

Committee: Street Management Advisory

Date: 29th January 2014

Agenda item:

Ward: Dundonald

Subject: Proposed A1 CPZ Dupont Road Area, Raynes Park – Statutory Consultation)

Lead officer: Chris Lee, Director of Environment & Regeneration

Lead member: Councillor Andrew Judge, Environmental Sustainability & Regeneration

Forward Plan reference number: N/A

Contact Officer: Paul Atie, Tel: 020 8545 3214

Email: paul.atie@merton.gov.uk

Recommendations:

That the Street Management Advisory Committee considers the issues detailed in this report and recommends that the Cabinet Member for Environmental Sustainability and Regeneration:

- A) Notes the results of the statutory consultation carried out between 14 November and 6 December 2013, on proposals to introduce A1 Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) to include Abbott Avenue, Bronson Road, Chestnut Road, Dupont Road, part of Kingston Road (Bushey Road to Dorien Road) and Sydney Road.
- B) Notes and considers the representations received in respect of the proposals as detailed in Appendix 2.
- C) Considers the objections against the proposed measures.
- D) Agrees to proceed with the making of the relevant Traffic Management Orders (TMOs) and the implementation of the proposed 'A1' CPZ to include Abbott Avenue, Bronson Road, Chestnut Road, Dupont Road, part of Kingston Road (Bushey Road to Dorien Road) and Sydney Road, operational Monday to Friday, between 8.30am and 6.30pm as shown in Drawing No. Z78-213-01 rev C in Appendix 1.

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1. This report details the results of the statutory consultation carried out with the residents and businesses Abbott Avenue, Bronson Road, Chestnut Road, Dupont Road, part of Kingston Road (Bushey Road to Dorien Road) and Sydney Road and based on the feedback received, recommends the inclusion of Abbott Avenue, Bronson Road, Chestnut Road, Dupont Road, part of Kingston Road (Bushey Road to Dorien Road) and Sydney Road into the proposed A1 CPZ. See Drawing No. Z78-213-01 rev. C in Appendix 1.

2. DETAILS

- 2.1. The key objectives of parking management include:
 - Tackling 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 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.

Pay and display shared use/permit holder bays: - For use by pay and display customers and permit holders.

Pay and display only bays: - For use by pay and display customers.

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 where parking impedes the flow of traffic or would create an unacceptable safety risk e.g. obstructive sightlines or unsafe areas where pedestrians cross.

2.4. Within any proposed CPZ or review, 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.

Background Information

2.5. During June/July 2013 an informal consultation was carried out within the Apostles area on the proposals to introduce a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) A1 to include Abbott Avenue, Bronson Road, Chestnut Road, Dupont Road, part of Kingston Road (Bushey Road to Dorien Road), part of Lower Downs Road (Kingston Road to Lower Downs Road Bridge) and Sydney Road.

2.6. Following the informal consultation and based on the results of the consultation, it was agreed to proceed with a statutory consultation to include Abbott Avenue, Chestnut Road, Dupont Road, Sydney Road and part of Kingston Road (property nos 472 to 540 and include 565) into the proposed A1 CPZ.

Bronson Road

2.7. Due to majority of Bronson Road residents opting against a CPZ during the informal consultation, it was decided to exclude Bronson Road from the controls. However, as soon as the consultation results were published the Council received two petitions (one online petition and one hard copy by post) from Bronson Road. After filtering out any duplicate signatures between the two petitions it revealed 73 of 101 households signed the petition to be included in the A1. Residents of Bronson Road expressed their concerns and fears of being the last uncontrolled road in the Apostles area and have therefore changed their minds about having parking controls introduced.

- 2.8. Following the receipt of petition from Bronson Road the Council agreed to include Bronson Road into the Statutory Consultation for A1 CPZ to give residents further opportunity to air their views.


Kingston Road

- 2.9. In light of Bronson Road being included in A1 CPZ, it was felt that this section of Kingston Road (Bushey Road to Dorien Road) should also be included in A1 CPZ. This is because Kingston Road residents have very little access to off-street parking and if A1 CPZ is implemented they would be completely surrounded by controls with no access to on street parking in the vicinity of their homes. Therefore, it was agreed to include Kingston Road (Bushey Road to Dorien Road) within the statutory consultation to also give residents of this road a further opportunity to air their views.
- 2.9.1 To mitigate the parking pressure that Kingston Road may have on the side roads, it is proposed to split Kingston Road (Bushey Road to Lower Downs Road) into the two adjacent zones (proposed A1 CPZ and existing 5F CPZ); this will allow the parking pressure overflow from Kingston Road to be shared between Bronson Road and Oxford Avenue. Kingston Road residents displaying a valid permit will be able to park either side of Kingston Road, as well as their respective adjacent zones.

3. CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN

- 3.1 The statutory consultation to introduce the proposed parking controls in Abbott Avenue, Bronson Road, Chestnut Road, Dupont Road, part of Kingston Road (Bushey Road to Dorien Road) and Sydney Road commenced on 14 November and ended on 6 December 2013. The consultation included the erection of street notices on lamp columns in the vicinity of the proposals and the publication of the Council's intentions in the Local Guardian and the London Gazette. Consultation documents were available at the Link, Merton Civic Centre and on the Council's website. A newsletter with a plan, attached as Appendix 3, was also circulated to all those properties included within the consultation area.
- 3.2 The newsletter detailed the information
- Hours of operation of the zone (Monday to Friday, between 8.30am and 6.30pm);
 - Double yellow lines operating "At any time" without loading restrictions;
 - Single yellow lines (mainly between parking bays and across dropped kerbs);
 - Permit holder bays;
 - Pay and display shared use bays in Abbott Avenue, Dupont Road, Bronson Road, Chestnut Road and Sydney Road;
 - Zone boundaries

The plan below shows the extent of the consultation area.



3.3 The statutory consultation resulted in a total of 17 representations, 4 of which are in support of the proposal, 8 against and 5 comments. These representations are detailed in Appendix 2. A representation was also received by the Metropolitan Police with no comments or observations.

3.4 Those who objected to the scheme generally believe that the controls are unnecessary or do not support the scheme layout. The layout of the scheme was designed to ensure access and safety; maximise available space and use and where possible accommodate requests received from local residents and businesses. Representations and officers comments are detailed in Appendix 2 of this report

Passing Gaps.

3.5 The proposed double yellow lines at various locations in Abbott, Avenue Dupont Road, Sydney Road, Chestnut Road and Bronson Road are designated as passing gaps. Within the design all existing drop kerbs have been used as passing gaps in order to maximise parking spaces but some of these roads do not have drop kerbs. These facilities are usually introduced in narrow roads where vehicles are parked on one or both sides of the road without a space where opposing traffic can manoeuvre into to give way to on-coming traffic. In the absence of a passing gap, drivers will have to reverse all the way out in order to let the on- coming traffic pass. Passing

gaps also allow for stopping to load and unload for a few moments and will assist refuse vehicles as well as other motorists during refuse collection. It is appreciated that residents want every available kerbside designated as parking space, but the aim of a CPZ is to regulate and control traffic and parking in the area therefore the Council cannot implement a scheme that would compromise access and safety.

- 3.6 The recommendation to introduce the measures is based on majority support demonstrated by those who responded during the informal consultation, petition and the statutory consultation. It should be noted that a statutory consultation is based on the reasons for objecting to the making of the Traffic Management Order. Often those who object, tend to make representations and in this case 5 wrote in support, 8 against and 3 commented. It is officer's recommendation to introduce the proposed measures.

3.4 Ward Councillor comments

Upon requesting comments from all ward Councillors, officers received the following comment from one of the Councillors:

“As I said at the RP forum I think it is best to go ahead with the CPZ asap as per consultation, the Cllrs can seek residents’ views at a later date to determine if they wish to change the times to 1 or 2 hours and if so what time. Personally I would wait until 12 months after implementation but my fellow ward councillors may wish to do sooner?”

4. **PROPOSED MEASURES**

- 4.1 It is recommended that approval is given to make the relevant Traffic Management Orders (TMOs) for the implementation of the proposed ‘A1’ CPZ to include Abbott Avenue, Bronson Road, Chestnut Road, Dupont Road, part of Kingston Road (Bushey Road to Dorien Road) and Sydney Road, operational Monday to Friday, between 8.30am and 6.30pm as shown in Drawing No. Z78-213-01 Rev B in Appendix 1.
- 4.2 In considering the above measures, the Council must consider whether or not the problems currently being experienced in these roads is of sufficient significance for change to go ahead; whether or not the change proposed is proportionate to the problems experienced and is acceptable in consideration of the possible impact.
- 4.3 The CPZ design comprises of permit holder only bays to be used by residents, businesses and their visitors with some shared use bays and pay & display only bays facilities made available for pay & display customers. 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.

Hours of Operation:

- 4.4 The A1 CPZ will operate Monday to Friday between the hours of 8.30am and 6.30pm.

Permit Issue Criteria:

- 4.5 The Council periodically reviews the permit and pay and display parking costs. However, the price structure presented during the initial informal consultation stage will be unaffected for the first year, after which the borough wide charge will apply. It is, therefore, proposed that the residents’ permit parking price structure should be as follows – the cost of the first permit in each household is £65 per annum; the second permit is £110 and the third permit cost is £140. An annual Visitor permit cost is £140.

Visitors' permits:

- 4.6 It is recommended that the system and charges applied elsewhere in the Borough, at the time of consultation, for visitor permits should also be introduced. All-day Visitor permits will remain at £2.50 whilst half-day permits will be priced at £1.50. The allowance of visitor permits per adult in a household shall be 50 full-day permits, 100 half-day permits or a combination of the two, per annum.

Business permits:

- 4.7 It is proposed that the business permit system should be the same for zones elsewhere in the borough, maintaining the charges of £331 per 6 months (as was at the time of the consultation), with a maximum of only two permits per business without off- street parking facilities.

Pay & Display tickets:

- 4.8 It is recommended that the charge for parking within the pay and display shared use/permit holder bays reflect the standard charges applied to these types of bays in the borough, at the time of consultation. The cost will be £1.10 pence per hour, with a maximum stay of up to 2 hours. Purchase of tickets will be available before 8.30am.

4.9 Trade 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.

5. TIMETABLE

- 5.1 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 Local Guardian 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.

6. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

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

7. FINANCIAL RESOURCE AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 The cost of implementing the recommended measures is estimated at £35k. This would include the publication of the made Traffic Management Orders, road markings, signs and ticket machines.
- 7.2 The Environment and Regeneration budget for 2012/13 contains a provision of £250k for parking management schemes. The cost of these proposals 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.

9. HUMAN RIGHTS & EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY COHENSION IMPLICATIONS

9.1 The implementation of 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.

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 as well as 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 IMPLICATION

10.1 N/A

11. RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

11.1 The risk in not addressing the issues as part of the consultation exercise would be the loss of confidence in the Council. The proposed measures may cause some dissatisfaction from those who have objected but it is considered that the benefits of introducing the measures outweigh the risk of doing nothing.

12. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

12.1 Before reaching a decision to make the necessary Traffic Management Order to implement a scheme, the Council must follow the statutory consultation procedures pursuant to the Road Traffic Regulation Act ("RTRA") 1984 and the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure)(England and Wales) Regulations 1996. All objections received must be properly considered in the light of administrative law principles, Human Rights law and the relevant statutory powers.

12.2 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.

12.3 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. Z78-213-01 Rev B

Appendix 2 – Representations and officers' comments

Appendix 3 – Statutory consultation material



Notes
Do not scale from this drawing



Client	Merton Council
Project	Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs)
Proposed Zone A1	Dupont Area
Drawn by	LM
Checked by	LM
Date	May 13
Scale	1:1000

Client	278-213-01
Project	B
Client	TMO
Scale	1:1000
Client	Merton Council London Road Morden, Surrey SM4 5DX www.merton.gov.uk

Representation - Support

Abbott Avenue

12315018 – Residents

I am writing in response to the recent proposal for a CPZ on Abbott Avenue, details of which I received in the post yesterday. My wife (cc'd) and I live on Abbott Avenue and completed the survey upon which the latest plans are based. Whilst broadly in favour of introducing a CPZ on Abbott Avenue (Mon-Fri), we are both disappointed that the proposed hours of operation are currently 8:30am-6:30pm. We would strongly favour a smaller time window during the day in which the CPZ applies so as to enable free parking for people coming and going as part of day-to-day life, whilst preventing commuters and others from using the road for free parking all day long. Indeed, to support my point, I note that only 43.9% of Abbott Avenue respondents favoured the 8:30am-6:30pm window, whereas a combined 51.3% favoured either 10am-4pm or 11am-12pm. I am an ordained minister on the staff at Dundonald Church (577 Kingston Road) and, together with wife, my role there includes hosting visitors (in groups as well as individually) in our home on a regular basis, often during the day. The introduction of a CPZ which applies all day would have a significant impact on the ease with which we can host visitors and it would cause them (and us) considerable inconvenience. Furthermore, as a young family with small children we often host friends & family as visitors, many of whom have to travel by car. With a CPZ in operation all day, even just short visits (part and parcel of everyday life, especially with small children) become costlier and indeed more difficult. We are grateful for the work being done by the Council to address the issue but would ask that you give due consideration to reducing the hours of operation in order to ensure that residents are not unduly penalised for the parking patterns of other non-residents. I hope you might feel that the number of respondents who did not favour an 8:30am-6:30pm window merits a thorough review.

Officer Comment

During the consultation, residents were given several options with regards to days and hours of operation. The proposed operational period of Mon-Fri, 8.30am-6.30pm was the option supported by the majority who responded.

BRONSON ROAD

112315679 - Resident

I am writing in support of the proposed CPZ A1 including Bronson Road, and the proposed timing of operation.

SYDNEY ROAD

12315019 - Resident

I would like to state my support for the proposed CPZ in Sydney Road, SW20. I agree that the controls should operate Monday-Friday from 8:30 am to 6:30 pm.

12316814 - Resident

Further to all of the comments that have been made regarding the above CPZ consultation, I wished to reiterate the desperate need for its implementation and that the scheme, apart from my comment below, has our house holds full backing. For the past year our lives have been completely blighted by the knock on effect of extending the Apostles CPZ at the beginning of the year (as previously stated no residents of Dupont Road received any documentation informing us that Dorien Road had begun a petition). As such this whole saga could have been avoided. I also wish to stress again that Dupont Road does not need two sets of passing points. These rules are being set by individuals who do not live in the roads but feel that they know better than residents. If these passing points are so vital then why were they not implemented in Dorien Road which is the same length, if not longer than Dupont Road. One passing point located in the middle will be more than enough.

Officers Comments:

Support noted. The proposed double yellow lines in various locations in Dupont Road, Sydney Road,

Chestnut Road and Bronson Road serve as passing gaps to ensure traffic movement. Within the design all existing drop kerbs are considered as passing gaps in order to maximise parking spaces but some of roads do not have drop kerbs. These facilities are usually introduced in narrow roads where vehicles are parked on one or both sides of the road without a passing and drivers have to reverse all the way out in order to let the on coming traffic out and also for delivery vehicles to load/unload goods and for the refuse to pull into in order to give way to other traffics during refuse collection. It is appreciated that residents want every available kerbside designated as parking space, but the aim of a CPZ is to regulate and control traffic and parking in the area therefore the Council cannot implement a scheme that would impede traffic flow hence the passing gaps.

The proposed CPZ will prioritise parking for local residents within the scheme and remove all non essential parking from the area e.g commuters, residents from adjacent CPZs who do not want to pay for parking. All other vehicles without permit would be unable to park in these roads except for those who need to stop for loading/unloading purposes. With commuter vehicles removed from any included road road, the Council is confident that there would be enough parking spaces for the use of residents within this scheme. CPZ does not guarantee residents parking spaces in front of their houses but by removing non-resident parking it will make parking easier within 100 metres of their homes and will remove traffic caused by those motorists who currently travel from road to road looking for a parking space.

12316815 – Resident

I am a resident of Dupont Road. We need Dupont Road to be included in the CPZ for the following reasons:
1) From the petition (87% in favour) and informal consultation (91% in favour) it is very clear that the overwhelming number of residents of Dupont Road are in favour of a CPZ in Dupont Road. 2) Dupont Road (and to a lesser degree the other Apostle roads outside the current CPZ) has become the free car park for the businesses, business employees, business customers, residents of Merton Mansions, commuters using Raynes park station and Wimbledon Chase station as well as some owners of 2nd vehicles in streets within the current CPZ. This is totally unacceptable since the residents of Dupont Road are no longer able to find parking. Surrey Catering, one of the businesses on Kingston Road is one of the main contributors to additional (unwanted) vehicles parked in our road. They leave 3 vans on a near permanent basis in our road (including over weekends) and during the day, their employees take up these parking spaces when the vans are used to conduct business. Despite the fact that Surrey Catering and the other businesses can obtain business permits (which are tax deductible expenses), they prefer to not do so, and continue to park in our road and take up the parking spaces which should be used by residents of Dupont Road. Also, if they employed local people, their employees would not need cars to drive to their place of work. The Apostle area is well served by public transport (3 bus routes and two stations with very frequent train services) and employees and customers of the local businesses should use these forms of transport (like the rest of us do when we visit most businesses in London!) and not depend on Dupont Road to provide their free parking! 3) Dangerous driving has become the norm in Dupont Road since the expansion of the CPZ to include Edna and Dorien Road. Due to the fact that parking spaces have disappeared, people travel at great speeds when spaces are spotted in order to secure these. This is very worrying for me as a father with two young children. 4) Further developments in the area (Manuplastics site and small piece of land opposite the Chase) may cause further pressures on the already volatile parking position.

Officers Comments:

The CPZ aim to prioritise parking for local residents within the scheme and remove parking from the area by commuters, residents from adjacent CPZs who do not want to pay for a permit and visitors. With these vehicles removed from a controlled road, the Council is confident that there will be enough parking spaces for residents within this scheme.

Representation - Against

ABBOTT AVENUE

12315014 – Resident

Please register my objection to the CPZ proposals for Abbott Avenue. I objected previously on the basis that outside my property you have proposed a 'pay and display' bay and I see you have not amended your plans. Why do my views not count? Furthermore your conclusions draw on 53.3% majority and 41.6% objection - why are not the views of the almost equal 41.6% being taken into consideration? It is clear the proposal has almost been won by a slight margin, if anything a coalition agreement should be made. Why are you going to put a 'Pay and Display' bay outside properties 53-71? Who do you think will actually use 'Pay and Display' in Abbott Ave? Why is there such a large area of 'Pay and Display' in Abbott Ave compared to the other apostle roads? Why are you putting a 'Pay & Display' bays outside residential properties in Abbott Ave but not outside residential properties in the Apostles? Where is and what is the justification? I am disappointed that you have not explained the meaning of 'Pay & Display shared bay' in plain English. There is no explanation for this in the leaflet. I phoned the council who told me one thing on the phone but without it being in writing, it is not clear what exactly this will mean. Secondly, if I have work men, I don't understand what kind of permit I will have to get for them - will they have to pay the pay & display rate per hour or would I be able to get a visitors permit for them? On the proposal you plan to make the private close at the end of Abbott Ave double yellow lines, where do you propose those residents will park? At the moment the residents park in the proposed double yellow line area. It will mean they will be pushed out onto the street taking up the little and permit bays. It is also unfortunate that you have timed your public meetings at very inconvenient times for people like myself that work shifts. There has been no alternative meeting times for shift workers. I can foresee that my views will not be taken into consideration, you will not answer my questions and the Council will roll out the CPZ despite opposition. I would appreciate a reply to my questions.

Officers Comments:

The proposed pay and display (P&D) bays in Abbott Avenue are shared use bays which can be used by both residents and visitors. The purpose of the shared use bays were explained in the informal consultation leaflet and the Frequently Asked Question leaflet. These are bays designed for use by either permit holders or non permit holders who must purchase a pay and display ticket. These bays have maximum stay for pay and display customers but permit holders are not subject to any time restriction.

12315684 – Resident

I am sorry to see the threat is looming upon us being very much against the scheme. I have lived in Abbott Avenue since 1986 and do not wish to leave the area but this will force me to do so. It seems very unfair that one person in Dupont Road can affect so many people and/or other roads a good distance from him. It makes us wonder who this person is. Freedom has always been paramount in this country - this will have the opposite effect with no benefit to us. We are all getting older (many residents in Abbott Avenue have been here over 40 years) and we shall need vehicular help from contractors, service providers etc from time to time. I hope you receive this email and CPZ in Abbott Avenue does not occur.

.Officers Comments:

The CPZ will prioritise parking for local residents within the scheme and remove all non-essential parking from the area e.g commuters, residents from adjacent CPZs who do not want to pay for parking and all other vehicles without a permit would be unable to park in these controlled roads except for loading/unloading of goods. The Council is confident that there are enough parking spaces for the use of residents within this scheme.

12316350 - Resident

I am writing to you with reference to the proposed resident parking scheme with particular reference to Abbott Avenue, Wimbledon. I have noticed on the plan that there are double yellow lines outside of my property (at the end of the "crossover"). I have spoken to the Project Engineer Leonardo Morris, who confirms that this is the case with the reason being that my property is mid-way down the road and this will give people a place to pull in and pass. I object to the double yellow lines and require this to be changed to single yellow marking. I have lived in Abbott Avenue for more than 38 years and it is a short straight road cul-de-sac with an adequately-sized turning circle at the end. When residents' parking is implemented, under the proposed scheme and during peak hours, no one will be able to park at the end of their "crossovers" as this will be marked with single yellow lines. This will create a number of passing places during peak parking hours. For note the residents' scheme restricts parking between the hours of 8.30-6.30pm Monday to Friday. Outside of these extensive peak hours, parking is not a problem, which you recognised in setting the hours of your proposed scheme. Therefore there are naturally spaces up and down the road for waiting, passing etc. Furthermore, by creating a "permanent" space mid-way down the road ie. One which will always be vacant,

this will become known as a "permanent" 3-point turn point. At the moment, I suffer the ongoing issue whereby people cannot be bothered to go down to the end of the road (to the turning circle to turn around and do so by backing up to my front door using the "crossover". This has caused my neighbour to install a fixed and bolted bollard in the middle of his frontage. As I am sure you appreciate this practice of reversing is extremely dangerous and an accident waiting to happen. In addition, you will see on the plan that my frontage/crossover has a tree on one side and a lamppost on the other. I cannot tell you the number of near misses that have occurred as people undertake this practice nearly hitting either tree or lamppost. I look forward to hearing from you confirming the decision reference the line painting.

Officers Comments:

The proposed double yellow lines in various locations in CPZ are designated as passing gaps. Within the design all existing drop kerbs have been used as passing gaps in order to maximise parking spaces but some of these roads do not have drop kerbs. These facilities are usually introduced in narrow roads where vehicles are parked on one or both sides of the road without a break and drivers have to reverse all the way out in order to let the oncoming traffic out and also for delivery vehicles to load/unload goods and for the refuse pull into in order to give way to other traffics during refuse collection. It is appreciated that residents want every available kerbside designated as parking space, but the aim of a CPZ is to regulate and control traffic and parking in the area therefore the Council cannot implement a scheme that would impede traffic flow hence the passing gaps

CHESTNUT ROAD

12316218 - Resident

I wish to oppose the implementation of a controlled parking zone in Chestnut Road.

We were consulted on this issue two years ago and gave a clear 'No'; repeating the consulting gives the impression that the original consultation was not a true exercise in democracy, but rather a sham designed to permit the Local Authority to introduce additional revenue raising powers.

I realise that the situation may change, and that there may be an argument to reappraise the situation. Indeed, The Department of Transport's "Operational Guidance to Local Authorities, Parking Policy and Enforcement, Traffic Management Act 2004 (Revised Edition November 2010)" in Chapter 4 directs that Local Authorities should monitor and appraise parking policy. Clause 4.3 recommends that consultation is carried out, while clause 4.5 states that "The appraisal should ensure that parking policies still apply at the right place and the right time." While the residents of Chestnut Road, having rejected a controlled parking zone once, are now being re-consulted (presumably after a further appraisal), there appears to have been no appraisal of the controlled parking zones where these exist elsewhere in the Apostles, nor any re-consultation of those streets that have had a controlled parking zone implemented to determine whether the residents of those streets still wish to keep the parking zone in effect. This appears to breach at least the spirit, if not actually the letter, of the DoT guidance. Moreover, it tends to confirm that the implementation of CPZ is designed primarily as a revenue raising scheme, rather than a genuine exercise in local democracy. If a Controlled Parking Zone is introduced in Chestnut Road, will the Council guarantee a further re-consultation in between 1 and 3 years' time to enable the residents to have assessed the effectiveness of the scheme, after which the zone will be discontinued if that is the wish of the bulk of the respondents responding? Such a guarantee would go a long way to re-assuring me, and I suspect many others, that this consultation exercise is genuine; conversely, without such a guarantee, it would confirm that this truly is a revenue raising exercise. I also feel it worth noting that there used to be a public car park on the Thames Water land at Raynes Park. The Council granted permission for this land to be developed for residential use (increasing the number of residents' cars requiring parking space) and for commercial purposes (Waitrose) with car parking dedicated to short term use for shopping, so simultaneously removed about 100 long term car park spaces, increased demand for local residents' parking and created a 'pull factor' in the form of Waitrose drawing more cars into Raynes Park. While the Thames water infrastructure under the site may have made sub-surface car parking facilities difficult to construct (though likely still possible, given the scale of above ground development), a combined above ground car-parking and commercial development (as for example the B&Q store at New Malden) would have been technically feasible. However, the Council's planning department evidently chose not to require this of the developers, and hence created additional stress on parking capacity in the Raynes Park area.

Thus the Council itself has contributed significantly to such parking issues as do exist in Raynes Park. It appears that the residents of the Apostles are to be made, literally, to pay for the council's poor planning.

Officers Comments:

The council carries out reviews as and when deemed necessary. The Apostles original CPZ was reviewed along with the consultation that extended the CPZ to include Vernon Avenue and Carlton Park Avenue. The majority of those who responded did not want the hours of operation changed but those roads close to the Railway Station wanted the days extended to include Saturday but this was not majority view therefore the Council's decision to keep the status quo was in line with the result of the consultation. CPZs are reviewed if there is a petition for change or if it becomes obvious that the zone is not working. Any such review would be

subject to available resources / funding. Thames Water Land does belong to the Council. The Council had it on lease and when the lease expired, Thames Water sold it to Waitrose for redevelopment.

12316347 Chestnut Road

As an elderly (over 80), non car owning resident of Kingston Road (No 511) I wish to register my concern about the proposed new parking arrangements in my immediate vicinity. There is no provision for parking along this busy road and my visitors with cars or trades people (handyman, gardener) who may need to work on my property have at the moment to park in Bronson Road or the lower end of Lower Downs Road. This is difficult enough even now, so I am seriously worried that the situation will worsen considerably in the future as parking spaces in Bronson or Lower Downs Roads would appear to be very restricted. I realise that this is a very awkward area traffic wise and would not object to purchasing parking permits if needs must, but would they be able to be utilised by my visitors – would not the spaces in Bronson, Lower Downs etc be already taken by the residents of these roads or their visitors? Where else would callers at my address be able to park that is not too distant? At the moment I am reasonably able-bodied, but it may be that I shall need the assistance of carers in the future so this new situation causes me concern. I do not wish to knock down my front wall and gate and demolish my front garden in order to accommodate a case if this can be avoided as it is an expensive and ugly solution to this problem, especially as I don't own a car in the first place! I would ask, therefore, that in your deliberations you give some thought to these considerations and give reasonable assurances to those of us on this stretch of road that adequate provision be made for suitable and convenient places for visitors, callers, trades people etc to park.

Officers Comments:

There would be permit holder bays in the road for residents who purchase permits. Visitors would be able to use a visitor permit to park; alternatively visitors can use pay and display shared use bays close to Kingston Road junction.

12316692 Chestnut Road

In August the local councillors informed us that Chestnut Road had voted against a CPZ in this road so I was shocked to receive, 3 months later, notification from you that the Council had overturned that decision you gave no reasons for this but looking at the figures it appears that you must have based in on the secondary question of 'neighbouring road'. But four of the other roads voted against making five in total so there was not reason to allow this question to take precedence. In any case the difference was one vote and you are allowing it to overtake a 21/4 majority against a CPZ. When you are seeking to impose substantial costs on residents one vote should not be enough to overtake the primary decision. Furthermore you are allowing this decision to overturn all the other 'no' road with the exception of Bronson Road on the basis that they will have nowhere to park. Bronson Road seems to have enjoyed a special advantage over the other roads by being notified in advance of these decisions since you say you have already received a further petition of 73 names, 17 more that voted in the first place. Are you now going to accept this petition as it stands despite the initial consultation ending in July, or do you request all 73 to respond to this statutory consultation individually with reasons to overturn initial result. I ask because this is precisely what you are requiring the 'no votes' to do and it would be wrong to discriminate, I voted against the introduction of a CPZ in Chestnut Road as I do see a parking problem during the day. I walk this road on a regular basis, sometimes twice a day and there are always places to park. For example Tuesday 26 No 2.00pm 14 places, 4.30pm 19 places, Wed 27 Nov 10.00 16 spaces, 11.45 10 spaces, Wed 4 Dec 9.30 11 spaces. This seems in general to be at least 10 spaces free on a regular basis. Therefore I do not understand why the people who petitioned the Council from my road could not find a place to park, unless of course, they want to park directly outside their own door on all occasions. True earlier in the year there were 5 or 6 skips and building materials parked on the road so it may have been difficult to park. But this was also temporary and should not be used as justification for a CPZ. In the evening there seem to be more of a problem but this not be solved with a CPZ either. It concerns me that there has been no proper study done to establish how many parking spaces are available at different times. No vehicles number recognition van has toured the area to establish whether it is residents or commuters/shoppers causing a problem. Without such facts all you have is unsubstantiated claims which you seem to have accepted without question. The Council therefore seems prejudiced in favour of the CPZ. Not only is it just a year since the previous consultation when all these road voted against but it seems to have selected the facts to fit the outcome it favours. As mentioned above it has selected 1 vote to overturn a majority but it has selected the minority vote the 8.30-6.30 hours of operation. The majority vote was against these hours and indeed if you remove the Dupont Road results which have skewed this figure, the majority in the other road favour the 11-12 option. A vast difference in the hours covered which ought not to be ignored. To sum up Chestnut Road should not have a CPZ and if you impose one it should be for the hours of 11-12pm only. I would like to conclude by saying that as a 'no votes' I feel there is more pressure to provide a reasoned case against whereas the 'yes voters' can just sign a petition or tick a box. No effort required.

Officers Comments:

With regards to the results of the informal consultation, Q3, do you support a CPZ in your road, 18 (40%) said yes and 21 (60%) said no. Q4 would you be in favour of a CPZ in your road if the neighbouring road(s) or part of your road were included in a CPZ? 18 (51.4%) said yes and 14 (40%) said no and 3 (8.6%)

<p>undecided. The analysis of Q3 show that 4 people were against and Q4 show that 4 people were in favour and 3 people undecided.</p> <p>In terms of the hours of operation in Chestnut Road, analysis show 12 people in favour of 8.30am to 6.30pm, 12 in favour of 1 hour and 9 in favour of 10am to 4pm. The analysis of Dupont Road and Sydney Road show that 68.6% and 62.5% respectively were in favour of 8.30am to 6.30pm. Therefore the majority of residents in these three roads opted for 8.30am to 6.30pm. Therefore the same hours of operation must be adopted for Chestnut Road. Different hours of operation would require another consultation and any road with different hours of operation cannot be part of a zone but a stand-alone zone. Based on the low number of requests regarding shorter hours, it would not be feasible to undertake another consultation at this time.</p>
<p>KINGSTON ROAD (Bushey Road to Dorien Road)</p>
<p>12315689 - Resident</p> <p>Re-Proposed CPZ A1-Apostles (Dupont/Kingston) - Lower Downs Road to Dorien Road, and Bushey Road to Lower Downs Road, I write to object the inclusion of Kingston Road (Bushey Road to Lower Downs road) as part of the CPZ. There will be limited spaces available for us living in that part of the road, even allowing for parking to be shared between Bronson Road and Oxford Avenue. I cannot afford to pay for an annual fee for parking my car just for the privilege of "securing a space" from limited spaces available. In other words, having a parking permit does not guarantee a parking space in the designated areas.</p> <p>Officers Comments:</p> <p>The CPZ will prioritise parking for local residents within the scheme and remove all non essential parking from the area e g commuters, residents from adjacent CPZs who do not want to pay for parking and all other vehicles without a permit would be unable to park in these controlled roads except for loading/unloading of goods. The Council is confident that there will be enough parking spaces for the use of residents within this scheme.</p>
<p>12316352 - Resident</p> <p>I am writing to lodge an objection to the proposed Controlled Parking Zones being introduced in Bronson Road / Chestnut Road / Kingston Road etc. (All the other roads in the area are already Controlled Parking) I work for a company in Kingston Road and drive to work every day (as do a number of my colleagues), There are no staff parking facilities at the offices so we have to park in the side roads. I understand that we will not be eligible for permits so we will be struggling to park in the area. 4 The 'Pay & Display' you are introducing will be no help as it will be 5 hours maximum and we are at work 9 hours a day. If there were car parks we would use them but there are none in the area. You will no doubt say that we should use public transport, but as we all pay road tax and car insurance, I feel we are entitled to use our vehicles instead of having to wait for buses (which are full of schoolchildren)..</p> <p>Officers Comments:</p> <p>Long stay commuter parking is the cause of parking congestion in the area. Residents who live in these roads cannot find a parking space during the day. Given that in this area the on-street parking demand outweighs the number of available kerb side space, it is necessary to manage the parking demand by having a set of criteria for the provisions of parking permits and the appropriate tariff structure for both permits and pay and display machines.</p>
<p>SYDNEY ROAD</p>
<p>12315017 – Resident</p> <p>I am writing concerning the purposed CPZ on Sydney Road and the surrounding Apostles Roads. In particular my attention was drawn to two things that concern me with current plans on Sydney Road;</p> <p>1) I am not sure both disabled bays are still in use on the road, as much as they should 100% be there if I am mistaken, but thought it may be worth you double checking the status of usage on these.</p> <p>2) Having driven up and down the road, even without permits there is no reason to have passing bays, all this will do is lose all important parking spaces, seems to work against the objective of this proposal.</p> <p>Thought it was important to point these two concerns out</p> <p>Officers Comments:</p> <p>It can be confirmed that the disabled parking facilities in this road are still in use. The CPZ will prioritise parking for local residents within the scheme and remove all non essential parking from the area e g commuters, residents from adjacent CPZs who do not want to pay for parking and all other vehicles without a permit. The Council is confident that the proposals provide sufficient parking within the CPZ</p>

Representation - Comments

ABBOTT AVENUE

12315684 - Resident

<p>I am sorry to see the threat is looming upon us being very much against the scheme. I have lived in Abbott Avenue since 1986 and do not wish to leave the area but this will force me to do so. It seems very unfair that one person in Dupont Road can affect so many people and/or other roads a good distance from him. It makes us wonder who this person is. Freedom has always been paramount in this country - this will have the opposite effect with no benefit to us. We are all getting older (many residents in Abbott Avenue have been here over 40 years) and we shall need vehicular help from contractors, service providers etc from time to time. I hope you receive this email and CPZ in Abbott Avenue does not occur.</p>

.Officers Comments:

<p>The CPZ will prioritise parking for local residents within the scheme and remove all non-essential parking from the area e g commuters, residents from adjacent CPZs who do not want to pay for parking and all other vehicles without a permit would be unable to park in these controlled roads except for loading/unloading of goods. The Council is confident that there are enough parking spaces for the use of residents within this scheme.</p>
--

LOWER DOWNS ROAD

12315011 - Resident

<p>I've just received your letter dated 14th November in relation to the proposed introduction of CPZ. This has totally distressed me this evening and I am beside myself. Reason being, I will have absolutely no where to park the two cars belonging to my household when this is implemented in Abbots Avenue. Reason being, we only have 3 spaces outside our house which all residents in the whole area scramble for. Lower downs voted not to have CPZ and this will not affect many of my street residents because they have their own off street parking. We don't and in the stretch I live in only 2 of us householders are owner occupiers, and the other one has their own drive. All the other homes are rental properties and the tenants do not drive. I feel as though I and the house opposite mine (I think number 11) are the only permanent home owner families in this street who will be negatively impacted by these proposals, because we have cars+ no where to park! The houses or temporary residents (rentals) who choose not to purchase permits will park as they do already (from the other side of the bridge) in the 3 spaces outside my house +thus putting No.11, my daughter+I having absolutely no where to park as we won't have permits allowing us to park on Abbots or other roads. Last year I commenced an application for a crossover to enable me to construct a drive and park at the front of my house, however I was advised by one of your colleagues that I would probably not be granted a crossover as I have a tree near my property and am not far enough away from the corner bend. I urge you to reconsider either the decision to exclude us Number 28 from purchasing a permit or grant me a crossover to park our cars on my property. I am seriously considering selling up, but who will want to buy my house if they have no where to park? This letter received when I got home from work has distressed me sufficiently that I will not rest until I have received a reply which will alleviate my anxiety.</p>

SYDNEY ROAD

1212315687 - Resident

<p>I received the CPZ proposal. I have recently moved to Sydney Road. I have a couple of queries. First, I note that the letter makes no reference to any potential cost of the permit. I assume therefore, as it is not referred to, there is no cost? Second, if there is a cost what is the justification for it and the legality by which it can be charged? Finally, I know that some of the properties are rented and split into two or three dwellings. What is the situation in terms of car spaces offered where this is the case? I look forward to hearing from you.</p>

Officers Comments:

<p>The cost of permit was sent to residents in the area as part of the informal consultation that was carried out previous. The Frequently Asked Questions (FQA) detailed all permit prices. We will let you have a copy of the FQA if the scheme is approved.</p>
--

Officers' Comments

The decision to consult on A1 CPZ initially was based on the petitions received asking to be included in the zone. This was explained within the consultation material. The petitions came from Dupont Road and Chestnut Road.

Bronson and Kingston Roads will be an extension to the proposed A1 CPZ, therefore the same hours of operation must be adopted. Different hours of operation would require another consultation and these 2 roads would be a sit alone zone. Based on the low number of requests regarding shorter hours, it would not be feasible to undertake another consultation at this time

Pay & display shared use bays are introduced to allow parking for visitors to the businesses on Kingston Road and Abbott Avenue. Residents and visitor with a permit can also use these bays without any time limit

Within any parking management, the Council gives priority to maintaining access and safety at all times and not just during specific times. Parking can only be permitted where it does not impede on access and passing gaps are also used to sure vehicles have some where to pull in to give way to oncoming traffic.

Every effort is made to accommodate the needs of businesses within a regulatory framework that is primarily concerned with residents' parking and to strike a balance on charges that address a range of policy objectives such as reducing parking demand, promoting sustainable transport, covering the costs of implementation, maintenance and administration of the scheme. Given that in most areas the on-street parking demand outweighs the number of available kerb side space, it is necessary to manage the parking demand by having a set of criteria for the provisions of parking permits and the appropriate tariff structure for both permits and pay and display machines.

The proposed double yellow lines in various locations are designated as passing gaps. Within the design all existing drop kerbs have been used as passing gaps in order to maximise parking spaces but some roads do not have drop kerbs. These facilities are usually introduced in narrow roads where vehicles are parked on one or both sides of the road without a break and drivers have to reverse a long way in order to let the oncoming traffic pass; passing gaps also facilitate delivery vehicles and refuse vehicles.

It is appreciated that residents want every available kerbside designated as parking space, but the aim of a CPZ is to regulate and control traffic and parking in the area therefore the Council cannot implement a scheme that would impede traffic flow hence the passing gaps.

The CPZ will prioritise parking for local residents within the scheme and remove all non essential parking from the area e.g commuters, residents from adjacent CPZs who do not want to pay for parking and all other vehicles without a permit. With these vehicles removed from the zone, the Council is confident that would be enough parking spaces for the use of residents within this scheme. CPZ does do not guarantee residents parking spaces in front of their houses or road but it will make parking in these roads easier and residents will be able to park within 100 metres of their homes.

Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ)

Proposed CPZ A1 - Apostles (Dupont/Kingston)




ISSUE DATE : 14 NOVEMBER 2013

Councillor Andrew Judge

Cabinet Member for
Environmental Sustainability
and Regeneration

T: 020 8545 3425

E: andrew.judge@merton.gov.uk



Dear Resident/Business

The purpose of this leaflet is to let you know the outcome of the informal consultation carried out during June/ July 2013, on the proposal to introduce a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in your road.

The consultation resulted in a total of 334 questionnaires being returned, representing a response rate of 29.3%. As it can be seen from the enclosed consultation results table, 53.3% of respondents support a CPZ, compared to 41.6% who do not and 5.1% who are unsure or had no response. Further analysis of the results on a road-by-road basis has revealed that there are some roads that are completely against having parking controls and therefore these roads are being excluded from the proposed zone at this stage.

The results of the consultation along with your views and officers' recommendations were presented in a report to the Street Management Advisory Committee and the Cabinet Member on the 18 September 2013, which is available on the Council website, www.merton.gov.uk/cpza1_apostles.

After careful consideration, the Cabinet Member agreed to proceed to statutory consultation to introduce the proposed A1 CPZ to include Abbott Avenue, Chestnut Road, Dupont Road, Sydney Road and part of Kingston Road (property no's 472 to 540 and 565), operational Monday to Friday between 8.30am and 6.30pm. The hours of operation is in line with the 68.6% majority opting for Monday to Friday and 45.8% majority opting for 8.30am to 6.30pm.

For a complete breakdown on a road by road basis please refer to the enclosed consultation results.

Bronson Road

Following the Street Management Advisory Committee and the subsequent decision to exclude Bronson Road from A1 CPZ, the Council has received a substantial petition (73 households) from Bronson Road requesting to be included in the A1 CPZ. The Council, have therefore taken the decision to include Bronson Road in this Statutory Consultation to give residents a further opportunity to air their views.

Kingston Road

Bushey Road to Lower Downs Road:

Following the decision to include Bronson Road with the consultation for A1 CPZ, it is considered prudent to include this section of Kingston Road, as Kingston Road would be surrounded by controls with no parking available to Kingston Road residents in the event of the limited parking on Kingston Road is fully utilised.

Lower Downs Road to Dorien Road:

This section of Kingston Road has no parking on the carriageway, which means if all the Apostle roads are controlled these residents would not have access to parking within their immediate vicinity.

Therefore, a decision has been made to include Kingston Road into this Statutory Consultation.

The Council intends to split Kingston Road (Bushey Road to Lower Downs Road) into its two adjacent zones (A1 CPZ and 5F CPZ); this will allow the parking pressure overflow from Kingston Road to be shared between Bronson Road and Oxford Avenue. Kingston Road residents displaying a valid permit will be able to park either side of Kingston Road, as well as their respective adjacent zones.

For further detail please see the enclosed plan, drawing no Z78-213-01B CPZ A1.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

A 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. Representations for and against the proposals described in this Notice must be made in writing to the **Head of Street Scene and Waste, Merton Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, Surrey, SM4 5DX** or email trafficandhighways@merton.gov.uk by no later than **06 December 2013** quoting reference **ES/SGE/ZONE RP AREA**. Objections must relate only to the elements of the scheme that are subject to this statutory consultation.

All representations along with Officers’ comments and recommendations will be presented in a further report to the Street Management Advisory Committee and/or the Cabinet Member for Environmental Sustainability and Regeneration. 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.

A copy of the proposed TMO, a plan identifying the areas affected by the proposals and the Council’s Statement of Reasons can be inspected at the Merton Link, Merton Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, Surrey, SM4 5DX during the Council’s normal office hours Monday to Friday, 9am to 5pm. A copy can also be inspected at Raynes Park Library. This information is also available on Merton Council’s website at www.merton.gov.uk/cpza1_apostles.

Please note that following the completion of each stage updates will be posted on the Council’s website at www.merton.gov.uk/cpza1_apostles. You will receive a newsletter after the Cabinet Member decision is made, advising you of the outcome of the consultation.

If you require further information, you may contact Leonardo Morris on 020 8545 3840.

DUNDONALD WARD COUNCILLORS

Cllr David Dean Tel - 020 8542 2434
Email: david.dean@merton.gov.uk

Cllr Chris Edge Tel - 020 8545 3396
Email: chris.edge@merton.gov.uk

Cllr Suzanne Grocott Tel - 0208 545 3396
Email: suzanne.grocott@merton.gov.uk

CONTACT US

Project Engineer - Leonardo Morris
Tel - 020 8545 3840
Email: trafficandhighways@merton.gov.uk

Request for document translation

CPZA1 - APOSTLES


If you need any part of this document explained in your language, please tick box and contact us either by writing or by phone using our contact details below.

- Albanian**
Nëse ju nevojitet ndonjë pjesë e këtij dokumenti e shpjeguar në gjuhën amtare ju lutemi shenojeni kutinë dhe na kontaktoni duke na shkruar ose telefononi duke përdorur detajet e mëposhtme.
- Bengali**
এই ডকুমেন্টের কোনো অংশ আপনার নিজ ভাষায় বুঝতে চাইলে, দয়া করে বাস্তবিক (বকস) টিক চিহ্ন দিন এবং চিঠি লিখে বা ফোন করে আমাদের সাথে যোগাযোগ করুন। দিবে যোগাযোগের বিবরণ দেওয়া হয়েছে।
- French**
Si vous avez besoin que l'on vous explique une partie de ce document dans votre langue, cochez la case et contactez-nous par courrier ou par téléphone à nos coordonnées figurant ci-dessous.
- Korean**
만일 본 서류의 어떤 부분이라도 귀하의 모국어로 설명될 것이 필요하다면, 상자속에 표시를 하고 우리에게 전화나 서신으로 연락하십시오.
- Polish**
Aby otrzymać część tego dokumentu w polskiej wersji językowej proszę zaznaczyć kwadrat i skontaktować się z nami drogą pisemną lub telefoniczną pod poniższą podanym adresem lub numerem telefonu.
- Portuguese**
Caso você necessite qualquer parte deste documento explicada em seu idioma, favor assinalar a quadricula respectiva e contatar-nos por escrito ou por telefone usando as informações para contato aqui fornecidas.
- Somali**
Haddii aad u baahan tahay in qayb dukaameentigan ka mid ah laguugu sharxo luqaddaada, fadlan sax ku calaamadee sanduuga oo nagula soo xiriir warqad ama telefoon adigoo isticmaalaya macluumaadka halkaan hoose ku yaalla.
- Spanish**
Si desea que alguna parte de este documento se traduzca en su idioma, le rogamos marque la casilla correspondiente y que nos contacte bien por escrito o telefónicamente utilizando nuestra información de contacto que encontrará más abajo.
- Tamil**
இதில் உள்ள அங்குசத்தின் சில பகுதிகளை உங்களின் தாய்மொழியில் விளக்க வேண்டுமானால், கீழ்க்கண்ட இடத்தில் குறிப்பிட்டு எழுத வேண்டுகோள். தொடர்பு கொள்ளும் முறை கீழ்க்கண்டவாறு.
- Urdu**
اگر آپ اس دستاویز کے کسی حصے کا ترجمہ چاہتے ہیں تو اس کے کسی حصے کو اس جگہ پر نشان لگائیں اور ہمیں اس کے بارے میں مزید جاننے کے لیے درخواستیں ارسال کریں۔


- Large print
- Braille
- Audiotape

Your contact:
Name.....
Address.....
.....
.....
Telephone.....

**Leonardo Morris,
Merton Civic Centre,
London Road, Morden,
SM4 5DX**



Reproduced from Based upon the Ordnance Survey's 1:2500 maps with the permission of the Controller of H.M.S.O., Crown Copyright Reserved. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright © and may London Borough of Merton 100019259 2013



Z78-213-01B CPZ A1 - APOSTLES SHT 2 OF 2

Reproduced from the above Council's 1995/96 Annual Report. Copyright of H.M.S.O., Crown Copyright Reserved. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. London Borough of Merton 100019259 2013

This page is intentionally left blank