

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

1. Title of report

Proposed No Stopping restrictions (Clearway) Church Road (statutory consultation)

2. Reason for exemption (if any)

3. Decision maker

Councillor Stephen Alambritis, Cabinet Member for Transport

4. Date of Decision

6-4-23

5. Date report made available to decision maker

5 April 2023

6. Decision


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

- 1) Notes the result of the statutory consultation carried out between 16 January and 25 February 2023 on the proposals to introduce a Clearway (No stopping) restrictions in Church Road Wimbledon between the borough boundary and No 78 Church Road.
- 2) Notes and considers the representations received in respect of the proposal as detailed in Appendix 2.
- 3) Agrees to proceed with the making of the relevant Traffic Management Orders (TMOs) and the implementation of the proposed Clearway along Church Road Wimbledon as shown in Drawing Nos. Z27-694-01 (see Appendix 1).
- 4) Agrees to exercise his discretion not to hold a public inquiry on the consultation process.

7. Alternative options considered and why rejected

Do nothing. This would be contrary to the concerns expressed by some road users and would not resolve the obstructive parking that is currently taking place. It will also do nothing to facilitate the function requirements of the road i.e. being a London Distributor Road, Primary Emergency route and a bus route. In the event of an incident, lack of action could put the Council at risk. It will also do nothing to change behaviour in terms of attitude toward the use of private motorised vehicles.

Declarations of Interest



Cllr Stephen Alambritis

Cabinet member for Transport.

date

6/4/23

Cabinet Member Report

Date: 4th April 2023

Agenda item: Ward: Village

Subject: Proposed Clearway Church Road Wimbledon-statutory consultation

Lead officer: Adrian Ash, Interim Director of Environment & Regeneration

Lead member: Councillor Stephen Alambritis, Cabinet Member for Transport

Forward Plan reference number: N/A

Contact Officer Paul Atie, Tel: 020 8545 3337 Email: paul.atie@merton.gov.uk

Recommendations:

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

- 1) Notes the result of the statutory consultation carried out between 16 January and 25 February 2023 on the proposals to introduce a Clearway (No stopping) restrictions in Church Road Wimbledon between the borough boundary and No 78 Church Road.
- 2) Notes and considers the representations received in respect of the proposal as detailed in Appendix 2.
- 3) Agrees to proceed with the making of the relevant Traffic Management Orders (TMOs) and the implementation of the proposed Clearway along Church Road Wimbledon as shown in Drawing Nos. Z27-694-01 (see Appendix 1).
- 4) 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 details the undertaking of the statutory consultation and the outcome on the Councils' proposals to introduce Clearway restriction in Church Road, Wimbledon.
- 1.2 It seeks approval to progress with the above recommendations.

2 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Currently, there is an informal arrangement to discourage parking along Church Rd Wimbledon by means of solid white line which is not enforceable. For most part of the year, there is very little or no parking along Church Rd Wimbledon (between the borough boundary and No 78 Church Rd). However, between April and June (prior to and in preparation for the Championships) a number of vehicles, mostly commercial vehicles park along the route, at times causing congestion which generates complaints.
- 2.2 There have been requests to address this problem and although initially officers were considering double yellow lines (no parking and no loading at any time), given the length of the road, it is considered that the best solution is a Clearway. This means that parking can be prevented by installing signs at each point of entry without the need for any road markings and thereby would not need to destroy the road by removing the existing extensive white line and replace it with

yellow lines and blips along with a number of repeater signs. This would be detrimental to the aesthetics of the Church Road and its environment.

3.0 PROPOSALS

- 3.1 In recent years, the Council has received a number of complaints regarding the obstructive parking that is taking place along Church Road causing traffic congestion and safety hazard. To address this problem the Council is proposing to introduce Clearway restriction along the length of Church Road between the borough boundary and No 78 Church Road. This will ensure that the road is clear of parked vehicles thereby ensuring safety and access at all times.
- 3.2 Church Road is a London Distributor Rd, Primary Emergency route and a bus route. Council's statutory duty is to ensure safety and access for all road users are maintained at all times.
- 3.3 It should be noted that a No stopping (Clearway) restriction has been operating along this section of Church Road during the All England Lawn Tennis Club annual championship fortnight and this proposal would mean that the restriction is applied throughout the year at all times. The advantage of the No stopping restriction (Clearway) is that no road marking is required and the existing white lines can remain in place. The implementation of the proposed restriction will include installation of signs on Lamp Columns at each point of entry along with some repeater signs.

4 STATUTORY CONSULTATION

- 4.1 The statutory consultation on the Council's proposal to introduce the proposed Clearway was undertaken between 16 January and 25 February 2023. The consultation included the erection of street Notices on lamp columns within the vicinity of the proposals and the publication of the Council's intentions in Wimbledon and Wandsworth Times and the London Gazette. The information was also available on the Council's website and at the Civic Centre. The consultation document was posted to all those households and businesses within this section of Church Road.
- 4.2 The statutory consultation resulted in 24 representations, 1 representation in support, 3 comments and 20 against the proposed restrictions. All the representations are detailed in Appendix 2.

Ward Councillors

- 4.3 Ward Members were informed of the proposed restrictions and the statutory consultation. At the time of writing this report, no comments were received.
- 4.4 The majority of the objections are from those using The Wimbledon Club. There appears to be an expectation that anyone using the Club's facilities are required to drive and use Church Road as an overflow car park. The Wimbledon Club has a relatively large car park and consideration should be given to encouraging visitors to use active and / or sustainable modes of transport. It is suggested that the restrictions would be detrimental to Wimbledon Club and an assumption is made that everyone using the facility must drive and their parking needs met. Access to the facility is not being prevented and all visitors should be encouraged to consider alternative modes of travel.

5.0 Officer's recommendations

- 5.1 It is recommended that the proposed restrictions are implemented to safeguard Church Road, Wimbledon from becoming an overflow car park and to manage the obstructive parking that has been increasing in recent years.
- 5.2 The Council has a statutory responsibility to respond appropriately to concerns regarding obstructive parking, access concerns and to ensure safety and access are maintained for all road users at all times.
- 5.3 The Council has a number of policies that encourages the use of sustainable and active travel and discourages the use of private motorised vehicles. Although it is appreciated that Wimbledon Club may be promoting safe parking practice, in practice, Church Road does become dangerously blocked which impacts cyclists, public transport and general traffic and the Council needs to ensure that good parking practice is adhered to. Church Road as a public highway is for passage and not a car park.
- 5.4 The proposed restrictions ensure clear sightlines, access and manoeuvrability for all road users especially for pedestrians, service vehicles, buses and emergency services. Although it is acknowledged that loss of current unrestricted parking along Church Road may be seen by the members of the Club as loss of parking, it should be noted that informally parking has historically been discouraged but due to an increase in non-compliance, it has become necessary to take the appropriate action. Church Road is a London Distributor Rd, Primary Emergency route and a bus route. It is not for the Council to facilitate the parking needs of visitors and obstructive parking must be discouraged if not fully prevented. The Council's statutory duty is to ensure access and safety are maintained at all times. Once the Council is aware of obstructive parking, lack of mitigating action could put the Council at risk. The Council could be accused of not acting responsibly in discharging its statutory duties.

6 TIMETABLE

- 6.1 If agreed, the Traffic Management Orders could be made 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 Wimbledon & Wandsworth Times and the London Gazette. The documents will also be made available on the Council's website. The measures will be introduced soon after.

7. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

- 7.1 Do nothing. This would be contrary to the concerns expressed by some road users and would not resolve the obstructive parking that is currently taking place. It will also do nothing to facilitate the function requirements of the road i.e. being a London Distributor Road, Primary Emergency route and a bus route. In the event of an incident, lack of action could put the Council at risk. It will also do nothing to change behaviour in terms of attitude toward the use of private motorised vehicles.

8 FINANCIAL RESOURCE AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 To introduce the proposed restrictions will cost approximately £5k. This includes the making of The Traffic Management Orders. This will be funded from the budget identified for 2023 / 2024.

9 LEGAL AND STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 The Traffic Management Orders would be made under Section 6 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.
- 9.2 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 Cabinet Member in reaching a decision.

10 HUMAN RIGHTS, EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY COHESION IMPLICATIONS


- 10.1 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 parking needs of the residents and visitors are given consideration but it is considered that maintaining safe access must take priority. In this case, there is no demand for residential parking and those visiting the area should be encouraged to use alternative modes of transport.
- 10.2 Bodies representing motorists, including commuters are included in the statutory consultation required for draft traffic management and similar orders.
- 10.3 The implementation of waiting restrictions affects all sections of the community especially the young and the elderly and assists in improving safety for all road users as well as achieving the transport planning policies of the government, the Mayor for London and the borough.
- 10.4 By maintaining clear access points, visibility will improve thereby improving the safety at junctions; bends and along narrow sections of a road and subsequently reducing potential accidents.
- 10.5 Regulating and formulating the flow of traffic will ensure the safety of all road users and improved access throughout the day.

11 RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

- 11.1 The risk in not introducing the proposed restrictions would be Church Road will continue to serve as an overflow car park and continue to be used by commercial vehicles during certain times of the year which then increases the potential risk to all road users.
- 11.2 The risk of introducing the proposed restrictions could lead to possible dissatisfaction amongst those who object to the restrictions.

12 APPENDICES

- 12.1 The following documents are to be published with this report and form part of the report.
Appendix 1 – plans of proposed restrictions
Appendix 2 – Representations and Officer's Comments
Appendix 3 – statutory consultation leaflet



Notes	Rev	Date	Reasons	Drawn	By	Check	By	Drawn	By	Check	By	Appr	By	Drawn	By	Check	By		
<p>TRAFFIC & HIGHWAYS</p>													<p>Developed for Merton Council by the Strategic Business Unit of Merton Council. All Rights Reserved. Unauthorised reproduction or distribution is prohibited. Merton Council is a registered charity (1120204) and a company limited by guarantee (1042346).</p>			<p>PROJECT: WAITING RESTRICTIONS Z27</p>		<p>Drawing No: Z27-693-01A</p>	
<p>Drawn by: SC Date: 21.12.22</p> <p>Checked by: PA Date: 21.12.22</p> <p>Approved by: PA Date: 21.12.22</p>													<p>TITLE: CHURCH ROAD CLEARWAY SIGN LOCATIONS</p>		<p>Merton Civic Centre London Road Morden, Surrey SM4 5DX www.merton.gov.uk</p>		<p>Classification: DRAFT</p> <p>Scale: 1:2000</p>		

Support**002 Burghley Road**

I am supportive of the measures proposed, but would like to add:

- Measures to address excessive speeding on Church Road, especially vehicles driving down the hill from the roundabout with Burghley Road/St Mary's Road.
- supporting the Council's plan to promote active travel: pedestrian crossing next to the roundabout on Church Road. The current crossing is very dangerous for pedestrians as cars swing around at high speed from St Mary's into Church Road, heading into the Village and pedestrian traffic often remains stuck on the little traffic island.
- reinstate pedestrian island on Church Road below the roundabout. This island was removed 'temporarily' around 10 years ago to facilitate large lorries servicing one of the many AELTC construction projects.

I would appreciate a call to discuss further.

Comments**Parkside Residents Association**

I am still Chair of the Parkside Residents' Association so thank you for contacting me about this proposal. I am happy to circulate details to colleagues.

I know that AELTC contractor parking on Church Road has been a major headache for residents - we have seen gridlock on a number of occasions - and last year there were discussions with the AELTC, who were sympathetic to the problems being caused, about steps which could be taken to address the issue. In fact I had sent them a reminder very recently to see what could be done before the problem resurfaced for this year's Championships' infrastructure work. So this intervention is timely.

Double yellow lines had been discussed before but I note the comments in the leaflet on the practicalities. I am not familiar with Clearways but having read the explanatory notice and noting that there will just be white lines on the road as at present, the signage will need to be prominent, and the restrictions enforced rigorously. Residents' experience locally (there is a lot of ongoing residential building work in this area) is that even in roads with CPZs and marked bays, contractors' vans and vehicles frequently ignore the restrictions, creating bottlenecks by parking on both sides of roads close to the site where they are working and treat occasional parking tickets as an occupational hazard. At least double yellow lines are widely understood, and in the main, are respected. I also assume that the Clearway restrictions will operate 24/7 and year round? That being the case, I think there may be some questions put to you on whether it is possible to allow some weekend parking, primarily for Wimbledon Club attendees when their on site parking is full (perhaps outside of the AELTC construction work period) but I will leave it to those affected to contact you with any concerns they may have on that aspect.

003 Burghley Road

I live on the corner / roundabout at the intersection of Church and Burghley Roads. I welcome the Council's efforts to address this issue.

The traffic congestion on the section of Church Road referenced is due primarily, if not exclusively, to work being done at the All England Lawn Tennis Club. The situation occurs year round but is particularly acute in the month before and the month after the tennis Championships.

Restrictions are not necessary on a 24/7 basis. I suggest that restrictions be in place Monday – Friday from 8am to 6:30pm rather than on a permanent basis.

I also suggest that in run up to and dismantling of the Championships, essentially during the months of June and July, the Council vigorously enforce these new restrictions.

023 Belvedere Estate Residents Association (BERA)

Further to the notice with regards to this proposal, BERA would like to make a representation. Whilst it is welcomed that the issue of AELTC contractors parking on Church Road is being addressed, a 24/7 Clearway is more than is required. We would like to suggest a single yellow line operating from 8am - 6pm Monday to Friday and 8am - 1pm on Saturdays.

Objections**001 Wimbledon Club**

I write in my capacity as Chairman of the Wimbledon Club. The imposition of parking restrictions on Church Road will seriously hurt our club as on busy days such as Saturday and Sunday mornings when many juniors attend cricket camps in the summer, there is a requirement to park on Church Road as our car park is full. Our members have car stickers on display on their front windscreens which identify them and their car. This is a requirement during the Wimbledon Championships to allow for access to our Club when Church Road is temporarily closed, so we have a system to identify members cars. We are probably the major sports club in the Borough and keen to participate in furthering the ambition to be the "Borough of Sport" With many planned initiatives such as fun days and sports days at our club which would require additional parking on Church Road and consider any restrictions would seriously reduce our ability to stage these events. The parking by contractors during the build up and dismantling of facilities for the Tennis Championships could be catered for on the extensive land their acquired on the golf course and better management of contractors.

004 Clonmore Street

I strongly object to your proposal to implement parking restrictions on Church Road to remove and prevent obstructive parking and address traffic congestion. My grounds for this objection are as follows:

1. With the exception of The Wimbledon Championships and the period of set-up and take-down, Church Road has never suffered from traffic congestion caused by obstructive parking, nor have I seen any evidence to suggest that is the case.
2. The Wimbledon Club, a sporting facility opposite the AELTC, has limited parking. It is a magnet for children in summer and winter to learn to play cricket, tennis, hockey and squash. Church Road is a convenient 'overflow' for the club when hosting sports events, camps or matches. Parking on Church Road at such times causes limited inconvenience or congestion, removes any burden on local residential parking (which in itself is some distance away) and is a crucial element to the club's ongoing success as one of the biggest amateur sports providers in the area.
3. In light of the fact that Merton Council is working with London Sport to further develop its ambitious plans to put Merton on the map as a Borough of Sport, then such a restriction seems contrary to such an ambition.

While I appreciate this may be pre-emptive of the (strongly contested) build programme desired by the AELTC, without making accommodation for The Wimbledon Club then the council and AELTC is in danger of further damaging already strained relations.

005 No address provided

I am writing to object to the proposed no stopping restrictions in Church Road. This will clearly impact on the players/supporters coming for matches at the Wimbledon club. Parking on Church Road does not happen every weekend, nor during the Wimbledon fortnight and does not create any particular traffic issue. Restricting parking on this usually quiet road with good sight-lines would have a knock on impact to neighbouring residential roads. This is another scheme by the AELTC to ostracise the Wimbledon Club and make the running of the club difficult to the detriment of grass roots and youth sport. The AELTC treat the whole area as if it were personal property and wish to take over the whole area for themselves preparing the ground for their gigantic and unnecessary new development. I urge you to reconsider the restrictions and to put the community first.

007 Herbert Road Sw19

I OBJECT to this proposal

006 Montserrat Road SW15

We use The Wimbledon Club as members for cricket and hockey. There are often sports events and practice days on the weekends where it is not possible to park inside the club. Many therefore park on Church Road where there are no issues arising from the street parking. There is no sensible reason for you to change this to no parking. There are no residential properties along this stretch of road and cars are not blocking the road for traffic. Whoever has put this proposal forward has not thought about the ramifications for the club and clearly does not utilise the sports facilities here so has no understanding of how it works. Parking this way has been fine for many many years so what is the reason for the proposal? I can't see any justification for it at all. In your document you say the parking is obstructive? In what way has it been obstructive. You also only talk about the 'Championships' so clearly whoever is proposing this is very narrow sighted. Please send me the reasons why you believe the parking is obstructive.

008 Cottenham Park Road

I object to the proposal to stop people parking on Church Rd. This will adversely affect junior hockey players. I also strongly support the development of the hockey pitch at Richard's Lodge School.

009 Bowood Road SW11

I would like to OBJECT to the above proposal (ES/CHURCHRD). As a user of the Wimbledon Club, parking is key to enabling access to the sports facilities for me and my family, all of which contribute to a healthier outcome for my family, something which I'd have thought is important. The road is hardly that busy outside of the tennis tournament anyway.

010 Gladstone Road SW19

I object to the proposal.

011 Combemartin Road SW18

I would like to OBJECT to the proposal preventing cars from parking on church road as it will prevent children in our borough from playing sport. I am sure that you will agree that when we face an epidemic of child obesity and reductions in children playing sport the council should not be putting further barriers in place. I trust you will do the right thing choose not to harm our children and reject this proposal.

012 Camelot close SW19

I am a resident of Wimbledon and have been active in using the Wimbledon club for many years. this club has long wait list for junior and senior membership across cricket, tennis, hockey and squash. I feel the children participation particularly at weekend should be encouraged and protected by the council. The coaching is among the highest of standards in the country and great for the borough. We make such a sacrifice for the tennis fortnight - but the success of the wimbledon club is also something we should all be proud of - so I really struggle with why the council needs introduce parking restrictions on church road. I've never seen any accidents or incidents when travelling along church road when busy. It's a key resource that needs protecting. Given this, I would like to OBJECT to the proposal preventing cars from parking on church road as it will prevent children in our borough from playing sport. In times after covid where we have real mental

health challenges among kids, and a lack of sports participation, it makes no sense to create barriers for parents to help kids get to their sports. I look forward to hearing back from you.

013 Rayleigh Road SW19

I would like to OBJECT to the proposal preventing cars from parking on church road as it will prevent children in our borough from playing sport. I am sure that you will agree that when we face an epidemic of child obesity and reductions in children playing sport the council should not be putting further barriers in place. I trust you will do the right thing choose not to harm our children and reject this proposal.

014 Tilehurst Road, SW18

I would like to OBJECT to the proposal preventing cars from parking on church road as it will prevent safe and efficient access for children playing sport at the Wimbledon Club site. I am sure that you will agree that when we face an epidemic of child obesity and reductions in children playing sport the council should not be putting further barriers in place to prevent access to sports facilities and clubs. Thank you for your consideration.

015 No address provided

I would like to OBJECT to the proposed restriction on car parking and the introduction of a Clearway on Church Road. I have children, one of which has SEND. He attends Linden Lodge School and all my children participate in sport and outdoor activities around Church Road and in Wimbledon Park. Clearway will have a two fold effect. No Stopping at any time on Church Road will push cars into the neighbouring Wandsworth Borough onto Wimbledon Park Road and those surrounding residential streets making them less safe for residents. Wimbledon Park Road is mainly a residential road, whereas Church Road for the majority of its length is not residential with only a small number of houses at the south western end (junction with St Marys Road and Burghley Road). The second part of my objection is that it will put an unnecessary barrier for families and children from Merton borough and from neighbouring boroughs from participating in sport and physical activities in and around Church Road i.e. Wimbledon Park, Wimbledon Park Lake and The Wimbledon Club. I am sure that you will agree that when we face rising child obesity, coupled with reductions in Local Authority sports provision the council should not be putting further barriers on organisations that are trying to increase participation in sport and physical activity. I OBJECT to a "No Stopping at any time" Clearway.

017 No address provided

I would like to OBJECT to the proposal preventing cars from parking on church road as it will prevent children in our borough from playing sport. I am sure that you will agree that in the current environment the council should not be putting further barriers in place when it comes to outdoor health, fitness and team social engagement. I trust you will do the right thing and reject this proposal.

018 Ernle Road SW20

I am writing as a Merton resident objecting to the proposal preventing cars from parking on Church Road. For years I have used this to park while my sons have been playing cricket at the Wimbledon Club. This is a completely unnecessary proposal which will greatly inconvenience Merton citizens like myself.

019 No address provided

I have just heard about the proposals to prevent parking on Church Road when parents are dropping their children off to play hockey. I cannot see how this would benefit anyone, except rich residents, the very political tennis section of the Wimbledon club and their cronies, the extremely high and mighty All England Club. I would like to strongly object to the proposal. We should be breaking down barriers to children playing sport, not putting them up. While we are thinking about this, the council should lobby in the strongest possible terms for the All England club to contribute more to the community. They do next to nothing with schools (except randomly picking one kid per class at the age of 3 or 4 and giving them free tennis lessons - what a nonsensical and ill thought out policy that is. Why not broaden it out?). Then they close every other road within a mile of the club during the tournament as if they own the whole borough. And to be honest, that's what it feels like, like they have the council in their pocket. What benefits do the locals get? Mmm struggling to think of anything. Anyway, back to parking. I trust you will do the right thing and choose not to harm our children and reject this proposal.

020 Elborough Street SW18

I am sending this email to register my objection to the proposed parking restrictions on Church Rd. I believe this will be detrimental to the area as it will further reduce parking availability and it will prevent parents parking their cars there whilst their children attend sports activities nearby. The more difficult we make it to play sport, the greater the level of obesity amongst the population, especially children. We know sport delivers multiple benefits to our physical and mental health. People need spaces to park to go to the steadily reducing number of sports pitches. The reason given of addressing traffic congestion perplexes me. I've lived in SW18 for over 20yrs and apart from the Wimbledon fortnight have NEVER come across traffic congestion on this part of the road! The road is already 20mph with minimal footfall and housing. Parked cars ensure drivers drive with more care and attention. Banning parking on what is very often an empty road may well lead to cars traveling faster (and please don't put up yet another speeding camera). I'd love to see some facts to support this proposal please. Thank you for registering and acknowledging my objection.

021 Earlsfield Rd SW18

I would like to OBJECT to the proposal preventing cars from parking on church road as it will prevent children in our borough from playing sport. Playing sport is integral to fighting child obesity and the council should be supporting initiatives like this, not putting further barriers in place. I trust you will reject this proposal.

022 Cottenham Park Road SW20

I write to object to the Council's proposal to introduce a 24 hour Clearway along Church Road. The Statement of Reasons states that this action is necessary to prevent obstructive parking and address traffic congestion in Church Road. The explanatory document dated 16th January 2023 states that this obstructive parking occurs in the period prior to, during and after the tennis championships. By implication, the traffic congestion is as a result of this obstructive parking. I assume therefore that the council is referring to the considerable number of vehicles belonging to contractors and individuals that are involved in setting up and preparing for the championships and dismantling afterwards and is seeking ways to reduce the traffic congestion caused by the presence of these vehicles on Church Road at this time. The Clearway would apply for 24 hours a day 12 months of the year, while the problem that is to be addressed occurs only for a few weeks each side of the championships, as stated in the proposal documents. Obstructive parking does not occur during the fortnight because the temporary road closure that has been in place for the last few years, and will probably be made permanent, is controlled by the AELTC. Now that the AELTC own the old golf course and have access to it, there are sufficient areas there for vehicles involved with their operations to be temporarily accommodated, and hence the problem of obstructive parking on Church Road could be removed with some organisation on their part. If the Clearway is introduced, presumably this will happen. It is the local community that will be effected by this measure. For example, although the Wimbledon Club usually has adequate parking for its members, there are occasions when visitor numbers are such that additional parking is required. Such restrictions on the road outside the club will seriously curtail the club's ability to host large sporting events, particularly those involving junior sportsmen and women, many of whom come with family and friends. It is not always possible to use public transport to reach this part of the borough. I put it to council that they reconsider this proposal which in my view is somewhat draconian. Alternative ways to minimise traffic congestion on Church Road could easily be found with some cooperation between the AELTC, the community and LBM.

024 Church Road SW19

I understand that each resident in the proposed area above was issued with a letter dated the 16th January 2023 as part of the Councils Statutory Consultation. Regrettably I did not receive this notification and have only today heard from a neighbour about the proposal. I appreciate the deadline for comment was 25th February but in view of the lack of notice and the fact that this mail although not supportive of the proposal is only a few days on that you will include my comments in the submission to the Cabinet Member for Transport. My comments are as follows:

- Within the area mentioned 'between Borough Boundary and 78 Church Road' there is in fact no obstructive parking other than - a council designated parking space outside 121 Church Road: the Somerset Road Bus Stop and outside The All England Lawn Tennis Club during the weeks surrounding the Wimbledon **Championships**
- There are actually very few dwellings along this part of Church Road as the majority of the Road is AELTC The Wimbledon Club and Golf Course
- All the dwellings have driveways so there is no regular obstructive parking and any occasional obstruction is brief and does not cause traffic congestion
- I have lived in Church Road since 1998 and the level of obstructive parking and traffic congestion caused is non-existent unchanged
- I am therefore at a complete loss as to where 'this imaginary obstructive parking that is taking place on Church Road causing traffic congestion' is?
- You refer to Welford Place and Rectory Orchard traffic displacement during the Championships only which confirms my contention that a permanent Clearway is not required
- Further I wonder who has observed this obstructive parking and traffic congestion?
- Finally the current road markings in this area are perfectly adequate.

In summary I object to and do not believe there is any need for a Permanent Clearway in Church Road between Borough Boundary and 78 Church Road other than during the Championships and that it is an unnecessary enforcement designed to inconvenience residents and a complete waste of residents council tax. I have forwarded a copy of this mail to Stephen Hammond MP for Wimbledon. Thank you and I trust in view of the circumstances my comments will be included.

Church Road, Wimbledon Proposed Clearway Restrictions

Statutory consultation

16 January 2023



Dear Resident/Business,

Proposed Clearway along Church Road between Borough boundary and No 78 Church Road

As you may be aware, historically, advisory solid white lines were introduced to deter parking along Church Road which until recent years had been effective. However, it has been noted that in recent years parking is taking place along Church Road prior, during and sometime after the Championships. To address this obstructive parking, the Council considered the introduction of waiting and loading restrictions which would involve the removal of the white lines and the implementation of double yellow lines along the entire length of the road. Given the length of the road and the impact of the removal process of the road marking on the road surface, the Council intends to introduce a Clearway.

This means that no stopping will be permitted at any time. The advantage of a Clearway is that no road marking is required and the existing white lines can remain in place. The implementation of the proposed restriction will include installation of signs on Lamp Columns at each point of entry along with some repeater signs.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

A Notice of the Council's intention to introduce the above restriction will be published in a local newspaper (Wimbledon and Wandsworth Times), London Gazette and posted on lamp columns in the vicinity. Representations against the proposals described in this Notice must be made no later than **17th February 2023** quoting reference **ES/CHURCHR**D by emailing trafficandhighways@merton.gov.uk or a letter to Environment & Regeneration Department, future Merton, Merton Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, Surrey, SM4 5DX. Objections must relate only to the element of the scheme that is subject to this statutory consultation.

All representations along with officers' comments and recommendations will be presented in a report to the Cabinet Member for Transport. **Please note that responses to any representations received will not be made until a final decision is made by the Cabinet Member.**

Welford Place and Rectory Orchard

The proposed Clearway in Church Road may cause vehicles to be displaced into these unrestricted roads particularly in the weeks running up to the Championship. To manage the impact of displacement, the Council is proposing to extend the Event Days restrictions by two weeks before the start of the championships. This means the Council will issue the residents the annual Event Days permits for four weeks to cover the additional two weeks. Please note that this is for information only and not subject to this statutory consultation.

VILLAGE WARD COUNCILLORS (contact details of Ward Councillors are provided for information purposes only)

Cllr Max Austin max.austin@merton.gov.uk
Cllr Thomas Barlow thomas.barlow@merton.gov.uk
Cllr Andrew Howard andrew.howard@merton.gov.uk

Cllr Stephen Alambritis Cabinet Member for Transport stephen.alambritis@merton.gov.uk

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