (Option 8 proposals).
- 2.4 Due to the complexities of the proposals, the preparation and approval of the consultation material took longer than expected. In order to have time to analyse and consider the outcome of the consultation in time for September SMAC, it was agreed by the Cabinet Member that it would be necessary to consult with the residents, local businesses and other organisations during the summer holiday period. Following ward members and Cabinet Member approval, the consultation documents (attached as Appendix 5) were delivered to the agreed consultation area with a start date of 5 August 2009 and end date of 4 September 2009.
- 2.5 In recognition that residents may be away at this time of the year, certain concessions were agreed to be afforded to respondents such as
- an additional 9 days over and above the standard 3 week period for return of questionnaires.
 - residents were given the opportunity to forward their responses online at www.merton.gov.uk/watm

It was also agreed that officers would make every effort to include any late return of the consultation responses. Responses received up to 14 September 2009 have been considered within the results reported in section 4 and appendix 2 of this report.

3. CONSULTATION

- 3.1 4223 consultation documents were delivered to all the premises within the consultation area. A total of 624 responses were received representing a response rate of 14.78%. 11 responses were considered void for various reasons, taking the total responses considered for reporting to 613.

3.2 A public exhibition was also held in Wimbledon Library on 15 August 2009. Approximately 50 people attended the exhibition where officers were present to answer queries regarding the proposals. Some attendees filled in comment sheets, which have been included in Appendix 4 of this report together with other correspondences received during the consultation. In general the main issues which many discussed at the exhibition were:

1) their objection to the proposed changes in use of permit bays to shared use bays.

2) their objection to the proposed speed cushions for the Belvedere area.

3) the impact of the Woodside/Wimbledon Hill Road junction changes which were implemented in 2004.

4) questions relating to how the consultation responses would be considered.

These issues are also mirrored within the overall results included in this committee report.

3.3 The proposals put forward for consultation covered a large area of Wimbledon and therefore it was necessary to consult a larger area that would reflect the proposals. The consultation area was agreed with the Cabinet Member prior to the start of the consultation. It is recognised that for each proposal, certain residents were likely to be less affected than others depending on their geographical location. For this reason, more consideration will be given to responses from those directly affected by the various aspects of the proposals and this was highlighted in the consultation newsletter and 'additional information' on the scheme web page. In order to address this issue all responses considered have been assigned a weighting point before reporting. This is explained below.

3.4 Weighting Principle

Appendix 1 contains a set of plans showing the consultation area and the consideration (weighting system) which has been assigned in the analysis to the responses from any particular road or section of road. The results / responses received on a road by road basis are also presented in a tabular format as Appendix 2. All roads / sections of road have been assigned a weighting point of 3, 2 or 1. A higher assigned number, means a higher consideration has been given to the response received. This allows comments from residents directly affected by the proposals because of their close proximity to the proposed measures to be given a higher degree of consideration over those further a field which are assigned a lower weighting.

This principle, has been applied to every proposal within option 8 thus requiring different weighting points for an area dependent on its location in relation to the proposal in question. It should also be noted that where within this report a majority either in favour or against any part of the proposals is reported, this relates to the results obtained after applying the weighting points. This may not necessarily relate to actual number of responses. Where the consultation area has been divided into two or more weighting groups, details of sections of each road for each group are given in Appendix 1 and 2.

4. **RESULTS OF THE INFORMAL CONSULTATION**

The following tables present the data both, as number of responses and also with the weighting applied to them. This has allowed a good comparison on how residents of various areas have responded to various questions.

Below each results table a short officer response is provided to explain the result. Options on how the Cabinet Member might consider responding in light of the results are also provided. However, as they are not exhaustive, it should be borne in mind that other worthy options may also exist which the Cabinet Member may wish to be explored.

4.1 Table 1

Q1. Do you agree with the proposal to introduce 'Waiting/Unloading' restrictions, Mon-Sat between 7am to 10am and 4pm to 7pm within the existing Pay & Display bays and the Disabled bay, located in the southern section of Church Road?												
	Total questionnaires sent to area (No's)	Total returns from area (No's)	Responses considered i.e. YES + NO + UNDECIDED (No's)	YES (No's)	NO (No's)	UNDECIDED (No's)	Yes (%)	No (%)	Undecided (%)	Yes <i>(Weighting applied to percentage)</i>	No <i>(Weighting applied to percentage)</i>	Undecided <i>(Weighting applied to percentage)</i>
Area assigned weighting 1	4223	613	574	321	180	73	55.9	31.4	12.7	55.9	31.4	12.7
Total Average to be considered for reporting in favour or against proposal										55.9	31.4	12.7

4.1.1 OFFICER COMMENTS:

The consultation results show that a clear majority of those who responded are in favour of restricting loading and unloading activities during peak times within the pay and display bays and the disabled bay in Church Road. This proposal would help improve the flow of traffic along Church Road thereby making it more attractive for motorists. There is likely to be a loss of revenue to the council as a result of shortening the operational hours for the pay and display bays. It is, however, considered that the benefit would outweigh the potential loss of revenue. If approved, it would be necessary to undertake a formal consultation. The results of the consultation would be reported to the Cabinet Member.

4.1.2 The Cabinet Member would need to consider the results and approve one of the following options :

Option 1 - Proceed with this proposal and agree to the undertaking of a formal consultation.

Option 2 - Do Nothing- This would be against the wishes of the majority of those who responded and would not help achieve the desired objectives.

4.2 Table 2

Q2. Do you agree with the proposal to introduce 'traffic calming' as proposed for Church Road?												
	Total questionnaires sent to area (No's)	Total returns from area (No's)	Responses considered i.e. YES + NO + UNDECIDED (No's)	YES (No's)	NO (No's)	UNDECIDED (No's)	Yes (%)	No (%)	Undecided (%)	Yes (Weighting applied to percentage)	No (Weighting applied to percentage)	Undecided (Weighting applied to percentage)
Area assigned weighting 1	4068	572	531	268	215	48	50.5	40.5	9.0	50.5	40.5	9.0
Area assigned weighting 2	155	41	40	21	14	5	52.5	35.0	12.5	105.0	70.0	25.0
Total Average to be considered for reporting in favour or against proposal										77.7	55.2	17.0

4.2.1 OFFICER COMMENTS

The results indicate that the majority of those who responded support the proposed traffic calming proposals for Church Road.

If approved, it would be necessary to undertake a formal consultation. The results of the consultation would be reported to the Cabinet Member.

4.2.2 The Cabinet Member would need to consider the results and approve one of the following options :

Option 1 - Proceed with this proposal and agree to the undertaking of a formal consultation.

Option 2 - Do Nothing- This would be against the wishes of the majority of those who responded and would not help achieve the desired objectives.

4.3 Table 3

Q3. Do you agree with the proposal to trial the use of speed cushions in the Belvedere Roads?												
	Total questionnaires sent to area (No's)	Total returns from area (No's)	Responses considered i.e. YES + NO + UNDECIDED (No's)	YES (No's)	NO (No's)	UNDECIDED (No's)	Yes (%)	No (%)	Undecided (%)	Yes (Weighting applied to percentage)	No (Weighting applied to percentage)	Undecided (Weighting applied to percentage)
Area assigned weighting 1	2865	349	331	138	155	38	41.7	46.8	11.5	41.7	46.8	11.5
Area assigned weighting 2	1164	177	163	77	78	8	47.2	47.9	4.9	94.5	95.7	9.8
Area assigned weighting 3	194	87	86	30	51	5	34.9	59.3	5.8	104.7	177.9	17.4
Total Average to be considered for reporting in favour or against proposal										80.3	106.8	12.9

4.3.1 OFFICER COMMENTS:

The consultation result shows that the majority are opposed to the trial of speed cushions as a mechanism to reduce rat running through the Belvedere roads.

4.3.2 The Cabinet Member would need to consider the results and approve one of the following options :

Option 1 - Proceed with this proposal and agree to the undertaking of a formal consultation. The results of the consultation would be reported to the Cabinet Member. To proceed with this proposal would be against the wishes of the majority and it is likely to be met with opposition during the formal consultation. It should also be noted that if the Cabinet Member decides to proceed with this proposal, it is recommended that the speed cushions would be constructed in tarmac, for reasons such as cost and practicality.

Option 2 – Do Nothing. This would do nothing to alleviate the concerns of the residents.

4.4 Table 4

Q 4. Do you agree with the proposal to trial a width restriction of 6' 6" within Belvedere Grove?												
	Total questionnaires sent to area (No's)	Total returns from area (No's)	Responses considered i.e. YES + NO + UNDECIDED (No's)	YES (No's)	NO (No's)	UNDECIDED (No's)	Yes (%)	No (%)	Undecided (%)	Yes (Weighting applied to percentage)	No (Weighting applied to percentage)	Undecided (Weighting applied to percentage)
Area assigned weighting 1	2865	349	328	144	136	48	43.9	41.5	14.6	43.9	41.5	14.6
Area assigned weighting 2	1164	177	160	64	88	8	40.0	55.0	5.0	80.0	110.0	10.0
Area assigned weighting 3	194	87	86	28	51	7	32.6	59.3	8.1	97.7	177.9	24.4
Total Average to be considered for reporting in favour or against proposal										73.9	109.8	16.4

4.4.1 OFFICER COMMENTS:

The consultation result shows that the majority in all three weighted areas are not in favour of the trial of a width restriction in Belvedere Grove. Though officers believe that this proposal in conjunction with the other measures for the Belvedere area would have a positive effect in reducing through-traffic in those roads, it is doubtful that this proposal in isolation would have the same effect. The Police have raised concern that the introduction of a width restriction at the proposed location is likely to increase response time for the London Ambulance Service (LAS) and London Fire Brigade (LFB). The LAS and LFB have not provided their comments.

4.4.2 If approved, a formal consultation would need to be carried out for a minimum period of six months starting from the date the 'Experimental Order' comes into effect. It should also be noted that in the event that this proposal is approved for implementation, officers recommend the width restriction be put in at 7'00". Recent investigations to the possible provision of this feature, has shown that the southern kerb lines of Belvedere Avenue at its junction with Belvedere Grove would also require to be built out in order to accommodate this feature, however the buildouts would not result in loss of any formal parking spaces.

4.4.3 The Cabinet Member would need to consider the results and approve one of the following options :

Option 1 - Proceed with the implementation of this experimental proposal (no further consultation with residents prior to implementation will be carried out). Residents will be allowed to comment (consultation period) for a period of 6 months from the date the relevant experimental Traffic Order comes into force. The results of the consultation would be reported to the Cabinet Member following the Statutory 6 months consultation period. To proceed with this proposal would be against the wishes of the majority and it is likely to be met with opposition during the 6 month 'post implementation' formal consultation period.

Option 2 - Do Nothing. This would do nothing to alleviate the concerns of the residents.

4.5 Table 5

Q 5. Do you agree with the proposal to convert all existing Resident Permit and Permit holder parking in the bounded area (as shown in drawing no. 2), to 'Shared Use' parking?												
	Total questionnaires sent to area (No's)	Total returns from area (No's)	Responses considered i.e. YES + NO + UNDECIDED (No's)	YES (No's)	NO (No's)	UNDECIDED (No's)	Yes (%)	No (%)	Undecided (%)	Yes (Weighting applied to percentage)	No (Weighting applied to percentage)	Undecided (Weighting applied to percentage)
Area assigned weighting 1	3587	418	385	247	80	58	64.2	20.8	15.1	64.2	20.8	15.1
Area assigned weighting 2	263	57	54	27	25	2	50.0	46.3	3.7	100.0	92.6	7.4
Area assigned weighting 3	373	138	138	14	119	5	10.1	86.2	3.6	30.4	258.7	10.9
Total Average to be considered for reporting in favour or against proposal										64.9	124.0	11.1

4.5.1 OFFICER COMMENTS:

The consultation result shows that the area assigned weighting point of 1 is in clear support of changing the Permit bays to 'Shared Use' bays in Lancaster Road and the Belvedere area. However, residents within the area where the change is proposed are very strongly opposed to the proposals. It should also be noted that the Council frequently receives complaints from the residents of Lancaster Road regarding lack of parking spaces for the residents and these proposals would exacerbate the current parking situation for the residents.

4.5.2 The Cabinet Member would need to consider the results and approve one of the following options :

Option 1 - Proceed with this proposal and agree to the undertaking of a formal consultation. The results of the consultation would be reported to the Cabinet Member. To proceed with this proposal would be against the wishes of the majority who are directly affected and it is likely to be met with strong opposition during the formal consultation.

Option 2 – Do Nothing.

4.6 Table 6

Q 6. Would you like to see more parking bays within the area wherever possible?												
	Total questionnaires sent to area (No's)	Total returns from area (No's)	Responses considered i.e. YES + NO + UNDECIDED (No's)	YES (No's)	NO (No's)	UNDECIDED (No's)	Yes (%)	No (%)	Undecided (%)	Yes (Weighting applied to percentage)	No (Weighting applied to percentage)	Undecided (Weighting applied to percentage)
Area assigned weighting 1	3587	418	390	229	115	46	58.7	29.5	11.8	58.7	29.5	11.8
Area assigned weighting 2	263	57	49	27	17	5	55.1	34.7	10.2	110.2	69.4	20.4
Area assigned weighting 3	373	138	135	48	77	10	35.6	57.0	7.4	106.7	171.1	22.2
Total Average to be considered for reporting in favour or against proposal										91.9	90.0	18.1

4.6.1 OFFICER COMMENTS:

The consultation results show that the areas assigned weighting points of 1 and 2 are in favour of additional parking bays in Lancaster Road and the Belvedere area. However, residents within the concerned area are opposed to this proposal. This is true when only considering numbers from each area. However, the population density and number of returns would need to be taken into account. Considering the results within the weight point system indicate that there is a marginal support for this proposal.

4.6.2 The Cabinet Member would need to consider the results and approve one of the following options :

Option 1 - Proceed with this proposal and agree to the undertaking of a formal consultation. The results of the consultation would be reported to the Cabinet Member. If approved, this proposal is likely to be met with some opposition from the residents during the formal consultation.

Option 2 – Do Nothing. This would not counter balance the negative impact of the proposed measures for Church Road parking bays. This, however, will only apply should the Cabinet Member approve the proposals for Church road.

4.7 Table 7

Q 7. Do you agree with the proposal 'raised entry treatment' at the junction of Belvedere Drive with Wimbledon Hill Road? Refer to drawing no.2 for detail.												
	Total questionnaires sent to area (No's)	Total returns from area (No's)	Responses considered i.e. YES + NO + UNDECIDED (No's)	YES (No's)	NO (No's)	UNDECIDED (No's)	Yes (%)	No (%)	Undecided (%)	Yes (Weighting applied to percentage)	No (Weighting applied to percentage)	Undecided (Weighting applied to percentage)
Area assigned weighting 1	4156	588	549	256	221	72	46.6	40.3	13.1	46.6	40.3	13.1
Area assigned weighting 2	67	25	25	12	11	2	48.0	44.0	8.0	96.0	88.0	16.0
Total Average to be considered for reporting in favour or against proposal										71.3	64.1	14.6

4.7.1 OFFICER COMMENTS:

The consultation results show that there is a reasonable level of support for this proposal when the appropriate weighting point is applied.

4.7.2 The Cabinet Member would need to consider the results and approve one of the following options :

Option 1 - Proceed with this proposal and agree to the undertaking of a formal consultation. The results of the consultation would be reported to the Cabinet Member.

Option 2 – Do Nothing.

4.8 Table 8a

Q 8a. Would you support a raised entry treatment in Alan Road at its junction with St Marys Road?												
	Total questionnaires sent to area (No's)	Total returns from area (No's)	Responses considered i.e. YES + NO + UNDECIDED (No's)	YES (No's)	NO (No's)	UNDECIDED (No's)	Yes (%)	No (%)	Undecided (%)	Yes (Weighting applied to percentage)	No (Weighting applied to percentage)	Undecided (Weighting applied to percentage)
Area assigned weighting 1	4198	596	552	198	265	89	35.9	48.0	16.1	35.9	48.0	16.1
Area assigned weighting 2	25	17	17	7	8	2	41.2	47.1	11.8	82.4	94.1	23.5
Total Average to be considered for reporting in favour or against proposal										59.1	71.1	19.8

4.8.1 OFFICER COMMENTS:

The consultation results show that the majority are opposed to the proposed raised entry treatment in Alan Road at its junction with St Marys Road.

4.8.2 The Cabinet Member would need to consider the results and approve one of the following options :

Option 1 - Proceed with this proposal and agree to the undertaking of a formal consultation. This would be contrary to the wishes of the majority who responded and is likely to generate strong objections during the formal consultation. The results of the consultation would be reported to the Cabinet Member.

Option 2 – Do Nothing.

Table 8b

Q 8b. Would you support a raised entry treatment in Belvedere Avenue at its junction with Church Road?												
	Total questionnaires sent to area (No's)	Total returns from area (No's)	Responses considered i.e. YES + NO + UNDECIDED (No's)	YES (No's)	NO (No's)	UNDECIDED (No's)	Yes (%)	No (%)	Undecided (%)	Yes (Weighting applied to percentage)	No (Weighting applied to percentage)	Undecided (Weighting applied to percentage)
Area assigned weighting 1	4198	596	554	198	265	91	35.7	47.8	16.4	35.7	47.8	16.4
Area assigned weighting 2	25	17	17	6	10	1	35.3	58.8	5.9	70.6	117.6	11.8
Total Average to be considered for reporting in favour or against proposal										53.2	82.7	14.1

4.8.3 OFFICER COMMENTS:

The consultation results show that the majority are against the proposed raised entry treatment in Belvedere Avenue at its junction with Church Road.

4.8.4 The Cabinet Member would need to consider the results and approve one of the following options :

Option 1 - Proceed with this proposal and agree to the undertaking of a formal consultation. This would be contrary to the wishes of the majority who responded and is likely to generate strong objections during the formal consultation. The results of the consultation would be reported to the Cabinet Member.

Option 2 – Do Nothing.

4.9 Table 9

Q 9. Do you agree with the traffic calming measures proposed in the relevant section of the newsletter? <i>Note: The relevant section of newsletter contains traffic calming for Burghley and Calonne Road.</i>												
	Total questionnaires sent to area (No's)	Total returns from area (No's)	Responses considered i.e. YES + NO + UNDECIDED (No's)	YES (No's)	NO (No's)	UNDECIDED (No's)	Yes (%)	No (%)	Undecided (%)	Yes (Weighting applied to percentage)	No (Weighting applied to percentage)	Undecided (Weighting applied to percentage)
Area assigned weighting 1	3145	307	268	84	147	37	31.3	54.9	13.8	31.3	54.9	13.8
Area assigned weighting 2	505	161	145	58	60	27	40.0	41.4	18.6	80.0	82.8	37.2
Area assigned weighting 3	573	145	142	64	71	7	45.1	50.0	4.9	135.2	150.0	14.8
Total Average to be considered for reporting in favour or against proposal										82.2	95.9	21.9

4.9.1 OFFICER COMMENTS:

The consultation shows that the majority are opposed to all the proposed traffic calming measures in Burghley and Calonne Road. However, when considering the results on the individual features (Q9(i) to Q9(vii)) the results show support for the introduction of these features.

Table 9i

Q 9(i). If you answered 'NO' or 'UNDECIDED' to Question 9, would you agree with Traffic Calming outside 35 Burghley Road? <i>Note: Question has been reworded for clarity within this report</i>									
	Total questionnaires sent to area (No's)	Total returns from area (No's)	Responses considered i.e. YES + NO + UNDECIDED (No's)	YES (No's)	NO (No's)	Yes (%)	No (%)	Yes (Weighting applied to percentage)	No (Weighting applied to percentage)
Area assigned weighting 1	3145	307	231	98	133	42.4	57.6	42.4	57.6
Area assigned weighting 2	505	161	118	62	56	52.5	47.5	105.1	94.9
Area assigned weighting 3	573	145	135	78	57	57.8	42.2	173.3	126.7
Total Average to be considered for reporting in favour or against proposal								106.9	93.1

4.9.2 OFFICER COMMENTS:

The results show that the majority are in favour of this traffic calming measure outside No 35 Burghley Road. If this proposal is approved 4 parking bays would need to be removed. Every effort will be made to add bays at suitable alternative location. This feature will assist the enforcement of the proposed 20mph speed limit within the vicinity. The removal/relocation of the parking bays and implementation of speed cushion associated with this traffic calming feature will require a formal consultation. The proposed build outs associated with this traffic calming feature do not require a further consultation.

4.9.3 The Cabinet Member would need to consider the results and approve one of the following options :

Option 1 - Proceed with this proposal and agree to the undertaking of the appropriate formal consultations (for removal of the bays; introduction of any new bays and the speed cushions). The results of the consultation will be reported to the Cabinet Member.

Option 2 – Do Nothing. This would not help to address the speeding and the general safety issues within the road.

Table 4.9ii

Q 9(ii). If you answered 'NO' or 'UNDECIDED' to Question 9, would you agree with Traffic Calming outside 58 Burghley Road? <i>Note: Question has been reworded for clarity within this report</i>									
	Total questionnaires sent to area (No's)	Total returns from area (No's)	Responses considered i.e. YES + NO + UNDECIDED (No's)	YES (No's)	NO (No's)	Yes (%)	No (%)	Yes (Weighting applied to percentage)	No (Weighting applied to percentage)
Area assigned weighting 1	3145	307	231	95	136	41.1	58.9	41.1	58.9
Area assigned weighting 2	505	161	118	62	56	52.5	47.5	105.1	94.9
Area assigned weighting 3	573	145	135	79	56	58.5	41.5	175.6	124.4
Total Average to be considered for reporting in favour or against proposal								107.3	92.7

4.9.4 OFFICER COMMENTS:

The results show that the majority are in favour of this traffic calming measure outside 58 Burghley Road. This feature will assist the enforcement of the proposed 20mph speed limit within the vicinity. The implementation of speed cushion associated with this traffic calming feature will require a formal consultation. The proposed buildouts associated with this traffic calming feature do not require a further consultation.

4.9.5 The Cabinet Member would need to consider the results and approve one of the following options :

Option 1 - Proceed with this proposal and agree to the undertaking of the formal consultation. The results of the consultation will be reported to the Cabinet Member.

Option 2 – Do Nothing. This would not help to address the speeding and the general safety issues within the road.

Table 9iii

Q9(iii). If you answered 'NO' or 'UNDECIDED' to Question 9, would you agree with the proposed changes at the junction of Calonne/Burghley Road? <i>Note: Question has been reworded for clarity within this report</i>									
	Total questionnaires sent to area (No's)	Total returns from area (No's)	Responses considered i.e. YES + NO + UNDECIDED (No's)	YES (No's)	NO (No's)	Yes (%)	No (%)	Yes (Weighting applied to percentage)	No (Weighting applied to percentage)
Area assigned weighting 1	3145	307	231	116	115	50.2	49.8	50.2	49.8
Area assigned weighting 2	505	161	118	66	52	55.9	44.1	111.9	88.1
Area assigned weighting 3	573	145	135	78	57	57.8	42.2	173.3	126.7
Total Average to be considered for reporting in favour or against proposal								111.8	88.2

4.9.6 OFFICER COMMENTS:

The results show that the majority are in favour of the proposed changes to the Calonne Road / Burghley Road junction. This feature would assist with the enforcement of the proposed 20mph speed limit within the vicinity and it will improve sight lines and reduce crossing distance for pedestrians. The proposed changes do not require a formal consultation.

4.9.7 The Cabinet Member would need to consider the results and approve one of the following options :

Option 1 - Proceed with this proposal.

Option 2 – Do Nothing. This would not help to address the speeding and the general safety issues within the road.

Table 9iv

Q9(iv). If you answered 'NO' or 'UNDECIDED' to Question 9, would you agree with Traffic Calming outside 15 Burghley Road? <i>Note: Question has been reworded for clarity within this report</i>									
	Total questionnaires sent to area (No's)	Total returns from area (No's)	Responses considered i.e. YES + NO + UNDECIDED (No's)	YES (No's)	NO (No's)	Yes (%)	No (%)	Yes (Weighting applied to percentage)	No (Weighting applied to percentage)
Area assigned weighting 1	3145	307	231	95	136	41.1	58.9	41.1	58.9
Area assigned weighting 2	505	161	118	61	57	51.7	48.3	103.4	96.6
Area assigned weighting 3	573	145	135	77	58	57.0	43.0	171.1	128.9
Total Average to be considered for reporting in favour or against proposal								105.2	94.8

4.9.8 OFFICER COMMENTS:

The results show that the majority are in favour of this traffic calming measure outside No 15 Burghley Road. If this proposal is approved 2 parking bays would need to be removed. Every effort will be made to add bays at suitable alternative location. This feature will assist the enforcement of the proposed 20mph speed limit within the vicinity. The removal/relocation of the parking bays and implementation of speed cushion associated with this traffic calming feature will require a formal consultation. The proposed build outs associated with this traffic calming feature do not require a further consultation.

4.9.9 The Cabinet Member would need to consider the results and approve one of the following options :

Option 1 - Proceed with this proposal and agree to the undertaking of the appropriate formal consultations (for removal of the bays; introduction of any new bays and the speed cushions). The results of the consultation will be reported to the Cabinet Member.

Option 2 – Do Nothing. This would not help to address the speeding and the general safety issues within the road.

Table 9v

Q9(v). If you answered 'NO' or 'UNDECIDED' to Question 9, would you agree with Traffic Calming outside 32 Calonne Road? <i>Note: Question has been reworded for clarity within this report</i>									
	Total questionnaires sent to area (No's)	Total returns from area (No's)	Responses considered i.e. YES + NO + UNDECIDED (No's)	YES (No's)	NO (No's)	Yes (%)	No (%)	Yes (Weighting applied to percentage)	No (Weighting applied to percentage)
Area assigned weighting 1	3145	307	231	94	137	40.7	59.3	40.7	59.3
Area assigned weighting 2	505	161	118	64	54	54.2	45.8	108.5	91.5
Area assigned weighting 3	573	145	135	75	60	55.6	44.4	166.7	133.3
Total Average to be considered for reporting in favour or against proposal								105.3	94.7

4.9.10 OFFICER COMMENTS:

The results show that the majority are in favour of this traffic calming measure outside No 32 Calonne Road. If this proposal is approved 4 parking bays would need to be removed. Every effort will be made to add bays at suitable alternative location. This feature will assist the enforcement of the proposed 20mph speed limit within the vicinity. The removal/relocation of the parking bays and implementation of speed cushion associated with this traffic calming feature will require a formal consultation. The proposed build outs associated with this traffic calming feature do not require a further consultation.

4.9.10 The Cabinet Member would need to consider the results and approve one of the following options :

Option 1 - Proceed with this proposal and agree to the undertaking of the appropriate formal consultations (for removal of the bays; introduction of any new bays and the speed cushions). The results of the consultation will be reported to the Cabinet Member.

Option 2 – Do Nothing. This would not help to address the speeding and the general safety issues within the road.

Table 9vi

Q 9(vi). If you answered 'NO' or 'UNDECIDED' to Question 9, would you agree with the proposed highway changes at the junction of Burghley/Marryat Road? <i>Note: Question has been reworded for clarity within this report</i>									
	Total questionnaires sent to area (No's)	Total returns from area (No's)	Responses considered i.e. YES + NO + UNDECIDED (No's)	YES (No's)	NO (No's)	Yes (%)	No (%)	Yes (Weighting applied to percentage)	No (Weighting applied to percentage)
Area assigned weighting 1	3145	307	231	111	120	48.1	51.9	48.1	51.9
Area assigned weighting 2	505	161	118	69	49	58.5	41.5	116.9	83.1
Area assigned weighting 3	573	145	135	80	55	59.3	40.7	177.8	122.2
Total Average to be considered for reporting in favour or against proposal								114.3	85.7

4.9.11 OFFICER COMMENTS:

The results show that the majority are in favour of the proposed changes to the Burghley/Marryat Road junction. This feature would assist with the enforcement of the proposed 20mph speed limit within the vicinity; improve sight lines and reduce crossing distance for pedestrians. The proposed speed table will require the undertaking of a formal consultation.

4.9.12 The Cabinet Member would need to consider the results and approve one of the following options :

Option 1 - Proceed with this proposal and agree to the undertaking of the formal consultations. The results of the consultation will be reported to the Cabinet Member.

Option 2 – Do Nothing. This would not help to address the speeding and the general safety issues within the road.

Table 9vii

Q 9(vii). If you answered 'NO' or 'UNDECIDED' to Question 9, would you agree with the proposed highway changes at the junction of Burghley/Church/St Marys Road? <i>Note: Question has been reworded for clarity within this report</i>									
	Total questionnaires sent to area (No's)	Total returns from area (No's)	Responses considered i.e. YES + NO + UNDECIDED (No's)	YES (No's)	NO (No's)	Yes (%)	No (%)	Yes (Weighting applied to percentage)	No (Weighting applied to percentage)
Area assigned weighting 1	3145	307	231	115	116	49.8	50.2	49.8	50.2
Area assigned weighting 2	505	161	118	65	53	55.1	44.9	110.2	89.8
Area assigned weighting 3	573	145	135	83	52	61.5	38.5	184.4	115.6
Total Average to be considered for reporting in favour or against proposal								114.8	85.2

4.9.13 OFFICER COMMENTS:

The results show that the majority are in favour of the proposed changes to the Burghley/Church/St Marys Road junction. This feature would assist with the enforcement of the proposed 20mph speed limit within the vicinity; improve sight lines and reduce crossing distance for pedestrians. The proposed speed table will require the undertaking of a formal consultation.

4.9.14 The Cabinet Member would need to consider the results and approve one of the following options :

Option 1 - Proceed with this proposal and agree to the undertaking of the formal consultations. The results of the consultation will be reported to the Cabinet Member.

Option 2 – Do Nothing. This would not help to address the speeding and the general safety issues within the road.

Table 10

Q 10) Would you support an additional road narrowing (prioritised working) coupled with speed cushions outside No. 17 Calonne Road? Please note that this feature is not shown in the drawings and parking will be affected. This feature would be similar to the one proposed outside No. 32 Calonne Road.												
	Total questionnaires sent to area (No's)	Total returns from area (No's)	Responses considered i.e. YES + NO + UNDECIDED (No's)	YES (No's)	NO (No's)	UNDECIDED (No's)	Yes (%)	No (%)	Undecided (%)	Yes (Weighting applied to percentage)	No (Weighting applied to percentage)	Undecided (Weighting applied to percentage)
Area assigned weighting 1	3145	307	261	50	147	64	19.2	56.3	24.5	19.2	56.3	24.5
Area assigned weighting 2	505	161	141	29	64	48	20.6	45.4	34.0	41.1	90.8	68.1
Area assigned weighting 3	573	145	140	28	77	35	20.0	55.0	25.0	60.0	165.0	75.0
Total Average to be considered for reporting in favour or against proposal										40.1	104.0	55.9

4.10 OFFICER COMMENTS:

The results show that the majority are opposed to the proposed traffic calming measure outside No17 Calonne Road. The proposed measure will require the undertaking of a formal consultation. The parking bays would be affected the extent of which has not yet been determined. Any change to the parking bays and the introduction of a speed cushion would require the appropriate formal consultation.

4.10.1 The Cabinet Member would need to consider the results and approve one of the following options :

Option 1 - Proceed with this proposal and agree to the undertaking of the formal consultations. This would be against the wishes of the majority and is likely to attract objections during the formal consultation. The results of the consultation will be reported to the Cabinet Member.

Option 2 – Do Nothing. This would not help to address the speeding and the general safety issues within the road.

Table 11

Q11) Would you support three abreast speed cushions outside No. 9a Calonne Road? Please note that this feature is not shown in the drawings and parking will not be affected in this case.												
	Total questionnaires sent to area (No's)	Total returns from area (No's)	Responses considered i.e. YES + NO + UNDECIDED (No's)	YES (No's)	NO (No's)	UNDECIDED (No's)	Yes (%)	No (%)	Undecided (%)	Yes (Weighting applied to percentage)	No (Weighting applied to percentage)	Undecided (Weighting applied to percentage)
Area assigned weighting 1	3145	307	262	53	141	68	20.2	53.8	26.0	20.2	53.8	26.0
Area assigned weighting 2	505	161	140	34	58	48	24.3	41.4	34.3	48.6	82.9	68.6
Area assigned weighting 3	573	145	138	28	76	34	20.3	55.1	24.6	60.9	165.2	73.9
Total Average to be considered for reporting in favour or against proposal										43.2	100.6	56.1

4.11 OFFICER COMMENTS:

The results show that the majority are opposed to the proposed traffic calming measure outside No 9a Calonne Road. The proposed measure will require the undertaking of a formal consultation.

4.11.1 The Cabinet Member would need to consider the results and approve one of the following options :

Option 1 - Proceed with this proposal and agree to the undertaking of the formal consultations. This would be against the wishes of the majority and is likely to attract objections during the formal consultation. The results of the consultation will be reported to the Cabinet Member.

Option 2 – Do Nothing. This would not help to address the speeding and the general safety issues within the road

Table 12

Q12. Do you agree with ALL the proposed changes to Wimbledon Hill Road as described in the newsletter? If NO or UNDECIDED, please explain clearly which part/s of the proposal you do not support or are undecided about, together with reasons.												
	Total questionnaires sent to area (No's)	Total returns from area (No's)	Responses considered i.e. YES + NO + UNDECIDED (No's)	YES (No's)	NO (No's)	UNDECIDED (No's)	Yes (%)	No (%)	Undecided (%)	Yes (Weighting applied to percentage)	No (Weighting applied to percentage)	Undecided (Weighting applied to percentage)
Area assigned weighting 1	4223	613	575	320	194	61	55.7	33.7	10.6	55.7	33.7	10.6
Total Average to be considered for reporting in favour or against proposal										55.7	33.7	10.6

4.12 OFFICER COMMENTS:

The results show that a clear majority of those who responded are in favour of the proposed changes to Wimbledon Hill Road and its junctions with Woodside, Mansell Road and Alexandra Road. This proposal is likely to improve the flow of traffic along Wimbledon Hill Road, which in turn may benefit the Belvedere area to combat rat running.

4.12.1 The Cabinet Member would need to consider the results and approve one of the following options :

Option 1 - Proceed with this proposal.

Option 2 – Do Nothing.

Table 4.13

Q13) Do you support the proposed changes to the existing 7.5 tonne Lorry Ban for the area shown in the figure within the proposal?												
	Total questionnaires sent to area (No's)	Total returns from area (No's)	Responses considered i.e. YES + NO + UNDECIDED (No's)	YES (No's)	NO (No's)	UNDECIDED (No's)	Yes (%)	No (%)	Undecided (%)	Yes (Weighting applied to percentage)	No (Weighting applied to percentage)	Undecided (Weighting applied to percentage)
Area assigned weighting 1	1841	294	276	195	48	33	70.7	17.4	12.0	70.7	17.4	12.0
Area assigned weighting 2	2382	319	293	216	45	32	73.7	15.4	10.9	147.4	30.7	21.8
Total Average to be considered for reporting in favour or against proposal										109.0	24.1	16.9

4.13 OFFICER COMMENTS:

The results show that a clear majority of those who responded are in favour of the proposed changes to the existing lorry ban. Although this proposal is likely to benefit the residents with regards to a slight decrease in volume of traffic, the residents and the local businesses within the area will not be able to receive deliveries by vehicles of 7.5T and above. However, this fact is recognised by those who responded in favour of the change as the advantages outweigh the disadvantages.

4.13.1 The Cabinet Member would need to consider the results and approve one of the following options :

Option 1 - Proceed with this proposal. This would be in line with the wishes of the majority who responded.

Option 2 – Do Nothing.

Table 14

Q 14) Do you support the proposed 20mph speed limit for the area shown in drawing no. 1A?												
	Total questionnaires sent to area (No's)	Total returns from area (No's)	Responses considered i.e. YES + NO + UNDECIDED (No's)	YES (No's)	NO (No's)	UNDECIDED (No's)	Yes (%)	No (%)	Undecided (%)	Yes (Weighting applied to percentage)	No (Weighting applied to percentage)	Undecided (Weighting applied to percentage)
Area assigned weighting 1	4223	613	580	384	168	28	66.2	29.0	4.8	66.2	29.0	4.8
Total Average to be considered for reporting in favour or against proposal										66.2	29.0	4.8

4.14 OFFICER COMMENTS:

The results show that a clear majority of those who responded are in favour of the proposed 20mph speed limit for the area. This would require the undertaking of a formal consultation and the results will be reported to the Cabinet Member.

4.14.1 The Cabinet Member would need to consider the results and approve one of the following options :

Option 1 - Proceed with this proposal and the undertaking of a formal consultation. This would be in line with the wishes of the majority who responded.

Option 2 – Do Nothing.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The work to date has been funded through Merton's 2009/10 Capital Programme of £108,000 for Wimbledon Area Traffic Study. A further £72,000 is currently available for 2010/11 for the Wimbledon Area Traffic Study. Pending Cabinet Member's decision regarding the proposed measures, further funding will be required to undertake the appropriate formal consultations and possible implementations. This cost will be dependent on the extent of the agreed works.

6. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 The Traffic Management Orders for a 20mph speed limit would be made under Section 84 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended); and Section 9 of the Act enable the highway authority to carry out an experimental scheme of traffic control (an experimental traffic order). An experimental traffic order remains in force for a maximum of 18 months.
- 6.2 The proposed junction speed table can be introduced under powers conferred by Section 90A of the Highways Act 1980 (as amended). A Notice must be published detailing the proposals, and a minimum of 21 days to invite representation. No Order is required.
- 6.3 The TMOs for the amendments to the parking bay 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.

- 6.4 All road markings and signage will be in accordance with TSRGD 2002.

7. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

- 7.1 Detailed within the results section of this report.

8. HUMAN RIGHTS & EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 The implementation of the proposals will affect all sections of the community. The proposed measures aim to improve conditions for the residents of the area together with those using Wimbledon Hill Road. This is to be achieved by discouraging through-traffic from the residential roads onto the Distributor Roads.
- 8.2 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 needs of the residents are given consideration but it is considered that improving safety on the borough roads take priority over environmental issues like noise and pollution. The undertaking of a formal consultation will provide a further opportunity for the local community to air their views.
- 8.3 Bodies representing motorists, including commuters are included in the statutory consultation required for draft traffic management and similar orders.
- 8.4 The implementation of 20 mph speed limit affects all sections of the community especially the young and the elderly; and assists in improving safety for all road users as well as achieving Merton's commitment in reducing speed, casualty and severity of road traffic accidents.

9. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

9.1 Not applicable

10. RISK MANAGEMENT AND HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 The introduction of the proposed speed cushions within some of the areas may result in an increased or no change in noise levels. This depends on driver behaviour and type of vehicle. Speed cushions will be constructed in such a manner so as to allow larger vehicles to straddle thereby minimizing noise and vibration.
- 10.2 The road safety implications/risks during construction and maintenance will have to be fully considered at each stage of the detailed design process.
- 10.3 As this is a Merton Capital funded scheme, TfL are not obliged to undertake a road Safety Audit. No Safety Audit has been undertaken by external consultants, however one will be required in accordance with the Highways Agency design note on Road Safety Audits.
- 10.4 The Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 1994 will apply to these proposals. Therefore when undertaking its duties as Client and Designer under these regulations, the Council follows the Approved Code of Practice, 'Managing Health and Safety in Construction', published by the Health and Safety Commission. The Planning Supervisor appointed for this scheme is F.M.Conway Ltd. Potential risks will have to be identified during the detailed design stage.
- 10.5 One risk that has been identified are the impact of one of the measures on cyclists. Currently pedal cyclists have a comparatively safe environment on the approach to the junction of Wimbledon Hill Road and Woodside. This is in the form of a marked advisory cycle lane. However the proposed changes to this junction will require this short stretch of cycle lane to be removed which could expose cyclists to an increase in risk of conflict with the mainstream traffic.

Appendices – the following documents are to be published with this report and form part of the report

Appendix 1	Weighting plans
Appendix 2	Consultation Responses to Questionnaire
Appendix 3	Consultation reply card comments
Appendix 4	General Consultation Correspondence and Public Exhibition Comments
Appendix 5	Consultation material
Appendix 6	Website Additional Information

Background Papers – the following documents have been relied on in drawing up this report but do not form part of the report

Street Management Overview & Scrutiny Panel report dated 26th November 2003.

Street Management Overview & Scrutiny Panel report dated 30th March 2005.

Cabinet Street Management Committee report dated 20th July 2005.

Cabinet Street Management Committee report dated 29th September 2005.

Cabinet Street Management Advisory Committee report dated 15th January 2008.

Cabinet Street Management Advisory Committee report dated 17th June 2008.
Cabinet Street Management Advisory Committee report dated 13th March 2009.
Cabinet Street Management Advisory Committee report dated 10th June 2009.
Cabinet Street Management Advisory Committee report dated 10th June 2009.
Cabinet Member decision dated 18th June 2009

Contacts

- Report author:
 - Name: Waheed Alam
 - Tel: 020 8545 3200
 - email: waheed.alam@merton.gov.uk
- Meeting arrangements – Democratic Services:
 - email: democratic.services@merton.gov.uk
 - Tel: 020 8545 3356/3357/3359/3361/3616
- All press contacts – Merton's Press office:
 - email: press@merton.gov.uk
 - Tel: 020 8545 3181
- London Borough of Merton:
 - Address: Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, SM4 5DX
 - Tel: 020 8274 4901

Useful links

Merton Council's Web site: <http://www.merton.gov.uk>

Readers should note the terms of the legal information (disclaimer) regarding information on Merton Council's and third party linked websites.

<http://www.merton.gov.uk/legal.htm>

This disclaimer also applies to any links provided here.