

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

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

### **1. Title of report and reason for exemption (if any)**

Non Key Delegation Wimbledon Area Traffic Scheme

### **2. Decision maker**

Andrew Judge, Cabinet Member for Environmental Sustainability and Regeneration

### **3. Date of Decision**

22<sup>nd</sup> October 2014

### **4. Date report made available to decision maker**

Friday 17<sup>th</sup> October 2014

### **5. Date report made publicly available**

### **6. Decision**

Following a meeting and agreement with Ward Councillors on the results of the informal consultation for the Wimbledon Area Traffic Scheme (WATS) carried out in March 2014 approves the items below:

- A.** Not to proceed with the proposed traffic calming measures in Ridgway,
- B.** Not to proceed with the traffic calming measures in Woodhayes Road,
- C.** Not to proceed with the traffic calming measures and cycle track in Southside Common,
- D.** Approve officers carrying out a statutory consultation on the proposed replacement of the speed cushions in Ridgway Place with sinusoidal road humps.
- E.** Approve officers carrying out a statutory consultation for an experimental 7' - 0" (2.1 metres) width restriction in Belvedere Grove.
- F.** Approve officers carrying out a statutory consultation for an experimental 7' - 0" (2.1 metres) width restriction in Belvedere Drive.

### **7. Reason for decision**

There was insufficient support in the consultation from residents to proceed A-C. In respect of the Ridgeway measures (A) these were devised as a complete scheme, so that although there was limited support for one kind of measure (the creation of raised speed tables for 4 pedestrian crossings in the vicinities of the junctions of Rydon Mews, Edge Hill, Thornton Road and Homefield Road) the professional advice is that that they would only work as part of a wider scheme for which there is insufficient support.

Alternative options considered and why rejected

Proceeding with no measures at all would not meet the acknowledged concerns insofar as they relate to D to F for which there was sufficient local support to proceed.

**8. Documents relied on in addition to officer report**

Wimbledon Traffic Individual Responses Analysis

**9. Declarations of Interest**

None

*Archer Judge*