

Schofield. N

I write in response to the [London Borough of Merton Draft Third Local Implementation Plan: Transport Plan February 2019](#) and have the following comments:

-) The consultation was little known of and I have no idea how you publicised it – it's long at 102 pages and since many residents only found out about it today, responses (like mine) will be rushed.
-) The consultation document is, like many previous ones eg Future Wimbledon, very poor quality. It is riddled with spelling and grammatical mistakes which makes the meaning of sentences unfathomable. It also has factual mistakes eg names of roads (Philips Bridge vs Phipps Bridge & Abbey Primary School vs Merton Abbey Primary School). This implies it was written by someone with no knowledge of the area and wasn't proof-read. It is not a professionally-produced document. This means that residents have little faith in the quality of content/ ideas. It also means we cannot understand the meaning of some paragraphs to respond properly.
-) 3.52 talks about "Rat runs through local streets across the borough". Residents in South Park rd have been petitioning the council about this for many years now and met several times with Andrew Judge & Stephen Hammond. We have kept records and signed a large petition. False promises from the council came, of course, to nothing. So I have little faith in the council now addressing this specific issue and believe it's just posturing on behalf of the council again. The main culprit is actually skips and HGV's based in industrial units near Plough Lane using 20mph Access Only areas as rat runs. Also, parents driving children to the local faith school as the catchment is very wide. Both users are easily identified. I have NEVER seen "Congestion caused by people cruising the streets looking for somewhere to park". This is a complete red herring.
-) I believe that Merton won money to use to set up a Mini Hollands Cycling scheme 5 years ago or so. I have never seen where this money has been spent. Indeed, for many years, the council talked about encouraging cycling through this sort of scheme then it was suddenly dropped and cycling has been ignored since the departure of Cllr Judge. Again, the suggestion that cycling will be prioritised is simply posturing with no solid plans. Many residents would welcome more thought being put into local cycling schemes.
-) 3.59 "Residents are protective of kerb space in their streets". This patronising comment aimed at residents with cars (ownership necessary for all sorts of reasons), is unnecessary and insulting. If car ownership is truly unnecessary in this borough due to public transport efficiency, then why are Merton employees provided, free of charge, with parking permits which allow them to park wherever they like in the borough? Most residents have cars which they use occasionally where public transport doesn't facilitate a journey eg visiting the countryside for walking, carrying heavy loads etc. Of course we walk/ cycle/ use public transport for short local journeys or to access London/

neighbouring towns. Cars are more often parked than in use and so produce no pollution most of the time.

-) Second car owners should carry the burden of restricted kerbside parking, not first car owners.
-) 3.61 I do not believe that evidence is yet conclusive that electric vehicles are actually better for the environment as electricity is generated mainly through power stations.
-) 3.82 & 3.83 street trees. if the council is serious in its love of street trees, it wouldn't just aim to "retain" existing trees but would aim higher with a positive tree planting program
-) 3.84 If the council is TRULY concerned with flood management due to more severe & frequent weather events, then it would ensure that Veolia fulfils the roadside gully sweeping part of its contract, to ensure that rainwater clears freely through drains. Unfortunately these are blocked by autumn falling leaves which aren't collected for the whole year. This problem is exacerbated by roadside litter left by Veolia, and uncollected fly tipped litter, which also blocks drains.
-) 3.122 "Higher than necessary levels of on-site parking and/or unrestrained kerbside parking and loading can make for a unwelcoming street scene, which discourages community interaction, walking, cycling and public transport use. By limiting access to on-street parking permits and the effect management of kerbside space. When used alongside the Healthy Streets principles we can help create more environmentally friendly and safer places, where people want to live and socialise" This para makes no sense – see 2nd sentence. If the council is so against kerbside parking then one assumes they are open to more & more residents paving over their front gardens to facilitate parking. I don't need to stress how bad this is for the environment. Removing kerbside parking is also inequitable as it only affects those without room for parking on their own properties – eg larger houses in the Village.
-) 5.41 "School Part-time road closures (Experimental) – This is being explored at a number of schools where specific issues have been identified involving either air quality, congestion or danger reduction. Potential schools for include: · Merton Abbey primary School, High Path, South Wimbledon;..." To identify Merton Abbey as an area of air pollution, congestion or danger, and then to have imposed a new Harris Academy high school on the same road, at the same time as the major regeneration of the High Path Estate frankly beggars belief. Plans for calming this immediate area are going to have to be much more significant than this if the council is genuinely serious in its concerns for children's health.
-) 5.42 Cycle parking- there are already insufficient spaces for cycle parking in Wimbledon Town centre. If cycling is to be further encouraged then serious thought needs to be attached to the provision of more, and more secure, spaces. Also at major centres eg hospitals, doctors' surgeries, libraries etc.
-) 5.54 20mph speed limits. Are these now statutorily enforceable?