

Meeting with New Bera, CWARA and Burghley Road Action Group

LONDON BOROUGH OF MERTON	
Environment & Regeneration	
	Belvedere Meeting 05 th July 2010
	Date: 05.07.2010 Time: 18.30
	Minuted by Waheed Alam
Action Needed By:	<p>Attendance:</p> <p>Councillor Andrew Judge (CAJ), (Cabinet Member for Environmental Sustainability & Regeneration)</p> <p>Mario Lecordier (ML), (London Borough of Merton)</p> <p>Waheed Alam (WA), (London Borough of Merton)</p> <p>Cathy Williams (CW), (Chair of New Bera)</p> <p>Anita Harlock (AH), (Chair of CWARA)</p> <p>Gordon Lawson (GL), (Resident of Alan Road)</p> <p>Alexander Justham (AJ) (Burghley Road Action Group Representative)</p>
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CAJ explained the objective of the meeting was to learn more of the traffic problems through the area and wanting to know what those in attendance saw as a solution. CAJ asked why the group did not believe Option 8 to be a solution to the rat running problem. 2. AJ explained that there is an existing volume and speeding problem in Burghley Road. The volume problem was defined as the movement of traffic coming off of Parkside and travelling along Somerset, Burghley, St Marys Road etc. AJ believed the solution to this problem was that Burghley Road should be closed off at its junction with Church Road. AJ explained that this would not cause chaos elsewhere as Burghley Road is often closed at this point during the Wimbledon Tennis tournaments without signs of problems elsewhere. He also explained that a similar closure should also be put in place in Somerset Road at it's junction with Church Road to ensure that traffic doesn't then divert down that route. Alternatively this closure could also be placed in Somerset Road at it's junction with Marryat Road which would then allow properties 200 to 226 Somerset Road access from Church Road. AJ suggested that both options could be put forward to those property owners to check their preference. AJ explained that the closures of Burghley and Somerset Roads as described were in fact previous council proposals of 1990. 3. a) (Officers were not able to confirm the closure of Burghley Road /

Church Road junction, however following the meeting, officers can now confirm that a traffic Management Order is usually made to facilitate any closure that the Police, may wish to implement to ensure safety and manage traffic flows).

b) (Officers are unable to confirm whether the Council in 1990 ever proposed the closures described above, or whether any type of consultation was undertaken at the time).

- I
4. AJ and GL were of the view that cars can reach speeds of up to 60mph in Burghley Road. CAJ explained that the council acknowledges the speeding problems in Burghley Road and confirmed that traffic calming for Burghley Road was still being considered, which should help control speeds. However AJ maintained that traffic calming was not likely to have an effect on traffic volumes.
 5. CW responded to CAJ's question in 1 above by explaining that Option 8 does not address the fundamental issue of stopping rat-running traffic from the residential roads in the Belvederes. Other traffic calming schemes in Merton prove that they do not resolve traffic volume problems. Option 8 would be a waste of resources and not achieve the objectives. New BERA would like to see cheap and effective solutions and one which allows close monitoring.
 6. CAJ questioned whether New BERA had ever been consulted on any option worthwhile in their view.
 7. CW responded that although many options had been modelled and the first few options had some merits, residents were not given the opportunity to comment on them. In March 2009, residents were able to respond to Option 7 only. Resident Associations were never given the opportunity to talk to Officers directly regarding the problems and other potential solutions.
 8. CAJ asked CW for New BERA's preferred solution which would also be supported by members of the Resident's Association.
 9. CW explained that New Bera and CWARA jointly believed that 4 strategically placed road experimental closures would resolve the problems in the local area. CW and AH marked on a map the approximate positions of the road closures. (The closures were marked as follows)
 - In Belvedere Avenue, between its junctions with Alan Road and Belvedere Grove.
 - In St Marys Road, between its junctions with Highbury Road and Arthur Road.
 - In Lake Road, between its junctions with Ricards Road and Church Hill.
 - In Woodside, between its junctions with Worcester Road and

Bernard Gardens.

10. WA was asked to comment on the proposed closure. WA in turn asked of CW and AH whether they believed the closures should happen at the same time and whether they should be of a physical nature or simple 'No entry' signage.
11. CW and AH were of the view that the closures should happen together and in order to keep down costs could consist of just signage. This would also allow emergency vehicles to go through the 'No Entries'. An alternative to just signage was put forward by GL and AJ that the council could use large lego style blocks (water filled traffic separators) to provide temporary road closures. These could be easily removed on Somerset Road at times of special events such as the Tennis/Olympics. WA was of the view that in order to gauge the effects of an experimental scheme, the closures cannot just rely on signage or have gaps within the traffic separators blocking the road to allow emergency vehicles through. This is likely to be abused by other drivers and the experiment may not reveal the true extent of traffic displacement. If the 4 proposed closures for the Belvedere and Woodside area did work as desired during the experiment, this would likely cause a great inconvenience to local residents as the detours could be great and may be unacceptable. In total 6 closures were tabled and WA advised that an extensive scheme such as the one being discussed warranted a consultation with the community to establish prior acceptability. AH explained that experimental schemes do not require a pre-consultation and WA agreed that AH was technically correct. CW and AH explained that the proposals had been passed to their members in the past and was generally supported by them.
12. CAJ asked for Officer views on the road closures and WA said that he needed more time to consider the proposals and understand the implications of the road closures.
13. WA explained that, from the traffic data collected in September 2009, he believed that Woodside and Lake Road did not suffer from rat running and so his initial thought at the time was that a 'phased approach' should be adopted i.e. all closures should not be introduced at once. If road closures were to be considered then from a practical point of view they should first be considered in the Belvederes, the effects monitored and if found necessary further measures considered.
14. AH agreed that the Wimbledon Hill end of Woodside did not suffer from traffic volumes but disagreed that the other end didn't either. AH gave the following explanation: For the past 5 years CWARA has maintained there is a distinct rat-run coming up from Gap Road, up Leopold Road, turning left on Woodside, then along and up St Mary's Rd to access the Belvederes/Village/Parkside. The reverse happens in the evening. The highest numbers of course are in the morning/evening rush hours. Counts of 600 cars were confirmed by

your official data Sep 09. This is why we have always said we are part of the Belvederes rat running issue. You need to keep this through traffic going up Leopold Rd and continuing along Arthur Rd and Church Rd--the only way is prevent them going all the way down Woodside to turn up St. Mary's. There has been much less traffic at the Wimbledon Hill Rd end of Woodside since the banned turns--but the Leopold Rd end has not been helped at all. The section of Woodside between Springfield Road and Leopold Rd requires cars to park on the pavement, thus making the road wider for cars to pass. In fact this allows more traffic as people are not deterred from using our residential road, Woodside, as a quick rat-run up to the Village and beyond. By making us park like this the Council is in fact enabling cars and trucks to use our road more. Other similarly long roads like Kenilworth or South Park Rd have cars parked on the road--so cars avoid this route as they know they will encounter on-coming traffic and have to reverse. Please can we park on the road, not half on the pavement in this section of Woodside mentioned?

15. CAJ asked the Resident Associations to confirm the total number of registered members with the respective associations on a road by road basis. This was agreed by CW and AH. AJ explained that he represented the Burghley Road Action Group and as such wasn't able to provide the information as they do not hold registered members. However he explained the Action Group had support from the majority of the residences on the road and also have the full support and work together with the Somerset Road Residents Association which represents the top half of Somerset Road that becomes Burghley Rd and they have over 40 members.

16. CAJ concluded the meeting on the likely next steps to be as follows:

- Officers to consider the proposals and potential impact on the surrounding area and report back to the Cabinet Member for Environmental Sustainability & Regeneration.

Note:

In view of the forthcoming summer holiday period and the lack of resources, the Council will not be able to review the proposals discussed before mid September 2010.

Assesment of the New Bera, CWARA & Burghley Road Action Group Proposals

The proposals outlined by the 3 groups consist of six road closures in total, four of which were proposed jointly by New Bera and CWARA (listed as 1-4 below) with the objective of tackling rat running in the Belvedere and Woodside areas. The additional two closures (listed as 5-6 below) were proposed by the Burghley Road Action Group with a two-fold objective of tackling rat running and speeding through Burghley Road.

The proposed closures are as follow;

1. In Belvedere Avenue, between its junctions with Alan Road and Belvedere Grove.
2. In St Marys Road, at its junction with Arthur Road.
3. In Lake Road, between its junctions with Ricards Road and Church Hill.
4. In Woodside, between its junctions with Worcester Road and Bernard Gardens.
5. In Burghley Road, at its junction with Church Road.
6. In Somerset Road between its junction with Marryat Road and Church Road.
7. Peak time ban on use of the pay & display bays and loading /unloading activities in the southern section of Church Road (as previously consulted on in 2010 under the Option 8 scheme).

Officer Analysis of Impact of Road Closures 1-4

The road closures 1-4 would result in the loss of 4 pay and display bays in Lake Road and 2 Shared Use bays in Belvedere Avenue. The road closure within Lake Road (southern section) will force drivers to turn around in the road outside the school to continue their journey. This would be an inappropriate situation outside a school and needs to be carefully considered.

As there is insufficient road space to create a turning head by the proposed road closure in Belvedere Avenue a similar situation can be envisaged whereby users of the Shared Use bays would be forced to carry out 3 point turns to continue their journeys.

The road closures (with the exception of the short links given below) would eliminate all through-traffic from the area **bounded by** Church Road, High Street, Wimbledon Hill Road, Alexandra Road, Leopold Road, Arthur Road and St Marys Road. The following links would remain unprotected from through traffic:

- Alan Road-Belvedere Avenue between St Marys Road and Church Road.
- Parkwood Road-Woodside between Alexandra Road and Leopold Road.
- Springfield Road-Woodside between Alexandra Road and Leopold Road.
- Rostrevor Road-Woodside between Alexandra Road and Leopold Road.

Under this proposal it is clear that most of the defined area would no longer carry through-traffic, however the impact of the removal of large volumes of traffic to the most likely alternatives could prove a burden on those roads. Many residents will also be forced to travel along the periphery of the 'no-through area' thereby leading to extra traffic on the periphery.

Residential traffic, traffic to and from Bishop Gilpin School located in Lake Road, Pay and Display users of the Controlled Parking Zone etc would be limited in their choice of routes to enter or exit the cordoned off area. As the majority of households (calculated to be approximately 800) live south or east of the proposed closures this will force them through Belvedere Grove, Belvedere Drive or Woodside for entry and exit to their residences i.e. they would no longer be able to avail the following junctions for exit or entry to the area:

1. Belvedere Avenue junction with Church Road.
2. Alan Road junction with St Marys Road.
3. St Marys Road junction with Arthur Road.
4. Lake Road junction with Leopold Road.
5. Leopold Avenue junction with Leopold Road.
6. Woodside junction with Leopold Road.
7. Rostrevor Road junction with Alexandra Road.
8. Springfield Road junction with Alexandra Road.
9. Parkwood Road junction with Alexandra Road.

For exiting the area the following should be noted and taken into consideration when evaluating this proposal:

Woodside junction with Wimbledon Hill Road caters only for a left turn in and out, therefore further limiting choice of entry and exit for residents thereby possibly forcing them to either use Belvedere Drive or Belvedere Grove.

Currently turning right out of Belvedere Drive at its junction with Wimbledon Hill Road often proves difficult. This is likely to be made more difficult as it is expected that traffic flows going down the Hill towards the Town Centre will increase as a result of the closures. Build up of traffic in Belvedere Drive is likely to encourage drivers to use Belvedere Grove.

The limitation of suitable exit or entry points could cause the buildup of traffic at the above junctions especially during morning peak times leading to driver frustration during the trial of the scheme.

Dependent on the level of local traffic being concentrated onto Belvedere Drive and Belvedere Grove, the residents of these roads may experience little benefit of the scheme.

Given below is a short assessment of possible likely flows of traffic which can be expected under this proposal. It should be noted that the following assessment has not taken account of any 'Traffic Evaporation' and also makes a number of assumptions as follows:

- a) The Road Closures 1-4 will all be implemented at the same time.
- b) All traffic currently using Belvedere Grove, Belvedere Drive and Woodside is through-traffic only.
- c) Diverted traffic will choose the nearest alternatives i.e Church Road and Alexandra Road.
- d) Diverted traffic will be equally distributed to the most likely alternatives.

Table 1 Possible Traffic reassignment to Church Road and Alexandra Road

Road Name	Current Northbound Traffic Flow (Weekly Flows)	Current Southbound Traffic Flow (Weekly Flows)	Implementation of Road Closures 1-4	
			Possible Northbound Flows (Weekly Flows)	Possible Southbound Flows (Weekly Flows)
Belvedere Grove	20734	20451	Residential or visitor traffic only	Residential or visitor traffic only
Belvedere Drive	11574	10277	Residential or visitor traffic only	Residential or visitor traffic only
Woodside	10659	10747	Residential or visitor traffic only	Residential or visitor traffic only
Church Road	25052	27168	46536	47906
Alexandra Road	47148	39886	68632	60624

The actual reassignment of traffic to Church Road and Alexandra Road could depend on a number of factors of which the following can be considered to be of importance.

- Destination of drivers.
- Available road capacity on High Street and Wimbledon Hill Road at time of travel.
- Road works in the area.
- Other unidentified reasons beyond the scope of this study.

Officer Analysis of Impact of Road Closures in Burghley Road and Somerset Road

The impact assessment of these 2 road closures is provided in Sections 3.9 to 3.11 of the main report

Meeting with BERA 20th July 2010

Present

Charles Sturge – BERA (CS)

Roger Chadder – BERA (RC)

Piers Stanfield – BERA (PS)

Councillor Andrew Judge – LB Merton (Cllr J)

Mario Lecordier – LB Merton

Cllr J explained that he was meeting with an number of resident associations to listen to their concerns and that this meeting has been arranged to give BERA an opportunity to express their views.

CS explained that the BERA members in Belvederes included residents from High Street, Belvedere Drive, St Mary's Road, Church Road, Lancaster Road

New BERA also represent Belvederes – clash with BERA about which group is actually representing the Belvederes.

BERA view is that there is no huge problem – not a constant stream of traffic.

A219 High Street is designed for use by through traffic. Other residential roads should not take through traffic.

RC stated that Church Road was not designed to take through traffic.

Diversion of traffic from Ridgway into Church Road would clog up the main road (A219)

PS: Church Road is not designed for through traffic. The carriageway is narrow and the footway is heavily used by pedestrians. Speed and volume of traffic affect road users and residents.

Cllr J: There is a distinction between distributor road and residential roads – differential in treatment.

BERA stated that there was a proposal from New BERA in 2004/5 for consultation on road closures. Reversing one way in Queens Road – Cllr Judge stated that he had no recollection of road closures.

Many local access roads have been closed.

Cllr J: Agrees with the principles for closing roads both in the past and in the future.

There could be evaporation of traffic.

PS stated that previous administration have adopted a political approach to the through traffic problem.

Cllr J agreed that Ward Councillors have local knowledge and should be consulted.

Repeated concerns expressed from residents in Belvederes.

Road closures have been considered in the past.

Cllr J: reaffirmed that he was not against road closures.

BERA stated that there was a letter from Ward Members in March 2010 recognising the problems

Cllr J stated that the extent to which the Option 8 proposals had followed professional advise was questionable.

Ward Councillors have a valid view that there is a problem in The Belvederes.

PS stated that Church Road has more houses.

It was agreed that moving into residential roads would result in a clear set of expectations.

Cllr J stated that he would like to see a reduction in traffic in residential roads to make them safer.

PS stated that the closure proposals would make Church Road unsafe.

Cllr J expressed concerns that there had been significant expenditure so far and excessive consultation in the past. Cllr J also stated that there is capacity for temporary closures to test and measure impact.

PS stated that there was a consistent view across a wider area. There is a clear majority of the local area who oppose road closure because of limited roads in the area capable of carrying through traffic.

A petition of 2005 showed a significant numbers in favour of keeping roads open.

Cllr J stated that ther was also a speeding problem in Burleigh Road.

Cllr J confirmed that there will be consultation with residents immediately affected.

Broad concerns – 20mph limited in the area. 20mph zones are enforceable. Limited funding is available to consider 20mph zones/limits.

PS stated that residents would be inconvenienced by road closures.

Cllr J agreed that there was division of opinion.

The meeting agreed that there need to be some form of consultation and that consultation likely to take place before implementation.

25/7/10

Belvedere Estate Residents Association (BERA)

Wimbledon Traffic – The Belvederes

BERA is the Residents Association representing the area bounded by High Street, Wimbledon Hill Road, Belvedere Drive, St. Mary's Road, Church Road and includes the Lancaster Roads. BERA has been in existence for many decades. There is another organization (New Bera) which broke away from BERA some 5 years ago in order to promote reduction in traffic, principally in Belvedere Grove and Alan Road, with road closures as its main aim. BERA opposes road closures and is supported in this by the Wimbledon Union of Residents Associations to which it is affiliated (New Bera is not so affiliated). BERA acknowledges that there is more traffic in the Belvedere roads than is appropriate for local access roads but believes that closures would be highly undesirable.

The main reasons for opposing closures are:

- 1) There are few roads which enable traffic to cross the A219 (Wimbledon Hill) between the town centre and the War memorial by Wimbledon Common. We believe that the substantial closure of Woodside some 10 years ago and the traffic restrictions in Queens Road (a local distributor road) are one of the principal causes of the additional traffic which Belvedere Grove and Alan Road now experience. Further road closures would necessarily substantially increase the traffic using the remaining such roads – principally Church Road and Marryat Road.
- 2) Much time and money has been spent by the Council in recent years searching for a “solution” to the problem of increased traffic in the Belvedere Roads. We consider that there is no solution to this “problem” without improving the main roads serving traffic from the South West into London – namely the A3 and the A24. Such improvements are largely beyond the power of Merton Council to achieve.
- 3) The extensive consultations which have taken place over the years, both formal and informal, have shown major opposition to road closures in the Belvederes because of the likely adverse effect on other roads in the

borough. These consultations have generally extended to areas beyond the Belvederes and, in our view, rightly so.

- 4) The Belvedere Roads with the perceived problem are less residential than Church Road - the "local distributor road":
- | | |
|---|--|
| i) Alan Road | 15 houses one of which one is in 3 flats |
| ii) Belvedere Avenue | 10 houses |
| iii) Belvedere Grove | 30 houses of which a few are in multiple occupation + a small block of flats |
| iv) Belvedere Drive | 26 houses + Harrowdene Court and Bluegates (flats) |
| v) Highbury Road | 16 houses |
| vi) Church Road from High Street to St. Mary's Road (but excluding flats over shops and also excluding Belvedere Square and Old House Close): | 57 houses |
- 5) The possibility of a trial period of road closure causes us serious concern as we are not aware of previous experimental changes having been reversed. The consultations which have recently occurred do not indicate anything beyond a very local and vociferous support for closures opposed by the majority.
- 6) Whilst BERA supported the relatively modest changes proposed in "Option 8" (**with the important exception of the proposal to convert many Residents' parking bays to "shared use"**) BERA is content to support the maintenance of the status quo which is certainly the cheapest option open to the Council.

Charles Sturge
Chairman - BERA

20th July 2010

MEETING WITH WURA
2nd September 2010

Present

Leonard Mostyn – WURA (LM)

Cllr Andrew Judge – LB Merton (Cllr J)

Mario Lecordier – LB Merton (ML)

LM explained that A219 extends from junction with A404 to A24. It is a North/South Road which is very difficult to cross.

Traffic from A3 uses Wimbledon because of congestion at Robin Hood Roundabout and Robin Hood Gate. The railway line is a constraint

Last 40 years Council has considered only the street in question when considering complaints from residents.

Distributor road – Church Road and Alexandra Road

WURA would resist any restrictions as it would displace traffic onto other roads. The impact of right turn from Worple Road into Wimbledon Hill Road demonstrates the sensitivity of the key roads.

Cllr J stated that no decisions had been made. Officers are considering options.

LM explained that other residents have requested the closure of inner roads off A219. There are also 20 schools in the area which generate a considerable amount of traffic.

Cllr J stated that people already manage road closures in other parts of the borough e.g. South Wimbledon and that he was keen to develop Home Zones giving priority to pedestrians.

LM stated that Belvedere Grove as a Home Zone would be well supported. Speed is also an issue in Belvedere Grove. The High Street in the village is very narrow. Significant volume of traffic turning right from High Street into Church Road would cause a tail-back. Only extraordinary/drastic measures would prevent through (cross) traffic in Belvederes

Cllr J explained that he had received representation for closure in Burghley Road

LM said that WURA would be concerned about experimental schemes. He was also concerned at impact on access to Waitrose store in Alexandra Road

Cllr J expressed concerns at the level of past consultation in the area and explained that funding was limited.

Cllr J also explained that officers would work and develop proposals on the basis of evidence. More traffic in local distributor road rather than in residential road. Alexandra Road, Church Road, Leopold Road, Arthur Road to be used to distribute traffic.

LM expressed concerns that businesses will lose out if closures are implemented. There is a need to protect the village character. Closures will impact on parking and affect viability of businesses and shops.

Cllr J stated that complaints received were about through traffic and not parking.

One possibility of closures in Belvedere Grove, Belvedere Avenue, Belvedere Drive, Woodside but Residents' Association opposes restrictions in these roads. Impact on other roads will depend on the measures implemented.

LM referred to Traffic modelling of options 1-7. Cllr Judge stated that he was not advised of previous modelling work.

Minutes of Meeting with Parkside

LONDON BOROUGH OF MERTON Environment & Regeneration	
	Belvedere Meeting 10 th September 2010
	Date: 10.09.2010 Time: 18.30
	Minuted by Waheed Alam
Action Needed By:	<p>Attendance:</p> <p>Councillor Andrew Judge (CAJ), (Cabinet Member for Environmental Sustainability & Regeneration)</p> <p>Mario Lecordier (ML), (London Borough of Merton)</p> <p>Waheed Alam (WA), (London Borough of Merton)</p> <p>Sue Cooke (SC), (Chair of Parkside RA)</p> <p>Hamish Bryce (HB),</p>
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CAJ explained the objective of the meeting was to learn more of the traffic problems through the area and a desire to know the thoughts of those in attendance. CAJ asked SC to identify the boundary of the Parkside Resident Association.. 2. SC stated that the area was bounded by Marryat Road, part of Burghley Road, Calonne Road, Parkside The area consists of approximately 400 households of which approximately 200 are members of the Resident Association which she represents. 3. CAJ enquired whether all members of the Association held the same view regarding the traffic issues of the area and also when was the last the Association sought their views. 4. SC explained that the issues were last discussed at the Annual General Meeting of the Association in June 2010. 5. SC gave a brief history of the Belvedere traffic issues and explained that traffic management proposals for the area originated from a review of Bus route 93 , which concluded the removal of through traffic in the area. As a result the Council prepared a consultation to close off the Belvedere roads which residents of Parkside had opposed. The Parkside roads are currently not affected by the Belvedere traffic issues, however closures in the Belvederes would divert traffic to other areas.

I

6. HB explained that if the Belvederes was to be closed off to through-traffic then this would have a negative impact on three areas (1) The High Street and south of it (2) Wimbledon Hill Road (3) North/northwest of the Belvederes.
7. CAJ asked if there was any evidence to suggest this and HB advised that the previous modelling work carried out proved that this is a likely scenario.
8. WA explained that previous modelling work had not and could not (due to limitations of the base model) take account of evaporation which one can expect to occur if a road closure or similar scheme was to be implemented.
9. CAJ explained that he was keen to work on the basis of evidence, professional advice and some form of consultation. He advised that he had met with other residents groups of the area some of which had expressed a desire for road closures. particularly at Burghley Road junction with Church Road and a second at junction of Somerset Road with Church Road)..
10. SC explained that the Action Group only represented a small part of Burghley Road and didn't have majority support of the area. It was unlikely that residents would support the suggested road closures, however this could only be determined through a consultation.
11. HB enquired whether all road closures would happen at the same and be experimental in nature.
12. CAJ explained that any proposed road closure in the area would be experimental in nature and although no decisions or plans had been formulated exactly where or how many closures would be needed, it is likely that the full experimental scheme would be implemented at the same time.
13. SC and HB believed that it would be unwise to implement all closures simultaneously as the objective should be to measure the impact of closures in just the Belvederes Roads on the surrounding area. Any Belvedere scheme should be implemented in isolation and if the experiment proves a negative impact elsewhere then the scheme should be removed.
14. CAJ explained that it was too early to make such decisions at this time as the impact would have to be carefully measured. It may be possible to reduce a negative impact by modifying or expanding the experimental scheme.
15. SC enquired what level of increase in traffic on the other roads would be classed as acceptable.

16. ML explained that the objective of any scheme in the area would be to divert traffic to the Distributor roads. An increase on the Distributor Roads is desirable, however it would be difficult to quantify an acceptable level. This would be determined once any experiment was underway.
17. SC believed that though the objective to move traffic to the distributor roads was in line with the UDP, in reality even the distributor roads were not capable of carrying more traffic. There are too many few points at which traffic can cross Wimbledon Hill Road (A219). The closure of roads in the area would add to the problem.
18. CAJ asked if Parkside RA supported the idea of traffic calming in Burghley and Marryat Road. HB explained that previous support from residents had been in response to not only the real speeding issues in Burghley Road but also in response to the idea that traffic calming elsewhere was being proposed. Now that traffic calming elsewhere is no longer being proposed and other ideas (road closures) are being considered, the Association would have to consult their members to gauge their view.
19. CAJ concluded the meeting on the likely next steps to be as follows:
 - Officers to consider the proposals and potential impact on the surrounding area and report back to the Cabinet Member for Environmental Sustainability & Regeneration.

Minutes of Meeting with Wimbledon East Hillside Residents Association (WEHRA)

LONDON BOROUGH OF MERTON	
Environment & Regeneration	
	Belvedere Meeting 20 th January 2011
	Date: 20th January 2011 Time: 10.30 am
	Minuted by Waheed Alam
Action Needed By:	<p>Attendance:</p> <p>Councillor Andrew Judge (CAJ), (Cabinet Member for Environmental Sustainability & Regeneration)</p> <p>Waheed Alam (WA), (London Borough of Merton)</p> <p>Leigh Terrafranca (LT), WEHRA Planning & Licensing Officer</p> <p>Vanessa Forster (VF), WEHRA Traffic & Parking Officer, Committee Member</p> <p>Ann Thomas (AT) WEHRA Membership Secretary, Committee Member</p> <p>Philippa Burford (PB) WEHRA Secretary, Executive Committee Member</p>
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CAJ enquired of LT about the size of the Wimbledon East Hillside Resident Association (WEHRA) membership size and the area that they represented. 2. LT explained that WEHRA represents residents of the area bounded by Alexandra Road, Leopold Road, Woodside and Wimbledon Hill Road. Outside of this area, Glendale Drive and Bernard Gardens also formed part of their membership. This amounts to some 800 households with a membership of between 20-25%. 3. CAJ explained that the Council had already met another Resident Association (RA) representing Woodside. LT responded by stating that the other Resident Association, CWARA was in fact not even working as a proper RA, and as an example, cited that they appear to not have held an Annual General Meeting in 2010. CAJ responded by saying that he presumed WEHRA did have an AGM to which LT confirmed they were in fact about to send a newsletter to their members in 2 weeks time. LT went on to give a history of WEHRA's past successful actions as an RA. CAJ responded by agreeing that they did indeed appear to be a well founded and grounded RA. 4. LT pointed out that the Steering Committee set up in the past to look at the Belvedere issues had ultimately – though set up with good

intentions - had done more harm than good to the health of the Wimbledon community.

5. CAJ explained that parts of the previous proposals, such as the proposed parking changes and traffic calming in the Belvederes (Option 8), which was put out to consultation were actually not fit for purpose/objective and that was why they had revisited the decision of the previous Cabinet Member. CAJ confirmed of WA that cars passing through Belvedere Grove were in the region of 40,000 per week and this was simply too high for the nature of the road.
6. LT was surprised at the 40,000 Belvedere Grove weekly estimate, and that road was singled out amongst all other roads, for gating. LT said that Belvedere Grove has always had this level of traffic and those moving to the road accept that Belvedere Grove has a large volume of traffic passing through it, and that property prices historically have reflected that.
7. CAJ explained that Officers were in fact in the process of coming up with an experimental scheme and are hopeful of taking their findings to the Street Management Advisory Committee meeting in March 2011.
8. LT stated that generally modelling of proposals gave a good indication of the possible effects and enquired whether modelling would form part of the assessment on the councils future proposal. LT asserted that previous models on earlier proposals had shown that traffic would displace to other roads thus rendering the scheme redundant. Importantly the research confirmed that Wimbledon has a small road network, and that roads in this area were not saturated, in their professional opinion.
9. WA explained that previous modelling works had not taken account of possible evaporation. Evaporation is a number/percentage based on opinion and by no means can be taken as a perfect science. The best way to assess the effects of proposals is to measure the impact of a scheme by putting it in, as an experimental scheme. The Council has already collected data for volumes of traffic in the wider area and so comparing this with future data collected upon implementation of a proposal will provide definitive answers.
10. CAJ requested WA to explain his proposal to the group. WA talked through the proposal and explained the various elements. WA said it was important that filtration of traffic through various roads remains for the benefit of residents. Complete stoppages would only disadvantage residents and add greater traffic onto the periphery of the cordoned area.
11. VF was of the opinion that under the proposal explained and the fact that a Waitrose was planned at the Former B&Q site on Alexandra Road, traffic is likely to travel from Belvedere Drive, St Marys Road ,

Woodside and through one or more of the side roads exiting onto Alexandra Road, between Lake and Parkwood Road, to push traffic back to Wimbledon Hill Road. This movement has not been stopped through the proposals and put forward her own suggestion that Woodside should have a road closure. She apologised to the remainder of her group that she had not discussed this with them prior to the meeting however, she could foresee this to be more or less a definitive route that drivers coming from Ridgway area travelling to Waitrose would take. With this plan, St Marys becomes the new distributor road, and Parkwood would take the bulk of increased volume towards Wandsworth and Waitrose.

12. WA was of the opinion that with the widening of the junction of Woodside and Wimbledon Hill Road and other changes proposed for the section of Wimbledon Hill Road between its junction with Worple Road and Alexandra Road, drivers would be given an incentive to use the more straight forward route as opposed to the route which VF explained. This is because the route explained in point 11, (with the exception of Belvedere Drive) consisted of existing traffic-calmed streets. It is however inevitable that the Waitrose development will generate more traffic.
13. VF disagreed with this viewpoint and said that in effect the development of Waitrose and the proposals explained were in effect a double Whammy for their residents. She explained that although Waitrose had given £100,000 for treatment of roads if extra traffic is found within the local residential roads, Waitrose may have an argument later that the increase in traffic passing through residential roads was a result of the councils experimental scheme. There were simply too many variables all being put in place around the same time, which might not give conclusive results. WEHRA believes that no road changes should be made until after Waitrose is open, in the coming year, as traffic patterns will soon change dramatically in their area, and this has to be factored into any changes to the road network within the Belvederes.
14. LT enquired why the council was no longer considering the earlier 20mph speed limit for the area.
15. CAJ explained that over and above the fact that Council funding was limited, he is of the view that signage without physical measures has little effect on driver behaviour when it comes to speed. WA agreed with this and explained that Department of Transport publications state that 20mph speed limits without traffic calming reduce speeds in the region of about 1mph. WA said that as a result of the recently implemented traffic calming measures in St Marys Road and Lake Road Area, traffic survey results had shown a reduction in the volume of traffic in the area thereby suggesting that traffic-calming plays a positive role in reducing volumes of traffic.
16. LT disagreed with Dept of Transport 'generalisation,' and cited the highly successful 20 mph blanket limit in Portsmouth.. She said their RA would want a 20mph speed limit for their 10 Roads and would be happy to do so without traffic calming and enforcement.

17. CAJ concluded the meeting on the likely next steps to be as follows:

- Officers would consider all viewpoints put forward by the RA and report back to the Cabinet Member for Environmental Sustainability & Regeneration. The Street Management Advisory Committee meeting in March 2011 will consider the proposals put forward before any decision is taken. The Council will endeavour to show draft proposals to all RA's prior to taking them for a discussion at SMAC.