

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

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

1. Title of report

Proposed CH CPZ Hillcross Avenue

2. Reason for exemption (if any)

3. Decision maker

Councillor Martin Whelton, Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Housing and Transport

4. Date of Decision

26 February 2021

5. Date report made available to decision maker

16 February 2021

6. Decision

- That the Cabinet Member considers the issues detailed in this report and
- A) Notes the result of the statutory consultation carried out between 19th November and 18 December 2020 on the proposals to extend the existing Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) 'CH' (in Cannon Hill Ward) to include Hillcross Avenue between Nos 1 and 113 Hillcross Avenue and between Maycross Avenue and property No 90 Hillcross Avenue.
 - B) Notes and considers the representations received in respect of the proposal as detailed in Appendix 2.
 - C) Agrees to proceed with the making of the relevant Traffic Management Orders (TMO) and the implementation of the proposed extension of CH CPZ to include Hillcross Avenue between Nos 1 and 113 Hillcross Avenue and between Maycross Avenue and property No 90 Hillcross Avenue; operational Monday to Friday between 11am and 3pm as shown in Drawing No. Z78-368-01 in Appendix 1.
 - D) Agrees to exercise his discretion not to hold a public inquiry on the consultation process.

7. Reason for decision

1. Support from residents for the implementation of a controlled parking zone
2. The introduction of controlled parking will improve road safety in the area.
3. Residents will have parking prioritised as a result of controlled parking.

8. Alternative options considered and why rejected

8.1 Do nothing. This would not address the current parking demands of the local business community.

Councillor Martin Whelton

Cabinet Member for Housing, Transport, and the Climate Emergency

26 February, 2020

Committee: Cabinet Member Report

Date: 11th February 2021

Agenda item:

Ward: Cannon Hill

Subject: Proposed CH CPZ extension Hillcross Avenue – statutory consultation.

Lead officer: Chris Lee, Director of Environment & Regeneration.

Lead member: Councillor Martin Whelton, Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Housing and Climate Change

Forward Plan reference number: N/A

Contact Officer: Paul Atie, Tel: 020 8545 3337

Email: <mailto:paul.atie@merton.gov.uk>

Recommendations:

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

- A) Notes the result of the statutory consultation carried out between 19th November and 18 December 2020 on the proposals to extend the existing Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) 'CH' (in Cannon Hill Ward) to include Hillcross Avenue between Nos 1 and 113 Hillcross Avenue and between Maycross Avenue and property No 90 Hillcross Avenue.
- B) Notes and considers the representations received in respect of the proposal as detailed in Appendix 2.
- C) Agrees to proceed with the making of the relevant Traffic Management Orders (TMO) and the implementation of the proposed extension of CH CPZ to include Hillcross Avenue between Nos 1 and 113 Hillcross Avenue and between Maycross Avenue and property No 90 Hillcross Avenue; operational Monday to Friday between 11am and 3pm as shown in Drawing No. Z78-368-01 in Appendix 1.
- D) Agrees to exercise his discretion not to hold a public inquiry on the consultation process.

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report presents the results of the statutory consultation carried out on the Councils' proposals to extend the existing CH CPZ to include Hillcross Avenue between Nos 1 and 113 Hillcross Avenue and between Maycross Avenue and property No 90 Hillcross Avenue.
- 1.2 It seeks approval to progress with the above recommendations.

2. DETAILS

- 2.1 The key objectives of parking management include:
 - Tackling of congestion by reducing the level and impact of traffic in town centres and residential areas;
 - making the borough's streets safer and more secure, particularly for pedestrians and other vulnerable road users through traffic management measures;

- Managing better use of street spaces for people, goods and services, ensuring that priority is allocated to meet the objectives of the strategy;
- Improving the attractiveness and amenity of the borough's streets, particularly in town centres and residential areas;
- encouraging the use of more sustainable modes of transport;

2.2 Controlled Parking Zones aim to provide safe parking arrangements, whilst giving residents and businesses priority access to available kerbside parking space. It is a way of controlling the parking whilst improving and maintaining access and safety for all road users. A CPZ comprises of yellow line waiting restrictions and various types of parking bays operational during the controlled times. These types of bays include the following:

Permit holder bays - For use by resident permit holders, business permit holders and those with visitor permits;

Shared Use - Pay and display (P&D) / permit holder bays - For use by P&D customers and permit holders.

2.3 A CPZ includes double yellow lines (no waiting 'at any time') restrictions at key locations such as at junctions, bends and along certain lengths of roads (passing gaps) where parking impedes the flow of traffic or would create an unacceptable safety risk e.g. obstructive sightlines or unsafe areas where pedestrians cross. These restrictions will improve access for emergency services; refuse vehicles and the overall safety for all road users, especially those pedestrians with disabilities and parents with prams. Any existing double yellow lines at junctions will remain unchanged.

2.4 The CPZ design comprises mainly of permit holder bays to be used by residents, their visitors or business permit holders and a limited number of pay and display shared use bays, which are mainly located near businesses. The layout of the parking bays are arranged in a manner that provides the maximum number of suitable parking spaces without jeopardising road safety and the free movement of traffic.

2.5 Within any proposed CPZ, the Council aims to reach a balance between the needs of the residents, businesses, visitors and all other users of the highway. It is normal practice to introduce appropriate measures if and when there is a sufficient majority of support or there is an overriding need to ensure access and safety. In addition, the Council would also take into account the impact of introducing the proposed changes in assessing the extent of those controls and whether or not they should be implemented.

2.6 Following the implementation of CH CPZ in September 2019, some residents in Hillcross Avenue petitioned the Council requesting the existing CPZ be extended to include their section of Hillcross Avenue.

3. STATUTORY CONSULTATION

3.1 The statutory consultation on the Council's intention to extend CH CPZ to include Hillcross Avenue between Nos 1 and 113 Hillcross Avenue and between Maycross Avenue and property No 90 Hillcross Avenue was carried out between 19th November and 18 December 2020. The consultation included erecting Notices on lamp columns

in the vicinity of the proposals and the publication of the Council's intentions in the Wimbledon and Mitcham Times and the London Gazette. Consultation documents were also available at the Link, Merton Civic Centre and on the Council's website. A newsletter with a plan (see Appendix 3) was also distributed to all those properties included within the consultation area.

- 3.2 The newsletter detailed the following information:
- details of the statutory consultation
 - A plan of design layout and zone boundary
 - Zone operational hours (Monday to Friday between 11am – 3pm)
- 3.3 The statutory consultation resulted in 20 representations, 8 representations in support; 1 comment and 11 against the proposed extension to the CPZ. Of those who objected, there are 5 from within the proposed extension and 6 from outside the zone. Details of these representations along with officer's comments can be found in appendix 2.
- 3.4 The prominent point raised within the representations from those within the boundary of the proposed CPZ extension, relate to the costs associated with parking permits; the waiting restrictions (yellow lines) reducing available parking space and a view that despite the majority objection from those who were initially consulted along this section of the road prior to the introduction of the existing zone, the scheme is now being extended to include this road.
- 3.5 In response to the issues raised, it should be noted that CPZs must be self-funding. This means that the parking tariffs covers the costs associated with implementation, administrations, maintenance and enforcement of CPZs. Any surplus funds generated is legally required to be ring fenced to be invested back into the highway / transport or fund concessionary travel schemes.
- 3.6 Several points were made regarding the positioning of proposed waiting restrictions (yellow lines) in the proposed scheme. The layout of the parking restrictions are arranged in a manner that provides the maximum number of suitable parking spaces without jeopardising road safety and the free movement of traffic; additionally, within a CPZ, all kerbside must either be controlled with yellow line waiting restrictions (such as at junctions or across vehicle dropped kerbs / access) or designated parking places and it is not normal practice to introduce parking places across dropped kerbs (driveway) therefore single yellow lines are marked to provide clearance during CPZ operational hours. Alternatively, a parking bay would need to be introduced across a crossover and any permit holder would be able to park within the bay.
- 3.7 One of the issues raised in representations include concern for the potential parking displacement into uncontrolled section of Hillcross Avenue; the sentiment that residents of these uncontrolled section of this road will receive a 'double blow' with increased parking pressure by being outside the adjacent CPZ with reduced kerbside parking availability.
- 3.8 By virtue of section 122, the Council must exercise its powers under the RTRA 1984 so as to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic including pedestrians therefore, access for all road users take priority over parking. It is therefore essential that the yellow lines are introduced as proposed. The residents within the uncontrolled areas have not demonstrated support for a CPZ and it would be unreasonable to ignore the requests from those who have petitioned the Council for inclusion.

Ward Councillor Comments

3.9 Ward Councillors have been engaged during the consultation process and have been advised of the outcome of the consultation and officers' recommendations; at the time of writing this report, no comments have been received against the proposed measures.

4. PROPOSED MEASURES

4.1 It is recommended that the Traffic Management Orders TMOs be made to extend the existing Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) 'CH' to include Hillcross Avenue between Nos 1 and 113 Hillcross Avenue and between Maycross Avenue and property No 90 Hillcross Avenue.

4.2 The CPZ design comprises of permit holder bays to be used by residents and their visitors. The layout of the parking bays are arranged in a manner that provides the maximum number of suitable parking spaces without jeopardising road safety and the free movement of traffic.

4.4 Permit issue criteria

It is proposed that the residents' permit parking provision should be identical to that offered in other controlled parking zones in Merton at the time of consultation. The charges for permits are (tier 2 on the price list) £100 for the first car in a household, £150 for the second in a household and £200 for the third and subsequent car in a household plus an additional charge of £150 for a diesel vehicle. An annual visitor's permit is £320.

4.6 Visitors' permits

Half-day permits at £3. Half-day permits can be used between 11am and 3pm. The allowance of visitor permits per adult in a household shall be 100 half-day permits.

4.7 Trades permits

Trade Permits are priced at £900 per annum. Trades permits can also be purchased for 6 months at £600, 3 months at £375, 1 month at £150 and Weekly at £50.

4.9 NEW CHARGES

Please note that between 10 September and 26 October 2020 the Council carried out a statutory consultation on emission based-parking charges which will affect the existing permit and P&D tariffs. It is likely that a final decision will be made early 2021 and if approved, the new charges will be implemented after April 2021. For full details please refer to the website

<https://www.merton.gov.uk/streets-parking-transport/parking/consultations/charges-2020>

5 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

5.1 Do nothing. This would not address the current parking demands of the residents in respect of their views expressed during the informal consultation, as well as the Council's duty to provide a safe environment for all road users.

5.2 Not to introduce the proposed double yellow lines. In the event of an incident, however, this would put the Council at risk and the Council could be considered as failing in its duties by not giving safety and access priority, especially for emergency and refuse collection service vehicles.

6. TIMETABLE

- 6.1 If a decision is made to proceed with the implementation of the proposed CPZ, Traffic Management Orders could be made within six weeks after the made decision. This will include the erection of the Notices on lamp columns in the area, the publication of the made Orders in the Wimbledon and Wandsworth Times and the London Gazette. The documents will be made available at the Link, Civic Centre and on the Council's website. A newsletter will be distributed to all the premises within the consulted area informing them of the decision. The measures will be introduced soon after.

7 FINANCIAL RESOURCE AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 The cost of implementing the proposed measures is estimated at £12k. This includes the publication of the Made Traffic Management Orders, the road markings and the signs.
- 7.2 The Environment and Regeneration revenue budget for 2020/21 currently contains a provisional budget for Parking Management schemes. The cost of this proposal can be met from this budget.

8. LEGAL AND STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 The Traffic Management Orders would be made under Section 6 and Section 45 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended). The Council is required by the Local Authorities Traffic Order (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 to give notice of its intention to make a Traffic Order (by publishing a draft traffic order). These regulations also require the Council to consider any representations received as a result of publishing the draft order.
- 8.2 The Council has discretion as to whether or not to hold a public inquiry before deciding whether or not to make a traffic management order or to modify the published draft order. A public inquiry should be held where it would provide further information, which would assist the Council in reaching a decision.
- 8.3 The Council's powers to make Traffic Management Orders arise mainly under sections 6, 45, 46, 122 and 124 and schedules 1 and 9 of the RTRA 1984.

9. HUMAN RIGHTS & EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY COHENSION IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 The implementation of new CPZs and the subsequent changes to the original design affects all sections of the community especially the young and the elderly and assists in improving safety for all road users and achieves the transport planning policies of the government, the Mayor for London and the Borough.
- 9.2 By maintaining clear junctions, access and sightlines will improve, thereby improving the safety at junctions by reducing potential accidents / risks.
- 9.3 The Council carries out careful consultation to ensure that all road users are given a fair opportunity to air their views and express their needs. The design of the scheme includes special consideration for the needs of people with blue badges, local residents, businesses without prejudice toward charitable and religious facilities. The needs of commuters are also given consideration but generally carry less weight than those of residents and local businesses.
- 9.4 Bodies representing motorists, including commuters are included in the statutory consultation required for draft traffic management and similar orders published in the local paper and London Gazette.

10. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

10.1 N/A

11. RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

11.1 The risk of not introducing the proposed parking arrangements is that the existing parking difficulties would continue and it would do nothing to assist the residents nor address the obstructive parking that has been identified.

11.2 The risk in not addressing the issues from the consultation exercise would be the loss of confidence in the Council. The proposed measures may cause some dissatisfaction from those who have requested status quo or other changes that cannot be implemented but it is considered that the benefits of introducing the measures outweigh the risk of doing nothing.

12. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

12.1 When determining the type of parking places are to be designated on the highway, section 45(3) requires the Council to consider both the interests of traffic and those of the owners and occupiers of adjoining properties. In particular, the Council must have regard to: (a) the need for maintaining the free movement of traffic, (b) the need for maintaining reasonable access to premises, and (c) the extent to which off-street parking is available in the neighbourhood or if the provision of such parking is likely to be encouraged by designating paying parking places on the highway.

12.2 By virtue of section 122, the Council must exercise its powers under the RTRA 1984 so as to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic including pedestrians, and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway. These powers must be exercised so far as practicable having regard to the following matters;

- (a) the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises,
- (b) the effect on the amenities of any locality affected including the regulation and restriction of heavy commercial traffic so as to preserve or improve amenity,
- (c) the national air quality strategy,
- (d) facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and securing the safety and convenience of their passengers,
- (e) any other matters appearing to the Council to be relevant.

13. APPENDICES

13.1 The following documents are to be published with this report and form part of the report;

- Appendix 1 - Drawing No.Z78-368-01,
- Appendix 2 - Statutory consultation document newsletter,
- Appendix 3 – Representations and Officer’s Comments.



KEY

	PROPOSED PERMIT HOLDER BAY
	PAY & DISPLAY ONLY BAY
	SHARED USE BAY
	SINGLE YELLOW LINE
	DOUBLE YELLOW LINE
	CPZ BOUNDARY
	EXISTING CROSSOVERS
	DISABLED BAY
	SINGLE YELLOW LINE
	DOUBLE YELLOW LINE
	LAMP COLUMN

Notes
Do not scale from this drawing

No.	Revision	Drawn	By	Checked	Date

Sustainable Communities
environment & regeneration

TRAFFIC & HIGHWAYS

Reproduced from plans submitted to the Greater London Authority (GLA) for the purpose of the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) application for Cannon Hill (CH) Extension Hillcross Avenue. The GLA reserves the right to amend the plans at any time without notice. The GLA is not responsible for any errors or omissions in the plans. The GLA is not liable for any loss or damage arising from the use of the plans.

Project	CANNON HILL (CH) CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE
Title	PROPOSED DESIGN LAYOUT CH EXTENSION HILLCROSS AVENUE
Author	PA
Checked by	SG
Approved by	SG
Date	28/02/20
Date	28/02/20

Merton Civic Centre
London Road
Morden, Surrey
S14 5DX
www.merton.gov.uk

Consultation Reference: Z78-368-01

Consultation Period: 1500

Appendix 3 - Representations and Officer's Comments

Support

001

Further to the proposals outlined on your website I fully support the proposed extension to the CPZ as referenced above.

004

I welcome the consultation and would like to express my support for the proposed CPZ at Hillcross Avenue, Morden.

With the creation of the CPZ in all the other roads nearby apart from Hillcross Avenue, and given the demand for parking to access the London Underground, parking for residents and their families at Hillcross Avenue has been severely compromised.

Without having access to the CPZ to the north and since there is Morden park to the south, Hillcross Avenue residents cannot access any parking in the adjacent roads.

008

We would like to make a representation in support of the Councils intention to extend the local Cannon Hill Controlled Parking Zone to Hillcross Avenue. We were disappointed that Hillcross Avenue was not included in the initial setup of the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in the local area.

We have lived at number x Hillcross Avenue close to the junction with Maycross Avenue for 38 years. Directly outside our house we have a bus shelter, a bus stop flag pole, a pillar box, a litter bin, and telegraph pole so therefore we cannot have off-street parking at the front of our house like many of our neighbours. When we first moved to Hillcross Avenue parking close to the house was not an issue but over the years the situation has deteriorated due to more and more footway-crossovers being installed, the extension of the bus stand stopping area, and additional 'yellow line' restrictive parking being put in place. Also the average number of cars per household has increased and we are now at a point where it has at times become impossible to park reasonably close to our house. Also with the CPZ being implemented in the roads adjacent to Hillcross Avenue some people for example living in Maycross Avenue are parking their vehicles in Hillcross Avenue rather than pay to park in their own street. In addition, commuters using Morden Station will still try to find parking spaces in this section of Hillcross Avenue.

The result of all of the above means that there is insufficient parking space in our part of Hillcross Avenue for the **residents**. If we arrive home with our vehicle on a weekday any time between 11am and 3pm we are almost certainly guaranteed that there will nowhere to park. Even outside of the controlled parking hours it is difficult to find a parking space. The lack of controlled parking also makes it difficult for people to visit us as there is simply nowhere for them to park during the day.

We have seriously considered moving away from this area. This is not something we particularly want to do as we have many ties to this area but unless the parking situation improves we feel it will be our only option as we need the use of a vehicle and need to be able to use it on a regular basis.

In relation to the implementation of CPZ in Hillcross Avenue I have some questions:

1. Will this implementation create more or less parking spaces than we currently have today?
2. If we purchase a CPZ permit can it be used in the roads adjacent to Hillcross Avenue or any other roads within the Cannon Hill CPZ?
3. How is the allocation of permits handled? Could we end up with a situation where there are more permit holders than parking spaces and as a result still be unable to find a suitable parking space close to our house despite the fact we have purchased a permit?
4. If the CPZ for Hillcross Avenue **does not** go ahead then am I able to purchase a permit to allow me to park in Maycross Avenue or any other part of the Cannon Hill CPZ? (I did ask Merton Council this question a while back but never got a response. A neighbour at number x Hillcross Avenue also made such an approach and was told it will be possible)

Could you please acknowledge receipt of this email so that we know that our representation and questions have been received? Also answers to the questions would be very much appreciated for clarification.

I look forward to hearing positive news regarding this proposal and can be contacted on the numbers below if you wish to further discuss any aspects of this representation.

011

with reference to the proposed extension to the current Cannon Hill Controlled Parking Zone, to include a section of Hillcross Avenue.

I fully support this proposal as I have frequently had vehicles partially parked across my front driveway. This happens even though there is the informative white line painted on the road highlighting the dropped kerb.

I would also like to raise a new issue that has arisen in the past few weeks. Namely the parking of commercial vehicles. As can be seen from the attached photos, I have had several different commercial vehicles parked partially across or adjacent to my front driveway. These vehicles cause a substantial 'blind spot' when I drive off my driveway, especially if I want to turn left, and there is a vehicle parked on the opposite side of the road. They have been parked in this location every evening/night and all weekend for the past 4 weeks. The reason I am highlighting this issue, is due to the frightening 'near miss' I had last weekend, when I just could not see what was approaching along Hillcross Avenue.

I am hoping that the commercial vehicle parking restrictions currently in Ashridge Way, Woodland Way, Monkleigh Road, etc are also to be extended to Hillcross Avenue.

Also, as it is not particularly clear, can you please advise/confirm the operating hours of the yellow lines/restricted parking, both double and single lines.

013

I agree to the consultation going forward. Hillcross avenue, residence in particular, could benefit from a total ban on all overnight commercial vehicle parking, as it becoming unworkable, and increasingly dangerous.

014

Many thanks for starting the consultation – We at No xx Hillcross Avenue **fully support** this proposal and hopefully look forward to it being implemented sometime in the near future. Our support is on the basis that we like many have no viable off street parking (blocked by trees and a bus stop) and the proposed system may be the only way we can secure a parking space. On a second point, current Government proposals to stop the sale of petrol and diesel cars by 2030 this CPZ may be the only way that Hillside residents have reliable access to charging points in the future - I for one will not have the option to charge an electric vehicle without access to roadside charging points.

016

I am writing in support of the proposed Controlled parking Zone. We have been worried for some time about the increased risk in having so many cars parked so tightly on Hillcross Ave. It is very difficult to reverse out of our driveway in the mornings.

But more importantly I think the congested parking has led to two accidents on Hillcross in front of our house. The first one led to our car and another parked vehicle to be written off. In the other instance a car was turned over completely. Luckily no-one was injured in either accident. I think cars speed up coming onto the brow of the hill, then either lose control due to the traffic calming which they do not anticipate, in addition they cannot see oncoming traffic due to the many cars parked either side.

018

I'm writing to support the proposed extension of the CPZ to include Hillcross avenue due to the difficulties that the residents have been having to find parking.

Comments

005

I have read your letter regarding proposed extension to parking restrictions in Hillcross Avenue in Morden, I have a couple of questions, how many complaints do you have to receive to make the council act ? I would like to know why the restriction on parking is for four hours, why can't it be for one hour in the middle of the day so that no one can park and go to work or leave their vehicles for long periods of time and therefore stop residents being able to park.

My parents live in the new proposed area and although I can walk to them as I also live in our borough but these changes have an effect on their visitors which is so vital as people get older.

I know this is a consultation period but I also think when you send the proposal letters they should go to a wider community and not just the residents immediately affected as it has more far reaching consequences.

I live in Shaldon Drive which already has parking school restrictions and if my parents didn't live in Hillcross I would not necessary know about any new plans.

These all have consequences for residents.

I look forward to your response to my concerns

Against

003

I am a local resident and must object to this proposal as it will result in a further net loss in the road space available for residents, their visitors and contractors working in the area.

If implemented, anyone stopping a vehicle for a matter of minutes during the hours of operation will be made a law breaker with financial penalties just for exercising their current reasonable rights. If parking charges and fines are to be levied then these should be paid by the collectors split equally to each resident affected without deduction for expenses.

006

I have been made aware of the Council's intention to extend the Cannon Hill CPZ to Hillcross Avenue by my local counsellor Jenifer Gould and not by any other means.

I live at xx Hillcross Avenue so will be directly affected if this CPZ is extended and therefore I wish to make a representation to you **to strongly object** to this proposed extension.

The information on your website regarding this proposed extension states that ***"the Council has received a number of correspondences and a petition from some residents complaining about parking difficulties"***. We are a very tightknit community in this part of Hillcross Avenue and I am not aware of any of my neighbours making such a complaint and I have certainly not signed a petition regarding parking on this road. Is it possible to see these "correspondences" and "petition" either by a Freedom of Information request or directly from your department with the relevant names redacted? You might advise me on this please.

The reasons for my objections to extending this scheme are as follows:

1. I feel that there is **not an issue with parking** in this part of Hillcross Avenue. Looking out of my window now (4pm on a Friday), I can see three parking spaces outside my house.
2. Parents of children attending Hillcross School who have no choice but to drive their children to school, cannot now stop / park near the school due to the School Streets scheme introduced in October in Ashridge Way, Woodland Way and Monkleigh Road. I have no issues with parents parking on Hillcross Avenue for school collections (which will be within the proposed time limits of the CPZ). If they cannot park close to the school and have no choice but to drive their children to school due to time constraints or other reasons, where do you propose they park? This will just create a concertina effect pushing all the cars into a smaller area possibly leading to illegal parking or the blocking of driveways.
3. Some of your council colleagues park on Hillcross Avenue and again, I do not have an issue with this. Where do you propose they park their vehicles if they cannot use public transport to get to the Civic Centre and cannot afford to park all day in the car parks run by the council?
4. Nos. 52-74 and 73-95 Hillcross Avenue are fronted by grass verges and the council will not allow vehicular access across these verges on to driveways. No. 54-72 and 75-93 Hillcross Avenue will have no choice but to park on the street and to purchase the relevant permits and I feel this unfairly discriminates against these residents with vehicles.
5. Any person wishing to engage a tradesperson with a vehicle at their premises will need to purchase a visitors permit. If these works take a substantial time or are protracted (e.g in the case of building works) the resident will incur a substantial cost for the trade vehicle (s).

I have copied Cllr Jenifer Gould into this email and I also intend to take this matter up with my MP Stephen Hammond.

I look forward to hearing from you regarding the information I have requested above. Kindly acknowledge receipt.

007

To respond to the consultation. We live at xx. both cycle to work and strongly object to the proposal as it would save us money to drive to work instead. (this is a non-sense) This is not wanted or required on this part of Hillcross Ave and we strongly object. We are happy for things to remain as they are. This disproportionately effects. Those of us that can't park on our drives and who cycle to work. It is a perverse incentive to make us drive to work. Which is crazy and compromises Merton's emissions reduction. This will have negative environmental impact.

009

We object to the proposals to extend the scheme. This will push traffic to the surrounding roads and also make the roads busier and faster. This seems to be yet another money grabbing scheme

010

I'd like to make a representation against this proposal.

The number of residents who have trouble parking on Hillcross are going to be residents who don't have driveways. They are a vocal minority, but still only a minority of the potentially impacted residents. These residents may have difficulty parking at times, but they will always be able to find a space. If they have to walk a bit further to get to their cars then this isn't such a bad thing - Merton Council could count this towards getting residents to live a healthier lifestyle!

This proposal impacts on 103 households (1 to 113 Hillcross Avenue and Maycross Avenue to 90 Hillcross). Out of that total number of households, only 30 households or 29% of the total households do not have driveways. So, this proposal is being sought by a minority of households and yet will impact on all 103 households in terms of adding costs, bureaucracy and making it more difficult for people to visit us. This is unfair.

The non-residents parking on Hillcross are in the main commuters and during the day on Fridays, pre-pandemic, worshippers at the mosque. The commuters are going to be people who live in the relative vicinity of this area but find it easier to drive to Hillcross and then walk to Morden Underground Station- by reducing the area in which they can park, it will create parking problems nearby as they will just park their cars in areas next to the controlled parking zone. Unless people are incentivised properly or there are further improvements to public transport past the underground network, they will not stop using their cars. You will just create genuine parking problems in the surrounding area.

There is not a systematic, persistent problem of non-residents parking on Hillcross, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. It's a big long avenue. There is space.

Many residents with driveways also park second cars or allow visitors to park across their driveway when visiting. So, the introduction of single yellow lines for all dropped kerbs, will also displace more cars along Hillcross.

My main objections are:

- By imposing a parking permit system, you will be impacting on residents who rely on help from visitors - it will impact on care for the elderly, unpaid childcare from family members visiting households and shift the "problem" of non-residents parking further down Hillcross and to Morden Park car park and the nearby streets off Hillcross.
- It will effectively be a stealth/indirect tax on residents and their visitors - as we start to see some potential light at the end of the tunnel with Covid-19, we should not be making it harder or imposing a cost on people visiting each other. A lot of households have been hit financially by the pandemic and mental health has suffered as well: the council should not be imposing more costs on residents which potentially make it more difficult to visit and stay connected with family and friends.
- My Mother visits us to assist with childcare (except when the country has been under lockdowns and when not permitted under the tier system). It's a 45-minute drive for her to visit us and we're very lucky to have her support. While it's sometimes not easy to park, she always manages to find a space. A big reason for her providing childcare is financial - childcare and nurseries are expensive in the UK. We also want our children to see their Grandmother regularly. Family bonds are incredibly important at this time.

- From a social/community perspective you will make it more difficult for people to visit and worship at the Ahmadiyya mosque. A proportion of Ahmadi Muslims visit the mosque while living a fair distance away so public transport is not always feasible. I know this as I've given directions to Ahmadi Muslims, parking on Hillcross, who have come from other parts of the UK to visit for the first time.
- Since the start of lockdown there has been less people parking on Hillcross and this will likely remain the case for a long time, even with vaccines on the horizon. It would be a waste of the council's time, effort and resources to implement a parking permit system when there are less people commuting and less people parking on Hillcross. Even if things were to return to normal with a vaccine, the parking permit system would impact the majority of residents negatively rather than the minority of residents who have to park on the road.

I would suggest that the Traffic and Highways department look at another problem that has persisted before, during and after the lockdowns- the problem of people speeding down Hillcross between 1 Hillcross and 113 Hillcross at 40mph+ as there are no traffic calming measures. We've had people racing motorbikes down the road at dangerous speeds (70mph+) in the evening. Motorists turn left out of Ashridge Way onto Hillcross and accelerate at high speed despite cars parked on both sides of the road.

In the last 4 years, we've had three major accidents in close proximity to our house where drivers have crashed into the parked cars of residents. These were just accidents close to our home outside neighbouring houses. Friends who live along Hillcross have had cars smashed into and know of further accidents. The health and property of residents is more at risk from this than commuters parking in the street. Can the Traffic and Highways department please focus on this rather than more costs and paperwork for residents?

012

In relation to the consultation for a Controlled Parking Zone between Now 1 and 113 Hillcross Avenue, we would like to register our objection to its introduction for the following reasons:

- Due to vehicles being of different sizes and required spacing, the CPZ would reduce the number of parking spaces available, where 2 vehicles currently park, only 1 space will be available and where 1 vehicle can currently park, there will be a single yellow line (such as the space in front of No. 33 next door)
- While there are more spaces from No. 53 onwards, there are very few spaces planned on the map and fewer than the current number of cars that are usually parked by residents at weekends
- The CPZ will cause difficulties for us and other residents when swapping cars, need to park on the road for a services vehicle (Utilities, builders, Double Glazing, etc.) to park on the drive or if we need to go out for a short time and need to park one car on the road. The limited spaces would already be taken by residents.
- In order for us or our visitors to park on the road, we would need to pay the significant cost of a permit
- As more residents have drives and crossovers put in, the number of marked spaces will decrease even further, especially with many having their own crossovers rather than a single shared one as we have

0015

We wish to object to the proposed extension of the Cannon Hill Controlled Parking Zone to Hillcross Avenue, from Links Avenue to the junction with Ashridge Way.

We have lived on Hillcross Avenue for some 23 years and have never experienced parking problems, either ourselves or for visitors. We therefore do not subscribe to the view that a CPZ is needed to safeguard residents' parking. Further, at a time of the COVID pandemic when jobs and income are at real risk, including our own, we wholeheartedly oppose the introduction of fees for resident and visitor permits.

017

I am writing in regard of the statutory consultation regarding the above.

I am making representation against the controlled parking zone on the following basis:

- 1) I have lived here for over 20 years and have not found an issue parking in Hillcross Avenue during the day and therefore believe that this is a waste of time, and money. Many residents now have

crossovers and dropped kerbs which has reduced the opportunity for non residents to park during the day. In addition many of the residents use their cars for work, which leaves adequate parking during the day, safely for visitors if required.

2) We were only consulted on this last year for exactly the same scheme and residents made it abundantly clear at this time that we did not wish for the controlled parking zone to be implemented in Hillcross Avenue. Therefore we fail to understand why this has been again raised at a massive cost to our council when the residents of the street have made their wishes clear. It appears that someone at the council has an agenda which they wish to push through, ignoring the residents who are the council tax payers. This is not acceptable.

3) Having read the cost of permits for residents, which appears to be extortionate, it is apparent that this is another money making scheme to penalise residents who own cars. In light of the economic environment in which we are currently living, due to covid, when many residents are experiencing financial hardship, furlough and loss of jobs, this seems immoral to impose what appears to be yet another money making scheme to elicit more money over and above the expensive council tax that we already pay.

4) Additionally, it is unacceptable, that I have already paid the London Borough of Merton a huge sum of money to have a crossover put in and now I am going to be asked to pay even more money for my family to be able to park at my property.

5) In addition, you talk in the consultation about safety on the road at this juncture of Hillcross and Links Avenue. However, safety has already been addressed by reducing the speed along this road to 20 miles per hour and inserting yellow lines by the islands to allow buses to pass safely as no cars can now park there. I do not therefore believe that further measures will in any way improve visibility, safety or improve the ability for cars to pass. The road is wide enough and the measures I believe have already been put in place to ensure traffic safety. I do not therefore believe that the controlled parking zone is necessary.

Please confirm receipt of my objections by return.

019

I strongly object to the introduction of further parking restrictions in the Hillcross Avenue area of Morden. As a resident I am saddened at the depths our council representatives will plumb, in their pursuit of commercial gain

020

I object to the proposed Hillcross Avenue Controlled parking Zone **Reference ES/CHex-Hillcross for the following reasons:**

1) **The whole of Hillcross Avenue should be made a CPZ not just part of it**

Since the proposed Hillcross CPZ is only between No 1 and 113 Hillcross and between Maycross and No 90 Hillcross, it will definitely negatively affect the residents that live in the lower part of the avenue (from No 113 and No 90 onwards) and only increase the difficulty in finding a parking space for all residents on Hillcross Avenue. The residents living lower down Hillcross Avenue will suffer, as car owners will simply move their cars further along the Avenue. **This is not fair. Either make the whole of Hillcross Avenue a CPZ or don't introduce it at all.**

2) **The number of resident's parking bays proposed is insufficient for this part of Hillcross Avenue**

At the moment we only have 2 cars, but will shortly be reducing this to one, so this is of no great concern for us. But there are residents who have recently moved into this part of Hillcross Avenue that have 4 or more cars or more importantly others who are elderly and disabled, that have several daily visits from carers or helpers during the day, who all need parking. Are they allowed to share residents parking permits and how many visitor's permits is each household allowed? The CPZ will make receiving health care, shopping and deliveries more difficult for these particular residents.

3) **Incorrect Parking Bays in front of dropped Kerbs at No 25 Hillcross and also No 19 Hillcross**

Can you please explain why the proposed Hillcross CPZ map shows a parking bay in front of the dropped kerb at No. 25 Hillcross? I presume this is because the map is out of date? There will also be another dropped kerb at No 19 shortly, as they have been recently been given permission. **That means two residents parking bays that are displayed on the map are not correct and do not exist. I believe there may be others that are incorrectly shown. These need to be checked.**

4) **Unnecessary Single Yellow lines in front of dropped kerbs**

I would like to know why in the proposed Controlled Parking Zone for Hillcross Avenue, the department are introducing yellow lines in front of dropped kerbs? Surely these are not necessary as it is already illegal for people to park in front of dropped kerbs, unless they have the homeowners permission? Why do we need them? We already have double yellow lines on the most dangerous parts of Hillcross Avenue which are more effective with dealing with dangerous parking.

002 -

I am writing to offer comment for the consultation on the proposed CPZ extension into Hillcross Avenue. As a resident of Hillcross Avenue I am quite frankly appalled at what I see as little more than another money grab from the council.

As far as I see it, the supposed need for this has arisen as a result of previously introduced schemes forcing people to look towards Hillcross Avenue for parking and not a fundamental space issue. To me, this suggests a snowball effect and that all the introduction of this will do is push people further along Hillcross and kick the proverbial can quite literally down the road.

Hillcross is a road that contains many families and also many elderly residents, both of these are groups that rely on visitors at all times of day, not just at the times that will fall outside of the CPZ and therefore all this will do is punish those in the proposed zone by making visitors have to pay and/or punish those further along the road by forcing people to park in these areas, thus reducing the space available outside of the proposed CPZ.

If you were genuinely interested in protecting parking for residents, as opposed to purely raising funds, then why not issue a free of charge permit to residents along with an annual quota of visitor permits (also free of charge) and introduce charging to be applicable only to anyone not in possession of either a resident or a visitor permit? That would genuinely protect the rights of residents without just essentially levelling a tax for having a car in the CPZ.

I do genuinely understand the issues around finding parking spaces but simply introducing more and more areas under CPZ doesn't alter anything other than to move the problem along the road or to the next road that doesn't yet have the restrictions. I would like to see alternatives tabled for residents to consider as well, rather than just the same 'solution' each time that really does just seem to be a way of making money and little else.

Thank you in advance for taking the time to read this and consider my input.

Officer's comments

Before the Council considers any possible resident parking schemes, it requires a demonstration of support from the residents for the concept of controlled parking. This consultation was initiated because residents along this section of Hillcross Avenue petitioned the Council for the CPZ to be extended.

The consultation is for an extension to the existing CH CPZ with operational days of Monday to Friday between 11am and 3pm.

The implementation and administrations costs for the CPZ and subsequently the cost for routinely enforcing the scheme is paid with the revenue generated through the sale of parking permits; effectively the CPZ pays for itself. Any surplus funds generated is legally required to be ring fenced to be invested back into the highway / transport or fund concessionary travel schemes.

Regarding the positioning of proposed waiting restrictions (yellow lines) in the proposed scheme, the layout of the parking restrictions are arranged in a manner that provide the maximum number of suitable parking spaces without jeopardising road safety and the free movement of traffic. Additionally within the CPZ, all kerbside space must either be controlled with yellow line waiting restrictions (such as at junction, narrow sections of the road and/ or across vehicle dropped kerbs / access) or designated parking places and it is not normal practise to introduce parking places across dropped kerbs (driveway) as any permit holder would be able to park within the bay; therefore single yellow lines are marked to provide clearance during CPZ operational hours.

The key objective of managing parking is to reduce and control non-essential parking and assist residents and short-term visitors. Within any CPZ, only those within the zone are entitled to parking permits. Residents can purchase 'Visitor Parking Permits' for their visitors which entitles them to park within any permit holder bays throughout the zone.

Those residents with off street parking who do not intend to park their vehicles on the proposed designated parking bay do not need to purchase a parking permit.

Within any parking management design, every effort is made to maximise the number of safe parking spaces, however it is important to note that safety and access for all road users always take priority over parking. It is normal practice to introduce double yellow lines even if a CPZ is not introduced and this was detailed in both informal and statutory consultation leaflets during the initial consultation of the CH zone and during the extension consultation.

The Council's refuse collection service regularly report that they are unable to gain access which means that they are often prevented from collecting the refuse - especially Westcroft Gardens and Leamington Avenue where service vehicles are unable to access through narrow sections of the carriageway because of vehicles parked both sides. The proposed 'at any time' waiting restrictions at narrow sections of the carriage way will ensure vehicular access especially for larger vehicles such as emergency and service vehicles.

Proposed Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) CH extension - Hillcross Avenue.



ISSUE DATE : 19 NOVEMBER 2020

Dear Resident,

The purpose of this leaflet is to advise you that following the implementation of the CH zone, the Council has received a number of correspondences and a petition from some residents complaining about parking difficulties. In response, the Council is now carrying out a statutory consultation on its intention to introduce a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in Hillcross Avenue between Nos 1 and 113 Hillcross Avenue and between Maycross Avenue and property No 90 Hillcross Avenue. This will be an extension to the existing CH CPZ in the Cannon Hill Ward. As this would be an extension to an existing zone, the days and hours of the CPZ controls would operate Monday to Friday between 11am and 3pm.

HOW WILL IT WORK?

All road space in a CPZ is managed by the introduction of parking controls. Parking is only permitted where safety, access and sight lines are not compromised. It is, therefore, normal practice to introduce double yellow lines at key locations such as at junctions, bends, turning heads and at specific locations along lengths of roads where parking would impede the passing of vehicles. It is also necessary to install single yellow lines (effective during the CPZ hours of operation) or "At any time" restriction where the kerb is lowered, i.e. at crossovers for driveways.

The key objective of managing parking is to reduce and control non-essential parking and assist residents, short-term visitors and the local businesses. Within any CPZ, only those within the zone are entitled to permits. This means that long-term parking will not be permitted during the operational times. An incremental pricing structure for 2nd and subsequent permits also assists in minimising the number of permits issued to individual residents and help discourage multiple car ownerships. CPZs comprise of various types of

parking bays such as permit holder bays (for use by resident or business permit holders and those with visitor permits); shared use bays (for permit holders and pay and display) and pay and display only bays (permits are not valid).

Council appointed Civil Enforcement Officers will enforce the controls by issuing fines/Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs) to vehicles parked in contravention of the restrictions. Outside the controlled times the restrictions are not enforced. However, Civil Enforcement Officers will issue PCNs for any other parking contravention such as parking on double yellow lines, footways and parking across individual crossovers without the property owner's consent.

The Council aims to reach a balance between the needs of the residents, businesses and the safety of all road users. In the event that the majority of those consulted do not support a CPZ in their road officers may recommend that only the proposed double yellow lines identified at key locations are introduced to improve safety and maintain access. This would be subject to the approval of the Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Transport and Housing.

Parking Controls - The following are incorporated within the proposed measures:

Double yellow lines at junctions, bends, ends of cul-de-sac and at strategic sections of the road to create passing gaps. (This will improve safety and access at all times by reducing obstructive parking that is currently taking place).

Shared Use Pay and Display bays are also proposed where it is necessary to allow non-residents to pay for parking for a short period at specific locations such as near shops, schools, churches and also in areas for longer term parking where residents are not directly affected, to allow effective use of the bays. (This will

increase the use of parking provisions in the area by pay and display customers whilst still maintaining parking).

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

Notice of the Council's intention to introduce the above measures will be published in a local newspaper (The Guardian), London Gazette and posted on lamp columns in the vicinity. It should be noted that this consultation is not a Yes / No tick box exercise. It is a statutory consultation which depends on consultees responding directly via making a representation. Representations against the proposals described in this Notice must be made in writing or email trafficandhighways@merton.gov.uk by no later than **18 December 2020** quoting reference [ES/CHex-Hillcross](#). Objections must relate only to the elements of the scheme that are subject to this statutory consultation. Representations in support are also welcome.

A copy of the proposed Traffic Management Orders (TMOs), a plan identifying the areas affected by the proposals and the Council's Statement of Reasons can be inspected at Merton Link, Merton Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, Surrey, SM4 5DX during the Council's normal office hours Monday to Friday, 9am to 5pm or at Morden Library. This information is also available on Merton Council's website www.merton.gov.uk/cpzchex

All representations along with Officers' comments and recommendations will be presented in a report to the Cabinet member for Regeneration, Housing and Climate Change. Please note that responses to any representations received will not be made until a final decision is made by the Cabinet Member.

The Council is required to give weight to the nature and content of your representations and not necessarily the quantity. Your reasons are, therefore, important to us.

The charges for permits are £100 for the first car in a household, £150 for the second in a household and £200 for the third and subsequent car in a household

plus an additional charge of £150 for a diesel vehicle. An annual visitor's permit is £320. Half day visitor permit is £3.00

Please note that between 10 September and 26 October 2020 the Council carried out a statutory consultation on **emission based-parking charges** which will affect the existing permit and P&D tariffs. It is likely that a final decision will be made early 2021 and if approved, the new charges will be implemented after April 2021. For full details please refer to the website <https://www.merton.gov.uk/streets-parking-transport/parking/consultations/charges-2020>

Further information on how CPZs work, details of permit costs can be found in our Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ's) at www.merton.gov.uk/cpzchex

CANNON HILL WARD COUNCILLORS

Cllr Pauline Cowper

Phone - 020 8545 3425

Email: pauline.cowper@merton.gov.uk

Cllr Jenifer Gould

Phone - 0208 545 4770

Email: jenifer.gould@merton.gov.uk

Cllr Nick McLean

Phone - 07497 088 970

Email: nick.mclean@merton.gov.uk

Cabinet member for Regeneration, Housing and Climate Change.

Cllr Martin Whelton

Phone: 020 8545 3425

Email: martin.whelton@merton.gov.uk

(The contact details of Ward Councillors are provided for information purposes only)



KEY

PROPOSED

- PERMIT HOLDER BAY
- PAY & DISPLAY ONLY BAY
- SHARED USE BAY
- SINGLE YELLOW LINE
- DOUBLE YELLOW LINE
- CPZ BOUNDARY

EXISTING

- CROSSOVERS
- DISABLED BAY
- SINGLE YELLOW LINE
- DOUBLE YELLOW LINE
- LAMP COLUMN



Reproduced from/used upon the Ordnance Survey's 1:25000 map with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office and may be reproduced in any form (subject to any copyright that may apply) by any person (other than the Controller) without the written permission of the Controller.

Scale	1:25000
Date	28/10/20
Author	28/10/20
Approved by	28/10/20

PROJECT
CANNON HILL (CH)
CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE

TITLE
PROPOSED DESIGN LAYOUT
CH EXTENSION HILLCROSS AVENUE

Client: Merton Council
Merton Civic Centre
London Road
Morden, Surrey
S14 5DX
www.merton.gov.uk

Reference: Z78-368-01

Consultation: CONSULTATION

Scale: 1:500

NOTES
Do not scale from this drawing

Rev	Reason	Date	By	Check	Date	By

Merton Council - call-in request form

1. Decision to be called in: (required)

--

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

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

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

3. Desired outcome

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

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

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

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

5. Documents requested

6. Witnesses requested

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

8. Notes – see part 4E section 16 of the constitution

Call-ins must be supported by at least three members of the Council.

The call in form and supporting requests must be received by 12 Noon on the third working day following the publication of the decision.

The form and/or supporting requests must be sent:

- **EITHER** by email from a Councillor's email account (no signature required) to democratic.services@merton.gov.uk
- **OR** as a signed paper copy to the Head of Democracy and Electoral Services, 1st floor, Civic Centre, London Road, Morden SM4 5DX.

For further information or advice contact the Head of Democracy and Electoral Services on

020 8545 3409