

Confirm Number 22016236

(Resident Arthur Road)

Dear Sir,

Re:- **Wimbledon Area Traffic Study. Statutory Consultation.**

I wish to make the following observations upon the latest proposal to reorganise the roads in my Town.

I must say that I feel that this proposal really does not represent responsible expenditure at this time of financial stringency. The Council cannot possibly justify such a significant outlay, to its residents, when it is bound to be seeking re-election on a manifesto of financial prudence, sensible expenditure, savings options, value for money and cost control, whilst promising to maintain, and where possible, enhance services to its taxpayers.

Any expenditure on highways matters at this time, and in the foreseeable future, should be directed at repairing the damaged roads and pavements, potholes, broken kerbs, and sunken manholes, so prevalent throughout the Borough, and so dangerous to vehicles, cycles, and pedestrians.

This project should be abandoned until all the more important matters have been addressed.

Although not completely ideal, the present movement arrangements work well enough within in the broader aspect of overall traffic in the SW19/20 area.

Reference:- **ES/SGE/WATS/WL**

I disagree with this proposal to introduce waiting/loading restrictions in Church Road, as shown on Drawing No Z36-24-09 because:-

1. There is no obvious advantage in introducing these loading and waiting restrictions in Church Road, save to penalise local residents and traders, by reducing the available parking time for shopping. If the double yellow line in this section of the road was to be "diligently enforced" there is, in reality, very little continuous significant congestion in this part of the street.

It is the area farther down the street, opposite Belvedere Square, that the spasmodic congestion occurs, and which is caused by the existing parking bays making the road way too narrow for vehicles to pass. The parking bays in this location, opposite Belvedere Square, should be reduced in number to solve the problem.

2. The removal of some of the parking bays in the section of Church Road, (opposite Courthope Road), and their conversion to "Loading Bays" would serve the residents and shopkeepers much better than "additional waiting restrictions", and it would remove the pressure to park on the double yellow lines.

Reference:- **ES/SGE/WATS/PA.**

I disagree with the proposal to convert residents permit and permit holder parking bays to shared use in all the prescribed roads as shown on drawing No Z36-24-09.

Because:-

1. Local residents will be greatly disadvantaged. Although the majority of dwellings in this area have some off street parking, there remains the need for some "reserved" resident permit holder bays to always be available for residents' visitors, and also for the trades-people serving the residents throughout the area, who can offer them their visitors' permits. This proposal will effectively, and significantly, increase the amount of parking spaces open to "non residents" at the expense of residents. This, although increasing the Council's income from parking charges in the locality, (please refer to the 1984 Road Traffic Regulation Act), it will severely disadvantage residents, and equally, it would also, hypocritically, depart from the Council's stated policy of deterring and reducing business journeys, emissions, and commercial parking in the area!

Reference **ES/SGE/WATS/20**

I disagree with the proposal for a 20 mph speed limit in the area shown on Drawing No Z36-24-12 because:-

1. The scheme, in itself, will achieve very little because all the carriageway obstructions, both existing, and proposed if implemented, will achieve a commensurate reduction in the speed of vehicles in any event. It will, therefore, merely duplicate the expenditure proposed in the other parallel proposals, thus exaggerating unnecessary expenditure.

I don't think that the Council can justify such expenditure to its Residents, at this time.

2. I do not believe that there has been any substantial evidence identified to support any realistic claim that there is overall excessive speeding throughout the area proposed for the restrictions, save perhaps in Arthur Road, where there are already speed cushions in the road, yet which fail to reduce the speed of larger vehicles on this section of the street. Elsewhere speeds are controlled largely by the narrowing of passage as a result of the parking zone bay layouts.

3. I think that a 20mph speed restriction, "but only around schools", would, and does, achieve some additional safety, as proved in adjoining Boroughs. I would support such a restricted use which is eminently sensible, where appropriate.

4. There is no doubt that restricting vehicle speeds to 20mph causes increased noise and pollution. At a time when the Council policy is to reduce emissions, it now proposes a scheme which will do the very opposite. Vehicles travelling at 20mph rarely get out of second gear, are therefore noisier, use more fuel, and create more emissions!!

5. If a 20 mph speed limit was implemented in this area then it must be in tandem with the "removal" of the bulk of the present ugly, visually intrusive, and environmentally "unfriendly", road obstructions, and so called "traffic calming" arrangements which make our road system, and visual amenities, so ugly.

Reference **ES/SGE/WATS/TC.**

I disagree with the proposals to implement speed cushions, and kerb build outs, particularly if a 20mph speed limit was also to be implemented in the area. I have already commented that this whole exercise is far too costly to be considered responsible expenditure within the Council Budget for years to come. These proposals will just duplicate a 20mph speed limit. In my opinion you either have one, or the other.

1. I do not disagree with the raised entry treatments, and they make an agreeable feature entry to the roads.

I do disagree with the speed table outside No 42 Church Road. This is a main through route for buses and emergency vehicles. This will cause damage and discomfort to patients in emergency vehicles and passengers in public transport, as well as creating considerable, unpleasant, and intrusive noise to the residents in the adjoining houses, from lorries and other larger transport vehicles. My neighbours, and myself, know this from personal experience, in Arthur Road, where we are unfortunate enough to suffer from the disadvantage of having tarmac speed cushions, originally installed against our wishes, and we get much noise from vehicles hitting them, particularly trucks and vehicles with mud-flaps. This comment also applies to the proposal for Maryatt Road. I imagine the visitors and coaches to the AELTC championships will not be impressed by driving over a switchback!

2. I disagree with the proposals to introduce tarmac speed cushions in Belvedere Grove. Any traffic speed is already controlled by the parking bay layout, which prevents speeding, acting as "build outs" In addition, the design is far too aggressive to the smaller, more environmentally friendly vehicles, which are the majority of vehicles using the roads, and have little or no effect upon the larger, less environmentally friendly traffic passing over them.

They create intrusive noise to residents living near them (refer to my earlier comment), and additional pollution and emissions, through additional braking and gear changes, which regrettably only become evident to residents after the obstructions have been installed, as this important aspect is not made clear in the consultation documents. I have yet to find a resident Council tax payer who likes them, and thinks they enhance the road system. I am sure that the Council's Officers and their Consultants cannot live near such undesirable features.

3. I disagree with the proposed "kerb build-outs with vehicular priority" in Burghley Road, and in Calonne Road, because these features have proved, in other parts of the Borough, to have precisely the opposite effect of reducing speed. They encourage drivers to speed up to reach the obstruction before other traffic advancing from the opposite direction. This happens in Garth Road and Motspur Park. Such dangerous features should be avoided in this part of Wimbledon. These features will also disturb residents' peace and environment in the same manner that I have described in 1 and 2 above.

4. I question the proposed re-arrangement of the junction St Mary's Road/Arthur Road /Alan Road, (Z36-24-10-2) to replace the existing mini-roundabout arrangement, with give way priorities, which seems complicated, but actually works well and safely and reduces speeds. The proposed arrangement looks neater but should be investigated further as it would seem to be likely to

actually cause more congestion and not reduce speeds! The same may apply to the Church Road/St Mary's Road junction, (Z36-24-10), which also seems to work safely enough. Why go to the expense of altering them when they work!

I trust you will consider these comments seriously. I use the streets around the place where I live, as do all other residents.

I, like them, have the right to safe and unobstructed, clear access around my Town, and I do object to all the obstructions placed in my path, whether it be when I walk over the uneven pavements, drive my "SMART" environmentally friendly car, being chucked about all over the place, or taking my life into my hands when I cycle around the Village, trying to concentrate on the traffic, whilst trying to avoid the huge potholes in all the roadways which can throw me off my bicycle.

Please let's fix these problems, before the Council spends all the money making life even more unpleasant for its residents by placing even more obstructions in our way.

Officer Response

The southern section of Church Road accommodating the existing parade of shops (between its junctions with Belvedere Square and High Street) is currently home to 11 pay and display bays and one disabled bay. These bays are often occupied during peak hours, and reduce the already narrow carriageway further preventing the flow of 2-way traffic along this section of road. When traffic volumes are low (off peak hours), vehicles give way to each other without causing excessive tailbacks. However, during heavier flows (peak hours), the bottleneck causes long tailbacks giving an impression of severe congestion, which in turn, encourages drivers to use the Belvedere residential roads as a cut-through, and in some instances forces larger vehicles to mount the footway.

The introduction of the Waiting & Loading restrictions as proposed will significantly improve the free movement of traffic along Church Road.

There are a number of Pay and display bays within surrounding roads, which remain unaffected by the proposals. No objections relating to this proposal was received from local traders.

Confirm Number 22016213 & 22016292

(Resident Church Road)

Dear Sir,

ES/SGE/WATS/PA

Option 8 (1) I write again to object to the waiting restrictions in Church Road (7-10am) & (4-7pm). I notice this will also apply to the Disabled Bay which was put there originally for me by L.B. Merton. I have not noticed any bad traffic jam because of all day parking. If you really must take it away, then I suggest you put two disabled bays at the end of Courthope Road.

(4) I also object to the conversion of all the Resident & Permit holder bays in Courthope Road. This is not a road with heavy traffic and residents should be given some priority.

I have written before about my disabled parking problems and received no reply. At my age (79) you cannot expect me to house for this reason.

Yours sincerely

Dear Mr Lecordier,

New Parking scheme for Church Road

I am glad that as a disabled resident, I find that you are keeping the disabled bay outside my house between 10-4pm.

However, I was hoping that you would keep it there full time. It was put there for me originally when I first moved here and Merton were just introducing yellow lines.

I often have to use the disabled bay opposite in Courthope Road but it is frequently occupied.

I do not see all these traffic jams which LB Merton refers to in Church Road. The Council often seems to forget that a lot of people live in Church Road.

For the same reason I do not think that parking spaces in Courthope Road should be for joint use i.e not just for residents.

I am registered disabled and am going to find life very difficult when these measures come into force.

Yours sincerely

Officer Response

It is noted that the proposed restrictions to the disabled bay could inconvenience the elderly lady who is a regular user of the facility, however, as laid out in her representations above, she would be content to have an extra disabled bay installed in Courthope Road near its junction with Church Road. This would require the conversion of an existing Pay and Display bay to a disabled bay in Courthope Road near to it's junction with Church Road. This would also be subject to the applicant meeting the current criteria and a separate consultation subject to Cabinet Member approval. An alternative could be for the blue badge holder to utilise any of the pay and display bays or permit holder bays in Courthope Road during the restrictions.

Confirm Number 22016500

(Resident Church Road)

----- Dear Sirs

WATM Formal Consultation

ES/SGE/WATS/PA.

I strongly object to the introduction of parking restrictions. It is already difficult for residents to park, particularly in Lancaster Road, and the proposed measures would make matters much worse.

I have a family with school age children and, due to the location of their school, there is no practical alternative but to drive to school. The introduction of the proposed measures, and the greater difficulty of finding parking spaces, would affect us badly. There are many other families with small children in the area who would be similarly affected.

ES/SGE/WATS/TC.

I support the proposal to introduce raised speed cushions on Church Road.

I would ask that the speed of vehicles is monitored after the introduction of these measures, as speeding vehicles may remain a problem.

ES/SGE/WATS/20.

I support the proposal to introduce the 20mph zone.

In Church Road, excessive speed is a real problem. There are many families with young children, and the pavements are well used by pedestrians.

ES/SGE/WATS/WL.

I object to the proposal to introduce waiting and loading restrictions on Church Road. The shops on Church Road rely on the availability of parking spaces, particularly during the busy morning and afternoon times, when people are likely to be passing in their cars. The introduction of these measures would adversely affect the local businesses.

In addition, the parking spaces have the effect of slowing down traffic and keeping it away from the pavements. The timing of the proposed waiting and loading is exactly when children will be walking to school. The increased speed of the traffic caused by the removal of restrictions during this period would be a retrograde step.

Yours faithfully

Officer Response

The southern section of Church Road accommodating the existing parade of shops (between its junctions with Belvedere Square and High Street) is currently home to 11 pay and display bays and one disabled bay. These bays are often occupied during peak hours, and reduce the already narrow carriageway further preventing the flow of 2-way traffic along this section of road. When traffic volumes are low (off peak hours), vehicles give way to each other without causing excessive tailbacks. However, during heavier flows (peak hours), the bottleneck causes long tailbacks giving an impression of severe congestion, which in turn, encourages drivers to use the Belvedere residential roads as a cut-through, and in some instances forces larger vehicles to mount the footway.

The introduction of the Waiting & Loading restrictions as proposed will significantly improve the free movement of traffic along Church Road.

There are a number of Pay and display bays within surrounding roads, which remain unaffected by the proposals. No objections relating to this proposal was received from local traders.

Confirm Number 22016499

(Resident Church Road)

-----Dear Mr. Alam,

Wimbledon Area Traffic Study Statutory Consultation

This is my submission to the consultation.

First I would like to congratulate Cllr. Brierly and all who contributed to the development of Option 8 which I see as a generally sensible approach to alleviating a problem which has cost the Council much time and money over the past 5 years. I earnestly hope that this will bring an end to this divisive matter; the only solution to reducing traffic flows across this residential area would entail a reduction in the traffic entering Copse Hill and Ridgway.

Ref ES/SGE/WATS/PA

Whilst it does not affect this household, I am conscious of a large number of local residents who are extremely concerned at the proposal to convert all Residents' only parking bays to "shared use". I wish to add my voice to these objections which, if implemented, will seriously prejudice those living at the Village end of Church Road.

Ref ES/GE/WATS/WL

I object to the proposal to introduce "waiting/loading" restrictions between 7am and 10am and between 4pm and 7pm within the existing Pay and Display bays and the Disabled bay at the southern end of Church Road. Several of the

businesses at this end of Church Road do a great deal of business in these, especially the morning, hours.

Yours sincerely,

Officer Response

The southern section of Church Road accommodating the existing parade of shops (between its junctions with Belvedere Square and High Street) is currently home to 11 pay and display bays and one disabled bay. These bays are often occupied during peak hours, and reduce the already narrow carriageway further preventing the flow of 2-way traffic along this section of road. When traffic volumes are low (off peak hours), vehicles give way to each other without causing excessive tailbacks. However, during heavier flows (peak hours), the bottleneck causes long tailbacks giving an impression of severe congestion, which in turn, encourages drivers to use the Belvedere residential roads as a cut-through, and in some instances forces larger vehicles to mount the footway.

The introduction of the Waiting & Loading restrictions as proposed will significantly improve the free movement of traffic along Church Road.

There are a number of Pay and display bays within surrounding roads, which remain unaffected by the proposals. No objections relating to this proposal was received from local traders.

Confirm Number 22016498 (Resident Church Road)

Dear Mr. Alam,

I and my family live at ■ Church Road and I wish to make the following representations in response to the formal consultation. My numbering follows the numbering used on pages 2, 3 and 4 in the leaflet distributed by Merton.

Waiting/Loading restrictions ES/SGE/WATS/WL

1. I oppose the introduction of parking restrictions between the hours of 7 - 10am and 4 - 7pm at the Village end of Church Road. Many of the shops along this stretch of Church Road and on the High Street depend on customers stopping on their way to and from work i.e. Newsagents, Dry cleaners, coffee shops etc. Restrictions already exist on the High Street and any further restrictions could result in the failure of several of these small businesses, many of which are unique to Wimbledon Village. In addition, the presence of vehicles in these spaces serves to slow down the traffic using Church Road; an aim which some of the other some of the other measures seek to achieve. Introducing this restriction is counter-intuitive.

Vertical deflections ES/SGE/WATS/TC

2. I support the introduction of a raised entry treatment at both ends of Church Road and outside 42 Church Road. This will help to reduce the speed of vehicles on this stretch of road.

3. I do not support the introduction of speed cushions in Belvedere Grove as I do not believe there is an issue with speeding in this road. Speed cushions merely irritate those who drive normal cars and favour those who drive 4x4 vehicles and vans. They are also unsightly.

6. I support the introduction of a raised entry treatment at the junction of Belvedere Drive and Wimbledon Hill Road. This is a dangerous junction and I believe the proposed raised entry treatment will benefit pedestrians crossing here.

10. I support the introduction of a raised junction at Burghley Road/Church Road/St Mary's Road. This is a dreadful intersection and can only be improved by this measure.

Parking arrangements ES/SGE/WATS/PA

4. I am strongly opposed to the conversion of any existing residents' parking bays to Pay and Display Shared Use. This makes absolutely no sense, as residents' only bays are well used and this measure will have no effect on the number of residents seeking to park in the Village. It will merely make parking for local people more difficult. I have no parking outside my house and use local roads on which to park. I also have two young children, so the ability to be able to park somewhere nearby is very important. On Sundays, when the existing parking restrictions are not enforced, it can often be very difficult to find a parking place, let alone one near my house. If this proposal is implemented, that situation will exist every day. The residents' only parking bays should remain.

5. Additional parking should be created where possible, and I have no difficulty in that being shared use.

20mph Speed Limit ES/SGE/WATS/20

9. I fully support the proposals to introduce a 20 mph speed limit throughout the area.

Yours sincerely,

Officer Response

The southern section of Church Road accommodating the existing parade of shops (between its junctions with Belvedere Square and High Street) is currently home to 11 pay and display bays and one disabled bay. These bays are often occupied during peak hours, and reduce the already narrow carriageway further

preventing the flow of 2-way traffic along this section of road. When traffic volumes are low (off peak hours), vehicles give way to each other without causing excessive tailbacks. However, during heavier flows (peak hours), the bottleneck causes long tailbacks giving an impression of severe congestion, which in turn, encourages drivers to use the Belvedere residential roads as a cut-through, and in some instances forces larger vehicles to mount the footway.

The introduction of the Waiting & Loading restrictions as proposed will significantly improve the free movement of traffic along Church Road.

There are a number of Pay and display bays within surrounding roads, which remain unaffected by the proposals. No objections relating to this proposal was received from local traders.

Confirm Number 22016199 (Resident Lancaster Road)

Dear Sirs,

1. With reference to ES/SGE/WATS/PA I strongly object to all of these proposals. I have several reasons for my objection. In the current economic climate this is a waste of council tax payer's money. There is nothing wrong with the existing parking arrangements. There is already too much disruption in this village caused by CHANGE. You should leave well alone. I particularly object to your proposal to interfere with my enjoyment of my home in Lancaster Road. We already have enough traffic in this road. My children play quite safely in this road. Your stupid ideas would only encourage yet more traffic and expose them to danger. Leave us alone.

2. With reference to ES/SGE/WATS/TC I strongly object to yet more of these stupid speed tables which have already been show to be dangerous. Your proposals will turn this village into a crazy golf course of traps, tables, bumps and God knows what. Driving in this area is already like driving through an obstacle course. But this is also a tremendous waste of money. My money. You should spend the money on something we need. We certainly do not need this.

3. With reference to ES/SGE/ WATS/LB. Lately Lancaster Road has been blighted by several huge lorries, much larger than 7.5 tonnes. The ban on heavy lorries should be extended to cover the whole village. I object to these proposals. I would like to see this ban extended.

4. With reference to ES/SGE/WATS/20 I strongly object to these proposals. Thirty is a sensible speed in the village. A lower speed limit will merely make it easier for bloody-minded police to penalize law-abiding citizens. It is my opinion that the lunatics who churn out these proposals will not be happy until we are all driving at 10 mph. In horse drawn carriages. When will you people learn? If it isn't broke, don't fix it. If the council votes this through I for one will never vote again.

5. With reference to ES/SGE/WATS/WL, I strongly object to these proposals. Your foolish idea to introduce loading restrictions in Church Road will drive these lorries into Lancaster Road where there are no such restrictions. There are occasions when there are several lorries parked here illegally delivering beer to public houses in the village, or huge piles of floor tiles to Fired Earth.

In conclusion, you have wasted time and money carrying out a traffic study that was not needed, and is hugely wasteful. Instead of frittering away money on these cloddish proposals the council should be working out ways of CUTTING expenditure. However, even as I write this letter I am almost certain that as usual, you will ignore those people who actually PAY for services in this village in the interest of placating those who have a vested interest in spending other people's money, such as Mister Waheed Alam. Instead of paying scheme engineers good money to carry out this study might I recommend that you reduce the council tax. We need Waheed Alam and his ideas like we need a war in Afghanistan. Moreover, your consultation document seems to me to be deliberately obfuscatory and, in the event of your riding roughshod over the feelings of those people who live in this village, your decision to initiate said proposals may indeed be ultra vires. This village needs no regeneration. It needs protection from town hall hooligans.

yours sincerely,

Officer Response

Courthope Road at its junction with Church Road has a large dedicated loading bay which delivery vehicles should be using for loading activities.

The loading restrictions for Church Road are proposed to apply between the hours of 7-10am and 4-7pm. Outside these hours there would be no restriction on loading/unloading activities on the yellow lines.

The consultation last year did not generate any objections from local traders over this proposal.

Confirm Number 22016204

(Resident Pine Grove)

Dear Sirs

This is a formal response to your consultation on traffic calming proposals in the area on Wimbledon Hill. Your reference numbers are:

ES/SGE/ WATS/PA ES/SGWE/WATS/TC ES/SGE/WATS/20 ES/SGE/WATS/WL.

We are long standing residents of this area, use its shops and other services and think we understand how it operates at a number of different times of day.

We object to principle to three features of the consultation:

- you give no justification for the proposed changes;
- they appear to be unnecessary and would therefore waste public resources, including local taxpayers' funds;
- your consultation period, at less than a month, falls well short of the standard consultation period which the Cabinet Office recommends for all public consultations.

We object in principle to every feature of the proposed changes. We particularly object to the proposed revisions to the junction of Alan Rd and St Mary's Rd. The present layout of the junction may be unusual but it is successful in directing easy traffic flow and avoiding accidents. These used to be common in this area and the present layout has been a distinct improvement.

We are reinforced in our objections to the proposed changes by the clear failure of the recent changes in Wimbledon Hill Rd. These too were never properly justified. Every user of this area complains about them. They cause longer circuitous journeys and the pollution that goes with it. If they are any guide to the likely quality of the current proposals they provide good evidence for no action at all.

Officer Response

The formal consultation newsletter/booklet sent out to residents on 18th February 2010 on page 8 clearly specified that the councils 'Statement of reasons' for the proposals could be inspected at Merton Link, Merton Civic Centre or at Wimbledon Library.

Further it should be noted that at the informal consultation stage a newsletter and drawings of the proposals was sent out to residents and under the heading 'CHURCH ROAD PROPOSALS' it was stated '

'It is anticipated that these proposals will help to remove the bottle neck in Church Road and ease traffic flows during peak times'.

The consultation period afforded for the formal consultation was 3 weeks between 18 February and 12 March 2010. This fulfils all statutory requirements for formal consultations of this nature.

The southern section of Church Road accommodating the existing parade of shops (between its junctions with Belvedere Square and High Street) is currently home to 11 pay and display bays and one disabled bay. These bays are often occupied during peak hours, and reduce the already narrow carriageway further preventing the flow of 2-way traffic along this section of road. When traffic volumes are low (off peak hours), vehicles give way to each other without causing excessive tailbacks. However, during heavier flows (peak hours), the bottleneck causes long tailbacks giving an impression of severe congestion,

which in turn, encourages drivers to use the Belvedere residential roads as a cut-through, and in some instances forces larger vehicles to mount the footway. The introduction of the Waiting & Loading restrictions as proposed will significantly improve the free movement of traffic along Church Road.

Confirm Number 22016505

(Resident St Mary's Road)

Dear Mr. Alam,

Re: Option 8 - Elements Approved by the Cabinet Minister

ES/SGE/WATS/PA

1. Ref Z36-24-09 - We disagree totally with the introduction of parking restrictions between the hours of 7 - 10am and 4 - 7pm at the Village end of Church Road. Many of the shops along this stretch of Church Road and on the High Street depend on customers stopping on their way to and from work i.e. Newsagents, Dry cleaners, coffee shops etc. Restrictions already exist on the High Street and any further restrictions could result in the failure of several of these small businesses, many of which are unique to Wimbledon Village. The Council should be championing small local businesses in these cash strapped times not making it impossible for people to park so that they can't frequent such businesses.

ES/SGE/WATS/TC

2. Ref Z36-24-10 - As you will know from previous correspondence we are not in favour of speed bumps - they do little to slow down traffic, are unsightly and dangerous for cyclists. Allowing parking at the Village end of Church Road as detailed above will, in itself, slow down the traffic as it does at present and in addition will save a lot of unnecessary expenditure.

ES/SGE/WATS/PA

3. Z36-24-10 - Comments as above - keep the Pay & display parking so that the Village shops are not inconvenienced and the traffic will slow down to accommodate that as it does at the moment. The traffic moves very slowly into and out of Belvedere Grove at both ends due to the narrowing at each end - we walk down this road several times a week at different times of the day and speed is not a problem.

ES/SGE/WATS/TC

4/5 Z36-24-09 - including additional roads i.e. Lancaster Gardens for shared parking, could result in the residents being unable to find a parking space outside (or any where near) their own home).

ES/SGE/WATS/LB

8. Z36-24-13 We would welcome a lorry ban. From the vantage point of my kitchen I [Susan] watch enormous vehicles at all times of the day (which have most likely come off A3, along rigdway, down Wimbledon Hill and turned left in to

Belvedere Drive before entering St. Mary's Road and turning right down Church Hill in order to head on towards Wandsworth, Battersea etc.).

ES/SGE/WATS/20

9. Z36-24-12 - Introducing a 20 mph speed limit for the whole area - we agree with this. (It was my [Susan] suggestion at the meeting with the Cabinet Minister). We trust that signage could therefore be reduced as it will only be required at entry and exit points and not throughout the area.

ES/SGE/WATS/TC

10. Z36-24-11 This is a very complex junction, particularly when trying to exit from Burghley Road, slightly up and around the mini roundabout to St. Mary's Road or Church Road, especially for manual cars with low horsepower - a raised entry will only make this more difficult and building over such a large area will be exceptionally costly, time consuming and disruptive. The roads and pavements throughout the area are in a dreadful state - the money would be better spent on repairs.

11 Z36-24-11 - as per No 10 above.

New Proposals added to the Option 8 Scheme

1. Z36-24-10 & Z36-24-10-2 ES/SGE/WATS?TC

We are totally against the removal of the mini roundabout at the St. Mary's Road junction with Arthur Road. This would allow the traffic which is constant at rush hours to travel too quickly up Arthur Road past the end of St. Mary's Road. A large number of pedestrians cross here (especially for the nursery and church, including many toddlers and mums with babies). It would also be impossible for vehicles to exit St. Mary's road and create congestion back towards Highbury Road and beyond. This situation would be further exacerbated by the extra traffic and parking created by the 6 new houses being built at the moment.

Removal of the roundabout at the end of Alan Road may deter vehicles from using that as a cut through but many of the above points apply in addition to making it impossible to exit from the church at busy times of the day. These two roundabouts work extremely well at the present - no need to change a winning formula.

Thank you for taking note of our comments. We have one further point to make in order to reduce the traffic traversing the Wimbledon Village area. (Those who live in an area and pay their council tax to that council should be free to drive, cycle and walk around their area safely). We would propose narrowing treatment at the entrance to Copse Hill so that vehicles are deterred from exiting the A3 at Wimbledon and using the route as described in point 8 above. We realise that this is only one entry point of many for vehicles to pass through Wimbledon but I feel that if the volume can be reduced by any means this would be a positive outcome.

Yours sincerely,

Officer Response

The southern section of Church Road accommodating the existing parade of shops (between its junctions with Belvedere Square and High Street) is currently home to 11 pay and display bays and one disabled bay. These bays are often occupied during peak hours, and reduce the already narrow carriageway further preventing the flow of 2-way traffic along this section of road. When traffic volumes are low (off peak hours), vehicles give way to each other without causing excessive tailbacks. However, during heavier flows (peak hours), the bottleneck causes long tailbacks giving an impression of severe congestion, which in turn, encourages drivers to use the Belvedere residential roads as a cut-through, and in some instances forces larger vehicles to mount the footway.

The introduction of the Waiting & Loading restrictions as proposed will significantly improve the free movement of traffic along Church Road.

There are a number of Pay and display bays within surrounding roads, which remain unaffected by the proposals. No objections relating to this proposal was received from local traders.

Confirm Number 22016519

BERA

■ Belvedere Grove, Wimbledon, London SW19 ■

Environment and Regeneration Dept
Merton Civic Centre
London Road
Morden, Surrey
SM4 5DX 11th March
2010

Dear Sirs,

- 1) Your Ref ES/SGE/WATS/PA

I write as Chairman of BERA. A number of my members have asked me to draw your attention to the likely inconvenience which will be caused by the shared parking proposals. Many of the houses in my area have limited or no off street parking and have to rely on resident parking bays for which they pay the annual fee. This is particularly true of those who live in the immediate vicinity of the Village.

- 2) ES/SGE/WATS/TC. There are reservations about the introduction of speed cushions. These have the tendency to irritate motorists and have

little practical effect in a built up area as most drivers, especially white vans, by pointing their vehicle at the centre of the cushion, can take it on at 25 to 30 mph. Further such practice tends to make motorists drive down the centre of the road which is not conducive to safe driving.

- 3) ES/SGE/WATS/WL. Residents in Church Road have asked me to draw your attention to the inconvenience that will be caused by the waiting and loading restrictions in the Village end of Church Road.. We are opposed to these restrictions as the shops in Church Road such as the newsagent and dry cleaners are busy from 7am onwards and as are the coffee shops around the corner in the High Street. There is nowhere else in the immediate area for short term parking. Also it is thought by restricting parking it will have the undesirable effect of speeding up traffic at that end of Church Road. It would make more sense to introduce restrictions between 4pm and 6pm. You might also consider changing the restricted hours to the High Street to be more 'shopper friendly'.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours faithfully,

Officer Response

The southern section of Church Road accommodating the existing parade of shops (between its junctions with Belvedere Square and High Street) is currently home to 11 pay and display bays and one disabled bay. These bays are often occupied during peak hours, and reduce the already narrow carriageway further preventing the flow of 2-way traffic along this section of road. When traffic volumes are low (off peak hours), vehicles give way to each other without causing excessive tailbacks. However, during heavier flows (peak hours), the bottleneck causes long tailbacks giving an impression of severe congestion, which in turn, encourages drivers to use the Belvedere residential roads as a cut-through, and in some instances forces larger vehicles to mount the footway.

The introduction of the Waiting & Loading restrictions as proposed will significantly improve the free movement of traffic along Church Road.

There are a number of Pay and display bays within surrounding roads, which remain unaffected by the proposals. No objections relating to this proposal was received from local traders.