NON-KEY DECISION TAKEN BY A CABINET MEMBER

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)

Wimbledon Area Traffic Study

2. Decision maker

Cabinet Member for Planning and Traffic Management

Councillor William Brierly

3. Date of Decision

6th May 2010

4. Date report made available to decision maker

04 May 2010

5. Date report made available to the Chairs of the Overview and Scrutiny Commission and of any relevant scrutiny panel

6. Decision

Proposal	Decision	Reason for decision	Alternative options considered and why rejected:
Option 8 Proposal 1 of Consultation booklet (ES/SGE/WATS/WL)			
NOTE: *Decision in relation to item 1should take into account the restrictions on the disabled bay and whether an extra disabled bay should be considered in Courthope Road as per Officers Comments in report.* *Items 1, 2, & 3 are all linked and together serve to reduce congestion in Church Road during peak times.*			
Item 1 – Church Road - Waiting & Loading restrictions within the pay and display bays and the disabled parking bay Mon–Sat between 7.00am-10.00am & 4.00pm-7.00pm	I agree this decision But wish the disabled bay to be relocated in Courthope Road.	It is clear there is a need to ensure Church Road has the capacity to handle a little more traffic	Without this change it is impossible to seriously handle the traffic problem before me.
Item 2 – Church Road- Proposed Loading restrictions (Mon -Sat between 7.00am-10.00am & 4.00pm -7.00pm) for Church Road between its junctions with Courthope Road and Belvedere Square along its south-eastern kerb line.	I agree this decision	see above	see above
Item 3 – Church Rd Proposed loading restrictions (Mon-Sat between 7.00am-10.00am & 4.00pm-7.00pm) along the north western kerb line of Church Road between the existing parking bays.	I agree this item	See above	See above

Proposal	Decision	Reason for decision	Alternative options considered and why rejected:
Item 4 - Courthope Road - Proposed maximum stay of 1 hour applicable to the existing loading bay	Agree this item	It is clear that this will only limit misuse of the loading bay.	I could do nothing but believe the comments in the officer report justify this.
Option 8 Proposal 2 of Consultation booklet (ES/SGE/WATS/TC)			
Raised junction at Church Road/ St Mary's Road and Burghley Road.	Agree this item	I accept the concern that residents have that this is the road that should be able to carry more traffic but I do not accept this should be unmanaged traffic and consider the proposals have to be appropriate	I note the majority of those stating a view on this object, but not only are numbers low, but also I believe I have a responsibility to ensure I manage the impact of increasing volumes in Church Road. This need not discourage this route when combined with Item 1-3.
Entry treatment at the Church Road/High Street junction.	Agree this item		
The speed table outside no. 42 Church Road.	Agree this item		
NOTE: *This proposal is shown in 3 parts in case Cabinet Member wishes to drop any of the elements. .*			
Option 8 Proposal 3 of Consultation booklet (ES/SGE/WATS/TC)			
Proposed Speed cushions in Belvedere Grove.	To invite my successor to decide, but with my advice that I do not believe a more viable option exists	I would like my successor to consider the viability of time limited no entries on the junctions with St Mary's Road that control commuting e.g. 7-9am, 4.30-6.30pm	
Option 8 Proposal 4 of Consultation booklet (ES/SGE/WATS/PA)			I have not had long enough to explore this possibility
Conversion of existing Permit Holder Bays to Shared Use Parking.	To reconsult with a view to use of allowing only 2hr P&D in addition to residents bays for most locations	I had not appreciated fully the risk of business parking (as opposed to shopper parking) causing an unreasonably dominant effect on roads near the village.	
Option 8 Proposal 5 of Consultation booklet (ES/SGE/WATS/PA).			
NOTE: . *Decision should take into account whether the proposed parking bay outside 18 Highbury Road should be dropped from the plans. Also take into account that this proposal is linked to the main proposal of converting existing Permit holder bays to Shared Use.* *Officers Comments in report in relation to both proposals in the report should be taken into account.*			
Provision of New Shared Use Parking bays.	To reconsult with a view to adding bays for 2hr P&D & Residents Parking only.	I accept there is a concern that maximising passing places risks passing gap problems & difficulties in exiting driveways but believe the principle would manage parking pressures and delay rat runners. Nevertheless, for the same reason as proposal 4, I do not believe this should be shared bays but rather 2hr P&D & residents parking only.	

Proposal	Decision	Reason for decision	Alternative options considered and why rejected:
Option 8 Proposal 6 of Consultation booklet (ES/SGE/WATS/TC)			
Proposed raised entry treatment in Belvedere Drive at the junction with Wimbledon Hill Road.	I agree this Proposal	this treatment marks the boundary between 30mph & 20mph and reminds residents this is a residential area.	Doing nothing would not be consistent with the approach adopted elsewhere in the borough.
Option 8 Proposal 7 of Consultation booklet (ES/SGE/WATS/TC)			
Proposed raised entry treatment in Belvedere Avenue at the junction with Church Road.	Do nothing	I am not convinced this is necessary.	← unnecessary use of resources
Option 8 Proposal 8 of Consultation booklet (ES/SGE/WATS/LB)			
Proposed Changes to existing 7.5 T lorry ban.	I agree this Proposal	This has caused few concerns from respondents. I don't consider this to be anything other than reasonable.	
Option 8 Proposal 9 of Consultation booklet (ES/SGE/WATS/20)			
Proposed 20mph Speed limit.	I agree this Proposal	This will go some way towards discouraging rat running. It should be noted the capital budget of the council offers support for enforcing this	I believe the broad concensus supports this
Option 8 Proposal 11 of Consultation booklet (ES/SGE/WATS/TC)			
Proposed raised junction and other changes at the Marryat Road and Burghley Road junction.	I agree this Proposal	This is a severe junction and while some would like me to close the road, a raised junction does go a long way towards managing the was traffic comes this jwnation	Do nothing - speed & volume Road closure - I do not believe this is viable at this location given the potential knock on effects.

Proposal	Decision	Reason for decision	Alternative options considered and why rejected:
Option 8 Proposal 12 of Consultation booklet (ES/SGE/WATS/PA)			
NOTE: *Items 1 & 4 in this proposal would both need to be approved as a minimum in order to allow the priority working feature outside 15 Burghley Road to proceed as per the proposal. Items 2 & 3 relate to the creation of new parking bays to replace those, which would be lost as a result of the feature outside 15 Burghley Road.* *Decision should take account of Officers comments in relation to the proposed parking bay o/s 9 Burghley Road.*			
Item 1 –Proposed removal of Permit holder bays from outside 12-16 and 11 Burghley Road in order to accommodate the Priority working kerb buildout at that location.	I agree this item		
Item 2 – Proposal to provide new Permit holder bays outside number 8 and number 9 Burghley Road on the southwestern kerbline.	I agree this item	I am happy that these are minor changes that will facilitate the necessary changes in the road	The consequences of doing nothing are too great
Item 3 –Proposal to extend the existing Permit holder bay outside No's 17 & 19 Burghley Road.	I agree this item		
Item 4 –Proposed speed cushions associated with the priority working system build outs outside No 15 Burghley Road.	I agree this item	There are serious issues of speed & volume in this road which need physical measures such as this to manage them	Doing nothing would neglect the speed issue

Proposal	Decision	Reason for decision	Alternative options considered and why rejected:
NOTE: *Items 5 & 7 would both need to be approved as a minimum in order to allow the priority working feature outside 35 Burghley Road to proceed as per the proposal. Item 6 relates to the creation of new Shared Use parking bays to replace those, which would be lost as a result of the feature outside 35 Burghley Road.* ***NEW ITEM*** *added below as per Stage 2 Safety Audit Recommendation. See Officer Report*			
Item 5 –Proposed removal of Shared Use bays from outside 35 Burghley Road in order to accommodate the proposed kerb buildout as part of the Priority working system at that location.	I agree this item	I am happy that these are minor changes that will facilitate the necessary changes in this road.	The consequences of doing nothing are too great.
Item 6 –Proposal to provide new Shared Use bays opposite no. 40 Burghley Road.	I agree this item		
Item 7 – Proposed speed cushions associated with the priority working system build outs outside No 35 Burghley Road.	I agree this item	There are serious issues of speed & volume in this road which need physical measures such as this to manage them.	Doing nothing would neglect the speed issue.
NEW ITEM – Permission to consult on an extra speed table on the side of property number 2 Atherton Drive. Feature required as per Stage 2 Safety Audit Recommendation.	I agree this item	I accept the concern that sufficient measures are needed to ensure measures operate appropriately	Doing nothing would neglect my duties to safety here.

Proposal	Decision	Reason for decision	Alternative options considered and why rejected:
NOTE: *Item 8 would need to be approved as a minimum in order to allow the proposed priority working feature outside 32 Calonne Road to proceed. Item 9 should take account of Officers Comments in relation to item 9 which relates to the creation of new parking bays to replace those, which would be lost as a result of the feature outside 32 Calonne Road.*			
Item 8 –Proposed removal of Permit parking outside 32 Calonne Road in order to accommodate the Priority working kerb buildout.	Reject but ask my successor to consider if another measure is needed in ~~Somerset~~ or Calonne Rd.	While there may be a calming measure in Calonne Road or at the top of Somerset Road, I am not convinced the proposed location is the right location	case for a traffic
Item 9 – Proposal to provide new Permit holder bays outside 27 Calonne Road.	Reject		
New Proposals added to Option 8 Scheme (Number 1 in Consultation booklet) ES/SGE/WATS/TC			
Provision of a raised speed table in St Marys Road at its junction with Alan Road and removal of the double mini roundabout together with changes in junction priority.	I agree this item	I believe this proposal will make the Crown Rd, St Mary's Road, Arthur Rd route the natural route and while it will be costly, is fundamental to reprioritising this route.	I note the opposition but cannot accept the role of the mini roundabouts in causing rat running here.
New Proposals added to the Option 8 Scheme (Number 2 in Consultation booklet) ES/SGE/WATS/TC			
Proposed speed tables in Marryat Road.	I agree this item	The need to manage speed in this location.	We have an obligation here to manage speed sufficiently so doing nothing is not an option here.

7. Reason for decision

As given above in 6, for all items within each of the proposals, together with others if any given below.

I have taken on board the advice from officers within this report & in meetings, letters & communications from residents and Residents association, a public meeting, comments from councillors & the MP.
Broadly I consider that while there is considerable opposition to many of the proposals, it would be a failure of my duty not to deliver a solution which balances the desires of different residents groups over the need to tackle the scale of rat running & the serious risk from speed in some locations. Some elements such as parking & the measures in Belvedere Grove must be considered, with my advice in mind, by my successor, but I believe I am in a better position to make a decision on most elements here which is why I have made a decision in spite of my term of office being so close to its end.

8. Alternative options considered and why rejected

As given above in 6, for all items within each of the proposals, together with others if any given below.

In many cases I have declined to do nothing because of the need to use a large number of measures to tackle the serious issues of speed and volume in the area in residential roads.

9. Documents relied on in addition to officer report

Its supporting documentation and the consultation documentation

10. Declarations of Interest

none.

11. Publication of this decision and call in provision

Send this form and the officer report* to democratic.services@merton.gov.uk for publication. Publication will take place within two days. The call-in deadline will be at Noon on the third working day following publication.

Signed ....W.....

Cabinet Member for ...TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT & PLANNING

Date ...6th May 2010...

PLEASE NOTE I HAVE BEEN ADVISED "NON-KEY DECISIONS" DO NOT REQUIRE A DELAY BETWEEN RECEIPT OF THE REPORT AND THE SIGNING OF A DECISION.

IF DECISION WAS SUBSEQUENTLY CALLED-IN, DATE OF OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMISSION MEETING AND OUTCOME

N/A

NOTE: Once the decision has been taken this form, together with a copy of the report, must be given to the Democratic Services Manager in the Corporate Resources Department so that the decision can be published to all Members of the Council.

N.B. I would recommend that the call in decision time be extended until my successor is appointed to the cabinet. I am happy to respond to a call-in even if I am no longer a councillor.

I accept that it is unfortunate the decision is being made so close to an election but consider, nevertheless, that it is my obligation to make the decisions here but would be very happy for this report to go to SMAC for their comments to my successor incase they wished to change decisions. Again I am happy to attend.

COUNCILLOR WILLIAM BRIERLY
Cabinet Member for Planning and Traffic Management
(Conservative, Cannon Hill Ward)

Home address:
[redacted]

London Borough of Merton
Merton Civic Centre
London Road
Morden SM4 5DX

Mob: 07852 974 829
Tel: 020 8545 3425 (Civic Centre)
Fax: 020 8545 4075 (Civic Centre)

6th May 2010

I have spent a considerable amount of time reflecting upon this decision both prior to receipt of the report and upon its receipt. I have been particularly mindful that it is regrettable to sign off a decision on the day of the election and two days after I have received the report. Nevertheless, I have come to the conclusion that I am in a position to make a decision on the recommendations represented in this report. I would like to give new members of the council the appropriate opportunity to challenge my decision and I would like to give the cabinet member sufficient time to intervene should they feel the need on this matter. Nevertheless, I feel I am far better placed to make the decisions on the Wimbledon Area Traffic Survey than my successor could be. It is with this in mind that I have decided it is the right thing to do to sign off the decision today.

I have been extremely mindful of the Statement of Reason in coming to my conclusions. I have had to wrestle with the fact that many of the proposals have little support and considerable opposition. In some cases I have changed my decision as a result. In some cases I have asked for the issue to be reconsulted upon where I feel we have not put forward the right thing e.g. shared use bays (which were never intended to increase staff parking for businesses) and on the issue of speed cushions I have left the decision to my successor. This is because while my instinct tells me cushions are the most effective weapon in my armory for discouraging (as opposed to preventing) cars from cutting through the Belvedere when combined with the other measures, I would like to have been in a position to have fully considered the possibility of timed no entry controls in roads such as Alan Road that would control commuters but not local travel. There are some items such as the removal of the mini roundabouts which have received general opposition but for which I consider the merits, as highlighted in the Statement of Reason, outweigh the arguments of opposition.

There are serious issues of traffic volume and in some cases speed which I feel duty bound to address and while the easy option for me would be to defer these decisions to my successor, I believe this would be a failure of duty. I feel I have had sufficient time and information to consider this issue and while the timing is regrettable, and is certainly not the timing I would have chosen, I believe this will make considerable steps towards managing the serious problems faced by residents.

I would ask officers to delay implementation of the proposals until August at the earliest so that my successor has the opportunity to meet with me or refer my decision to either the Sustainable Communities O and S panel or SMAC, if that is their wish.

Cllr William Brierly
Cabinet member for traffic management and planning