

General Letters/emails

Confirm number 22015440

Dear Mr Alam,

I am in receipt of the Consultation Paper on Wimbledon Area Traffic Study, and it would seem that there is going to be a lot of upheaval in Wimbledon, not to mention the expense involved at a time when I thought that Merton Council was having to cut back on essential services due to lack of funds. It does seem that funding is not an issue where anything to do with traffic is concerned.

My view is that if Woodside was open to traffic, turning right from Wimbledon Hill, at certain times of the day, and if Queen's Road was opened for traffic turning left from the Broadway, traffic would flow better, and there would not be the concentration of traffic in certain roads. that has come about due to these closures.

After parking in the Hartfield Road car park I have no choice, to reach Vineyard Hill, after following the one-way system on leaving the car park, other than to turn right and go down the Broadway and then Trinity Road etc, or turn left and go through Wimbledon up the Hill and turn right into Belvedere. This uses more fuel, causes more congestion, not to mention the time involved.

It does seem that the proposed measures, and those that have been introduced in the past, do not benefit all the residents of Wimbledon/Merton who all pay council tax to the London Borough of Merton. The benefit appears to be solely for a select few people.

Yours sincerely

Confirm number 22015439

Dear Mr. Alam

I have read your Study and believe:

1. Your Belvedere Area proposals and do not consider that they address the problem of numbers of cars/trucks passing through Belvedere Grove in particular. I will reserve final judgement until after consider the Exhibition. They key need is to reduce driving through Belvedere Grove and two principal ways, in my opinion, address this problem: first is to close off the road at the Village end (which I appreciate you seem to find difficult to recommend so I believe a less severe option is to make access to the road more difficult in some way or provide disincentives for drivers to move through it---not reduce their speed with bumps).

2. The second proposal I continue to make and have done so for months to the Council and our residents association, which has not made it into your proposal, is create bike lanes throughout the Village and create docking stations for bikes on some sidewalks. Your proposals and those of my residents association address car drivers and in general, many people who drive because they consider it unsafe to bike in the Village streets. By creating incentives to bikers and getting people out of cars (esp those who drive less than a mile because biking is not a real alternative currently), you

should get a large increase in roads being used for bikers and reducing volumes of ambient traffic in the village.

Also, by continuing to address drivers and their issues, you are not representing the large number of young people who do not go to meetings and do not write to you. Why are you not representing these people?

3. You may be aware that the Serco Group (UK) is introducing a bike sharing scheme (exported from Montreal--the so called Canadian Bixi System of bike rentals) to London in which 600 docking stations will be installed in Central London holding 10,000 bikes. Why can Merton Council not introduce a similar scheme on a smaller scale? And in advance of your doing so kicking and screaming in a few years, why not lay the groundwork now by allocating more road space to bike lanes to encourage bike use? More and more bikers lead to fewer cars for two reasons: drivers get out of cars and bike and/or road congestion of bikers creates a disincentive for cars whose lanes shrink.

I would appreciate your comments. In full disclosure, I am a keen biker (age 62) who has had 2 accidents on bikes in past few years on Village and nearby roads due to volume and speed of cars. In both cases, the car driver was at fault.

?? Clement Road
London SW19 7RJ

Confirm number 22015438

As a new resident owner of a property in this street ***I am horrified*** to learn that you propose to change the residents parking only bays to a shared use for pay and display.

I have just moved here from Kensington & Chelsea where residents parking consists of one single zone for the whole borough so, whilst I was frequently unable to park right outside my property, I was easily able to park at least somewhere close by.

However here in Lancaster Road I understand that the area covered by my residents permit is (absurdly) limited to a tiny area just around my property! Turn this parking area into shared use and I'll probably end up with nowhere free to park on the street at all! What kind of residents parking area do you call this – nonexistent?

If you insist on going ahead with the proposed change you have to accompany it with another change – viz to **greatly increase the area my permit is valid within**. Then, even if my immediate area is full of pay and display users, at least I'll be able to find somewhere valid to park nearby.

I'd be grateful for an acknowledgement of this email and some further dialogue on the subject.

Thank you

Confirm number 22015437

Dear Waheed,

Thank you very much for your time on Saturday at the traffic exhibition at Wimbledon library. It was most informative.

As I mentioned, I will certainly be completing the consultation paper to relay my views generally on the traffic proposals.

However, you kindly suggested that, because there are particular issues relating to a possible new (dual use) parking space directly outside my house at ?? Highbury Road, SW19 7PR, I should write to you directly and set these out - especially as all new spaces are very much subject to review and further investigation (and this single measure can have no real significance to anyone else in the context of the consultation).

My specific concerns are as follows:

(i) there are serious safety issues with creating a new parking space in this location (which may account for why there is no bay currently). In December, when we applied to the Council to reserve a space on the yellow line outside our house for certain deliveries, we were told by ???? of Parking Services that we could only do this if we paid an extra £90 also to reserve the residents' bays on the other side of the road. The reason given was that these bays would need to remain empty in order that traffic may safely pass. It was considered a safety risk, on that stretch of the road, to allow both sides to be occupied at the same time. I cannot see that anything has changed since then from a road safety perspective;

(ii) the proposed bay is very close to the main St Mary's Road (significantly busier than Belvedere Avenue at the other end, even with the recent traffic calming measures). Traffic turning in will not be aware of cars coming up Highbury Road and vehicles on both roads will have very little time to take evasive action if they meet head-on. They need passing areas outside my house and no.?? to avoid colliding and also to avoid "stacking up" along St Mary's;

(iii) again, because of the proximity to St Mary's Road, it is already very difficult for us to reverse cars out of our drive-way without incoming traffic potentially hitting us after they turn in. By adding further parked cars, there will be virtually no visibility and the chance of a traffic accident will be extremely high, I fear. Even now, visibility is impaired - as evidenced by our neighbour at no.?? recently reversing into our car parked on the opposite side of the road;

(iv) by adding this extra parking, it will also significantly reduce areas where we can cross the road free of parked cars - which is very dangerous, especially for small children, prams, etc. This, coupled with the proximity with St Mary's, increases the risk of someone being run over. As I demonstrated on Saturday, with cars parked all the way from no.?? and across no.??, drivers turning in from St Mary's will not see pedestrians wishing to cross; and

(v) the bays will also effectively prevent us using our own drive-ways for parking. The level of the drive-ways from the road is very steep and, unless approached at quite a narrow angle diagonally, cannot be accessed without damage to our cars. If cars are parked in the bays, we would have to

approach the drive-ways head on (which may also not be possible because of cars parked opposite) which is impossible.

I would also add that there is simply no need for any additional parking in Highbury Road. There are already more than enough residents and dual use bays on Highbury Road, Belvedere Avenue and on St Mary's Road, in particular.

Moreover, I believe both BERA and New BERA support my position. (Whilst BERA may support certain additional dual use parking, its Chairman has confirmed to me in writing that he sees no reason for this to apply to Highbury Road). Whilst I cannot claim to speak for all the residents in Highbury Road - a number of whom are on holiday and may know nothing of the proposals - of those I have spoken to none support the revised parking arrangements or additional bays.

For completeness, I confirm that in my response to the consultation paper I will be stating my objections to the dual parking proposals generally as I find it logically inconsistent to attempt to reduce congestion by actively encouraging non-residents to drive their cars into our roads for parking. I also believe this to be contrary to various criteria and guidelines of Merton Council itself, as well as those laid down for local authorities in general. These include:

- improving pedestrian safety, accessibility and convenience (Merton traffic and parking management website)
- achieving safe movement by reducing accident levels (Merton traffic and parking management website)
- reducing the impact of commuter parking (Merton traffic and parking management website)
- ensuring safe and expeditious movement of traffic, including pedestrians, in the Borough, considering and responding to users complaints and concerns (Merton traffic and parking management website)
- Planning Policy Guidance 13, especially to use parking policies to promote sustainable transport choices and reduce reliance on the car for work and other journeys
- the Highway Code, rules for pedestrians, to try to avoid crossing between parked cars

Given the preliminary nature of the proposals for additional bays; the marginal benefit (if any) the Council may see in them; and the serious concerns I have highlighted, I look forward to your confirmation that the additional bays proposal for the St Mary's end of Highbury Road will not be implemented. If necessary, I should be pleased to discuss this, over the 'phone or in person, at any time as it so directly affects me and my family.

I'm sure that it would be in no one's interest for the issue of a parking bay outside my house to be the subject of prolonged debate, litigation or "after the event" investigations should the safety issues I have outlined unfortunately be borne out.

Many thanks and best regards.

Officer Response

Dear ?????,

Thank you for your detailed email regarding the traffic proposals. I note your main concern regarding safety issues and would like to reassure you that issues such as safety have not been overlooked.

The creation of pinch points, whether through the use of kerb buildouts or parked cars, is not a new concept in the field of Traffic Engineering. Just as the Highway Authority has an obligation to ensure the highway is fit for use, road users are also expected to exercise care whilst using the public highway.

The proposed additional parking bay outside ?? Highbury Road would not encroach onto the double yellow lines protecting the proximity of the junction and will be in accordance with the advice given by the Highway Code i.e. Vehicles should not park within 10 metres of a junction. Moreover, you are aware, the Highbury junction with St Marys Road, already has a raised carriageway profile, which further ensures that vehicles entering and egressing Highbury Road slow down. These features, in my view, work well in ensuring safety at the junction.

The proposed bay outside your property, is unlikely to hinder your movements in or out of your driveways. Additionally, to ensure safety, you may wish to note that it is good practice, as advised by Highway Code rule 201, that when using a driveway, motorists should reverse in and drive out. Additionally as you are aware, the area o/s ?? and ?? Highbury Road are currently subject to a single yellow line restriction which permits parking after 6.30pm and all day on Sundays. With the proposed 20mph speed limit there should be a reduction in speed thereby enhancing road safety.

I hope the above will go some way in reassuring you that in drawing up the proposals road safety was not overlooked and will continue to be my focus for the various proposals.

In response to some of the other points which you have raised,

1) the council is not encouraging commuter parking through the proposals. This is demonstrated by the fact that pay and display tickets will not be issued by the ticket dispensing machines before the time the bays become operational and for those in Highbury this means not before 9.30am. This is well after the desirable time by which commuters would wish to utilise the spaces. Also worth noting is that Pre Paid Tickets (PPT) will not be valid in the converted or proposed additional bays.

2) Pedestrians are expected to choose crossing points with care. Highbury Road does not have formal crossing points and the proposals do not in any way encourage them to cross between parked cars.

The outcome of the consultation will be reported to the Cabinet Member for Planning and Transport before any decision. This is likely to be determined in late September or early October 2009.

If you feel the need to discuss these issues further please let me know and I will gladly come to meet.

Regards

Waheed

Dear Waheed,

Thank you for your response.

However, I do not feel any real investigation has been made in relation to the points I have raised. Whilst I appreciate your promptness, the distinct impression from your email is that the Council's mind is made up and is not taking residents' concerns seriously. This seems far from a consultation or that the bays' proposal is "subject to investigation".

By way of example:

(i) you say that, in your view, the raised carriageway works well in ensuring safety at the junction. What grounds have you got for saying this? Have you carried out any surveys showing the situation before and after the raising of the carriageway? I live there and I can tell you it has made no difference whatsoever. I can also tell you that all my neighbours say the same and it has been a waste of money. I invite you to find one resident in Highbury Road who says otherwise;

(ii) you also say "the proposed bay outside your property is unlikely to hinder your movements in or out of your driveways". Again, what basis have you got for saying this? I use those driveways. Have you? Have you even looked at them? If so, please tell me when? I'm telling you that I cannot access either one head on. Do you want to come to my house and have me prove it to you?

(iii) you suggest that I should reverse into my driveway so I can drive out forwards. If so, would you mind telling me why you then suggest putting a speed-hump exactly where I would need to reverse from? This is supposed to be a residential road, not a military assault course! The speed hump will make it impossible to reverse in as it will raise the front of the vehicle and cause the rear to hit the curb thus preventing access to the drive;

(iv) on commuter parking, having a 9.30am start is no answer. A lot of people do not start work until after then, and a lot of commuters will simply be those going into London, whether for shopping or otherwise, and having 9 hours on Highbury Road near the station would be ideal to commute from. And what of your violation of PPG 13 encouraging people not to use their cars in the first place? How are you able to justify that?

(v) finally, I agree your proposals don't "encourage" people to cross between parked cars – they force them to. If the road is full of parked cars, by definition you have no choice but to cross between them.

I'm sorry if I sound frustrated, but I live in this road and I don't appreciate having my serious concerns casually dismissed by those who don't and have no evidence to support themselves. I am a lawyer and I rely on clear evidence. This has not been provided and I feel this process is not a consultation but a determination.

Once again, will you please look into these points and give me clear evidence why I should not worry and there is no risk of accident or injury as a result of their introduction - or otherwise agree with me (and both residents associations and the Highbury Road residents themselves) that the parking proposals should not be introduced for this Road? You should know that the Council will be under intense scrutiny should warnings such as mine be ignored and an incident arise in the future.

Regards.

Confirm number 12207524

Wimbledon Village Business Association recently circulated a leaflet giving notice of changes to parking restrictions in Wimbledon Village. It indicates that there will be new restrictions to the length of time people can park, including in Lancaster Gardens and Lancaster Road. However, it does not indicate what the implications are for residents parking in the same spaces. Residents living in those streets rely on being able to use shared parking spaces and already find it difficult to find parking spaces. Please can you clarify what changes are being planned. Also, I am not aware of any consultation on those changes and wonder if this will be taking place.

Yours sincerely

??????

BERA

Officer Response

Dear ????,

Merton Council is currently undertaking a consultation on a number of proposals within the Wimbledon Area. The parking rearrangement which you refer to is explained in the consultation documents which were sent to residents/businesses within the consultation area.

As you appear to be affiliated with BERA, I assume you either have links to the effected area as either a resident or a business and so should have received this information on the 5th of August. Please let me know if for any reason you haven't or require additional information and I can put this in the post for you. For your information, the consultation ends on the 5th of September 2009.

regards

Waheed

Waheed,

Many thanks – I have now received all consultation material.

Regards

Confirm number 22015436

Dear Sirs

I no longer live within your consultation area, but my mother, who is now 92 years old, resides in Courthope Road, and has done for the last 50 years. She is crippled with arthritis, but just manages to get into our [REDACTED] to go shopping twice a week. We always attempt to take her out avoiding routes with traffic speed humps because even at very slow speeds, the small wheels and narrow wheelbase of our vehicle means the jolting effect is extreme (unlike for

the Chelsea Tractors owned by a large number of the other residents of the area) and this can cause pain in my mother's joints. Now you are proposing to put humps all down the road in which she lives, including one just outside her house. Courthope Road is a short road which has already had a restriction built at the Church Road end. Speeding and traffic accidents in that road must be extremely rare, so please would you reconsider the justification for what you are proposing. The old Belvedere Estate area has a very low density of population and it seems that the whole of your scheme is designed to benefit very few, wealthy and influential people, while increasing traffic in other, more densely populated streets. When we visit my mother we approach from Gap Road and travel along Woodside and up St Mary's Road as there is no right turn at the bottom of Hill Road and there is the one way system to negotiate at the end of Alexandra Road. The width restriction at the junction of Belvedere Grove and Belvedere Avenue creates congestion and can be dangerous because of the angle some drivers chose to negotiate the corner. Please focus some part of your traffic study on this, before you chose to make the design of this junction any worse.

Sincerely

Confirm number 22015435

Mr. Alam,

Further to my thanks for having sent me full details of the exercise this is just to say I've just returned a postal version of the survey.

Can I compliment you/ your department on the quality of the exercise. The documentation is very thorough and clear and the actual questionnaire is comprehensive and easy to complete. The documentation and explanation is a model of what it should be even if one does not agree fully with all the proposals.

Let me reiterate the point I made when we spoke on the phone, speaking as a resident of Homefield Road – not embraced by the consultation area. I do believe strongly that an exercise like this even though focused on areas to the N. of the High Street carries significant implications for all roads in the Village area – including those to the S/SW of the High Street e.g. Homefield Road, Lingfield Road, The Grange etc. If even some of the proposals are implemented there will be knock on effects back into these and other nearby roads. The area to the S/SW of the High Street is very close to where a lot of the changes may occur.

For this reason I think it is wrong that at least roads in this area were not given a chance to assist in the consultation. Residents there will be affected by the eventual outcome. I've participated by chance, having learned of the exercise by chance. Many of my neighbours will not have this opportunity.

Of course you have to draw a boundary somewhere, I accept that. But it would not have been difficult to have added some of the key roads near to the relevant area but lying S/SW of the High Street.

A good guide for any similar exercise in the future might be – take the High Street/Church Road junction as the Village centre and cover roads within a 1 kilometre radius of that. A bit arbitrary and you might want to then consider whether some “add ons” were needed. But a good starting point – one that perhaps should be used when you publish your findings from the consultation.

Regards,

Please note my email address has changed to
[REDACTED]

Confirm number 22015434

Dear Mr Alam,

I am a resident of Belvedere Drive, and was wondering if you would be able to provide your thoughts on the Wimbledon Area Traffic Consultation. Belvedere Drive is selected by satellite navigation systems (e.g. TomTom) as a preferred cut-through route. At present, I am unable to leave my windows open overnight, (more of a problem during the summer), as the noise levels in the early morning from about 630am can be too high.

In particular, I wonder if you would be able to comment on my following concerns :

1. There is no evidence that speed humps reduce traffic flow, and indeed may well increase noise levels. Could noise monitoring be considered by the council ?
2. 6'6" restrictions are being placed on Belvedere Grove, but not on any neighbouring roads. Why ? Effectively, this permits large lorries to pass down these roads. This is not an idle concern - large lorries quite regularly travel through Belvedere Drive already, causing the foundations of this building to shake. Again, could the council monitor the size of vehicles and noise levels?
3. Why hasn't an alternative been plan given ? In addition to road closures, why not the use of speed tables, or 6'6" restrictions on all roads in the Belvedere area ?
4. Has the option been considered, of removing the traffic lights at the bottom of Wimbledon Hill altogether, with the reintroduction of Give Way lines at the bottom of Woodside ?
5. Is it possible to lobby the manufacturers of satnav systems to give preference to distributor roads, and to refrain from using residential roads ?

I would greatly appreciate a response on the above, thankyou.

Confirm number 22015433

Cllr John Bowcott
Cllr Richard Chellew
Cllr Samantha George
Cllr William Brierly

By email

Dear representatives,

Wimbledon Area Traffic Study

While I have responded to the Informal Consultation Document on the above proposed scheme, I wish to make you directly aware of my opposition to the scheme and the reasons for my position. I believe incidentally that I am not alone in my unhappiness with the Council's proposals.

There is no need here to go over my responses to the questionnaire item by item but I write to emphasise certain general points.

Firstly I am unclear of the objectives of the proposed scheme.

It seems to me that the perceived need from residents for these measures arises from the previous decisions to make Wimbledon Hill and to a lesser extent Arthur Road difficult and disagreeable to negotiate. Motorists have then migrated in search of easier travel to using residential roads. Instead of tempting them back to these main arteries by making them more efficient and pleasant to use, the Council is trying to make the other roads equally disagreeable. Surely instead of having two unpopular results, it would make sense to remove the bus lane on Wimbledon Hill, and facilitate progress through the two junctions at the bottom. Cars would then have a much-reduced incentive to go through the area under discussion. Removal of the bumps in Arthur Road near the apparently disused school entrance would also greatly help. You are heading towards a situation of having two wrongs and failing to achieve a right.

Is your objective to make using cars in the Wimbledon area so disagreeable that motorists simply do not drive there? Local businesses need support rather than obstruction if they are to continue trading and the borough is to prosper. What weight is given in traffic planning to the needs of business? I think here, for instance, of the proposed extra difficulty of having a business in Church Road that requires goods to be collected or delivered. For myself, the degree of traffic obstruction presently in our borough makes me drive out of it to do business in other areas whenever that is at all reasonable.

Secondly, I am opposed to the widespread use of so-called "traffic calming" measures as they have a number of negative effects.

- i. They cause vehicles to change speed more frequently than would otherwise be the case. This causes extra fuel consumption, pollution, noise and wear and tear on the vehicles. They are therefore undesirable on environmental grounds.
- ii. My wife and I are pensioners and therefore of limited means. I therefore find it intolerable that in the last month we have had to pay out about £500.00 to replace a broken spring on one vehicle and repair the exhaust system of the other. Both vehicles are driven carefully, mainly within the Borough of Merton and so it seems virtually certain that so-called "cushions" and platforms caused this damage and expense.
- iii. I know of two other similarly owned and driven vehicles in this street that have had identical problems in the last two months. Can this be coincidence?

- iv. One of our vehicles is a very environmentally friendly vehicle (a Smart Coupe) and, being a small car, can only surmount these obstructions so slowly that we are obliged to hold up other traffic in such areas, which may drive other motorists to regrettable decisions. This amounts to discrimination against those who chose to buy small cars and does not sit well with any sense of responsibility to our fellow citizens.
- v. Also, I suffer from arthritic pains in my neck and back, which are exacerbated by the jolting that goes with obstructions in the road. Am I the only person with such problems? I doubt it!

Thirdly, my dictionary defines a “cushion” as “anything that serves to deaden a blow”. Therefore to use the term to describe solid obstructions in the road intended solely to deliver a blow is spin of the very worst kind and deserves to be exposed to public ridicule.

Fourthly, as a private pensioner whose income falls in real terms each year while my Council Tax rises, I see this proposal as a waste of public money. There is no evidence of any case-by-case cost / benefit analysis with categorical and measurable commitments on expected reductions in injuries or deaths for each proposed work. What, for instance, will it cost to re-engineer the junction of Calonne Road and Burghley Road? How many accidents / injuries/ deaths have there been there and who is making what commitment for a changed outcome? This argument is the same for each proposed work in the scheme.

Fifthly, I am very unhappy with the proposed 20mph zone since such schemes have in other areas encouraged a “vigilante” attitude from residents towards motorists with police forces encouraging reporting of allegedly speeding motorists. Such an atmosphere is not conducive to the kind of liberal and tolerant society that is the British tradition of which I wish to be a part.

In summary, the proposals as a whole make no economic, practical, environmental or political sense and I shall, come the next election, be unable to support councillors who have failed to halt them. I trust that I shall not be forced into that disagreeable position.

Yours sincerely



Cc Mr Stephen Hammond
The Editor, Wimbledon Guardian

Confirm number 22015432

Dear Waheed,

As residents of Highbury Road we are writing in connection with the Wimbledon area traffic consultation. We welcome the Council’s intentions to reduce the traffic flow through the Belvedere roads but have three main points about the specific proposals for our road.

In summary:

- (i) we request that Highbury Road should be narrowed at its junction with Belvedere Avenue in the same way as Alan Road in order to put the two roads on a comparable basis and slow traffic speeding round this dangerous corner
- (ii) we object to the conversion of existing “Permit Holder” parking bays to “Shared Use” parking bays;
- (iii) we object to the creation of any new parking bays.

In light of the Council’s proposal to impose width restrictions at the junction of Belvedere Grove and Belvedere Avenue, and the existing width restrictions at the junction of Alan Road and Belvedere Avenue we would request similar width restriction measures at the junction of Highbury Road and Belvedere Avenue on the grounds of safety and parity with Alan Road. Currently, traffic using this route speeds dangerously round this corner and is a threat to the many small children living in this road. In addition, we believe this would remove the need for at least one of the proposed speed cushions in the road at a saving to the Council.

We believe that additional bays are unnecessary and might create safety issues (including reduced visibility for crossing pedestrians as well as vehicles), whilst the conversion of existing bays would significantly inconvenience residents wishing to park in their own road and encourage non-residents to use the area as a car park – especially for Wimbledon Station. This is currently a residential street in a designated conservation area, which would be irreparably harmed by these arrangements.

On the basis of the above, we would be prepared to accept the imposition of a 20mph speed restriction and a trial period for the remaining speed cushion(s). However, we would stress that the speed cushions need to be of sufficient dimensions effectively to slow 4X4s and other wide vehicles.

We believe that most of the other residents of Highbury Road have also sent you a similar response either in their questionnaire, by letter or by e-mail.

Kind regards,

Confirm number 22015431

Dear Sam, John and Richard,

I am aware that the Consultation period has not yet concluded but thought I should draw you attention to a body of opinion in Marryat Road which has been brought to my attention; it may well be offered in the responses from residents there and accordingly I would ask you, as our ward councillors, to follow it up.

For a large number of residents, the maps and detailed notes included in the consultation have provided their first real opportunity to evaluate fully the details of

the proposals first outlined by Cllr Brierly in his letter of 29 May. Whilst it is my understanding that there is general support for the proposals, including the 20mph zone, concern has been expressed that in Marryat Road, a key route within the North Wimbledon area, there would be no measures to enforce the 20mph limit. In contrast, traffic calming is proposed for Church Road, Calonne Road, Burghley Road and within the Belvederes, which are the remaining through routes in the area.

Department of Transport guidelines indicate that roads with a 20mph limit require measures to enforce that limit. Without some enforcement measures in Marryat, there are concerns that it would become vulnerable not just to speeding but also to displaced through traffic looking for a faster short cut than would be achievable in any other local road.

I hasten to say that there are no clamourings in Marryat for humps or aggressive measures similar to those proposed for the Belvedere area. Nevertheless, there are other options, such as speed tables/platforms, or flashing 20mph signs which have been installed or proposed elsewhere which I believe Marryat residents would wish to consider to reassure them that the 20mph limit would have a realistic chance of being observed.

I appreciate that a further informal consultation would be time consuming for the Council, so if it would assist, the PRA would be happy to conduct a suitable straw poll of Marryat residents if we were given details of possible options.

One further point is that as a result of the ongoing industrial action by postal workers, post boxes in this area are not being emptied and it may well be that as a result, written responses to the Consultation will be delayed. I trust that in the circumstances, the deadline for replies of 4 September will be considered with a degree of flexibility.

Regards
Sue Cooke
Chairman
Parkside Residents' Association

Confirm number 22015430

Dear Mr Alam

I am writing to you with deep concerns about the proposed changes to parking in Old House Close. from residential permits to part pay and display.

We have extraordinary parking problems in our road already as there is simply more residents cars than spaces. I am sure this is often the case but we have such small houses there are no options at all to park on our drives as they do not exist. Most homes here have more than one car per family. There are 20 houses and only 10 spaces. It is also an area where many people choose to leave their cars being close to the shops and the station. Two cars who have local permits but who are not residents of our road park - each and every day in the close- leaving their cars all day while

they go to work. Whilst I know this is allowed it does put extra stress on the shortage of space for those of us that live here.

Please help us.

Many of us have children and need secure parking in the day, evening and night. There are also many women residents living alone and need to park in the close to walk home to their houses safely at any time of day. There simply is not the space in such a small cul-de sac.....and no accessible alternative. There are many roads nearby where residents have much larger houses and driveways to park in and are not - as we are- 100 per cent dependent on the road outside where our houses are.

I live at ?? Old House Close SW19 5AW.

I am also writing on behalf of my neighbor ??????. She does not have access to the internet but wants to appeal against any pay and display bays being introduced. She has lived in the close for 35 years and is very concerned about the parking situation and particularly the additional stress on spaces this will cause.

I will also forward a hard copy of letters from each of us.

Please do let me know if there is any other effective measure we should take to share our concerns.

Kind Regards

Confirm number 22015429

Dear Ms George,

As a resident of Belvedere Drive, I am writing to express my strong concern over the above, in the hope that you will be able to lobby for putting alternatives out to public consultation.

At present, commercial traffic, including large lorries and skips, regularly passes down Belvedere Drive and Belvedere Grove. This area is a well known cut through, a recommended route on satellite navigation systems. Already I am unable to leave my bedroom windows open at night due to early morning traffic noise, (which can be really uncomfortable in the summer heat), and fear that the proposed speed bumps will make the noise levels much worse, so that I will be unable to comfortably leave my windows open during the day.

The proposal does not explicitly aim to reduce through flowing traffic in the region (i.e. evaporation is not an explicit aim), rather to redistribute to more appropriate roads. It seems intuitive to me that introducing a width restriction on one of the roads only will increase traffic flow on neighbouring roads - is this what is anticipated, and desirable ?

I would therefore hope that an alternative proposal could be given, with more widespread use of width restrictions to encourage greater traffic evaporation, particularly commercial through traffic. Road closures are not be an option, due to displacement onto neighbouring areas. (This is despite the fact that this would be consistent with treatment of other residential roads in the borough, and I would ideally like this). Hence, I would like to see the use of width restrictions as a more feasible alternative. There is no evidence that speed bumps would cause evaporation, rather it seems likely would cause a significant decrease in the quality of life here - with an increase in noise pollution, and air quality.

A second concern about speed bumps - certain vehicles of the correct width and suspension (4x4s) can easily go over these bumps at great speed. If the aim is seriously to reduce speed, then perhaps the area should have speed cameras, and fines.

I would therefore be grateful for any support you can give to allowing us an alternative, which would ideally involve the following, from my point of view :

widespread use of width restrictions
- no speed bumps
- greater speed enforcement measures

Many thanks,

Belvedere Drive, SW19 7BY

Confirm number 22015428

Dear Waheed,

I am writing in connection with the Wimbledon area traffic consultation. I welcome the Council's intentions to reduce the traffic flow through the Belvedere roads.

As a resident of Highbury Road, however, I would urge in addition that **our road should be narrowed at each end, that is at its junctions with Belvedere Avenue and St Mary's Road, in similar ways to Alan Road and St Mary's Road.** This is needed to put all three roads on a comparable basis and to slow traffic speeding round the dangerous corners at each end of our road. The present volume, weight, acceleration and speed of traffic using the road pose serious dangers to the many children living here, and the increase in noise disturbance over recent years has been extremely troublesome.

I would particularly emphasise the need for narrowing at both ends of the road. Many of the drivers who now use the road put the accelerator right down as they are turning the corner at each end. The recent works at the St Mary's Road end, and the narrowing introduced in St Mary's Road, have encouraged traffic to divert into Highbury Road and have encouraged, rather than discouraged, dangerous speeding in our road.

For the rest, I very much **support** the proposal to introduce a 20 mph speed limit across the area. But **effective enforcement** will be essential. I would not object to the introduction of one or two more parking bays **provided** that the existing residents' bays are maintained and any additional bays do not impede sightlines for cars issuing from driveways into the road.

Kind regards,

Highbury Road
London SW19 7PR

Confirm number 22015427

Dear Councillor George

I have put forward my reservations to the planned road scheme changes in the Belvederes to limit flow of cars.

Surely though the planners cannot be serious in expecting to keep cars out of the Belvederes if they constrain Church Road parking in the morning and afternoon. That demand, which is obviously NOT local residents, will then spill into Belvedere Grove and side roads looking for space - Meaning; GOING INTO THE BELVEDERES. Hence it has the opposite effect of the intention.

For the residents - US, it means ever bigger problems finding a space within 2-300 yards as now also Courthope Road is suggested as shared parking area. Clements Road is already starting to be full, making it more likely we have to go from the corner of the high street to Highbury Road/Alan Road to find spaces.

Scrapping through Road spaces moves drivers to look in the smaller roads, where then residents gets squeezed out- Not really intended outcome I guess!

I hope you have chance to highlight to the right parties.

Best regards

Belvedere Grove
London SW19 7RQ

Confirm number 22015426

Dear Waheed,

As residents of ?? Highbury Road, I am writing in connection with the Wimbledon area traffic consultation. In response to Council's proposal to reduce traffic flow through the Belvedere roads, I would like to voice 3 main points about the specific proposals for our road.

In summary:

- (i) I request that Highbury Road should be narrowed at its junction with Belvedere Avenue in the same way as Alan Road in order to put the two roads on a comparable basis and slow traffic speeding round this dangerous corner
- (ii) I object to the conversion of existing "Permit Holder" parking bays to "Shared Use" parking bays;
- (iii) I object to the creation of any new parking bays.

Narrowing the junction would help slow down traffic from both directions on Highbury Road. As resident of ?? Highbury Road, I have witnessed many cars speeding to turn from Belvedere Avenue onto Highbury Road and on Highbury Road. I witnessed a minor accident in front of my house just yesterday. A car turned the corner too fast and hit the side mirror of a parked car (there were no other cars on the road).

I strongly oppose additional or conversion of bays as it would reduce visibility for children crossing streets and encourage non-residents to use this street as a car park for Wimbledon Station.

Other residents of Highbury Road share the same view. I thank you for your attention in this matter.

Kind Regards,

Confirm number 22015424

Dear Mr Alam,

At the Exhibition at Wimbledon Library on Saturday last, you spent a fair amount of time courteously responding to my questions for which I thank you.

Referring to the proposals for the Belvederes (I live in Belvedere Grove), we debated the Council's projection for a 40 to 60% reduction in volume of through traffic. Also, there has been mentioned previously an official study which stated a reduction of 27% average and a corresponding increase in surrounding roads of approximately 12%. As any such figures I have seen come from reports of 10 years or more ago, I requested to know the source of your figures and basis for projections. You kindly said that you would check and let me know.

For your reference, the origin of the 27%/12% as far as I can ascertain was in research by Webster and Mackie in 1996 looking at 20mph zones with traffic calming. This was repeated in a TRL report of May 1999. The calming measures used in the zones studied were 52% round top humps, 30% flat top humps 75 or 100mm high, 10% raised junctions and only 4% speed cushions. Bearing in mind that 20mph zones and humps were very much less common then, people have got used to them now, and speed cushions are easier to navigate, I wondered whether similar research now might well have a different result.

I should be much obliged if you could point me to some equivalent modern research which supports the target volume reductions.

With kind regards,

Dear Mr Alam,

I attach a copy of my e-mail to you of 19 August requesting information on a matter I discussed with you at the Exhibition. As yet I have had no reply.

I was hoping to have the benefit of this information before submitting a response to the Consultation, but this is due tomorrow.

Regardless of this, I strongly believe that up to date research evidence is vital for the debate on measures to control rat-running traffic. The Belvedere roads, particularly mine, have suffered long enough from a lack of such controls and I do request again that you provide me with the relevant data upon which the Council has based its statements on the expected reduction of traffic.

With kind regards,

Dear ????,

I'm sorry that I haven't been able to respond to your request earlier. As you will appreciate, I have been inundated with numerous requests in relation to the on-going consultation. We did speak in some detail at the exhibition and as I explained at the time, there is no universal mechanism by which the volume of traffic reduction can be predicted, however I attach a document published by TRL which partially contains the basis of my statement in the consultation newsletter. Please see page 26 which gives data regarding the 'After flow' effects of 20mph zones in London Boroughs. It shows that though there is generally a reduction of traffic flows where such schemes have been implemented, the actual figures can vary significantly. However, traffic reduction of upto 52% have been reported in certain instances.

Finally if I may add that the scheme proposed for the Belvedere area is significantly harsher than the average 20mph zone, hence a predicted/assumed reduction in the flow of through traffic of the order 40-60% through the area can reasonably be expected. Off course as you know the introduction of speed cushions and width restriction is on an experimental basis and therefore we will be collecting the 'Before' data to compare with the 'After' to confirm the actual figures.

I hope this information is sufficient for you for the moment. If you require further assistance do not hesitate to contact me.

regards

Waheed Alam

Dear Waheed,

Thank you very much for this. At least this report updates matters to 2002/2003 rather than 1996!

As you said when we spoke at Crown House this afternoon, the information in the report on the effect of 20mph zones on traffic volume is somewhat variable – from + 9% to – 52%. Having scanned the report briefly, it is evident that it concentrates mainly on accident and injury rates. Of the 137 zones in London in 2002, only 78 were available for analysis and only 14 of those had data on speed and only 11 on volume. I struggled to see if I could correlate type of calming with type of road with reduction in speed with accident reduction, but (like the authors) found it needed more research!

Evidently, a lot of the zones contained schools rather than being purely residential so it is even more difficult to get a comparison with the Belvedere roads. We have the misfortune to be one of the very few open road areas left, lying on the direct short cut line to and from central London, but happening to be residential rather than a distributor. One may speculate, for example, upon the discretionary potentials for walking instead of driving to a local school, or the choice by the committed commuter when a small zone of his/her route is made a bit more inconvenient – which one would show the greater reduction?

No doubt the debate will continue.

Kind regards,

Confirm number 22015423

Dear Ms George,

I am writing in connection with the proposed "temporary" road scheme for Wimbledon Village. I am at a loss to understand why the Council would reach the conclusion that turning the roads into the speed bump capital of England will meet the Conservative pledges to stop the Belvederes being used as rat runs. The latter is a fact is beyond dispute, as I can clearly see looking out of my window at 5.45 pm. All that speed bumps do is inconvenience drivers of smaller cars (who, by altering their speed cause more pollution) whilst four wheel drives and lorries take no notice of them at all. They will not reduce the volume of traffic, as drivers will continue to take the shortest route possible.

I think you are in a minority of councillors who are trying to fulfil the Conservative undertakings to stop the rat runs here. I am at a loss to understand the attitude of your fellow councillors. Objectively it appears that much political shananigans are going on, with agendas being followed that differ from the stated objectives in the Conservative manifesto. What is going on? I suspect that there are some with friends in other wards who want us to keep the problem and others who do not want to look as though they are benefitting themselves. What else?

I fear that the proposals will be voted through on the back of vociferous representations of those outside the actual area affected, without due weight being given to those who actually live and suffer here. A propos of which, I do not recall being asked my views about alterations to St Mary's Road - why do they have a voice on our alterations? Also, I fear that having had them forced on us, the speed bumps etc will become permanent or (but far less likely) that they are all removed at vast expense and then there will be no more money available to actually stop the rat runs.

Why is it that we are not being offered the road closures that have been put in force in so many other areas of Merton? What can we do? No doubt we shall be "out voiced" at the meeting. Unfortunately, I shall not be able to attend as it takes place in the week of my summer holiday. I can only ask that you continue to support our cause, prevent these speed bumps and push for road closures.

With best wishes

Confirm number 22015422

PARKSIDE RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION
20 Burghley Road
Wimbledon
London SW19 5BH
T:020 8946 4371 F:020 8944 6441
Email: DavidandSueCooke@aol.com

Cllr William Brierly
London Borough of Merton
Merton Civic Centre
London Road
Morden
Surrey SM4 5DX

11 September 2009

Dear Cllr Brierly

Wimbledon Area Traffic Study – Consultation

Having had some feedback from our residents, I am writing to offer comments on behalf of the Parkside Residents' Association upon the Informal Consultation on the Wimbledon Area Traffic Study which was circulated to individual households in August.

First of all we confirm our overall support for the proposals. After many years of debate and investigation, residents are finally being offered what we consider to be a comprehensive and holistic solution to the complex traffic management issues affecting the Village area. This Association has lobbied throughout this process for proposals which avoid closures, banned turns and similar measures which simply transfer traffic problems from one area to another. We support the emphasis on reducing traffic speeds across a wide area around the Village and very much hope that the proposed 20mph limits will discourage through traffic from using residential roads as a fast short cut.

Turning to matters of detail, and following the numbered questions in the consultation paper, our comments are:

1. Questions 1 and 2. Church Road proposals.

Agreed. We understand the need for the proposed parking restrictions. However, the bays involved are heavily used throughout the day and we are aware that Village businesses are anxious to expand parking provision for their customers. As our residents are concerned to support the ongoing commercial viability of the Village we consider that it is important to offer further parking provision, to compensate for the reduced availability of the bays referred to in Q1.

2. Questions 3 and 4. Belvedere Area proposals (Experimental Scheme Elements)

Agreed.

3. Questions 5 to 8 inclusive. Belvedere Area, Lancaster Road Parking and Junction Entry treatments.

Agreed. See our comments above as to the need for further parking provision in the Village and the need to discourage through traffic from using residential roads.

4. Question 9. Burghley Road/Marryat Road/Calonne Road proposals.

This Association has been lobbying for many years for measures to deal with the excessive speeding occurring in **Burghley Road** and so we very much welcome the commitment which has now been made to address this long outstanding issue.

We support all the proposals referred to for Burghley Rd. However, this area is within the Wimbledon North Conservation Area and its attractive historic features are noted in the recently completed Character Assessment. With this in mind we are concerned at the potential negative visual impact of the proposed traffic calming measures and their associated signage. These appear to be similar to measures recently installed in parts of St Mary's Road which in our view have had a most detrimental visual impact on that road. We do not consider that sympathetic design and traffic safety need to be mutually exclusive. Accordingly we would welcome further discussion with officers to consider what adjustments could be made to enhance the visual impact of the measures. Perhaps some planting in the build-outs would be appropriate.

We would also wish to discuss with officers the possible sites for the relocated permit bays to replace those outside 16 and 35 Burghley Road which will be lost. These bays are all well used and their removal would put pressure on the remaining bays in the road.

It has been drawn to our attention that on drawing 1B, section E, which shows the proposed junction feature at the Burghley/Church/St Mary's Rd junction, the existing second crossover for Hardwycke in Burghley Road, close to the junction, has been omitted. We do not know the scale which has been used on this drawing but a site inspection will be needed to ensure that the raised table does not extend in front of this crossover.

As for **Calonne Road**, we are aware that strong views have been expressed by some residents who are opposed to the proposals for their road but no doubt the completed consultation forms will give a clearer indication of the view of the majority. It does however appear that whilst many Calonne residents probably support the principle of a 20mph speed limit in the road, there would seem to be little support for its enforcement via as many as three traffic calming features as described in the questionnaire. It has been suggested that at most, a single installation should suffice. It has also been pointed out by some that, if only one traffic calming feature is to be installed, the bend in the road outside no 32 may not be the most appropriate location for its installation; perhaps a further site inspection and closer investigation of speeding patterns would be appropriate. Other residents have also suggested that a more visually acceptable traffic calming feature, such as a speed table/platform might be more appropriate as those proposed in the

consultation are likely to have a detrimental visual impact upon this part of the Conservation Area.

5. Question 12. Wimbledon Hill Road proposals.

Agreed.

6. Questions 13. Other proposals - Lorries

A particular problem within the PRA area is that in the daytime, heavy lorries frequently appear to ignore the "access only" entry restrictions and use residential roads as a short cut to Parkside. We would welcome advice on what further measures, if any, can be introduced to help enforce these restrictions.

7. Question 14. Other proposals – 20mph Speed Limit

As noted above, we support the introduction of the proposed 20mph limits for the area. However, we are concerned that within **Marryat Road**, there are no proposals for any measures to enforce that limit and that, without self enforcement of some kind, the limit will be ignored. Since traffic calming is proposed for Church Road as well as the Belvederes, we believe that this would also leave Marryat vulnerable to displaced through traffic looking for an alternative fast short cut. Residents of Marryat Road have suggested that modest traffic calming features such as a raised entry table at the High St/Marryat junction and a speed table/platform further towards the Burghley /Marryat junction might be appropriate, together with flashing speed warning signage in the lower section of Marryat between the junctions with Burghley and Somerset Road.

Yours sincerely

Mrs S Cooke
Chairman

Cc Ward Cllrs Bowcott, Chellew and George,
Cllr Chris Edge
Stephen Hammond MP
Waheed Alam

Confirm number 22015421

Dear Mr Alam,

I thought you might be interested in this latest email from the PRA, which does not consult members and residents directly within its boundaries, but rather makes suggestions to them based on the decision/s of the committees' preferred outcome on such matters as this.

I absolutely do not want flashing lights on Marryat Road or any other road in the borough for that matter, which would be a potential "blinding" hazard for drivers and those sensitive to such lighting. Our roads and footpaths are already cluttered with unnecessary "furniture." Who would want a flashing light outside their home 24/7 one of the committee members? I think not. Plus there is the cost and environmental impact of such lighting.

In principle, I have no objection to tables as self-enforcement measures on Marryat Road, but suggest that we try without first, not least because of the cost implication and the fact that speeding really isn't a problem on Marryat Road. It does happen occasionally, as it does elsewhere, but does not warrant attention. Then there is also the question of tables impeding the movement of emergency vehicles and the very heavy goods vehicles and (already very noisy and polluting) old routemaster buses for the three months in the run up to and break down after the tennis championships. Such vehicles will create additional noise nuisance going over such tables and will increase pollution by having to slow down and then speed up?

Kind regards



N.B Despite living on Marryat Road for 2.5 years and being the Chairman of Homefield Road Resident's Association (HRRRA) for 4 years before that, I have not met any of the committee members listed at the foot of the PRA email, nor have they introduced themselves to me. So how representative is it of the residents? In HRRRA, every resident was consulted on every decision before a consensus view was reached and then represented to bodies such as the council. That is no what PRA does.

From: parkside.residents@hotmail.com
Subject: Wimbledon Area Traffic Study - Marryat Road
Date: Fri, 11 Sep 2009 11:39:11 +0100

Dear Marryat Neighbour,

During the recent informal consultation on the Village Traffic issues, a number of Marryat residents contacted us with concerns that the scheme did not incorporate any measures to enforce the proposed 20mph limit in Marryat, whilst measures were being offered in other key routes. Dept of Transport guidelines recommend that 20mph limits need self enforcing measures to work. Whilst there is no suggestion that Marryat should have aggressive measures such as humps, we are concerned that without enforcement of some sort our road would become vulnerable not just to speeding but also to displaced through traffic looking for a faster short cut than would be achievable in any other local road in the new zone.

In our view, the most appropriate and visually least intrusive measures would be two shallow tables/platforms, one at the High St junction and the second further towards the Burghley junction, supported perhaps with flashing speed signage at suitable points including in the lower section nearer the AELTC.

Officers are now considering responses to the consultation. If you agree with our view, please email traffic officer waheed.alam@merton.gov.uk accordingly so he can take this into account in his report and copy your email to our ward councillors, john.bowcott@merton.gov.uk samantha.george@merton.gov.uk and richard.chellew@merton.gov.uk so that they are also aware of these concerns. It is not a problem if you have already replied to the consultation

and did not raise the matter then as you can point out that this is an issue which has been drawn to your attention subsequently. (If you have not yet responded to the consultation, there may still be time for a late response to be considered if you complete the questionnaire as soon as possible online at www.merton.gov.uk/watm ; the PRA is recommending supporting all the proposals save that questions 10 and 11 which refer to possible additional traffic calming in Calonne Rd should be for residents of Calonne Rd to consider. References to measures in Marryat could be added in the box for comments at Q 14)

Regards

Hamish Bryce, Ronnie Dunbar and Jonathan Tubbs, PRA Committee members for Marryat Rd and

Mike Rappolt, PRA Committee member for Peek Crescent.

Confirm number 22015420

Dear Sirs,

Having already completed the questionnaire on Village Traffic and returned it to you, it has been brought to my attention that the scheme does not include any measures to enforce the proposed 20mph speed limit in Marryat Road, whilst measures are being offered in other key routes. I am concerned that without enforcement of some sort, Marryat Road may become vulnerable to speeding and also displaced traffic looking for a faster shortcut than would be achievable in any other local road in the new zone. Perhaps the most appropriate and visually least intrusive measure would be to have shallow tables/platforms at the High Street junction, towards the Burghley junction and near the AELTC.

I would be grateful if you would take these points into account in your report.

Yours faithfully,

Confirm number 22015419

Dear Mr Alam

I have just been completing my response to the Wimbledon Area Traffic Study but can find no space on the form to make the following point, hence this letter.

There are now people regularly using scooters and motor bikes and I cannot recall having seen in the vicinity of Church Road and the roads off Church Road any separate parking facilities for these bikes, with the result that the owners not unreasonably use the parking bays. It is fair to say that they usually take great pains to park at one end of the bay thus in theory leaving the bay free for a car, but in practice this is not realistic, as even if with a small car one tries to squeeze in there is a danger, which too often becomes a reality, that the bike gets knocked.

I have to say I am unclear as to the regulations regarding the payment for the use of the bays. Presumably if the bike owner has paid then a car owner should not be trying to use the bay anyway. But does he pay? All very confusing.

As I understand it would appear that the Congestion charge favours bikes over cars I imagine the same principle applies to road use generally. That being so it would seem reasonable that the interest of the motor bike riders should be accommodated.

Yours faithfully

Confirm number 22015471

Dear Sir,

Traffic Study

One matter I would like to refer to you, which did not seem to fit in the questionnaire, is the parking of motor scooters and bicycles (motor bicycles) in parking bays in Church Road. Generally the owners try to park at our end of the bay at right angles to the pavement but when there it can be difficult for a motorist to reverse into the bay. I don't believe they pay the parking fees, but there is no other place for them to park. Perhaps the needs of the owners of those vehicles could be considered – a bay of their own in one of the side streets.

Yours faithfully

Confirm number 22015454

Dear Mr Waheed Alam

Mrs Sue Cooke, the President of the Parkside Residents' Association, has sent me a copy of the proposals outlined in the consultation documents of the Wimbledon Area Traffic Survey.

I fully support a widespread 20mph zone to the north of the High Street and Wimbledon Hill Road, Burghley, Church and Arthur Road extending to Somerset, Home Park and Strathaern Rd. The main point however is that the speed limit must be enforced by large appropriate signs and speed cameras at strategic points. Burghley Road has particular problems due to the 'switch back' nature of the road which encourages a Crest-run activity on the part of all too many drivers!

I am opposed to pinch points as they can lead to build up of traffic. I think the recent masonry measures in the St Marys Road locality have been singularly unsuccessful and hope that they will not be used here.

I can appreciate that there are tremendous difficulties in implementing any control of traffic in this area but something must be sorely wrong when the High Street is often less busy in peak times than the surrounding roads

Yours sincerely

Confirm number 22015470

Dear Sir,

CONSULTATION AUGUST 2009.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the proposals for the Wimbledon area traffic situation. I enclose the completed form with comments on some items which I hope will be helpful.

I feel I should add that it is unfortunate that you decided to carry out this consultation over the holiday period, which you acknowledge is difficult for residents, and offer as a reason the delay in reaching this point. This reads in a way almost contemptuous of residents and may attract criticism, especially as this is a not unfamiliar practice of government bodies.

I hope that useful results will nonetheless flow from the consultation.

Yours faithfully

Confirm number 22015472

To: waheed.Alam@merton.gov.uk

Cc: samantha.george@merton.co.uk; john.bowcott@merton.gov.uk;
richard.chellew@merton.gov.uk

Dear Waheed

As residents of Highbury Road we are writing in connection with the Wimbledon area traffic consultation. We welcome the Council's intentions to reduce the traffic flow through the Belvedere roads but have three main points about the specific proposals for our road.

In summary:

- (i) we object to the conversion of existing 'Permit Holder' Parking bays to 'Shared Use' Parking bays; we understand there is a legal obligation for the council to provide each road with some residents only parking bays. This is adhered to by all other London Boroughs.
- (ii) we object to the creation of new parking bays; and
- (iii) we request that Highbury Road should be narrowed at its junction with Belvedere Avenue in the same way as Alan Road in order to put the two roads on a comparable basis and slow traffic speeding round this dangerous corner.

We feel strongly that additional bays are entirely unnecessary and create serious safety issues (including reduced visibility for crossing pedestrians as well as vehicles), whilst the

conversion of existing bays would significantly inconvenience residents wishing to park in their own road and encourage non-residents to use the area as a car park - especially for Wimbledon Station. This is currently a residential street in a designated conservation area, which would be irreparably harmed by these arrangements.

In addition, in light of the Council's proposal to impose width restrictions at the junction of Belvedere Grove and Belvedere Avenue, and the existing width restrictions on Alan Road, we would request similar width restriction measures at the junction of Highbury Road and Belvedere Avenue on the grounds of safety and parity with Alan Road. Currently, traffic using this route speeds dangerously round this corner and is a threat to the many small children living in this road. In addition, we believe this would remove the need for at least one of the proposed speed cushions in the road at a saving to the Council. We would also favour a similar measure at the junction with St Mary's Road, especially if this would also eliminate the need for yet a further speed cushion.

On the basis of the above, we would be prepared to accept the imposition of a 20mph speed restriction and a trial period for the remaining speed cushion(s).

We believe that most of the other residents of Highbury Road have also sent you a similar response either in their questionnaire or by letter.

Kind regards

Confirm number 22015418

Dear Mr. Alam

I attended the library exhibition particularly wishing to speak with you but the entire 40 minutes I was there you were in conversation with Mr. Beresford of NEW Belvedere Estate Residents Association which I regret prevented me from making your acquaintance.

I very much wished to discuss with you how the Council can consider it appropriate to spend so much of ratepayers' tax resources on just one small area of the borough? The Council is pandering to a small vociferous cabal who do not even represent the whole of the Belvedere Estate, (having set up NEWBERA to push for changes when they met opposition within the original BERA). I consider it an immoral waste of scarce resources - especially when there are crying needs from social services, schools and other services for those who have greatest need in our borough.

The original pressure this residents' association placed upon the Council to turn the clock back resulted in a "me too" defensive attitude of other residents in other roads. None of the measures proposed is necessary: there is no safety profile which requires that such measures be imposed upon everyone 24/7/365 days of the year when the traffic surveys already undertaken indicate that the problem only exists during the rush hours during the school term time and then for only a few roads which residents deem "residential". Residents also live in roads you designate "distributor" e.g. Church Road. Highways are intended for vehicular/cycle/pedestrian usage, not as enclaves for those fronting them.

I have lived in Wimbledon for nearly 50 years so am totally conversant with the Village and of the changes which the passage of time has brought. That traffic has increased is not disputed but it is a necessary corollary of modern life. Health and Safety has legislated that children be separately seated in cars and this has led to a proliferation of vehicles on school runs; the establishment of large supermarkets, DIY stores etc. require car usage; and not everyone can possibly use public transport. There is a necessity for North/South journeys through this area to take place - the notion of traffic "evaporation" is fallacious - only displacement can occur to the detriment of other people.

One factor that I have not seen mentioned anywhere, and to which I would particularly like to draw your attention, is the rise in internet shopping. Each and every item has to be delivered by road. Narrowing roads with parking each side can only ensure that such deliveries will perforce bring traffic to a standstill. Life has changed and we must accommodate these changes and not try and return to the past.

I trust you will think most carefully before implementing any changes whatsoever. They are unnecessary and that they constitute a monstrous waste of scarce resources in the service of so few is totally unacceptable.

Yours sincerely

Confirm number 22015417

Dear Mr Alam

**Informal consultation: Wimbledon Area Traffic Study
Right turn for buses - Alexandra Road at junction with Wimbledon Hill Road
Box markings -junction with Worple Road**

Thank you for your letter dated 5 August informing London TravelWatch of these proposals and inviting our views. I am grateful for the invitation to comment.

London TravelWatch is the statutory watchdog representing transport users in and around London.

London TravelWatch has no comment on the general proposals, but would support the future plans for a right turn bus lane/gate from Alexandra Road and the box marking at the junction with Worple Road (drawing reference 1 B/H).

This would enable buses to operate two-way along Wimbledon Hill Road instead of diverting around St George's Road. This would be greatly welcomed by passengers.

Yours sincerely,

Vincent Stops
PP ' Streets & Surface Transport Policy Officer

Confirm number 22015485

Waheed,

Thank you for your letter and accompanying documents regarding The Belvederes proposals. Please accept my apologies for the delayed response, I have been on annual leave. As regards the proposals police would make the following observations.

Police would have no objection in principle to the idea of changing the bay hours and introducing waiting restrictions to prevent the bottleneck in Church Road, nor to the provision of the raised tables in Church Road.

Police would have no objection in principle to the proposed speed cushions in the Belvedere Roads. We would however have concerns about the proposed width restriction as this could have implications in relation to response times for LAS & LFB vehicles. Police would ask what the width restriction would achieve that other methods of traffic calming can not?

Police would have some concerns about the introduction of parking in existing parking gaps. If there was a recognized need for a gap which is now to be removed, this could have an adverse effect in emergency service response times. It is also possible that vehicles will increase their speed to try to get through these tighter sections first rather than wait as the existing gaps permit. It may also reduce crossing opportunities for pedestrians or reduce their intervisibility with traffic as they have to cross between parked cars rather than in the existing gaps. Whilst we understand the use of parked vehicles to prevent a straight line through, which can slow traffic, we would be concerned if the proposal led to one straight route through the middle and cars possibly playing "chicken" and leaving restricted crossing possibility for pedestrians.

As regards the drawings on drawing 1B, police would have no objection in principle or observations to the proposals in A, B, C, E or F. In D we believe the parking bay needs to be removed from by the Give Way lines; if it is occupied then it will tend to line up vehicles with the gap and possibly encourage them to try and beat the opposing flow. In G we would have no objection in principle or observations to the proposed speed table, but would object to the change of speed limit. In H, whilst police see the idea behind the proposals behind the realignment of carriageway space in Wimbledon Hill Road, we have some concerns. Stationary buses will now prevent any flow towards the village when stopped opposite Alwyne Road, as will right turning vehicles into Alwyne Road. Police would also have concerns about loading to the shops there if only one lane is available, passing traffic having to go fully into the oncoming lane. Will the improved flow away from the village outweigh the possible restriction on traffic leaving the town centre? As the flow on this road is probably tidal, whilst there will be benefits at one end of the day, will they be outweighed by any disadvantages when the main flow is in the opposite direction? The proposed box junction opposite Worple Road appears unlawful in both form and use; police would suggest that a Keep Clear marking is more appropriate. The box junction at the Alexandra Road junction appears incorrect; police believe it should be a full box rather than a half. The relocated pedestrian island whilst allowing two lanes southbound is liable to increase delays as the two lanes from Wimbledon Bridge merge in a tighter space and possibly block the junction. Will the left turn lane into Alexandra Road end up causing problems as traffic tries to move into the offside lane or will it simply ignore the markings and carry straight on; they are only advisory. The proposed Alexandra Road bus lane would be opposed by police if the reason for the right turn ban was safety related. As regards the proposed width restriction at J, there is a need to protect a turning head or provide some advanced signing to prevent vehicles getting stuck and having to reverse an excessive distance out.

Police would ask on what basis the 7.5 tonne lorry ban extension is proposed? We do not see that the existing route is likely to be used as a cut through as the physical width restriction in Arthur Road outside Wimbledon Park LT Stn will prevent lorries getting in and out or the area on one of the most desirable routes. Is there existing evidence that supports the need or is

this as a result of resident complaints? It has been our past experience that residents may not be as familiar with lorry weights as they think they are, and that lorries that are supposedly breaking the ban in fact frequently weigh in at 7490kg, and are therefore not excluded from the area. In the event that the ban was introduced it would fall to police to enforce, unless Merton were proposing to take up enforcement, and therefore could place a strain on local police resources. If there is actually a problem with these then we are happy to work with you to come to a solution, but we would like to be fully aware of the actual extent of the issue before we consider solutions or end up with a restriction that is not actually required.

Police would object to the proposed 20mph speed limit, on the same basis that previous objections have been made, that the proposal is not in keeping with Government guidelines on the use and signing of 20mph speed limits, is unlikely to be self-enforcing as 20mph limits should be and will create further variations of signing across the borough which we believe will result in less compliance rather than more, both in Merton and in surrounding boroughs.

I hope that these comments are helpful in coming to your final proposals and I look forward to seeing the detailed drawings. If you wish to discuss these comments any further please do not hesitate to contact me, and once again my apologies for the delay in responding.

Regards,

Richard.

COMMENTS FROM PUBLIC EXHIBITION

Confirm number 22015441

Comment from resident of Church Road

I live the village end of Church Road. Residents parking is already very limited. Making all bays Shared would have a very unacceptable level of competition for spaces made even worse.

I hope it may be possible ??????? the 'Residents only' bays at the Village end – especially Belvedere Square, Old House Close and Lancaster Road.

Confirm number 22015442

Comment from resident of Courthope Road

Agree with traffic restrictions but have problems with parking restrictions as even with Residents only restrictions we have problems finding spaces in Couthope Road.

Confirm number 22015443

Comment from resident of The High Street

Main issue is that there is no availability for pay & display in the streets around the High Street, Courthope, Belvedere Grove and Clement which are mix of residential and business use are full all day, and all evening long.

I do support the imposition of a 20 mph speed restriction.

Separate Issue—The new bag system of rubbish collection is not functioning properly. Bags are often not collected for a whole week at a time. Also there is no permission for glass collection in the Village.

Confirm number 22015444

Comment from resident of Farquhar Road

Please provide more motorcycle bays in Wimbledon Town Centre (near station) & also in Wimbledon Village.

Confirm number 22015445

Comment from resident of St Aubyns Avenue

Strong objections to increased road humps.

Will be returning questionnaire.

Confirm number 22015446

Comment from resident of Highbury Road

Very concerned (and opposed to) proposals for increasing dual use bays and creation of new parking bays. This can only lead to increased traffic congestion.

Confirm number 22015447

Comment from resident of Wimbledon Hill Road

I have a resident permit for Von and park in Belvedere Drive.
I am disadvantaged by the change of residents bay to mixed use. This will be particularly bad on a Saturday which is when I am likely to move my car a number of times during the day.
I would have no objection to the change on Monday to Friday only.
Overall I would be slightly concerned about the cost for an 'experiment' for limited obvious benefit. It is my money after all!

Confirm number 22015448

Comment from resident of Newstead Way

1. Having spent £500 on replacing broken car springs in last two weeks I oppose ALL use of "speed cushions" in all their forms.
2. As a driver of an environmentally friendly smart car, these cannot be negotiated at more than 18mph. Again a reason to oppose bumps.
3. A yellow Grid at the junction of Worple Road/Wimbledon Hill is a good idea.
4. Blanket 20 limits do not make environmental sense as most cars have to drive in a low gear at this speed.

Confirm number 22015449

Comment from resident of High Street

The idea of changing the parking bays in close vicinity of the High Street seems not well researched. Courthope Road is normally full during the day as is. Residents already pay for their permits, while that does not guarantee a space, how many times over do you intend to sell those places? Some concept of natural justice should be applied.

On the speed humps, I'm not convinced they work that well although I'm not that opposed.

20mph, why not.

Confirm number 22015450

Comment from resident of Leeward Gardens

I am concerned about safety crossing the road at junction of Hill Road/Belvedere Drive. There is a tree which blocks sight line on one side of the road which makes crossing feel unsafe.

Sight lines are obscured by cars parked in parking zones.

Could this be looked at?

Confirm number 22015451

Comment from resident of Woodside

Woodside – 7.5 T lorry weight restriction – lorries reversing due to width restriction or attempting to turn around, mounting pavements very dangerously or sitting with their engine running as they look on a map for alternative route.

Woodside/Wimbledon Hill Road junction – issue with signal playing. Short green interval & long red phase- Review?

Causing vehicles to 3 point turns & to reverse. Also road rage because the motorist behind hoots the horn wanting driver in front to go through the red light and when the driver does not the driver behind becomes angry and shouts out abuse.

Road cushions are a nightmare for drivers who are transporting the elderly (disabled with back problems) because although one cautiously drives over the road cushion-it is still jars the passenger again driving slowly causes the driver behind to become angry.

I can't see how a proposed "kerb cutback" can take place at the junction of Wimbledon Hill and Woodside (outside Foxtons) as it would endanger pedestrians walking two abreast as there doesn't appear to be enough excess to cut away and traffic would be too close.