

Comments in relation to Question 1**Alan Road**

1. The disabled parking bay must stay.
2. Disabled parking bay in full use would agree that bays nearest high street would benefit from restrictions as suggested.
3. I do not understand why you allow any parking in Church Road as it is so narrow with buses etc.
4. This would be detrimental to the shops and their customers.

Alwyne Road

1. In the main all the proposals seem sound to me, but I appreciate that my road is less affected than some. I am writing primarily to remind the Council of an idea raised at the last Wimbledon forum which without exception everyone agreed was an excellent idea. This was that a yellow grid should be put where Hartfield Rd turns left into Wimbledon Bridge Road (i.e. opposite Wimbledon Station immediately alongside Next. Currently despite traffic lights, cars block the pedestrian crossing as they attempt to turn left. This means that when people try to cross (when the green man appears) they have to make their way between stationary cars, particularly awkward for mothers with prams/pushchairs. The whole section is a complete bottleneck of pedestrian and cars. A yellow box grid would make a huge difference.
2. Thank you for consulting me. I agree with any proposal which cuts traffic and vehicle emissions.
3. N/A to me.

Arthur Road

1. No - these timing restrictions are already in operation in the High Street (and are often disregarded) and to make it even more difficult to quickly visit a shop (such as newsagents and/or dry cleaners) is unacceptable. I suggest increased traffic warden hours in these areas.
2. I suggest increased traffic warden.
3. I would argue that parked vehicles will help slow the traffic flow and help maintain the 20mph limit if it is introduced. I would suggest removing the restrictions already in force on the High Street for the same reasons. My comments refer to parked cars and not the loading / unloading of vehicles which should remain.
4. General comment to proposals - all of them. It would be better to leave system alone. Traffic is not too fast or heavy and I live in a busy road.
5. Given the current economic climate the council should be cutting costs not wasting it on surveys and spurious traffic schemes. It is not your money it is the council taxpayers.
6. Local residents and shopkeepers should not be inconvenienced by a reduction in parking merely to try and reduce 'occasional' bottlenecks for through traffic at peak times.
7. Continued use of parking bays will keep traffic speeds down in a similar manner to the Belvedere area proposals.
8. Not personally inconvenienced at present.
9. Only needed Monday to Friday. Saturday restrictions should be kept to a minimum.

Atherton Drive

1. Assuming permit holders only bays are converted to pay & display shared bays in question 5

Belvedere Avenue

1. But would be better if restriction applied 7am to 7pm or remove the bay. Church Road is a designated 'main' road. Would be best to make it easier to use to take the pressure off surrounding roads.
2. I would ban all parking in Church Road to encourage drivers to use this road
3. Yes I agree. Anything to make Church Road more usable and encourage traffic away from our 'rat run' past my house.

Belvedere Drive

1. I think the disabled bay should not be affected.
2. This affects local residents adversely so this introduction should be limited to the 4 bays in Church Road closest to the High Street.
3. Hopefully this will help the traffic move more freely at these busy times.
4. Not necessary.
5. Trades people, building workers and general workers should NOT be restricted in any way in going about their business. I know that shops have suffered from parking restrictions and it is difficult for house/flat owner to employ people to work for them because of the parking restrictions.
5. Do not agree with proposals especially road humps.
6. It seems appropriate to remove obstructions from Church Road, as a London distributor road, to allow traffic to move freely on the road, particularly during peak traffic times. However, I do not think the justification for this should be because the existing configuration "encourages drivers to use the Belvederes as a cut-through". Specific measures should be taken in the Belvedere Roads to deal with the Belvedere Roads problem – not speculative and unproven measures in other roads which may - and only may - produce benefits for the Belvedere Roads. The Council has successfully proved the existence of a serious problem with non-local through traffic in the Belvedere Roads; specific and effective measures, the effect of which is reasonably predictable from previous deployment, should be taken to deal with that problem.

Belvedere Grove

1. This is a bad idea. It would create extra traffic into the Belvederes in search of the new shared use proposed parking scheme spaces. This would drive residents even further away from their homes in search of a space (through bumps and traffic)
2. The use of loading & unloading bays is continually abused as is the use of disabled badges I am all for restrictions & positive enforcement
3. The 493 bus is often held up. This may encourage traffic to use this road rather than residential roads
4. See comments over page
5. Will not materially assist traffic flow - which is far less than the daily back-ups in Belvedere Grove. in Ridgway, also narrow and with double the traffic, presents few problems
6. Volume is the problem not speed
7. a) I take the 493 to Southfields at 9am I do not observe any congestion at the High St end of Church Rd.
b) It is a residential Rd as much as a business Rd. The residents who have limited parking need residents only parking bays.
8. if it is thought helpful, but church road does not usually have the same queuing and congestion at the junction with the high street that belvedere grove has
9. It is important that disabled parking bays should not be affected by the time restrictions.
10. They should only apply to the bays in the narrow part of the road
11. This is a local distributor road and should be as clear as possible at peak times.
12. This is a designated B road. A clearway zone appropriate for the peak flow of traffic ie Cleary (city bound) between 7am till 10am and (A3 bound) 4pm to 7pm for maximising the use and correct flow of traffic on this B road. Would be much better with less stop-start traffic that exists at present

Belvedere Square

1. This will only be acceptable if 'Residents Parking only' rule in other streets remain as otherwise this will put additional pressure on parking situation in those roads, especially Belvedere Square, which would be the natural alternative and is already proving insufficient parking space for residents.
2. Provided Belvedere Square parking does not become 'shared use'
3. If these restrictions were to apply, visitors would not have anywhere to park. This relates to Q5 - the lack of parking would restrict residents from parking in the Belvedere area if spaces are to be taken by non-residents

Bernard Gardens

1. There are too many large vehicles parked on Church Road. It is too narrow for large commercial vehicles (and buses as well!)

Burghley Road

1. The limits penalise those who need to shop/run errands after picking up school children
2. Restrictions should be confine to Mon-Fri only. Please consider the traders.
3. That bus should be stopped it ? road as that large more ? anything else
4. Such restrictions favour non local commuters over local shoppers whose inability to park will damage the trading competitiveness of the village. No evidence is given that they will reduce traffic flow in Belvederes.

Calonne Road

1. This will discourage car use in rush hour and should reduce traffic volumes.
2. It would be a problem for shoppers to restrict he use of parking bays particularly between 4 and 7 pm
Parking is extremely difficult in the area, as it is.
3. Only if you compensate traders for their lost business - 2 hours+ a day may make a serious indent in their profitability.
4. I would support Mon – Fri. Saturday not required
5. For this measure to be effective you will need to ensure that traffic wardens' main objective is to keep the road clear and not to write tickets. They will need to be instructed to warn people parking at the wrong time, particularly initially when we will all be unfamiliar with the new rules, and not to 'lie in wait' in order to give out as many tickets as possible. This is what they do outside Sainsbury's on Worple Road. In addition, there should be a BIG notice on the pay and display machine making it very clear that there is no parking before 10 as it isn't easy to see signs on lamp posts once you are on the pavement.
6. For this measure to be effective you will need to ensure that traffic wardens' main objective is to keep the road clear and not to write tickets. They will need to be instructed to warn people parking at the wrong time, particularly initially when we will

Church Road

1. We have 2x deliveries each day 7 days a week by van out the front of the shop. This proposal will make daily deliveries much more difficult.
2. Retail trade is suffering and the current restrictions are not helping. Restricting parking until after 10am will stop the moving customers and after 4pm the families that we rely on.
3. Waiting and loading unloading restrictions - agreeable, However general pay & display. We do NOT agree to restricted hours. Church Road is not a main thorough fare and does NOT suffer from excessive rush hour traffic congestion and should remain exactly AS IS. You will be denying trade to the shops/businesses in the village by restricting the hours. There should be no change to the amount of time a vehicle can stay.

4. This is restricting parking for access to local businesses unnecessarily. The introduction of the Church Road bus route was unwise in my opinion and has been the only real cause of any added congestion. I have worked here for c.10 years and do not see any reason to implement these restrictions at all.
5. The loss of parking spaces would be detrimental to local businesses, and their removal prioritises traffic issues over commerce and convenience.
6. This will lead to a widened road (fewer cars parked) and faster traffic. This is very dangerous for families with children - I'm sure 20mph will not be enforced where will shoppers park? Already too few residents' bays
7. These parking bays are much needed for local businesses and their removal would increase pressure on residents' parking elsewhere. They also serve a valuable function in slowing down traffic.
8. Agree here with views of Belvedere Estate Residents Association
9. It would have a detrimental effect on the shops on Church Road
10. I consider enough traffic congestions are caused by vehicles loading and unloading already in Church Road. To introduce what is suggested above will create traffic congestion between the given times - which are rush hour times - plus drivers will still load/unload during other times!
11. However, I feel ? strongly that the disabled parking bay must be kept
12. The disabled parking bay should either be an exception to these restrictions or alternative provision should be made nearby which is not restricted in this way. The removal of the right to use all the parking bays in Church Road during rush hours is excessive and damaging to the interests of local residents and businesses.
13. Satisfactory as it is.
14. The disabled parking bay should either be an exception to these restrictions or alternative provision should be made nearby which is not restricted in this way. The removal of the right to use all the parking bays in Church Road during rush hours is excessive and damaging to the interests of local residents and businesses.

Coach House Lane

1. It is not clear exactly what the 'waiting and loading' restrictions are. 'Disabled' parking bays should be checked regularly. Many people entering cars parked in disabled bays are more mobile than I am.

Compton Road

1. Yes I agree with your proposal, I am very old.

Currie Hill Close

1. Comments as follows refer to all of Wimbledon open all roads for 1 year and see what happens. I feel there would be an improvement.

Dora Road

1. Never been aware there was a problem.
2. But only if you do convert many of the residents only bays in Belvedere Grove etc into joint resident/pay & display bays.
3. Yes definitely there are often lorries/vans parked at the beginning of Church Road which stops traffic flowing and causes chaos, cars using their horns etc.

Glendale Drive

1. But make this no waiting 7am-7pm and no loading as in your plan.

2. There seems to be some belief that people who live in Wimbledon don't use their cars, that some vague 'outside agents' are descending on us and driving / parking here. We are the people who want to park here!

High Street

1. As a business, there is already a severe lack of loading facilities in the village.
2. The parking and deliveries are essential for the commercial viability of the village shops.
3. Some restriction is perhaps needed as well on a Sunday as it is often very blocked with cars parked on the single yellow lines.
4. There is not enough parking bays near the High Street as it is after 4pm so that will just make the problem worse.

High Street Mews

1. Please see attached enclosed letter.

Highbury Road

1. We want traffic to move smoothly through Church Road particularly during rush hour as this is our route. Ideally there should be no parking in Church Road except for deliveries at appropriate times. This way traffic could go through the village on a main bus route road. The traffic calming measures should not be encouraged in Church Road as this is a main road. Shouldn't loading / unloading be allowed very early in the morning. there is very little traffic about at 7am.
2. Not sure that these measures are sufficient.

Home Park Road

1. Time restrictions seem too lengthy ie would prefer 7 - 8.30 and 5.30 to 7.
2. This will severely impact the shops in Church Road. 8-9.30 might be ok.
3. Prioritising through traffic over parking for local shops is not right. Through traffic does not add value to the area. Stops parking for shop trade and creates more through traffic

Homefield Road

1. The principle is right - the proposed timings are probably excessive and harmful for local business. Why not consider shorter periods of time, say 0700-0900 and 1700-1900. This would achieve most of the objectives but be less of a burden to users of village shops.

Kenilworth Avenue

1. Comment relevant to all sections. There are far too many traffic calming measures in this area already. They result in people driving down the centre of roads and in my experience do not significantly reduce speeds. Some are positively dangerous and there are many better uses for our taxes.

Lake Road -

1. I will leave decision making to the specialists.
2. Provided these proposals are effective in removing the bottle neck in Church Road and easing the traffic flow during peak times

3. Reducing the time to 20 Min waiting only ok between these hours so residents can still pop into the shops as needed. Otherwise no, The shops will be too badly affected. Losing disabled bay bad for those requiring it.
4. The roads should still be as when I came here in 1968. I cannot say more on paper. It is something which should be understood! There used to be a public toilet in Wimbledon Village, which one approached by descending steps. There was a hand basin with shining brass taps. But this sort of thing I would tell the Chief Administrator who followed in the steps of Mr Roger Paine. The smoothing of the humps in the roads makes life more difficult

Lambourne Avenue

1. It would be very detrimental to the Village shops which are open before 10 and after 4. Wimbledon Village should be welcoming to shoppers not prevent them parking.

Lancaster Avenue

1. Important to keep the Disabled Bay in Church Road.

Lancaster Gardens

1. Waste of money
2. The disabled space is used by a resident who lives nearby and should not be removed as this person cannot be expected to move their car twice a day. If there really is no alternative to having this, then an extra disabled space should be created next to the existing one in Courthope Road. Also, if any of the 'Pay and Display' bays are shared use with permit holders, then they should not be time limited as residents would be unable to use them.
3. The council should consider removing the parking bay in Church Road nearest to the High Street. Buses on route 493 frequently have problems when vans & other large vehicles park in the bay. The council's proposals to ? to shared use parking bays in Lancaster Road & Old House Close adequately cover for the loss of this parking bay.

Lancaster Road

1. This will affect local businesses - the only problem in Church Road is the double parking of builders lorries due to the excessive development of houses in Church Road.
2. Is this really necessary?
3. Already problem parking in village before 10am. This will make problem worse.
4. This will negatively affect the businesses in the area. People should be able to park there all day. If we are trying to slow down the traffic keeping parking all day is another way to keep the cars moving at 20mph. What you should be addressing are the trucks that stop on the double yellow line across the street from the parking bays on Church Road to make deliveries. In addition, there is a resident of Walnut Tree Cottages who uses the disabled bay on Church Road outside of his home. What is he supposed to do when the disabled bay is suspended? Move his car and walk back to his home? Clearly not a practical solution.
5. We consider that all exclusive residents permit bays should remain, any new bays created should be shared use bays. the disabled bay at the south end of church road, should be retained in its current location and not be restricted as to time. 11 bays in Church road should either be retained as they are or that restrictions be confined to 4 bays closest to High Street.

Landgrove Road

1. Will further reduce use of shops/restaurant in the village- especially families who go out to eat earlier. Happened to us 2 weeks ago in High Street at 6 pm. Lorries ignore the loading times anyway!

Leeward Gardens

1. As a non driver & not resident in this street I have no comment - I am not usually around at the busiest times.
2. See comment later re need for access to shops/pubs for daytime loading/offloading- would this then be 10am to 4pm?
3. If local residents have requested this - then yes If it is an initiative then no. This is a local residents/ business issue and not one for wider consultation
4. I have grave doubts whether the proposed restrictions will have the desired effect

Leopold Avenue

1. The loss of pay & display bays & the disabled bay during those periods is not balanced by the few shops along this stretch which might find it useful
2. This would further restrict parking facilities for local shoppers

Leopold Road

1. Encourages more traffic. Should be kept for residents only.

Margin Drive

1. The parking existing at the moment is just about covering local shopping stops - any ? would affect local shops adversely with local people driving into other areas.

Marryat Place

1. The main problem results from cars parking at the top of Church Road on yellow lines close to the traffic island, thereby blocking road for buses. Cars will still park in restricted areas even if only for a few moments and still create blocks.

Marryat Road

1. The road gets unacceptably congested - and is therefore dangerous to cross
2. The village shops are already struggling to survive and further restricting parking will be a disadvantage and make no difference to traffic flow.
3. See comment 12
4. There is little enough parking in the village as it is.
5. I support waiting and loading bays and consider these help local shops.
6. No comment
7. To facilitate traffic flows during peak hours. However, may exacerbate heavy goods deliveries pre 7:00 for, say, sites under construction or redevelopment. How to enforce possible restriction? Advise through planning dept to developers, then on trust?

Newstead Way

1. See attached type script comments
2. 4pm to 6.30pm preferred
3. Its always a problem using this road & restricts the 493 bus route as well and the traffic backs up to the village roundabout, especially in the rush hours.

Old House Close

1. What on earth are you thinking. Do you want to destroy the commercial viability of this area. Stop this madness. Also, reverse the decision to disallow parking on the main stretch of High Street at these hours as the parking fines collected are one of the largest in London (to motorists it looks a perfectly safe place to park - which it is). It is perfectly ok to allow parking at all times in all existing marked bays.
2. As there are no bays for parking on the other side of the road, traffic flows freely here. Restrictions would just damage businesses, restrict further use of the Village facilities and deny parking to the disabled. Completely unnecessary as are the restrictions along the High Street presently in place - it kills business to the Village. Traffic moves well here.
3. No costings provided. We need to get Council Tax reduced, not roll out frivolous uncostly schemes.
4. I do not agree because the bottleneck is a useful feature to slow traffic down at peak times a feature you are artificially trying to create in other residential roads. Church Road is largely a residential road and cannot accommodate more traffic. Also, the pavements are too narrow to cope with increased traffic. Speed reducing features should be introduced in all roads in the area and absolutely must be introduced in Church Road. It should be noted that the bottleneck is at it worst with cars and vans stopping outside the newsagent and parade of shops opposite the parking bays in Church Road.

Parkside

1. No - as this will kill the business trade for the local shops who open early & shut late
2. You are already over metering the village STOP taxing us
3. This needs to be decided by those residents in that area that are directly affected.

Parkside Avenue

1. Reason 1: Traffic speeds would increase on that section. It is dubious that this would decrease accidents and may not be necessary to relieve the High Street Roundabout queuing. Reason 2: Adverse impact on village retailers from the displacement of parking to (where) - some distance.
2. All parking in the village should be de-regulated to one hour metered limits. Cars should be able to park on both sides of most roads this would 1)save the high street shops 2) Slow through traffic.

Parkside Gardens

1. I do not see the point of changing existing
2. Don't forget protection for cyclists throughout the area.

Peek Crescent

1. Not specific. Open to misinterpretation.

Rectory Orchard

1. Vehicles entering Church Road by turning right from High Street (at mini roundabout opposite Dog and Fox) are often restricted by vehicles parked in Church Road close to junction. Bus 493 often affected. Will proposed plans help this specific issue?

Somerset Road

1. I consider this is a complete waste of money in the present climate. Defer it until things improve
2. Against any further restrictions. The existing are ? to do the locals and businesses

3. We should not sacrifice a facility valuable to local residents going about their normal daily lives to proposal that will encourage yet more commuter traffic.
4. These exist on the High Street - which is fine, but where are we going to park if we want to pop into a local shop for 5mins 7-10am / 4pm -7pm?
5. Reducing parking time during shopping hours (9-5.30) by 3 1/2 hours would have a bad effect on local shops - even more people would drive to supermarkets with large / free car parks.
6. I often have to park during these times and so it would be even harder to find a space. There is not that much rush hour traffic up there and to make it easier would encourage even more cars to go through the Village.
7. Loading / unloading is distant from 'waiting' commercial vehicles should be discouraged from loading / unloading in the peak hours for traffic. Private traffic arrangements should remain as now.
8. have no clear ideas as to whether this will be beneficial or detrimental to residents
9. P Parking is far too restricted in the Village at present, and this affects traders and village life in general. To restrict it further will leave you with more empty shops/charity shops and affect the charm and use of the village. A bus service should never have been run through Church Road but through Marryat which is much wider and less used.

Springfield Road

1. The local shops should have priority any further restrictions could have adverse effects.

St Aubyn's Avenue

1. Allow the disabled bay as there are quite a few elderly people who like to shop in the village -- the bus route is bad enough - but other cars park & pay on the High Street or does not get congested.
2. Existing parking restrictions sufficient
3. This will be very inconvenient for residents wanting to shop early- as I do the high street is already 'No parking' before 10am

St Mary's Road

1. Loading/Unloading should be done outside of peak traffic hours i.e. 06:00-08:00 and 15:00-17:00 (2 hours should be sufficient).
2. If all exclusive residents' permit bays are converted to shared use bays, those residents with young families & the elderly will suffer.
3. Hanging all the exclusive to residents parking bays to shared use is excessive, perhaps it would be sufficient to confine the change to shared use to only the four bays nearest the High St. Disabled bays are an important local facility that should not be
4. However, it is important that loading / unloading restrictions do not affect ? viability of shops in the area - already ? very high rates
5. The loss of these bays at peak time would have an adverse effect on local residents and business. The removal of these bays would simply move parked cars onto nearby residential roads, and additionally only increase traffic speeds at the southern end of Church Road which is used much by pedestrians.
6. But restrictions need only apply to the 7 bays further away from the village as the road narrows here. The 4 bays plus disabled bay at the southern most end are situated on a wider section of road so do not affect traffic flow. Clear signage, with arrows pointing in the appropriate direction, could overcome the two differing restrictions. This is currently the case on Belvedere Grove where parking durations and costs are different depending on where you park on the road.

Vineyard Hill Road

1. Unnecessary. Spaces are very useful as they are currently, and congestion at the spot rarely causes more than 20 seconds disruption. A total waste of resources.
2. I would rather those be the times to load/unload as between 10-3 the bays are heavily used.
3. Local shops need available parking. There's not a lot anyway, why restrict it further? Buses / lorries too frequent, too fast in Church Road.
4. No, this creates confusion ? CPZ times & ? ? Why is it required on Saturdays? This would appear to be revenue raising proposal, as more penalty notices will be issued.
5. I do not have strong views on this & feel it is important for the residents. Obviously driving through it would be an improvement.
6. Disabled bays should be available all the time. Otherwise OK

Waldemar Road

1. Makes it very difficult to organise a local early or late shop (when the area is not busy) to the detriment of residents and local shops

Walnut Tree Cottages

1. The instruction could perhaps apply to this 4 bays at the south end of Church Rd but not elsewhere. Disabled bays should never be subject to the instructions, to impose this instruction on the rest of Church Rd would be particularly hard on local residents and
2. There are quite a few houses at the top of Church Road which makes it very difficult from the High Street. The disabled bay was put in for me in 1980, I feel I couldn't at age 78 manage without it. If this happens another disabled bay should be put in Courthope Road. Church Road is not mainly a shopping area. A lot of people live here. I have not noticed any bad traffic jams even with the 200 bus. The parking bays should be kept as they are, or limits only on the 4 bays nearest the High Street.

Welford Place

1. Will increase difficulties for local shop deliveries - particularly in the morning period.

Wimbledon Hill Road

1. The proposed restrictions will increase the pressure on Church Road shops (and on Villages shops as a whole) All Village shops suffer unfair competition from over large retail outlets elsewhere to the detriment of the Village as a community

Woodside

1. I do not agree with any measures that eliminates visitor pay & display or free parking outside peak hours.
2. Additional waiting restrictions within Wimbledon prejudice my ability to live a ? life. The disabled bay I agree with but not the additional restrictions
3. This is supposed to be a distributor road yet in fact the buses can hardly get through and it is for sections of the road virtually a single lane road.
4. Free flowing traffic should be encouraged on this road to avoid rat running.

Comments in relation to Question 2**Alan Road**

1. Excellent idea - This is designated a main road . Cars should use it and keep out of local residential routes.
2. do not believe speed bumps are effective and generate noise engine pollution
3. The traffic calming could have the effect of pushing more traffic through the Belvedere Roads - Church Road is supposed to be a main distributor road
4. Church Road is designated for through traffic. The proposed measures would encourage some traffic to divert to residential roads.

Alexandra Road

1. Speed tables and other similar measures are unnecessary and a waste of public money
2. But would raised treatments be better off down the narrow paths of Church Road as well

Alwyne Road

1. I support any proposal which encourages people to walk, cycle and use public transport. Vehicle fumes give me migraine.
2. I support the proposed 20 mph limits but am opposed in principle to the introduction of any more 'traffic calming' measures such as speed bumps.

Arthur Road

1. Although speed table eg are at junction of St Mary's Road & roundabout by St Mary's Church have absolutely no effect on speed of cars
2. I have no objection to speed cushions but raised calming features do not slow down traffic at junctions as it is already slow.
3. PLEASE no more traffic calming bumps, cushions, plateaus etc. As someone with an arthritic spine I find it painful enough already driving over these speed cushions even very slowly, and the thought of more is intolerable. Why not more 'pinches' and signs to deter lorries etc from using purely residential roads such as the Belvederes?
4. The parking places in narrower stretch (northwards from Courthope Road) should be removed as the road is just too narrow.
5. Don't agree that raised entry will remove bottleneck and can't see how two different speed limits (in either direction) can do anything but confuse. It is already narrow and I don't see cars speeding.
6. 20 mph restrictions & further speed bumps are unnecessary. The problem is congestion not speeding in Church Road. Have there been any accidents due to speed in Church Road in the last 10 years?
7. the occasional bottlenecks are caused by the parking bays opposite Belvedere drive. remove these and find replacements elsewhere. Traffic calming will has had no significant effect elsewhere. additional discomfort to buses, emergency vehicles and local residents will result with added pollution and noise.
8. There is more than sufficient 'traffic-calming' in the Wim Village area. If you introduce more you are likely to inconvenience residents as much if not more then trough traffic. It is our impression that most of the traffic encounters in the area consists of residents going about their legitimate business. This is a densely populated area and most people have cars/
9. It will make traffic worse rather than better. This route is the main southern access point for the whole Wimbledon park area. It is also used by many cyclists and school coaches, none of whom will 'enjoy' the measures.
10. Yes
11. I am not convinced of the need for a speed table half way along.

12. Wholly unnecessary. Traffic is already sufficiently slow and careful. This is wasteful public expenditure which will produce no worthwhile public benefit! The existing humps do not slow down bigger cars at all.

Belvedere Avenue

1. Church Road is the distributor road & should be left alone to encourage traffic onto it.
2. Church Rd is a Local Distributor Road and therefore should have no restrictions on traffic flow
3. Church Road is a designated 'main' road should be easy to use to take the pressure of surrounding roads.

Belvedere Drive

1. It will not have the desired effect of removing the bottle neck and easing traffic flow. Only a reduction in traffic will do so.
2. Existing is more than adequate.
3. We understand that the Police don't feel the platforms currently in our area have made any difference to speed and volume. And, indeed, we have noticed no difference in the speed or volume of traffic using Belvedere Drive since the platform at one end was introduced
4. Traffic calming measures do not help drivers of flow of traffic
5. The only way to achieve traffic calming is to keep the through traffic to main arteries - this can be achieved by closing off roads to make it much harder to weave through the Belvederes.
6. make no difference to volume of traffic is the point not slowing it down
7. The speed table would be welcomed but it is considered that the entry treatments make little or no difference.
8. Church road is a main road to southfields and ? road - it would be quite ridiculous to put traffic calming cushions etc. It is narrow enough so one has to pull over to let traffic by - its narrowness is enough to keep traffic slow.
9. There is a problem with excessive speed in Church Road. If there is evidence that raised tables are effective against speeding traffic, they should be deployed as proposed. The Council should publicise this evidence to provide justification for taking these measures. The Council should give a clear commitment that, if the measures prove to be ineffective at reducing vehicle speeds, further measures should be introduced to achieve this.
10. leave most things as they are restriction should be confined to the A bays closest to the High Street

Belvedere Grove

1. Please see comments relating to traffic calming. My comments would apply to all speed bumps raised sections and width restrictions
2. See comments over page
3. This is entirely a matter for Church Rd residents. [For information only, we do not believe it will materially affect speed or volume and could be a waste of money]
4. Since this is a distributor rd the free flow of traffic is important.
5. Provided church road residents approve
6. The speed table will possibly be more of a deterrent than the speed cushions in the Belvedere roads. This will push further traffic onto the Belvedere roads.
7. Bumps etc will reduce the environmental quality of the neighbourhood by increasing pollution for pedestrians and local businesses/ residents

Belvedere Square

1. They damage cars & vehicles, they slow down the emergency services, they will make bus journeys more uncomfortable and they are noisy where cars brake and accelerate away. They do little to slow the traffic.
2. Hives currently use this route, including buses during Wimbledon fortnight. Traffic calming would cause unnecessary noise with these vehicles speeding up and slowing down over this area. Speed bumps/restrictions are non effective for 4 x 4 vehicles and delivery vans which is relevant for many village vehicles
3. Reduced Speed limit ok. Raised entry only creates an unnatural traffic flow causing dramatic breaking from uncertain motorists and damage to cars resulting in noise as cars scrape ground due to motorists misjudging the treatment. Most motorists are not as skilled as they should be and all these obstacles create more difficulties for them and means traffic is not free flowing and more dangerous

Bernard Gardens

1. Totally opposed to any speed bumps anywhere - they are polluting & do not hinder large 4x4 vehicles and other large vehicles raised areas junctions are a good idea. Burntwood Lane style traffic calming is also good.

Burghley Road

1. Church and Burghley: Impact at corner of Church Road and Burghley Road will be significant during rush hour: More queuing, more hooting, more engine pollution NB 2nd crossover for Hardwycke not mentioned. Difficult entering drive at Hardwycke
2. I feel speed tables are a waste of time & money
3. Traffic at this point is already slow. A speed table will make no appreciable difference and will cause unwary drivers to brake suddenly, with potential for accidents.
4. As above
5. Traffic in Church Road is already slow. The proposal above seeks to allow it to go faster and this one seeks to slow it! Contradictory!

Calonne Road

1. This has no impact on traffic volumes or safety, beyond the proposed 20mph limit
2. I disagree with all the traffic calming suggestions for the following reasons 1. Traffic calming is costly in implement and maintain. 2. traffic calming is polluting (to implement and on-going) 3. I have not experienced undue congestion during my 28 years in the area. Please leave our roads as they are. We do not have a problem.
3. This is a distributor road and traffic should be encouraged to travel along it rather than local residential roads
4. These will be unsuitable for the large volume of traffic and the size of some vehicles using the road.
5. Traffic already moves very slowly and further damage to buses and cars should be avoided.
6. 'Traffic calming' implies speed - it is impossible to speed in Church Road which, as noted, is a 'bottle neck'. As for 'easing traffic flows' - the measures will actually slow traffic down.
7. I do not agree that these measures will be effective in keeping speeds down and for those of us who have to drive around the village during the day, taking children to school, shopping and all the other normal daily things, speed bumps are an irritation and cause damage to cars and extra pollution

Church Road

1. As above - our AM & afternoon deliveries will be impossible to make if no loading allowed at these times Mon-Sun

2. The area is becoming almost undriveable due to recent speed humps/ramps (which are also very unsightly) and they would be the main reason for me to consider buying a 4x4 as they are potentially damaging to conventional cars. If congestion is such an issue
3. Speeding is a problem mostly out of peak hours and needs to be controlled.
4. At least one further speed table should be placed between roundabout onto Church Road and Old House Close to calm traffic further.
5. I welcome the proposals to reduce speed of traffic in Church Road but think that more will be required.
6. The area is becoming almost undriveable due to recent speed humps/ramps (which are also very unsightly) and they would be the main reason for me to consider buying a 4x4 as they are potentially damaging to conventional cars. If congestion is such an issue surely drivers will not need calming measures to slow them down and if drivers are driving too fast there can't be too much congestion????
7. Cars do not speed along Church Road
8. With a speed limit of 20mph
9. These are more of a hazard.
10. But these proposals are insufficient without cameras for enforcement
11. N
12. They create more aggression

Clement Road

1. Church Rd is a local distributor road which is currently very under-utilised. These proposals might discourage its use even further.

Coach House Lane

1. I wasn't aware that people speed in Church Road. There are already quite enough bumps i.e. cushions in the road. There are more cars than people in Wimbledon which is enough to slow traffic down. Additional speed cameras is a waste of public money.

Courthope Road

1. You should seriously consider it for the High Street as well. One of the greatest risks to children strangely enough is speeding police cars.

Currie Hill Close

1. Traffic calming just causes much more pollution.
2. Unnecessary. Traffic density is high enough to ensure 'self calming'

Dora Road

1. I don't think that putting 'junction entry treatments' makes any difference - they are actually nice to drive over.
2. S called 'traffic calming' i.e. cushions & speed tables cause accidents and do not increase safety. They also harm the environment as cars brake & accelerate
3. The existing traffic calming measures in the borough are already on the extreme end of onerous. If you are imposing a 20mph speed restriction, this is all that is required. Use your resource on policing this unit, rather than wasting our money on complicated and ridiculous traffic "calming" measures which only serve to infuriate and irritate us.

4. You do not explain what a "speed table" is in your accompanying notes. If it will mean only one vehicle can pass it at a time then I strongly disagree there will be chaos when the buses (493) approached it. 2. I have noticed the "junction entry treatment" at Ernle Road, Lake Road, Murray Road bringing any improvement to traffic flow. I fear they may be a complete waste of money.
5. Not at the high street end.
6. No ..1 the roundabout approach from Church Road to the High Street is enough to slow cars down. 2. From the roundabout into Church Road, one does not need traffic calming as one cannot drive any faster than 20mph anyway, it would only contribute to slow down traffic too much at the roundabout itself, causing piles on the high street

Glendale Drive

1. No more traffic calming measures for Wimbledon
2. Traffic calming makes noise (slowing / revving / accelerating / bumping) and damages your car.

High Street

1. With the traffic & parked vehicles on Church Road, there is little need to slow the already slow traffic on Church Road.
2. Unnecessary, traffic is already ? by width of narrow road
3. Calming humps or bollards are not necessary in such a small road
4. I assume the raised table at Church Road/the High Street will not involve redoing the work being carried out this next week.

Highbury Road

1. Traffic calming measures such as humps and narrowing do nothing to reduce the traffic levels in the village. They serve to increase pollution and are being proposed at a time when they are being abolished in most other places in the country. The speed cushion at the end of Highbury Road is now used to cut the corner at greater speed
2. as a local access road church road should carry through traffic
3. There is no reason to reduce the appeal of Church Road for through traffic
4. It is a 'B' road which is already heavily congested. Further calming on this narrow & busy road is likely to make the problem worse: it is meant to carry traffic away from non 'B' roads by being a convenient through-route

Home Park Road

1. Traffic calming by encouraging parking out of rush hours is inappropriate for a bus route - just causes congestion far from calm
2. I would support this proposal if it includes cycle provision. Major issue is that there is no provision for cycling in this street proposal or the Wimbledon area traffic study proposal as a whole. This is a major oversight of strategic proportions. This scheme is about balancing the through traffic needs with needs of businesses and residents. How can it not include any cycle provision which would reduce car usage and facilitate local mobility. I for example cycle my children from my Home park road to a school off the Ridgeway. There is no cycle provision (Cycle lanes etc) along this route even though there are about nine schools off the Ridgeway! The school runs traffic is a major traffic generator and this proposal does not include anything to facilitate safely to the schools (through the area this proposal covers). In fact if I have read it correctly this proposal removes cycle provision (e.g on Wimbledon hill road!). This scheme needs to redesign to include cycle lanes through the roads this scheme covers. For example the below get you to schools along the Ridgeway from the east of the Belvederes 1 cycle lane along Arthur road, Alan Road, Belvedere avenue, Belvedere grove, and Ridgeway 2 cycle lane along Arthur road, St Mary's road,

Church road, Bevedere grove, and Ridgeway, Southside common and back down some roads to Ridgeway (e.g Clifton Road)

Kenilworth Avenue

1. I think this will make traffic slower
2. 20mph limit works better
3. The only benefit with spending money on in Church Road / Arthur Road would be to remove all the mini roundabouts - replacing them with nothing
4. There is no evidence that raised entry slows traffic any further than imposing a 20mph restriction. Evidence cited by various cycling organisations: I am sure the cycle clubs can supply it if wanted. It is poor value for money and hinders emergency vehicles, is more dangerous for cyclists and for transporting people with certain ailments and disabilities (including my elderly parents). Narrowing the road is also an added danger for cyclists. Bad for cars and extra cost and disruption to do the work.
5. As my response to Q9.1 i have concerns about the cost effectiveness of the measures and all the proposed works in these proposals. i would prefer to see council tax received used to improve education and policing in the area

Lake Road

1. Anyway to slow traffic in church road good.
2. We have enough speed humps already waste of money!! Stop the schemes please.
3. All efforts to reduce the level of speed are welcome

Lambourne Avenue

1. I don't think speed tables do anything.

Lancaster Gardens

1. The 20mph must be enforced to make this road safer. Narrow pavements mean that vehicles travel very close to pedestrians and speed must be kept down.
2. Traffic calming is needed further along Church Rd, preferably a set of speed cushions rather than speed table. No need for anything at roundabout. Cars already slow & entering 20mph + parked cars.

Lancaster Road

1. Fed up with speed humps, instead of width restrictions, as small low slung cars like mine MGF are ruined, even when proceeding slowly. Whilst 4x4 petrol guzzling cars have no problems.
2. Because cars travel down Church Road at dangerous speeds despite being a built up area.
3. OK with idea although cars don't rush down this road due to its width
4. There are many families and old people who live on Church Road and also walk along Church Road to go to school or to shop in the Village. Traffic comes along Church Road from Southfields extremely quickly (I have often seen truck drivers on the telephone while driving very fast along this road). We fully support the traffic calming measures.
5. Particularly agree with 'speed Table' just before 'Old House Close'

Leeward Gardens

1. As above

2. Waste of money - will achieve nothing
3. There are already mini roundabouts at the junctions of Church Rd with the High St and St Mary's road which slows down the traffic anyway

Leopold Avenue

1. You need to make sure these actually work. The ones on Lake Road are useless against speeding high clearance 4x4s
2. Unnecessary expense
3. Wastage of money. Would make no difference

Leopold Road

1. See attached - ten reasons

Lincoln Avenue

1. Unnecessary

Marryat Road

1. These proposals are 'old fashioned' and work is more advanced counting has shown that they have little benefit and far greater disadvantages particularly pollution. Where is the cost cutting benefit analysis for this?
2. Traffic calming is essential in Church Road.
3. Yes, but only on the condition that the traffic - calming proposals for Marryat Road / Burghley Road are also implemented. Our preferred option would be for none of the traffic - calming proposals to be implemented.
4. See comment 12
5. On condition Marryat road gets similar treatment
6. But not 20mph in Church Rd & then 30mph in High St. Maintaining 20mph over such an extended area as proposed is almost impossible in modern cars and if monitored could become a cash bonanza for Council. If not monitored it becomes pointless. Do away with the proposed 20mph area completely
7. On condition that Marryat Road given some form of additional 'traffic calming' in line with other areas / roads.
8. I am unhappy that this will just move the problem elsewhere and in particular Marryat Road - a more straight road with zero traffic calming measures currently and far faster speeding traffic than in Church Road.
9. If not drawing more traffic to Marryat Road - in that road more similar traffic calming is a interpreted priority

Newstead Way

1. See attached comments
2. But not village end as traffic moves very slowly this section in any case.
3. The mini roundabout at the junction of Church Road, Burghley Road, St. Mary's Rd could be altered to give equal priorities to all roads, as joining this junction from Burghley Road is difficult. The raised speed table is unnecessary as parking reduces road width and speeds anyway.

Old House Close

1. Church Road is a particularly narrow street and does not have a general problem with speeding (having lived there for over 15 years). Adding speed tables or other bumps in the road will result in vibration, noise and emission pollution as vehicles are forced to slow down and speed up. A similar proposal was made over 10 years ago and soundly turned down by the residents of this area
2. The entrance to Church Road from the High Street doesn't need it - traffic is already slow here. Traffic is fast in the section from the roundabout at St Mary's Road/Burghley Road up until Belvedere Square only the south section of Church Road is fine. Even so, I wouldn't put anything - it's not a major problem
3. No costings provided. We need to get Council Tax reduced, not roll out frivolous uncosted schemes.
4. Traffic on Church Road is too fast and needs to be slowed down. The pavements are narrow and is uncomfortable as a pedestrian.

Parkside

1. General points relevant to all - implement cheap measures (traffic light timing, ban lorries, shared bays, 20mph zone) Save tax payers money on rest & spend on education & social / health care - its a complete waste of funds to spend it on road cushions at the present time
2. Your traffic calming mounds are damaging our cars
3. This needs to be decided by those residents in that area that are directly affected.

Parkside Avenue

1. There is no advantage if the speed on Church Road is restricted by retaining the existing parking.
2. All Roads should be left alone. Change one and the traffic simply moves elsewhere. Certainly nothing should be done until the mansell/woodside junction is reopened and the St Georges Road/Alexandra Road properly re opened.

Parkside Gardens

1. Just a waste of money - the traffic the traffic does not go fast down Church Road

Parkwood Road

1. It's narrow enough already. Vans, lorries and buses are the worst offenders.

Peek Crescent

1. Not, not necessary

Pine Grove

1. Unnecessary and a waste of public money

Somerset Road

1. Ineffective, waste of taxpayers money and cause damage to vehicles
2. Traffic calming measures increase air pollution and traffic congestion, and are terrible for the emergency vehicles. It is better to control speed with cameras.

3. Against any further 'traffic calming' in what are relatively lightly used roads! The 'traffic calming' that exists is frustrating enough - indeed it is dangerous as drivers move to opposite carriageway to minimise the 'bump'
4. Please no more speed humps that jolt the car and cause yet more oil leaks! I use this section of Church Road daily and it is not practical to exceed the present 30mph speed limit. So a 20mph limit will slowdown the traffic (and cause great frustration and irritation!)
5. Although I'm not convinced it will reduce traffic, but it should reduce speed.
6. Traffic in Church Road doesn't need 'calming' as it is normally very slow because of the parked cars. It would be a waste of money.
7. Traffic calming is a nuisance to drivers and causes increased pollution. The traffic is calm enough.
8. Raised tables and lumps make proper vehicle control more difficult esp. when wet and damage both vehicles and occupants, furthermore appears to be little affect on speed by 'white van man'! One useful change, at Church Road entrance would be to remove 1 parking space outside ??????????and 93 bus to get round ???? more smoothly without swinging across the road
9. Total waste of money. It is not possible to speed at that junction. 20mph speed limit quite sufficient without expenditure of more bumps.
10. have no clear ideas as to whether this will be beneficial or detrimental to residents
11. Having lived on Church Road for some years the speed of much of the traffic is dangerous. Walking into the village along Church Road can be hazardous and a speed restriction would help this. Also running the 493 bus through Marryat Rd which is much wider and therefore safer.

Springfield Road

1. Traffic on this road is already restricted by the width of road and parked cars. The flow is slow. Putting in 'traffic-calming' is unnecessary and expensive in my view.

St Aubyn's Avenue

1. The same as (1) proposal
2. No problem with existing arrangements.
3. I think we should be encouraging inevitable traffic at peak times to get through and out of the borough.

St Mary's Road

1. Cars tend to speed along here making it awkward for drivers wanting to enter Church Road from one of the side roads.
2. Any traffic calming measures should be constructed sympathetically to the existing street scene and without too much ugly signage.
3. There should be more calming measures, not sure this is enough, should be out at the 493 bus stops. Traffic is very fast near junction with St Marys Road.

Vineyard Hill Road

1. Traffic flows at peak times on Church Road is, again, not significant enough to justify these resources
2. Traffic calming measures do not seem to work - they just annoy people who speed up to 'catch-up' the time they lost when negotiating traffic calming measures!
3. Unnecessary
4. I think removal of central road markings would be better. I do not think speed is an issue, but consideration for other road users is.

5. You seem to take account of certain lobbying interests only. "Through" to which you refer are not just carried out by non-Wimbledon drivers. Have you done a survey to see how many are done by residents. You will not displace those journeys, just perhaps move some of them onto adjacent roads to their disadvantage. We like living in Wimbledon for many reasons, one of which being that we can move about freely - let it remain so.
6. Waste of money

Waldemar Road

1. Having lived in the area for 12 years, I've never seen anyone driving too fast or dangerously in the area - the road layout doesn't facilitate this as it is. A complete waste of our money.

Walnut Tree Cottages

1. The calming devices are fine but only if the speed limit is imposed and enforced See Q 14
2. Traffic calming is unnecessary. Width restriction would inhibit emergency & delivery vehicles already suffering from the narrowing at end of Belvedere Grove / Belvedere Drive

Welford Place

1. Yes it makes access into Church Road easier fro the 493 bus. At present cars constantly park on the double yellow line outside the dry cleaners making it difficult for the 493 bus to pass between the parked car and the traffic island.
2. Strongly Opposed - Traffic has to slow to navigate the roundabout. The raised junction will cause additional noise/pollution and damage vehicle suspensions- even at low speeds. Public service vehicles will be adversely affected too as this is a bus route.

Wimbledon Hill Road

1. Excessive speed of traffic remains a dangerous problem everywhere. Self enforcing measures (traffic calming) are always welcome

Woodside

1. The council wastes huge money in this type of proposal. The main impact is not increased safety rather cars accelerating / braking with cars & ? ? providing safety implications for children.
2. 1. It is a waste of money. 2. The road works will cause more trouble than is justified by the outcome. 3. Speed tables cause cars to break / accelerate unnecessarily - causing noise & wasting fuel. 4. Speed tables will ruin the look & feel of the area.
3. I don't think speed has been an issue on this road and in principle as a distributor road, traffic should be able to flow in a reasonable manner.
4. Church Road is a local distributor road and the UDP clearly indicates traffic should be directed on to such roads to protect local access roads; raised entry tables at junctions are complete waste of time and money as evidenced by residents in our area St Mary's/Woodside and St Mary's/Church Road raised entries which do nothing to deter or slow traffic down.
5. This is a distributor road - Traffic claming will encourage traffic onto the local rat run road.
6. It is a local distributor road and should have no traffic calming until all local access roads have had volume reducing restrictions delivered as per request and agreement of residents of the local access roads.
7. These measures are designed to limit speed, but speed is not the issue in the Hillside area. The issue is excessive through traffic. The proposals which are the subject of this consultation do nothing to limit through traffic. they are, therefore, a total waste of public money and should not be implemented.

Comments in relation to Question 3&4**Alan Road**

1. The Belvederes do not have a speeding problem, rather it is a problem of volume
2. We agree with traffic calming measures but 3 humps in Alan Road is excessive. Why not 2 someone should catch and fine all talking on mobiles around this corner in the rush hour. It would raise £'s
3. I do not believe speed cushions will reduce the volume of traffic which is the real problem
4. These proposals will do little to address the volume of traffic. They will however lead to increase pollution both by a reduction in air quality and noise. The solution needs to be more radical with closures to avoid through traffic
5. the problem in the belvedere roads designed as local access roads in the UDP is the volume of through traffic both from commuters and locals. the proposals will do nothing to reduce this volume while further spoiling the environment for residents with added air pollution noise and unsightliness
6. Speed is not a problem, volume of traffic is. However if you have width narrowing in Belvedere Grove alone, it risks pushing traffic to Belvedere Avenue etc - can we have width restriction in Belvedere Avenue and Alan Road too?
 - a) Speed cushions will not reduce volume, and will increase noise and pollution.
 - b) The belvedere Roads are local access roads in the UDP, not for through traffic at all.
 - c) There is a clear breach of the last election manifesto to remove rat running from side roads.
There are plenty of other (over 50!) examples of gated closures as well as a mix of banned turns, one way etc in Merton - why can that solution not be looked at for the belvederes? Why the double standards?
7. Most of the traffic is from outside our area, as shown in the major traffic survey. What is needed are measures to divert this traffic away from residential roads, rather than this scheme which only aims to slow it down with devices onerous to residents.
8. speed humps will not cut the volume of traffic, nor will road narrowing, although the latter may deter some of the larger lorries currently cutting through the area

Alexandra Road

1. Belvedere doesn't in my experience as a local resident warrant these measure
2. I am unfamiliar with Belvedere Road and Grove
3. See answer to Q2. Speed cushions damage vehicles and increase emissions. Totally unnecessary.

Alwyne Road

1. I welcome all proposals to limit use of private cars except for the disabled and those who need them for their work.

Arthur Road

1. A width restriction can only work if there are fewer parking bays in Belvedere Avenue, otherwise there will be long jams of traffic
2. Please change the layout of the parking spaces nearest to the T-jct where Belvedere Grove joins Belvedere Avenue. These spaces cause problems all the time. Please remove altogether the single pace outside 31 Belvedere Grove and/or the double space immediately on the north side of Belvedere Avenue. There are such hold-ups here and occasionally it is very dangerous.
3. There more than enough speed humps in the area already and width restrictions only create bottle necks at peak times eg at Belvedere Avenue /Belvedere Grove.) There are already bollards on the corners which slow down traffic & make people wait. A 40% reduction is severely exaggerated - traffic has to get from one side of Wimbledon to the other. This 40% will only be diverted.
4. Will make for more congestion - not less.

5. Through traffic is already discouraged here. If all through traffic is stopped Church Road & the High Street will become even more congested.
6. Parking on both sides of Belvedere Ave near the jct with Belvedere Grove causes endless unnecessary delay. If width restriction is implemented in Belvedere Grove then parking in nearby sections of Belvedere Ave should be restricted to one side of the road only.
7. These speed cushions are aggressive to smaller less polluting vehicles and have no effect upon medium and large vehicles, save to increase noise, gear changes, and added pollution. They just inconvenience local residents who have no escape from them.
8. The present measures already create a chaotic and dangerous junction. the proposal is simply daft, and will route vehicles onto other adjacent roads. Leave well alone.
9. See comment on Q 2. You should think of the legitimate traffic residents needs - deliveries, taxis, all have cars etc. The inconvenience & extra difficulty these proposals would entail are likely to out weigh any benefit. Is this the right time to spend rate & taxpayers money on such schemes?
10. Traffic flow through the Belvederes is essential to all other residents of Wimbledon Hill/ Park/ House areas.
11. Traffic is already bad as it is. It will only make things worse also adding to pollution. There already is a narrowing of the road and that is enough to slow cars down. I am not aware that many lorries use this route.

Belvedere Avenue

1. For goodness sake. The council has already said it will attempt to reduce the volume of traffic in the rat run down Belvedere Grove, past my house and into Alan Road. You are going to make it chock a block.. Put a no through road in Belvedere Grove.
2. Speed cushions and restrictions will not have the desired effect of dramatically reducing traffic volumes. They will add to noise pollution and air pollution in this residential area.
3. Speed cushions will not reduce volumes, will significantly increase air and noise and will have only a very limited impact on speed, if any !
4. Agreement only because its the best of a series of bad proposals. Impact of proposals likely to be very marginal on volume and speed is not an issue!
5. Speed cushions raise the noise and pollution levels, they do not reduce the volume of rat-runners. I know from my own past experience as a rant runner en route for the centre of London. What we need is fewer rather than slower vehicles. Narrowing the road to 6ft 6ins would cause bad congestion .???the present restriction at the Belvedere Grove and Belvedere Avenue junction which is made worse by the parking bays adjacent to the junction
6. Belvedere roads have too much traffic speed Humps will not solve this!

Belvedere Drive

1. It will not discourage through traffic while Wimbledon Hill problems are not addressed. To the contrary artificially created hazards merely cause more danger for cyclists & pedestrians when trucks mount pavement.
2. Authority regarding roads gone mad. This whole area is overloaded with traffic devices. These add to the danger on the roads.
3. Speed cushions and speed bumps have been shown to increase pollution by up to 30%, and should not be used.
4. Cushions will not help to reduce volume of traffic, and will increase pollution. 4. Introducing width restriction in Belvedere Grove only will result in even more traffic in Belvedere Drive
5. The junction at Belvedere Grove / Belvedere Avenue is already a problem due to the restriction - further restriction would cause chaos at times!
6. We are concerned about the extra noise and pollution these might cause - particularly from the lorries and commercial vehicles that now use our road as a rat-run. If the heavy vehicles stopped using the road,

speed humps might be acceptable. But if the proposals in *4) go ahead, even more heavy vehicles will most possibly divert from Belvedere Grove to our road (Belvedere Drive). Hence our unwillingness to support wholeheartedly these proposals.

7. There seems to be 25 more speed cushions proposed in the Belvedere area the only certain outcome will be damage to cars, more noise and pollution. There is one proposed directly by the 19A drive. Having been in an ambulance last autumn I know that the driver had to take a longer road because of speed cushions. Have the ambulance drivers been consulted.
8. The road bumps will not stop the high volume of traffic which is the major problem. There should also be road buildouts reducing traffic to single lane - that will discourage those cutting through the area.
9. only if it is put on all roads of the belvedere estate
10. The width restriction in Belvedere Grove would result in most of the traffic being diverted to Belvedere Drive. The volume of traffic in Belvedere Drive is already badly affected by the closure of the right turn from Wimbledon Hill Road into Woodside.
11. The Belvedere Roads should be left as they are. With a 20mph speed limit imposed that would solve a lot of the situation.
12. Really strongly disagree with the use of speed cushions, as they increase noise levels and don't reduce flow. Would like to see the use of width restrictors and speed tables as a way of containing speed and volume of rat-running traffic I only approve of width restrictions and the use of speed tables if similar width restrictions / speed tables are allocated to all neighbouring residential roads - Belvedere Drive, Alan Road, Belvedere Avenue, Highbury Road. I don't see why vehicles over 6'6" wide are explicitly being permitted in these roads. At present, Belvedere Drive is being used as a cut-through for large lorries and coaches - this causes the foundations of this building to shake considerably sometimes. Speed cushions will just add to the noise and vibration they make if they are allowed through.

Please could noise (and perhaps pollution) levels be monitored in addition to traffic flow therefore. It is not an exaggeration to say that I cannot leave my windows open at night any more because of morning traffic noise levels between 630am and 9am.

13. It is completely inappropriate for such measures to be taken in the Belvedere Roads to address the blight of heavy volumes of through traffic, when the Council has failed to advance any evidence which suggests that those measures will (or even may) be effective. Does the Council really expect these measures to reduce volumes, or is the Council only putting off dealing with the problem until a future date? The problems in the Belvedere Roads are clear and proven by the Council's own counts – the Council should take specific and effective matters to deal with these problems, rather than speculative and unproven measures which only may be effective. We should not have to suffer the known disadvantages of speedbumps – noise, pollution, damage to car suspension systems – for such an uncertain benefit, particularly when there are more appropriate measures to deal with traffic volume ie turning/access restrictions and road closures. If the choice is speedbumps or nothing, I would support the installation of speedbumps on an experimental basis. But they should be removed if it becomes apparent that they are ineffective to deter rat-running through traffic, and replaced with an effective and more appropriate solution. They should also be removed and replaced with a more appropriate solution if through traffic is deterred but does not divert to an unacceptable degree onto neighbouring residential roads. Width restriction: Belvedere Drive already suffers from inappropriately large vehicles which tend to use the road as a London-bound rat run in preference to Belvedere Grove. If Belvedere Grove is to benefit from a width restriction, the same measure should be deployed in Belvedere Drive, otherwise oversized traffic seeking to use Belvedere Grove will simply divert onto Belvedere Drive. That would be a bizarre result after five years of campaigning by Belvedere Drive residents against the size and volume of vehicles using the road.
14. We are very concerned that it will force the large traffic down belvedere drive - they will have nowhere else to go. we do not think there vehicles will go down Wimbledon Hill Road if they can easily go through Belvedere Drive.
15. in the last few years in what was a conservation are planning and development have allowed to double or more the occupancy of the new units and subsequently increasing the car numbers

Belvedere Grove

1. Bumps and narrowing make it impossible to be a resident in Belvedere Grove

2. I do not believe that speed cushions reduce volumes of traffic. The rat run A3 ? will always ? the Belvedere Roads in spite of cushions It ? stuck on Wimbledon Hill when it ? 3 to 1 corners. What is needed is a equal sharing of the ?. We will never eliminate it.
3. Width restriction, my bentley is 82.72 wide (just under 7') I need 7'6' to access my home my dodge viper would also not get through at 6'6'. Speed bumps, my smart car would no longer be smart as I have virtually stop at each one to avoid damage & jarring to my back & my dodge viper would ground and damage itself due to its low ground clearance & projecting front splitter.
4. This is long overdue and will hopefully be successful- the height of bumps should be maximum, full width. Squares can be avoided and not work. See Gladstone Rd SW19 for most effective size. More may be needed.
5. The proposals may reduce speed, but are unlikely to reduce volume. Speed cushions / bumps increase noise and are bad for disabled / old people
6. Generally opposed to speed humps - cause extra noise and air pollution and can damage cars. Inconvenient.
7. I do not understand why having spent money on external consultant, we do not at least try out for an experimental period their recommendation ? What was option 7. BUT CURRENT PROPOSALS BETTER than nothing.
8. The proposed width restrictions on Belvedere Grove could potentially restrict access to our driveway. It would mean no longer being able to drive in and out.
9. It doesn't stop the problem of the excessive amount of traffic using the roads as a cut-through or to by-pass main routes.
10. Problem is VOLUME - no modern evidence that humps/narrowings reduce it. Minor inconvenience/no commuter deterrent or evaporation. Extra pollution and noise
11. 3)Speed cushions are a mixed blessing a skilful driver which a commuter is can take them at up to 30 mph and if reducing speed they cause constant braking and acceleration which just adds to noise and pollution.
4)The junction at Belvedere Avenue has an existing platform and narrowing this makes the turn in and out of Belvedere Grove tricky, why is any change required? Width limits would cause endless inconvenience to local business traffic, divert it onto neighbouring residential roads. Any vehicle unable to exit from Belvedere Grove would have to do a 3 point turn ,hardly conducive to traffic calming.
12. The issue that needs to be solved is the level of rat running in the Belvederes not just the speed of vehicles. These proposals will not address this.
13. Speed Cushions will lead to more noise from braking and acceleration and will increase pollution. Apart from this the huge volume of rat running traffic will only reduce slightly. The volume is our main problem. Cut through rat running should be stopped completely.
14. This scheme does not reduce volume. Belvedere Grove has too many cars - 7 days a week, 24 hours a day!
15. It is vital that the volume of traffic through Belvedere Grove is SUBSTANTIALLY reduced. If these measures are not successful in doing so more radical measures must be implemented. It is important for speed to be reduced.
16. i do not agree with speed humps they may reduce speed but do not reduce the amount of traffic which is our problem they also will increase already poor air quality as a partially ashtred person they make crossing the road treacherous for me with all be needed the restrictions may be useful but will not be needed for other belvedere roads as well
17. The proposals put forward do not address volume of traffic we have been waiting for many years for traffic reduction - these roads are local access roads which from the councils surveys show that 80% of traffic is through traffic. Other areas of Wimbledon have introduced closures, banned entries no right turns etc. Many of these areas ie Wimbledon South near tube station have much less volume of through traffic. The closures in Woodside / Wimbledon Hill Road increased traffic in the area . Speed cushions reduce speed but not volume. Please give us some alternatives to reduce traffic. In other areas you have provided alternative schemes for residents consideration. No right turns / gate closure / one way traffic must be a prudent alternative for these roads. Your consultants believe so.
18. With so much new building going on in Belvedere Grove, it is inevitable that large lorries will not be able to get through, and cause total chaos trying to turn round or back
19. The 20mph speed limit is welcome. The proposed width restriction is most welcome

20. volume not speed is the problem
21. Neither suggestion addresses the fundamental problem, identified by the residents and agreed by the council, that traffic volumes are excessive in these roads (a large proportion of which is down to rat running at peak times). The proposals are worse than useless as they will materially reduce the amenity of the neighbourhood through increased pollution and noise in what is a residential road.

Belvedere Square

1. As for question 2
2. Current restrictions in the Belvedere area are difficult enough to manoeuvre around with all the cars. Increase restrictions will cause more traffic

Burghley Road

1. 6'6" restriction at Belvedere Grove and Avenue is effectively a barrier to entry into Belvedere Grove. Belvedere Grove has been a cut-through for 40+ years I see no reason to change it now.
2. Where do you propose the shoppers to park??
3. Speed cushions damage residents cars, increase noise and pollution as drivers brake before and accelerate after them and are unsightly and unnecessary.
4. These expensive proposals will increase air and noise pollution, are not supported by the residents in the Belvederes and again no evidence is given in support of them decreasing traffic volume.

Calonne Road

1. See comments under 2
2. There are too many speed cushions proposed. If traffic is reduced by 50-60% along these roads there could be significant increased in other local roads. A fewer number of speed cushions (say half the number) would be more appropriate
3. Tables are more effective as they affect every wheel base size - the biggest offenders in Belvedere Grove are the mummies in their 4x4 on the school run.
4. There are sufficient restrictions in Church Hill. An over use of speed cushions in so many places will negate the object you are hoping to achieve
5. Through traffic is a necessity - width restrictions will affect the ability to make deliveries in the road. Belvedere Grove is not a private road and should not be treated as a special case - it has always been the continuation to Ridgway for North/South.
6. This would just move traffic on to other residential roads. I am most concerned that responding to a small vociferous group in the Belvederes is having a knock-on 'me too' effect that will result in little change in overall traffic flows but significant cost and environmental (and potentially vehicular) damage for residents of the area.
7. The problem with the Belvederes only arose when the Woodside junction was changed to prevent traffic turning right from Wimbledon Hill or from Woodside in order to facilitate a cycle pathway. Find another place for the pathway and reopen the junction allowing traffic to flow by using Woodside again. This would reduce the traffic on the Belvederes dramatically.

Church Road

1. May make van deliveries difficult for access to key roads etc.
2. Speed cushions are unsightly, potentially damaging to vehicles and out of place in this prestigious environment. Width limits are also unsightly, cause unnecessary congestion (e.g. Belvedere Ave/Belvedere Grove) and potentially innocent damage to vehicles.
3. The speed cushions will make these roads unattractive to those who cut through these roads. The width restriction is a completely different proposal which will not reduce the volume of commuter traffic passing

through the roads, but will cause delivery vans, ambulance and fire engines difficulty in navigating locally, which will probably result in journey times for these vehicles being increased.

4. Why should Belvedere Road be treated preferentially?
5. This will cause considerable inconvenience and is unnecessary.
6. The width restriction of 6'6" at this point would make it difficult for emergency vehicles
7. Width restrictions on Belvedere Grove will push wide traffic into other local roads. We should not do any scheme that favours one road over another.
8. The proposed width restriction in Belvedere Grove is unnecessary because large vehicles have never been cited as a problem in the Belvedere Roads. Such a restriction would cause any large delivery vehicle (for example) to perform a u-turn after making its delivery.
9. Satisfactory as it is.
10. Speed cushions are dangerous in that drivers in both directions often drive to the middle of the cushions.
11. The proposed width restriction in Belvedere Grove is unnecessary because large vehicles have never been cited as a problem in the Belvedere Roads. Such a restriction would cause any large delivery vehicle (for example) to perform a u-turn after making its delivery.

Clement Road

1. A more radical proposal is needed to stop 'rat-running' through traffic.
2. These proposals are totally inadequate for dealing with the very severe rat-running. This consultation should include proposals for gated closures or signage with equivalent effect, as has been done elsewhere throughout the borough.
3. The existing restriction is more than adequate and already causes chaos because there is often no place for people to pull in and let others through

Coach House Lane

1. These roads are very short and not very wide anyway.

Courthope Road

1. Speed cushions are not currently needed in Courthope Rd as it is residents parking only - if it is changed to shared use you will create MORE traffic - see comments later about this.
2. I see no reason for having speed bumps in Courthope Road. Traffic is minimal - mostly residents

Currie Hill Close

1. Noise and pollution will increase
2. unnecessary. I use these roads frequently and find no problems.

Dora Road

1. These roads are already traffic clogged and slow moving. Any more restrictions are unnecessary and could even cause accidents.
2. The existing nature of Belvedere Grove means that no further measures are required. Traffic slows naturally, as there is only one lane effective due to parked cars. Also, I would favour complete removal of the existing restriction and narrowing at the junction Belvedere Grove/Belvedere Avenue. What you propose is ridiculous and further waste of our council tax.
3. Sadly, I think increased volume of traffic is an unavoidable fact of life in London. Introducing these proposed measures will not deter motorists but merely make them angry and unpleasant, leading to road-

rage incidents. The only way to reduce traffic on our roads is to make driving more expensive and public transport cheaper

4. Speed cushions are dangerous as many drivers steer into the centre of the road to avoid them. Width restrictions are a nightmare with wide cars, I do not support their use anywhere.
5. I am opposed to All speed cushions which I regard as unsafe and dangerous to car occupants (Back strain etc)
6. The curve of Belvedere Grove itself, and the parking spaces(+ cars parked there) are good 'speed cushions' themselves, no need for real speed cushions

Glendale Drive

1. No more speed cushions for Wimbledon

High Street

1. The width restriction is unnecessary - the road is not often used by HGVs as a cut through and they are the only vehicles you will restrict.
2. Traffic is already slow in this area naturally due to raised junctions and volume of traffic. Also there are rarely accidents ? speed
3. I do not agree with anything that adds to the complications of driving these roads. We need flow not restriction
4. There are already problems for traffic at the Belvedere Grove/B. Avenue intersection. I suspect that adding a width restriction will cause those of us who live in the area a lot more problems.

High Street Mews

1. it will not lessen traffic

Highbury Road

1. Recently the Council has finished a consultation on roads near South Wimbledon Station. Residents were given two alternative schemes on which to give their views and one scheme included measures to stop through traffic by use of a gated closure. We would like the chance of making a similar choice.
2. proposals relate to speed not rat runs or volume which the conservative councillors manifesto indicates to address this pledge remains outstanding in the mean time Highbury Road should be narrowed at both ends if proposal 8a is implemented or at the junction with belvedere avenue if 8a is not implemented
3. We request that Highbury Road should be narrowed at its junction with Belvedere Avenue in the same way as Alan Road in order to put the two roads on a comparable basis & slow traffic speeding round this dangerous corner. Speed cushions should be large enough to slow 4x4s and other wide vehicles.
4. The width restriction will improve the flow of traffic at this junction and, hence, increase the attractiveness of Belvedere Grove to through traffic.
5. Highbury Road should be narrowed at its junction with Belvedere Avenue in the same way as Alan Road in order to put the two roads on a comparable basis and slow traffic speeding round this dangerous corner
6. I do not believe that speed cushions will have any impact on traffic volume, which is the principal concern. It will not deter motorists, but it will significantly increase both noise and air pollution and so is unacceptable.

Home Park Road

1. Width restrictions are unsightly. Do not see speed as a problem in the Belvedere Road areas. Congestion yes, speed no. Turning from B Ave into B Grove is the issue - if remove parking bays would be safer.

2. Speed cushions damage tyres and vehicles. If you go slowly to suit them, some idiot tries to overtake. Prefer chicanes
3. 7 foot would be ok
4. I would support this proposal if it includes cycle provision. Major issue is that there is no provision for cycling in this street proposal or the Wimbledon area traffic study proposal as a whole. This is a major oversight of strategic proportions. This scheme is about balancing the through traffic needs with needs of businesses and residents. How can it not include any cycle provision which would reduce car usage and facilitate local mobility. I for example cycle my children from my Home park road to a school off the Ridgeway. There is no cycle provision (Cycle lanes etc) along this route even though there are about nine schools off the Ridgeway! The school runs traffic is a major traffic generator and this proposal does not include anything to facilitate safely to the schools (through the area this proposal covers). In fact if I have read it correctly this proposal removes cycle provision (e.g on Wimbledon hill road!). This scheme needs to redesign to include cycle lanes through the roads this scheme covers. For example the below get you to schools along the Ridgeway from the east of the Belvederes 1 cycle lane along Arthur road, Alan Road, Belvedere avenue, Belvedere grove, and Ridgeway 2 cycle lane along Arthur road, St Mary's road, Church road, Belvedere grove, and Ridgeway, Southside common and back down some roads to Ridgeway (e.g Clifton Road)

Kenilworth Avenue

1. The width restriction will deter large vehicles from cutting through. I think the speed cushions are unnecessary and it just means drivers race from cushion to cushion
2. Almost all of the Belvedere problems have caused by turning Mansel Road into a one way street and removing the ability to turn right into Woodside. If you converted changes back again Belvedere's problems would disappear.
3. There is no point in discouraging traffic unless alternative forms of transport are used. Already the road closures and other restrictions have caused longer journey but unless some form of public transport (eg a circular minibus) is introduced to bring local residents into the central shopping areas, schools etc, they will still need to do this. A 20mph limit is a good idea but physical measures are not (see answer to Q2) on both safety and effectiveness grounds. And it is a waste of money.

Lake Road

1. Any reduction in traffic welcomed, particularly of large vehicles which block road and speed freely (chicanes as in St Marys Road Excellent) larger speed humps preferred to slow these larger vehicles (Including SUL's) still wish the council would go through with original plans to block off Alan road or belvedere grove at avenue. The Roads are currently very noisy for cyclist and pedestrians and people exiting cars due to speed and weight of traffic.

Lambourne Avenue

1. If there is a width restriction would there be space on the outside for bikes?
2. The location of the width restriction on Belvedere Grove is extremely poor and will cause damage and chaos. Having to drive south-east down the extremely narrow Belvedere Avenue (with cars parked on either side) and then have to turn right into Belvedere Avenue will be near impossible without hitting the bollards around the width restricted area. The area will become impossible to navigate with the likely congestion that this tight and dangerous intersection will create.

Lancaster Gardens

1. Traffic is already slowed down at that junction, therefore a width restriction would not slow down traffic much. But I think it would cause considerable disruption if large vehicles delivering to the area had to turn around. If a width restriction is necessary, it should be put at the other end where there is more space and traffic can exit along Courthope Road if it can't turn.

2. With the new 20mph and parking spaces, mostly occupied, not necessary. Let's not waste public money. With more parking spaces, as proposed, that itself slows down traffic.

Lancaster Road

1. Refer to comments 2. Also all speed cushions do is ruin cars & make them unsafe & are noisy for residents. All speed cushions should be removed & replaced by width restrictions.
2. These proposals would impede emergency services and create further long jams.
3. It is already impossible to travel quickly along these roads. Although we understand that trial speed cushions might be a good idea we do not agree with the width restrictions. The current situation keeps cars moving slowly along the Belvedere area.

Leeward Gardens

1. It is currently very dangerous for elderly pedestrians to cross Belvedere Drive, particularly near its junction with Wimbledon Hill Road. A lit pedestrian crossing nearby would be much more effective than traffic calming in reducing that risk and in making walking in the area a pleasant experience. (see q. 7 below)
2. As above
3. I think speed cushions are ineffective (and cause car wear and tear) and width restrictions are dangerous (causing cars to be in the wrong part of the road). So I would rather the council spend money on something else.
4. Waste of money - will achieve nothing. The current situation is perfectly acceptable.
5. I drive a small low emissions/low petrol consuming car and speed cushions make the drive extremely uncomfortable. Apart from being bad for the car, my child gets carsick because of constant up and down movement. Therefore next time I will be buying a car, I will have to buy much bigger one to make journey more bearable. That does not encourage being more eco-friendly.
6. Part of the problems caused in Belvedere roads emanate from the ill thought-out restriction which disallows turning right into Woodside when coming up Wimbledon Hill Rd. For example, if I take my car to the town centre to do shopping, which I cannot carry how am I supposed to return to Leeward Gdns? Why not let traffic turn right into Woodside. There is already a width restriction in Belvedere Grove at its junction with Belvedere Ave.

Leopold Avenue

1. Are you doing this because the council leader lives around there?
2. 3. This particular type of speed cushion will I'm afraid simply leave the effect of more lorries etc using surrounding area. 4. The existing restriction already slows down traffic here considerably. Anymore would lead to congestion at certain times of the day.
3. A width restriction here is likely to cause tailbacks that could gridlock local roads

Leopold Road

1. Speed cushions - too many in our neighbourhood, my car was damaged by these cushions and the shield came apart whilst driving on a motorway. Speed cushions create extra noise when heavy goods vehicles pass over.
2. See attached - ten reasons

Margin Drive

1. Slows down which I assume is the idea. 4. Stop law abiding traffic & speeds up people in a hurry to rush through first.

Marryat Road

1. See 2
2. No This will just push the traffic to Marryat Road or other similar roads - as previously stated, our preference is for none of these proposals to be implemented.
3. 4. The reason for being undecided about the width restriction is that we support a width restriction for Marryat Road as well, otherwise the knock on effect could be that there will be increased heavy traffic in Marryat Road where there is already a problem with a regular flow of heavy vehicles. Despite the 7.5 tonnes vehicle ban, and sign at the beginning of the road, heavy traffic comes through the road to other destinations, not for access to Marryat Road sites, all the time - skip vehicles, earth moving lorries, delivery vehicles, etc.
4. See comment 12
5. On condition Marryat road gets similar treatment
6. The greater obstacles in the Belvederes, the greater the certainty that rat-runners will use Marryat Rd. Your drawing 1A makes this very clear. Otherwise both traffic calming measures in Marryat Rd. Raised platforms, or kerb build outs. Please not triple
7. As comment Q2
8. Belvedere should not be treated from the total inclusive area
9. 4. If the width restriction is successful a similar restriction should be included in Marryat Rd/Somerset Rd s to slow speeds and discourage larger commercial vehicles.
10. Roads in an urban environment are for the flow of vehicles. Restrictions only deflect problems onto neighbouring roads, other areas or introduce new ones which until then did not exist. Belvedere Grove is a residential road adjoining a busy thoroughfare, Wimbledon Hill Road (an A road). Residents knew this when they purchased, if don't like, should move. Some vehicles will use any side road to avoid congestion, understandably, those in the Belvederes do exactly the same in other areas they drive through, can't fix, stop trying to, manage volumes of traffic flow as best you can, otherwise allow traffic to flow freely and let people have route choices, it all balances out overall.

Newstead Way

1. I have commented on so called traffic calming measures in my attachment to question 1. The same comments apply with equal force in this case.
2. I assume these 'speed cushions' are a new design that do not damage the suspension of smaller vehicles unlike the 'speed bumps' already installed. Have they been tested on all types of vehicles especially the smaller environment friendly vehicles.

Old House Close

1. See my answer to question 2 as to why speed cushions are a disbenefit. Very little large commercial traffic uses Belvedere Grove and such a width restriction would be a nuisance.
2. Traffic is already slow, except for the western section of Belvedere Avenue (Alan Road to Church Road). Speed cushions just cause more danger to pedestrians in such narrow streets as car drivers concentrate their view on them and don't look around. No need for them.
3. No costings provided. We need to get Council Tax reduced, not roll out frivolous uncostered schemes.
4. As previously mentioned, Church Road is largely residential: traffic should not be increased in Church Road and speed should be reduced as it is not designed to take more traffic or existing traffic at current speeds. Measures to reduce speed should be put in place on all roads in the area.

Parkside

1. Vans always get stuck - & slow traffic even more - Not many large vehicles use this road anyway.
2. Remove all the traffic calming there is TOO much

3. Speed cushions are dangerous for scooters and bicycles- I would prefer similar gentler cushions like 'raised entry' which are the width of the road. 4. This 6' 6" limitation should be throughout the village.

Parkside Avenue

1. 1.The width restriction would limit the size of traffic for through journeys - so advantages generally would increase flows somewhat on Courthope Road. 2. The proposed cushions would then serve no useful purpose.
2. See above 'STOP MEDDLING'

Parkside Gardens

1. Speed restrictions should suffice

Speed cushions and associated devices do enormous damage to vehicles which is not factored-in to surveys. They should only be implemented if absolutely necessary.

Parkwood Road

1. Just ban lorries & vans except for access to a property.

Peek Crescent

1. Pandering to Belvedere residents
2. I would suggest sleeping policemen as I now have to replace my tyres annually as they are worn out by these cushions, and perhaps a slight redesign as if you go slightly wrong they mess up the shock absorbers - I do not go over the speed limit and am usually c. 25mph

Pine Grove

1. I am very concerned the proposals have not addressed what I believe is a major potential accident spot - the fact that parking is allowed on both sides of Belvedere Drive between Wimbledon Hill Road and St Mary's Road. The road, particularly near Wimbledon Hill, is too narrow and twisty making it very difficult for drivers to see oncoming traffic. The solution is simple - allow parking on one side of the road only. You must check this out as a priority.
2. There is no need for speed restrictions here. Those already in place are unnecessary and cause damage to cars. Concentrating on repairing holes in the road which also act as traffic 'humps' would be preferable
3. Unnecessary and a waste of public money
4. The speed cushions on St Mary's Rd have little effect. Surely traffic lights somewhere on Belvedere Grove, set to make it quicker to go via Church Rd would be better at stopping rat-runners and speeders.

Somerset Road

1. Speed cushions are dangerous in that they tempt drivers to drive in the middle of the road to avoid them damaging their vehicles. Width restrictions also cause annoyance and could create accident situations. All are a waste of tax payers money.
2. Too many cushions already in this area,
3. A square inch of road surface is more precious than a square inch of pavement in the Belvedere Area. See also my comment to previous question.
4. 'Traffic calming' is misplaced and dangerous in these back roads refer (2) above.
5. Unjustified by cost and irritation!
6. This area is no more of a 'rat run' than lots of other roads in the area. Effectively blocking it off will just shift the problem.

7. Speed bumps damage cars (over time) and also make parking difficult. Traffic in the Belvedere area is normally very slow without further measures
8. Most drivers are careful around the village I feel these proposed measures are a waste of my council tax.
9. Speed cushions are incredibly expensive and totally unnecessary in this particular location - particularly if width restrictions are in operation at both ends of the road. 20mph speed limit sufficient. Plus cars parked on both sides - it is not possible to speed there. Width restrictions sufficient to deter through traffic.
10. No need for speed cushions, the traffic moves very slowly in these areas Certainly no requirement for 'width restriction'. Difficult enough as it is. Better to remove what is already there and 'open up'.
11. I think you should trial speed cushions and width restrictions on all routes at the same time, otherwise you will just force the traffic to use alternative routes which may not have been designed to cope with the extra strain

Springfield Road

1. I feel this is totally unnecessary. A waste of money which should be spent on resurfacing the roads, particularly St Marys Road and repairing pavements. The recent calming structures simply make life more difficult and in some cases more hazardous particularly restricting road entrances.

St Aubyn's Avenue

1. No reason to make access from our house to Wimbledon Village any more difficult than at present.
2. 3. Please do not add yet more speed humps and obstructions. The roads in the Belvederes area are already so congested with parking on both sides that speed is already effectively less than 10mph, because of always having to give way to oncoming traffic and waiting for a pause to proceed. Speed humps here will not 'calm' anyone and may be dangerous in this crowded situation. Much traffic is already local residents trying to find a way out or home negotiating no left/right turns etc. going around in circles. 4. Turning right out of Belvedere Grove into Belvedere Avenue is currently dangerous due to the behaviour of cars turning right without slowing from Belvedere Avenue into Belvedere Grove. The proposed position of the width restriction does not address this and could make it more dangerous.
3. The continuous traffic is at peak times mooring and evening Monday to Friday. The residents are using the roads all day Monday to Friday plus weekends.

St Mary's Road

1. The traffic at the Belvedere Ave end of Belvedere Grove moves very slowly because of the existing width restriction. Any further restriction would adversely affect emergency vehicles & other delivery vehicles may end up having to make an undesirable U turn creating unnecessary mayhem.
2. Based on the experience of the newly installed speed cushions in St Marys Road, cars have to reduce their speed to around 5mph in order to prevent their occupants receiving an unpleasant jolt. The purpose of the proposals is to limit vehicles to a speed of 20mph and it is beyond their remit to introduce measures that effectively impose a much lower speed limit than ?. Moreover the slowing down and subsequent acceleration (all below the 20pmh limit) makes for additional fuel consumption and noise, which is wasteful and unnecessary.
3. 3. I agree with the cushions on the route along Alan Road, Belvedere Avenue between Alan Road & Belvedere Grove, and Belvedere Grove. I think the number of speed bumps on Highbury Road, the remainder of Belvedere Avenue and on Belvedere Drive is excessive and should be reduced. 4. There is already a width restriction at the junction of Belvedere Ave & Belvedere Grove which for the most part creates an unofficial give way for traffic coming in the opposite direction hence further width restriction unnecessary.
4. I think this is unnecessary as traffic already moves slowly through this area due to the number of parked cars and the narrow junction at Belvedere Avenue/Belvedere Grove. Also very few 'heavy' vehicles use these roads.
5. Traffic is already slowed by the small bollards that narrow Belvedere Grove at its junction with Belvedere Avenue.

6. I disagree with the use of speed cushions in St Mary's Road due to excessive noise caused by some vehicles, especially those towing trailers. It is severely disruptive and alarming at times.
7. We do not believe that speeding in the Belvedere Roads is great or significant and that it is unlikely to have a significant effect whilst Church Road is so congested, whilst Woodside is effectively closed. There is already a significant restriction at the Belvedere Avenue / Grove junction

Vineyard Hill Road

1. Don't fix what ain't broke!!!
2. See previous answer. Where do the vehicles wider than 6'6' go to get in the area? There are already width restrictions in Woodside and Arthur Road.
3. Insufficient Need
4. Seems sensible to discourage rat running
5. I feel very strongly that narrowing & bumps are a waste of money in this road. I have lived here for 39 years and do not feel any change is necessary, but I am a great advocate of removal of road markings, except for parking bays.
6. You do it here and at best simply make other adjacent roads worse.

Waldemar Road

1. Speed cushions don't work - road speeds no different where they exist / don't. Just make the area more uncomfortable on drivers and noisier for residents.

Walnut Tree Cottages

1. 'Heavy' vehicles in the Belvederes are not really a significant issue. Traffic already moves slowly at junction of Belvedere Avenue / Grove because of speed platform & narrowing. At 6'6' width restriction would be bad for emergency vehicles

Welford Place

1. I do not understand why refuge islands should be removed: why not add more for the benefit of pedestrians
2. Width restrictions reduce useable road space and can be hazardous and have limited effect on speed reduction (eg Copse Hill and Martin Way)

Wimbledon Hill Road

1. 3) - as per 2 (see above) 4) 6'6' is too narrow 7' would be more appropriate. I support the general principle of a width restriction
2. Speed cushions are unsafe, damage the car and are useless to reduce accidents. They do not discourage cut-through.

Woodside

1. Except for removal lorries & emergency vehicles in attendance.
2. Speed restrictions via width restrictions are a minor irritant and fail to increase safety. Moreover they can cause serious damage to elderly drivers whose car control while adequate is not ? precise
3. Speed cushions and width restrictions cause cars that are already intent on speeding to speed through by zig-zagging which is more dangerous than if they would drive in a straight line. It is difficult for a pedestrian to predict what these cars are doing because they are all over the place. Crossing St Marys Road as a pedestrian is a nightmare. Do not do it to another road.

4. Traffic volume not speed is the issue on these roads. I am not sure speed cushions help.
5. volume of traffic, not speed is the key issue--cushions will not reduce volume--volume is so high at peak times that no cars currently exceed 20 mph as is!
6. I don't believe speed is an issue on these roads.
7. Will not reduce the volume of traffic which is the initial problem to be addressed.
8. These measures are designed to limit speed, but speed is not the issue in the Hillside area. The issue is excessive through traffic. The proposals which are the subject of this consultation do nothing to limit through traffic. they are, therefore, a total waste of public money and should not be implemented.

Comments in relation to Question 5&5A**Alan Road**

1. Residents who have paid for an annual ticket must have spaces for them alone - otherwise they have no guarantee of a parking space Westminster council allow 'resident only' spaces - we must have them also.
2. This is a preposterous idea which will bring more traffic into the area. It will also lead to a loss of amenity for existing residents who may no longer be able to park near their homes.
3. Extra parking will not be in place at rush hour, so the perceived benefit of narrowing the roads will not work. We should be discouraging, not encouraging, traffic
4. This would only be a hindrance to residents. The proposed new parking bay opposite this house (12 Alan Road) would make access to my drive very difficult.
5. Although this is to 'help' narrow the road it seems as if more cars are to be encouraged into the area and local householders will have difficulty parking.

Alexandra Road

1. I no longer drive a car
2. By all means increase the number of parking bays but reduce the swingeing parking charges. They are excessive and inappropriate. Such revenue - raising wouldn't be necessary if money weren't wasted on the sorts of other measures proposed.

Alwyne Road

1. Mon - Fri more preferable
2. I think residents have too many cars so should be encouraged to walk, cycle, share cars and use public transport.

Arthur Road

1. It will certainly bring more vehicles into the area. Good for trade maybe, and extra income for the council but not so good for local residents and traffic movement.
2. This is likely to cause more inconvenience for residents and more traffic as people are attracted to the road looking for parking places. It could also be dangerous, drivers are courteous to each other at present but tempers could fray if you cause more congestion.

Belvedere Avenue

1. It will have no impact on traffic volumes and break previous commitments given to residents that the parking bays would be primarily for the use of residents.
2. As ever, it does nothing for us. We have shared bays outside our house already. Alan Road has some resident only. If its all shared we will struggle to park and I question why you make us pay for resident parking
3. Traffic volumes are heaviest during early morning and early evening. Shared parking use will not have any effect on traffic calming.
4. A pointless proposal. Will only encourage more cars to enter the area.
5. I see no reason to submit residents to further difficulties.

Belvedere Drive

1. Residents will be unable to park in streets because they will be taken by meter paying drivers.

2. Parking time for non-residents must be limited to 4 hours only to prevent the bays being used by all-day commuters.
3. We would support conversion of a modest proportion not exceeding 40% of such bays with non-permit holders being restricted to a maximum of 3 hours to encourage more shoppers and discourage all-day parkers.
4. Where the parking area is in front of flats, this should remain as resident only parking due to the higher number of residents requiring parking.
5. I absolutely disagree with making parking for 9 hours on Belvedere Drive - to open the way to commuter parking is an absolute misuse of council powers - it will make access to roads parking impossible for residents - it will encourage more use of roads & is potentially not green - Turn Belvederes into parking lot. This is totally ? ?
6. I believe that as a result of converting residents only bays to shared use we will find it very difficult to find parking space, despite paying for residents permits. We experienced great difficulties before introduction of residents permits.
7. 5. This proposal would seriously affect the parking possibilities for local residents
8. The whole point of us achieving resident's parking was to stop commuters leaving their cars outside our house for 12 or more hours a day. Even though this new idea doesn't start till 9.30 it still offers later commuters a chance to leave their cars for 9 hours. And we pay a considerable amount for residents parking - presumably this will not be reduced if the new scheme is introduced.
9. I can see no reason for the change (8.30am) except hoping for more money.
10. I would ask that you look at the parking spaces in front of our house (19 Belvedere Drive) and opposite our drive way. These make entrance and exit to our drive very difficult and dangerous with volume of traffic.
11. This will only encourage commuters to park all day and block up spaces for local residents. At the very least implement what H+Fulham do, which is restricted hours i.e. only from 10am to 3pm for non-residents or a restriction of 2 hours for non-residents etc. The argument that a fuller road of parked cars will restrict traffic is ridiculous. Also would strongly suggest putting in something to curtail speed of cars coming down Wimbledon Hill into Belvedere Drive - they scream into Belvedere Drive at high speeds which is a high density crossing for pedestrians to Wimbledon station. Somebody will get hurt, it's only a matter of time - we see it all the time from our house!!!!
12. We already have fully packed cars on belvedere drive made absolutely no difference to volume of traffic permits issued to people who work in the village for all parking space are full anyway
13. The majority of the parking bays in Belvedere Drive should be reserved for residents only and these should be at least one parking bay for the disabled. Parking should be for a maximum of 5 hours, otherwise the parking will be used by commuters for 9 hours.
14. The huge amount of money by this conservative council on traffic calming measures is quite ridiculous These credit crunch times - especially as the council is in debt - money should be ? on the roads & come of the elderly, schools and nursing services.
15. Firstly, there are two separate car drivers (house sharers, not family members sharing cars) sharing my house here in Belvedere Drive - we park one on the driveway, and one on the road. We may not both be able to park in our own road if there is no separate allocation for residents. Secondly, I have noticed that drivers of large vehicles can see over the tops of parked cars in Belvedere Drive, and therefore go much more quickly than car drivers, as they can see when the 'coast is clear' in the bend down the road. I have repeatedly seen van drivers doing 40mph down Belvedere Drive, despite the road being full of parked cars. I do not think that car parking will meet the aim of traffic calming with this type of vehicle
16. I strongly object to my family's cars – and cars belonging to visitors to my house – being deliberately deployed as 'traffic calming measures'. My car has already been hit twice by 'hit and run' rat-runners causing over £1,000 of damage. Parking issues should be dealt with by reference to parking need, not with a view to creating physical barriers for rat-running traffic. If narrowing the road is effective to deter rat-runners, then width restrictions, build-outs and pinch points should be used rather than encouraging unsuspecting visitors to have their vehicles used for experimental traffic calming purposes. The proposal is, in any event, misconceived if the restrictions do not apply in Belvedere Drive until 9.30 a.m. - this will completely miss the morning peak time for rat-runners, between 7 a.m. and 9 a.m.. Similarly, if the variation of parking restrictions is intended to allow village shoppers to access the parking spaces, they will be gone by 6 p.m., around the time evening rat-running traffic hits Belvedere Drive. The Council's proposals here are unfortunately entirely consistent with its proposals generally in this matter – deploying inappropriate and unproven measures to address a problem for which there are clear and proven solutions

– e.g. access/turning restrictions and road closures. Whilst I believe that this proposal is misconceived, I suspect that increased numbers of parked cars will slow down through traffic and possibly cause frustrated drivers to use different routes. I therefore support the proposal in the absence of other more appropriate solutions to deal with the problem.

17. As these proposals relate to belvedere drive we believe they will result in accidents. When the parking bays are full belvedere Drive is already a single lane road. This doesn't stop people it but makes the junction they at both ends (St Mary's road and Wimbledon Hill Road) and with Belvedere Avenue extremely dangerous. This road is used regularly for and by school children waiting to (From school. We believe to change will result in accidents.

Belvedere Grove

1. it is hard enough to find a permit holders space within 100 meters (Courthope Road) often we already now have to go to Clement Road (250 meters away). Shared use could make it impossible to find one at all - Particularly if restrictions are launched on Church Road.
2. Sharing by Resident permits & permit holders I do not object to but pay & display definitely not. Permit holders returning would be unlikely to be able to park.
3. If more parking for visitors is essential it should not be at the expense of residents. Echelon parking with raised planting as in Kingston rat runs creates attractive logical use of wide roads where care is essential. Win win.
4. As it is we cannot park in our section of the road - it is full of VC permit holders. All the P&D slots are full by 9a, they should be made 2 hours not 5.
5. As residents we pay for resident parking in VoN. Other village areas have already the right to park in our area. If shared pay and display spaces will be scarce for residents, like us, as pensioners, who need spaces close to the house.
6. Visitors to residents would have difficulty trying to park.
7. Unnecessary and unfair on residents who pay for parking. There are always spare pay and display parking spaces short distance from High St, e.g. in Bel Ave.
8. Resident should have priority given for their parking needs.
9. I think it is unfair on residents who pay to have this change when pay and display parking spaces away from the high street begin in belvedere avenue etc are under used so unnecessary.
10. If you do this residents will never be able to park. Some bays must remain residents only. I have a disabled mother and am dependant on bays being available nearby. My neighbour is also disabled. Previously when bays were of mixed use we could not find parking spaces during the day and had to park in other streets well outside 50 metres from the house. Greater parking in my view will not affect the volume of traffic. It may just slow it down and in any event will not effect morning rush-hour as many shops are not open until 9.30am. We would be willing to compromise on parking to some extent if volumes were reduced.
11. Zone VOn is already available to zone VC and converting resident's bays to P&D will negate the Councils own intention in July 1998 that 'we intend that residents can normally park within 50m of their own home. If necessary P&D spaces will be converted to permit holders only' Please at least leave Clement Road for residents only --Please, please!
The change is too sweeping. Change a few bays at a time and study the impact.
12. Effectuated roads should decide for themselves.
13. The local residents need to be assured of parking near their homes.

Belvedere Square

1. Parking space in Belvedere Square is already insufficient. This deteriorated noticeably, when parking for non-residents was allowed after 6.30 pm as it is quite attractive to visitors of the Fire stable or other adjacent Pubs/Bars/Restaurants. It should be noted that it is a very narrow road and the frequency by which our car is damaged by other drivers (broken side mirror, broken rear lights, numerous scratches, etc.) is simply unacceptable, especially given that nobody feels obliged to pay for the damages caused. If

the number of 'anonymous' cars increases, the frequency of damages is bound to increase. Furthermore it is very difficult, if not impossible, to handle situations like returning from shopping with two little children and not being able to park anywhere near your house. Lastly, I understand the reason for introducing shared parking is to encourage parking in the roads affected to calm traffic. Obviously this is pointless in a cul-de-sac, why Belvedere Square should be definitely excluded from this rule.

2. Belvedere Square is a small congested area where none of the residents have garages and have to pay for parking which 'shared use' would make much more difficult. In addition, Belvedere Square is a no through road which many motorists fail to notice. This means there are frequent occasions when cars are trying to turn round in a small space, which is often difficult for large vehicles.
3. It is already very difficult for residents with permits to find a parking space in these areas, particularly Belvedere Square where there are only 12 bays and at least 15 residents with cars.
4. I live in Belvedere Square, pay for a parking permit and drive to work. Presently due to the 8.30am-6.30pm restrictions (Monday to Saturday) I very often do not get to park down my street (that I have paid a permit for) because I have to work late and get back after 6.30pm. Therefore those using the restaurant / bars are parking in my bay that I have paid for. Additionally this is even worse on Sundays. The new shared rules will ensure that the situation will get considerably worse for residents. If this goes ahead the residents should be given 'free' permits due to the considerable inconvenience this will cause, Alternatively the times should be 8.30am-8.30pm from Monday- Sunday and then be shared use.
5. As a current resident with a car, the parking is already difficult enough - if these bays become shared there will inevitably be less places for residents to use. Furthermore Belvedere Square is a difficult place to park, unless you are used to parking there. Increased use by non-residents will cause problems
6. There is insufficient parking for residents as it is. There is restricted width for parking resulting in many damaged cars. We would like to see more visits from traffic wardens in Belvedere Square.
7. Belvedere Square is too narrow for pay and display parking. (2 times this year I've had to repair dents to my car)
 1. There are not enough resident's spaces at the moment in Belvedere Sq and Old House Close.
 2. We want to discourage non-residents entering Belvedere Sq. It is too narrow and we have a permanent problem with UNSKILLED non-resident motorists looking for parking who get stuck, can not park, cannot 3 point turn, cannot reverse in a straight line to exit the Square. Everyday especially Thu/Fri/Sat evenings and Sundays and Bank Holydays we have people getting stuck and causing noise and damage to residents cars as they try to park or exit the street. It should be a quiet secure street

Burghley Road

1. Leaves it difficult for residents and their visitors to park.
2. 'Shared use' parking please
3. Any proposal which intends deliberately to reduce traffic flow by increasing road congestion is nonsense.
4. This disadvantages residents seeking to park. A maximum period of 9 paying hours so close to the station makes the Belvederes a commuter car park and encourages commuters to drive to those roads at peak hours possibly via Burghley. This proposal could INCREASE traffic volume for the whole area.

Calonne Road

1. See comments under 2
2. Some can be shared use but all is a step too far. Residents who go out driving in the day may not have any access to parking when they return.
3. The hours will prevent commuter parking.
4. Unnecessary proliferation of unsightly road furniture which necessitates motorists stopping to read as there is no uniformity in parking times.
5. We are worried, however, that this proposal will actually encourage visitors to Wimbledon Village to bring their cars thus increasing traffic volume.
6. This measure will lead to problems for residents who should have a right to park outside their own house. Mothers with young children who need to do a school run will have constant difficulties finding a space and loading and unloading their children. Disadvantaging residents to 'solve' a traffic issue does not make any

Cedar Court

1. Particularly Lancaster Road - there seems to be so many unused permit holder only spaces and so few shared use, could be shared use.

Church Road

1. Time should be a least 2 hrs minimum for visitors to the village, 1 hour is totally insufficient time.
2. Keep unrestricted pay and display in Church Road etc to eliminate the need. Businesses and residents have restricted parking and we know where we can/can't park and it works OK. Visitors to the area should have specific designated pay and display areas/ partially shared-use areas rather than a free for all as this is not fair to residents/businesses otherwise.
3. Please build a car park under the common or on the never used S Mary's church parcel of land. The Church could make money everyday not just in the tennis fortnight. This will help the local people park near their house or flat as the permit bays wont be taken up by people wishing to shop, as is proposed in Belvedere Square, and let's people wanting to visit the shops park without thinking I'm not going to Wimbledon village because I cant find a space. You have already ruined all the small independent shops with extortionately high rates and a lack of parking. Soon all there will be is KFC, Burger King and Carphone Warehouse. How dumber down can we go.
4. This is a ludicrous suggestion. Most of the permit holder bays are off the main road and their occupancy or otherwise will have no effect whatsoever on traffic movement. What possible justification can there be for local residents (and there are a huge number of families with small children and the elderly in the area) to lose the certainty they currently have that they will be able to park somewhere near where they live.

This is ridiculous. Where are residents going to park? We are not all wealthy enough to be able to afford off - road parking - We are ? Dr's outside London & need cars for commuting to hospital.

5. It is essential that residents are able to find parking spaced. The removal of these bays would have a greater adverse impact on local residents' quality of life than traffic does.

Church Road

1. Definitely not! Resident permit parking is fully used now by residents who have paid for the permits. There are no extra parking areas available from 8.30-6.30pm daily
2. For those of us living in the small, and mostly terraced house without drives, on or around the High Street end of Church Road, competition between residents and visitors for parking is already keen. I live on Church Road and am lucky if I can get a space in Belvedere Square (my nearest residents only option). I often have to use Lancaster Road or Lancaster Gardens and because most of the spaces there are 'shared' it is not infrequently impossible to find a space. There is some confusion as to whether Old House Close is available to me (this goes back some years and has never been clarified) so my next option is Belvedere Avenue, which is also mostly share and quite a long way from my house. I feel very strongly that all the existing residents only bays should be retained and that only the additional bays should be 'shared'.
3. A significant number of resident permit and permit holder bays should be retained for their exclusive use - preferably all of them. Any new bays could be designated for shared use.
4. Changes to Old House Close parking for residents would be catastrophic. My house is part of the close & my back gate opens onto a parking space I can use for my car my garage in the garage area is too small & positioned where if all residents tried to park I could not reach it. I am disabled & would have to sell my car.
5. Please refer to rider attached
6. A significant number of resident permit and permit holder bays should be retained for their exclusive use - preferably all of them. Any new bays could be designated for shared use.

Clement Road

1. What's the use of residents parking if it is not reserved?
2. There is already insufficient parking for residents in the Belvedere area; however if the rat-running was stopped it would be possible to create many new parking bays in the Belvederes for use by those visiting the village shops.

3. There is already a shortage of spaces for residents which has been made worse by the extension of the usage to VC - this is only going to get worse anyway. Parking hours are nothing to do with rat-running traffic.

Coach House Lane

1. The confusion between resident and pay parking bays should rightly be abolished.

Courthope Road

1. I have photographic evidence of parking bays full of residents only at 11.45am Friday 7th August - this is normal in Courthope Road. Shared use will cause more traffic looking for spaces - residents will not be able to park near their own premises. We will be just in line for shoppers in the daytime and restaurants and pub visitors in the evening as we are nearest the Village - more noise and a lack of security. As the road is very often fully parked with residents at present the new proposals will contribute nothing to traffic calming - quite the opposite.
2. It is already very difficult to park as a resident outside my house. This will make friends & family visits very stressful
3. I have a very specific comment in relation to Highbury Road and regarding one parking bay within it: I currently live at 14 Courthope Road but am soon due to move into 1 Highbury Road which I now own. My comments beneath relate to 1 Highbury Road, therefore. In summary, your drawing no. 2 shows a parking bay on what is currently an existing crossover for the driveway into 1 Highbury Road. The crossover has been there for many years and when we move in we will of course need to use it. 1 Highbury Road's driveway has hardly been used for 3 years because no-one has lived there. This will now change. The parking bay in question is the fourth and most northerly of the 4 bays outside 1 Highbury Road in drawing no. 2. I have no objection the other three bays being used either for residents or on a shared use basis, but as things stand when we move into our new house we will not be able, because of the fourth bay on your drawing no. 2, to access our driveway in the way that all other Highbury Road residents can. We will of course be able to park both of our cars in our driveway assuming we have access whereas a bay built on our crossover would only accommodate one car - so all ways round I would suggest that the council is better off amending its plans and removing entirely from drawing no. 2 the fourth bay.

Currie Hill Close

1. Old House Close to narrow and congested for shared parking. 5 hour parking in Lancaster Road would fill up with shop / office workers meaning fewer shoppers / less revenue for shops.
2. Excellent! most residents are able to park off street.

Dora Road

1. These parking bays are usually occupied throughout the day. I use this road a lot as due to traffic restrictions in Woodside one can no longer turn right up the hill. Lots of people have this problem & thus use Belvedere. Turning right up Wimbledon Hill was never a problem for anyone as there is a constant queuing here in any ?.
2. And where would the residents park?
3. To long hours, to short a length of stay (1 hour) no good for lunch in local restaurant/pub think about them too or shopping.

Glendale Drive

1. Max stay limited to no more than 3 hours. Reduce parking bays in Belvedere Drive in close proximity to the raised entry within St Marys Road.

High Street

1. Any increase in pay & display parking will be very welcome - A common complaint from our customers is insufficient parking bays.
2. Parking is already very difficult in this area, if anything residents parking should be increased to 10pm
3. The reality is that Courthope Road is full most of the time, 24/7. One wonders if all the current users are actual resident and not business users. If you add up the housing units on the block bounded by the High Street, Courthope Road and the bits of Church Road and Belvedere Grove adjacent to those spaces allocated to Resident use and compare that number with the number of Resident's Permits sold by Merton Council, I suspect that there is a questionable practice already; and now you want to take more money to sell those spaces again!
4. Time plates to read maximum 4/5 hours (not 9)

High Street Mews

1. Insufficient bays at present for permit holders

Highbury Road

1. We suggest maximum stay of 4 hours with no return within 1 hour, to prevent all day parking. eg during tennis fortnight
2. This is a highly residential area -but should understand some increase in ? use bays (i.e. in permit holder bays) No decrease in residential permit holder bays
3. The only change we would make is to take away all parking in Church Road except for loading and unloading outside rush hour traffic times. Other from this change we would keep parking as it is at the moment in roads other than Church Road.
4. This is against council policy inconvenient to residents make of developers car park the problem which parking bays were claimed to eliminate safety issues for pedestrians inappropriate for conservation area
5. Since you are using a map that does not show our house, now over 10 years old, or the 2 new houses nearing completion next door to us, it is impossible to have any confidence in your proposals.
6. It is essential for all residents to be able to park a short distance only from their house. we pay handsomely for the privilege.
7. I object to the conversion of existing 'Permit Holder' parking bays to 'Shared Use' parking bays in Highbury Road. This encourages non-residents to use the road as a car park, especially for Wimbledon Station. I also object to the placing of 2 posts outside number 11 Highbury Road as shown on drawing 2 as 2 red dots. The character of the village is profoundly affected by the over-zealous use of signs, and to have 2 outside a single house is completely unacceptable.
8. This is absolutely wrong. It will positively add to traffic congestion as it will encourage new drivers (non-residents) to drive into the roads, effectively using them as car parks, especially for Wimbledon station. It will also deprive residents of their parking amenity, which they already pay for, and so raises the question whether this is really a back door revenue raising scheme for the Council? Finally, and most importantly, encouraging parking will create serious safety issues by significantly reducing both pedestrian and vehicle visibility in these small roads. Accidents are bound to occur.
9. See attached letter

Home Park Road

1. I believe this will lead to the terrible risks which exist now in Home Park Rd. during the day when drivers cannot see small children or animals crossing by mistake. My dog was killed immediately outside the gates of Wimbledon Park in Home Park Rd. The driver said that due to the cars parked on both sides of the road, he could not see my dog.
2. I would support this proposal if it includes cycle provision. Major issue is that there is no provision for cycling in this street proposal or the Wimbledon area traffic study proposal as a whole. This is a major oversight of strategic proportions. This scheme is about balancing the through traffic needs with needs of

businesses and residents. How can it not include any cycle provision which would reduce car usage and facilitate local mobility. I for example cycle my children from my Home park road to a school off the Ridgeway. There is no cycle provision (Cycle lanes etc) along this route even though there are about nine schools off the Ridgeway! The school runs traffic is a major traffic generator and this proposal does not include anything to facilitate safely to the schools (through the area this proposal covers). In fact if I have read it correctly this proposal removes cycle provision (e.g on Wimbledon hill road!). This scheme needs to redesign to include cycle lanes through the roads this scheme covers. For example the below get you to schools along the Ridgeway from the east of the Bevederes 1 cycle lane along Arthur road, Alan Road, Belvedere avenue, Bevedere grove, and Ridgeway 2 cycle lane along Arthur road, St Mary's road, Church road, Bevedere grove, and Ridgeway, Southside common and back down some roads to Ridgeway (e.g Clifton Road)

Homefield Road

1. There is a case for some conversion but it is unfair for residents reliant on permit spaces to lose all of the spaces dedicated to them and for which they pay! How far you go with this should be influenced by 6 below - create more spaces! Space

Kenilworth Avenue

1. More parking which commences at 9.30am would help with errands & shopping in the village.
2. To enable use of village shops etc I would suggest 11.30am-6pm. I have used the village less and less because of the cost of parking. It can seem like a ghost town during midweek which is a shame
3. But 20 minutes free parking everywhere please.

Lake Road

1. Removing residents only parking bays very unfair to residents as parking opportunities so limited in area already. Residents pay for the right to park in front of their houses (up £10 in 2 years, and increase of 10% per year) they should at least have available parking spaces
2. As I always walk to the village (instead of using my car) I see my route from a pedestrian perspective. I believe the residents of these roads are far better qualified to answer these questions as they have first hand knowledge of who uses these parking bays

Lambourne Avenue

1. Great for shoppers though I don't know if this would affect ability of residents to park near their houses

Lancaster Gardens

1. In many areas, residents rely on these parking spaces for their own cars. Parking zones are small therefore many people live near the boundaries of zones, which adds to the difficulty of finding spaces. Conversion of parking bays would be a particular problem in Lancaster Road, as spaces are used by residents of Church Road as well as residents of Lancaster Road. Only new parking bays should be designated as shared use.
2. See comments question 1

Lancaster place

1. I live in Lancaster Place which is a private road which is much impacted by these proposals. I suggest the parking space outside 3 Lancaster Road should be for loading only to serve the 12 or so businesses in Lancaster Place and thus help reduce congestion for the 30 odd frontages in Lancaster Place.

Lancaster Road

1. I am a resident and it is already difficult to park with residents only. This would not be good idea. I pay money every year to park my car. I would not be happy with 'shared use' parking
2. There are insufficient bays most of the time for residents and sharing use will only worsen availability even with the new proposed bays. As a mother of twins it can be very difficult when there isn't enough space.
3. Currently all bays are filled every day and evening with resident permit holders. If this facility is ? we will be forced to park on the common or at least along way from our house locating other permit holder bays.
4. It is already difficult at the High Street end of Lancaster Road, converting to shared use will make it impossible because there are only a handful of spaces.
5. Converting the parking to 'shared use' will massively increase traffic in these roads and will encourage people to drive to the shops, knowing they can use these streets for parking. Some of these streets are currently safe for children to play because of low traffic volumes. These proposals will destroy that. I am strongly opposed.
6. No more shared use parking bays are needed.
7. As residents of Lancaster Road, there are already not enough bays even for residents. We have huge problems trying to park outside our house even though we have paid for our permits in Lancaster Avenue. It is a quiet road with an old people's home opposite. Shared bays would increase traffic and make road unsafe for elderly who wake up each day. Lorries with supplies turn into Lancaster Avenue would make it impossible to use pavement. Our house is an old Edwardian house - the front garden and drive are not large enough to have more than 1 small car in it. We do not wish to pave over the garden either, against current government policy and also it would ruin the look of the street. We therefore need our residents permit space and should be entitled to keep it.
8. Lancaster Road would simply become a car park for High Street businesses & shoppers. Residents would be seriously effected & quality of life decline.
9. It is already very difficult to park in Lancaster Road, even with a resident's permit as so many businesses park here. It will be impossible to park close to the house if residents are converted. This appears to be a money making exercise by the council. We already have to pay to park outside our own house. We should be able to continue to do so.
10. Insufficient spaces for residents if visitors use all spaces. This will result in even more traffic as residents cruise round looking for parking places.
11. As residents of Lancaster Road we do NOT agree with the proposal to convert all existing Resident Permit and Permit holder bays to Shared Use and to create more parking bays in the bounded area, and on Lancaster Road in particular, for the following reasons: 1) An influx of cars into Lancaster Road is a cause for concern because of the large number of families with young children and the existence of two care homes for the elderly in the area. Many homes have recently changed hands and many families with young children have moved into the area (including ours). The neighbourhood children ride their bikes on the road and run from house to house playing. They walk along the road to and from school and to walk their dogs. The addition of pay and display parking bays would increase the number of cars using the road. Impatient drivers late for appointments in the village would turn the road into a cut through which would threaten the safety of the children. The elderly residents of the two care homes on the road use their Zimmer frames to walk into the village to shop or have coffee. They have to cross Lancaster Road to get to the village and are moving at a very slow pace which makes them easy targets for cars. The most dangerous point on Lancaster Road is where it bears left (a right turn brings cars into Lancaster Gardens). It is here that cars travelling from Church Road turn very quickly into the road which is a blind spot and an accident waiting to happen. An increase in traffic will increase that risk of an accident. 2) Currently it is a struggle for residents of Lancaster Road to find parking close to our homes. Particularly during the school year there is competition with business permit holders for the spaces close to our homes. When you have small children a space close to your house is essential. As it stands it can be difficult to get parking close to home. We pay a large sum to have residents' parking permits and shared use bays would discriminated against those who have paid a considerable amount to have residents' parking. And what about the guest permits that we have paid for? Those would become almost useless with the pay and display spaces being taken up by others. 3) Late night noise and nuisance would increase on Lancaster Road with shared use parking and additional parking. Currently there is a problem on the road with patrons of Village bars and pubs parking on the single yellow lines and returning to their cars late at night when residents are already asleep. These bar and pub patrons return to their cars noisily, yelling and loudly banging car doors without any consideration for the residents who have young children sleeping and jobs to go to in the morning. 4) Currently the recycling lorry and rubbish disposal lorry park on a yellow

line on Lancaster Road about half an hour before commencing collecting recycling and then rubbish. Should you turn that into additional parking there will be no place for the lorry to park and wait. It would be forced to park in the middle of the street thus holding up traffic on the road. 5) Additional parking on Lancaster Road would also affect our ability to get in and out of our drives. This is clear on Sunday when the road is full of cars parking on the single yellow line. Negotiating the way in and out of our drives becomes extremely difficult when there are cars parked on either side of the entrance and across the street as well. 6) Lancaster Avenue is a private road where Lee house, a care home for elderly women, is located. The care home has regular food service deliveries by large trucks. These trucks have to carefully negotiate turning through automated gates in and out of Lancaster Avenue from Lancaster Road. Additional parking on either side of the entrance of Lancaster Avenue on Lancaster Road would limit the trucks' ability to turn safely into the road. 7) There are a number of Council-run homes for the elderly at the top of Lancaster Road on the Wimbledon High Street end. Many of the residents of these houses have hot meals delivered. The vans have to have a place to stop and park so that they can unload the hot meals and deliver them to the residents. Replacing the residents parking with shared use would mean that those spaces providing a safe place for the van to stop and deliver would no longer be guaranteed.

For all of these reasons we feel that replacing the current parking with pay and display shared use would create major problems for the residents of the road as well as for the services that should be able to access them without delay. This would occur all along the road. If you want to slow cars down please consider speed bumps but please do not give drivers a reason to enter roads and create new problems.

12. Re-Lancaster Road-We already have difficulty parking in bays now- imagine if we have to share with non residents. At weekends we find it virtually impossible to get in and out of our drives because of the cars on the road. The refuse collectors would suffer as would the delivery lorries who turn into Lancaster Ave. (Reversing). More cars would mean more noise and we share the road with the elderly and the very young who play in the street. The ambulance needs to stop in the road for the elderly - where would they stop and start.
13. The only space I can find near where I live in 43 Lancaster Road is in permit bays. You must preserve bays for people who live in the various roads. You must increase the number of bays to take the parking load caused by rush-hour closures in Church Road. May I suggest that any new shared bays in Lancaster Road are capped at 2 hours, not 5 hours to prevent blocking of bays for residents and businesses who need a degree of protection from the onslaught. You must create new bays in the empty sections of the road, as projected in your Map 3. By all means allocate these to shared use but please save my space for the daily home usage.

Landgrove Road

1. Too many different times in small area. Need to standardise parking times to avoid confusion.

Lawson Close

1. Not in Belvedere Square - Not enough space for residents and no turning should be no entry except residents. Parked cars all scraped by non residents looking for parking.

Leeward Gardens

1. The entry to Belvedere Drive from Wimbledon Hill Road combined with elimination of access from Alexandra Road by restricting entry to it to buses would place residents of & visitors to Leeward Gardens at a serious long term disadvantage.
2. As above
3. A survey should be conducted on residents only parking bays everywhere. When bays are used less than 50% by residents they should be made shared.
4. Belvedere Dr is quite difficult to drive along as it is, and I think the proposal to put additional parking bays near its junction with Wimbledon Hill Rd will not help.

Leopold Avenue

1. As you can see I am undecided since there are some parts e.g. Old House Close where they do not have room for off road parking and so using their car might not find a parking place on their return, making it necessary to drive some distance to find one.

Leopold Road

1. Encourages more traffic - should be left for residents.

Margin Drive

1. The village atmosphere is maintained by its local population & shops rely on this for the majority of the year (2 weeks of tennis excepted). Making parking harder for locals is a step backwards.

Marryat Road

1. There is not enough parking for Wimbledon people - priority must be given to residents.
2. Perhaps some residents feel they don't have enough access.
3. See comment 12
4. On condition Marryat road gets similar treatment
5. As comment Q2
6. I think a one hour stay is unrealistic and too short. A two hour limit would be better.
7. Absolutely not. Residents have to park near their homes for all the obvious reasons. These bays are already abused, privileges are sadly lost at night when the majority of working residents return home to park and then struggle to do so anywhere near their homes. Abuse of bays by traders or people working in Village using residents addresses continues unchecked despite me bringing it to the attention of the relevant council dept.

Old House Close

1. Old House Close was one of four roads in the area where it was agreed that Residents only parking was appropriate given the density of housing in the area and lack of off road parking. This concession was established when controlled parking was introduced and this concession should remain, as all spaces in Old House Close are still regularly occupied. Residents of each street in the area should speak for themselves.
2. We live in Old House Close, and there is so little parking anyway. Very difficult for myself as I have small children, and it's so hard to find a space outside. The garage area near us has very little space.
3. As a resident of 5 Old House Close I and my family vehemently object to this. We already take cars from residents of Walnut Tree Cottages, Church Road and Belvedere Square who cannot park in their streets. We are not a through road, but a close of families with children, and elderly residents and have difficulty in finding space for our own cars. Nos 38 and 36 Church Road have back access to Old House close which parking already prohibits and should be made specific to those houses (one resident is disabled). We would be plagued by a flow of cars looking for parking spaces, noisy and
4. especially against the Old House Close parking proposal. Parking is already quite difficult for people living in the close and opening the parking spaces to public will increase traffic making the close more dangerous. Many roads have off road parking, but
5. I live in Old House Close and this is ridiculous. It is not a rat run, there is no off-street parking suitable for modern cars (our garages are too small) and the proposal would increase traffic in this quiet cul-de-sac.
6. 1. It is not fair to residents of Church Road to increase traffic on this road. The road is not designed to take more traffic. In addition the pavements are too narrow and it is dangerous enough already as a pedestrian.
2 As a resident of Old House Close.

Parkside

1. Make parking at least 4 hours so that it encourages people to have lunch & shop in the village - Increase trade locally
2. Resident parking is exactly that ... not for NON residents
3. There needs to be more parking generally - the times needs to be monitored.

Parkside Avenue

1. (But subject to local residents positive agreement in respect of bays in Belvedere Avenue at north end.)
2. NO all far to complicated, as said above Abolish all parking except for 1 hour metered times for shoppers.

Peek Crescent

1. Residents deserve priority.

Rostrevor Road

1. I do not think it wise to increase parking in Belvedere Drive between Belvedere Avenue & Wimbledon Hill because the bend in that section makes visibility difficult.

Somerset Road

1. Particularly Lancaster Road - there seems to be so many unused permit holder only spaces and so few shared use, could be shared use.
2. More public parking - agreed.
3. Although not for all areas - some areas barely have enough parking for residents (where homes haven't driveways) eg. Old House Close.
4. Reasonable
5. Where will residents or business permit holders park??

Springfield Road

1. Residents in densely populated area should have priority.

St Aubyn's Avenue

1. No need to change existing arrangements
2. What you are proposing is to deliberately increase congestion and inconvenience in the area by making it 'parked-up' on both sides by paying meter users and making roads effectively impassable by two way traffic. This is dangerous and inconvenient to residents, there is no logic to it, and the misery is not a price local residents wish to pay for a dubious reduction in traffic flow.
3. Residents who pay for parking permits at considerable cost should have specific spaces as at present.

St Mary's Road

1. What happens outside of the time plate hours and on week-ends? These roads are so narrow at the best of times.
2. Disagree with the time plates for Belvedere Drive, Highbury Road and Alan Road allowing parking for 9 hours - keep the max at 5 hours
3. Making permit holder bays shared is designed to help trade in the area. A five hour maximum period is therefore excessive. Three hours should be sufficient at the most.

4. I agree that additional pay and display parking is required if the bays on Church Road are restricted, but not all resident bays in the area need to be converted, particularly those furthest away from the southern end of Church Road. I understand the desire to be consistent throughout the area, but I don't think it is necessary as there is no consistency at the moment and clear signage is always the best way to explain parking restrictions. In particular, if you allow people to park for 9 hours, this allows commuters to park in the village for the day and use the train station. A blanket change to resident parking seems unfair on local residents. !
5. Many residents in the area have insufficient off-street parking (eg Belvedere Close) and rely on the nearby residents bays, including local families and the elderly. Such residents should be given priority over other issues such as traffic calming and availability of parking for shoppers etc. I think that all existing resident bays should remain.
6. Exclusive use parking bays are an important facility for local residents. It would be potentially inconvenience local residents if all the bays were changed to shared use.
7. But there should be adequate resident parking for houses with no off street parking up in southern segment of Church Road.

Vineyard Hill Road

1. It should be up to those whose houses space is affected.
2. If there's enough parking for residents in these roads, if not no.
3. All time plates should be the same time - 9.30am-6.30pm, otherwise confusing.
4. I prefer it to stay the same, but feel this changes is up to residents.
5. Probably longer than necessary. It is really only relevant during the morning school run
6. But will there still be 20mph free?

Walham Rise

1. 1. Should be a right turn coming up the hill into both Woodside & Belvedere Drive. 2. Everyday cars coming up the hill turn round illegally half way up the hill to re-enter Woodside as a left turn

Walnut Tree Cottages

1. Possibly a limited number in carefully selected areas - the 5 bays at the south end of Lancaster Road would be an example.
2. This is mainly a residential area, so 'shared use parking' would affect as all.

Wimbledon Hill Road

3. I feel 9 hrs on a time plate is a bit long to let people park for. I would prefer 5hrs or 2hrs. If people are residents they have to have priority parking. It is unacceptable for someone who lives in the area and who has paid for a permit to not be able to park near their homes

Woodside

1. Up to 6pm
2. Could ? to make more shared bays available. Bad idea too waste money on the time plates.
3. I should not be allowed to make this decision. It should be determined by the individuals living on these local access roads.

Comments in relation to Question 6,7&8**Alan Road**

1. 7. Raised entry treatment at junctions are a complete waste of money. It makes no difference to driving.
8a. This junction has already got a raised entry. 8b. It would be a waste of money.
2. Alan Rd traffic situation currently very dangerous for small children. Alan Rd is major through road where drivers accelerate significantly. Oaktree Nursury is located at the end of Alan Rd.
3. Alan road/ St Marys already have narrowing inspite of this traffic from Arthur road into Alan road treat the two roads as one
4. Again the measures will not address the issue of through traffic in a meaningful way. They may slow traffic (with the undesirable consequences set out in my answer to Q and 3 above) but the effect on volume is unlikely to be achievable. No evidence has been produced to support the contention of volume decreases mentioned in the consultation document.
5. presumably means a bigger raised entry treatment as there is one already however this is inadequate and needs to be developed to stop vehicles whizzing round the corner from St Marys into Alan Road
6. They will look nice, but do nothing to reduce traffic. They might if there were 6' 6" width restrictions too in both places
7. 8a What is needed is a buildout of the curbs to narrow the road - as there is at the other end of Alan Road. This is a dangerous corner which many cars take at speed, coming from Arthur Road, often without signalling a left turn. 8b Not necessary.
8. Alan Rd already has a speed cushion...it does not work- 4x4 don't notice it, some traffic makes loud scraping noise, most do not slow or indicate turning at speed on to Alan Rd from the St Marys roundabouts. We do not want any more parking in Alan Road, especially at the St Marys road end as it is very difficult already to safely pull in and out of our driveways for the reasons listed above, without any more reduction of visibility

Alexandra Road

1. See comments above
2. See Q2, Q3 & Q4

Alwyne Road

1. People are buying bigger cars. Perhaps some bays should be specially for small cars only to discourage people from buying massive 4 x 4 to take their children down the road to school. The children will grow up to be obese and unhealthy.
2. Re 6. Provided it doesn't make cycling more hazardous.

Arthur Road

1. I think a raised entry on Belvedere Drive may pose safety issues when vehicles travelling up Wimbledon Hill Road are turning into the road, although hopefully the 20mph limit will slow traffic coming down the hill.
2. I believe raised entry treatments help to slow traffic down without the need for excessive measures such as regular speed humps.
3. Too close to existing roundabout.
4. 7. this will cause immense increase in danger to users as traffic enters and leaves Belvedere grove, being forced to negotiate these awkward configurations. This happens at the Ridgeway arrangements already. 8 These junctions work perfectly well at present. There is no excessive speed at this junction and the present raised area already causes discomfort to small vehicles and consequent added pollution.

5. Belvedere Avenue and church road junction will have increased danger with this proposal, as drivers concentrate on dealing with the upheaval, causing danger to pedestrians and following vehicles in church road. There is no proven problem in these locations. Leave well alone.
6. It seems unnecessary to have additional spaces in Alan Road.
7. Unnecessary. Traffic is already going slowly as drivers are aware of tricky turns, narrow roads and parked cars.
8. They are very expensive for very little effect and cause damage to car suspension.
9. None of these raised features will make a difference in slowing the traffic down as it is now it is impossible to drive fast at these junctions anyway. Changes of this type are a complete and disgraceful waste of residents council tax. What is the real reason for such pointless proposals ?
10. This is likely to cause more inconvenience for residents and more traffic as people are attracted to the road looking for parking places. It could also be dangerous, drivers are courteous to each other at present but tempers could fray if you cause more congestion.
11. There is no need for these. Traffic is already slow and careful at Alan Road/St Mary's Road because of the road narrowing undertaken some years ago. The junction of Belvedere Av w/ Church Road already required traffic to be cautious. These proposals are a waste of money if implemented.

Belvedere Avenue

1. These treatments need to be applied consistently to all the key roads on the Belvederes to avoid traffic displacement and ,therefore, should include Belvedere Drive and Highbury Road
2. I think 'raised entry' is a waste of money. It actually looks nice but does nothing
3. Waste of public money. Ineffective in reducing traffic volumes
4. Agreement to 7 and 8a and 8b only because best of a series of poor proposals. Their impact on volume likely to be very marginal - and speed is not an issue.
5. Raised entry treatment slows traffic so seriously that huge queues form causing general local chaos and more pollution

Belvedere Drive

1. Through traffic will not be discouraged by use of artificially created hazards while the Wimbledon Hill problems remain unresolved (eg. non synchronised traffic lights). Cyclists will be disadvantaged.
2. More parking bays = more chaos
3. The whole area is infested with traffic road controls that are a danger and unnecessary
4. 'Raised entry' will have no effect on volume of traffic. I would like to see width reduction together with chicanes to reduce volume and speed of traffic. Why are we not offered alternatives i.e. gates or 'no turn' signs?
5. 6) It depends what kind of parking bays 7) The raised entry treatment at the other end of the road has had minimal affect on speed 8) as in 7 - will this really slow drivers down?
6. Why not - Anything is better than nothing. Please note: Though that the raised entry and narrowing of road at St Marys Road end of Belvedere Drive is going to result in accidents - cars swing wide turning into Belvedere Drive (coming up the Hill) I alone have witnessed several close shaves
7. makes no difference to volume of traffic
8. But raised entry treatments make little or no difference to the volume of traffic.
9. I am surprised that a conservative controlled council is ? with a pressure survey to favour, Belvedere Drive, Belvedere Avenue, Belvedere Square and Alan Road so putting up the value of their houses. Roads have been built to be used. The roads are restricted to traffic ? means the traffic moves to the next door roads causing congestion elsewhere. The more roads which are kept open means the more steady flow of traffic. People should have done their homework before buying houses in these particular roads as they have always been heavy ?

10. These treatments do not encourage drivers to slow down, as I have seen in Belvedere Drive. I would think that a width restriction would be preferable over the entry treatments and parking bays as a way to calm traffic. Could we have speed cameras to ensure the 20 mph limit ?
11. 6 I think there should be a more thorough analysis as to whether increasing shared use parking bays will disadvantage local residents. However, the bays in Belvedere Drive are rarely full during the day so I would have no objection to increasing shared use. And I would have no objection in seeking to find additional parking spaces in the area, whether to use for residents only or shared use (although they may be hard to find!). 7 The raised entry treatment at the junction of Belvedere Drive and St Mary's Road has been completely ineffective in terms of deterring rat-running traffic and the speed at which it travels. I understand that may not be the principal purpose of a raised entry – rather the raised entry provides a physical warning that you are entering a 20 mph zone. I believe this objective is completely inadequate – the raised entry should operate as a genuine physical deterrent, both to deter rat-running traffic and slow it down on entry. If a raised entry is to be installed, its design should ensure that it is a proper deterrent, rather than a token effort to indicate to the driver that a 20 mph zone is coming up. The existing raised entry at Belvedere Drive should be modified to achieve this objective.
12. The huge amount of money by this conservative council on traffic calming measures is quite ridiculous. These credit crunch times - especially as the council is in debt - money should be ? on the roads & come of the elderly, schools and nursing services
13. The majority of the parking bays in Belvedere Drive should be reserved for residents only and these should be at least one parking bay for the disabled. Parking should be for a maximum of 5 hours, otherwise the parking will be used by commuters for 9 hours.
14. I absolutely disagree with making parking for 9 hours on Belvedere Drive - to open the way to commuter parking is an absolute misuse of council powers - it will make access to roads parking impossible for residents - it will encourage more use of roads & is potentially not green - Turn Belvederes into parking lot. This is totally ? ?
15. The whole point of us achieving resident's parking was to stop commuters leaving their cars outside our house for 12 or more hours a day. Even though this new idea doesn't start till 9.30 it still offers later commuters a chance to leave their cars for 9 hours. And we pay a considerable amount for residents parking - presumably this will not be reduced if the new scheme is introduced
16. As there proposals relate to belvedere drive we believe they will result in accidents. When the parking bays are full belvedere Drive is already a single lane road. This doesn't stop people it but makes the junction they at both ends (St Marys road and Wimbledon Hill Road)and with Belvedere Avenue extremely dangerous. This road is used regularly for and by school children waiting to (From school. We believe to change will result in accidents.
17. This will only encourage commuters to park all day and block up spaces for local residents. At the very least implement what H+Fulham do, which is restricted hours ie only from 10am to 3pm for non-residents or a restriction of 2 hours for non-residents etc. The argument that a fuller road of parked cars will restrict traffic is ridiculous. Also would strongly suggest putting in something to curtail speed of cars coming down Wimbledon Hill into Belvedere Drive - they scream into Belvedere Drive at high speeds which is a high density crossing for pedestrians to Wimbledon station. Somebody will get hurt, it's only a matter of time - we see it all the time from our house!!!!
18. Firstly, there are two separate car drivers (house sharers, not family members sharing cars) sharing my house here in Belvedere Drive - we park one on the driveway, and one on the road. We may not both be able to park in our own road if there is no separate allocation for residents.

Secondly, I have noticed that drivers of large vehicles can see over the tops of parked cars in Belvedere Drive, and therefore go much more quickly than car drivers, as they can see when the 'coast is clear' in the bend down the road. I have repeatedly seen van drivers doing 40mph down Belvedere Drive, despite the road being full of parked cars. I do not think that car parking will meet the aim of traffic calming with this type of vehicle
19. I strongly object to my family's cars – and cars belonging to visitors to my house – being deliberately deployed as "traffic calming measures". My car has already been hit twice by "hit and run" rat-runners causing over £1,000 of damage. Parking issues should be dealt with by reference to parking need, not with a view to creating physical barriers for rat-running traffic. If narrowing the road is effective to deter rat-runners, then width restrictions, build-outs and pinch points should be used rather than encouraging unsuspecting visitors to have their vehicles used for experimental traffic calming purposes. The proposal is, in any event, misconceived if the restrictions do not apply in Belvedere Drive until 9.30 a.m. - this will completely miss the morning peak time for rat-runners, between 7 a.m. and 9 a.m.. Similarly, if the variation of parking restrictions is intended to allow village shoppers to access the parking spaces, they will

be gone by 6 p.m., around the time evening rat-running traffic hits Belvedere Drive. The Council's proposals here are unfortunately entirely consistent with its proposals generally in this matter – deploying inappropriate and unproven measures to address a problem for which there are clear and proven solutions – eg access/turning restrictions and road closures. Whilst I believe that this proposal is misconceived, I suspect that increased numbers of parked cars will slow down through traffic and possibly cause frustrated drivers to use different routes. I therefore support the proposal in the absence of other more appropriate solutions to deal with the problem.

Belvedere Grove

1. Have a look at current schemes - people drive right through, often faster.
2. Please see my comments at number 3 & 4. I would have to consider legal action against the council if I was prevented from reaching or leaving my home. Speed cameras, would expect to slow traffic & banning of commercial vehicles over a certain weight.
3. See comment box above for the attractive answer to street parking - as such the raised entry treatment does not slow traffic enough if the cut through does not enforce 10 mph care. Echelon parking ensures traffic calming, visitor parking and income.
4. Width restriction in Belvedere Drive would be helpful as they have more large vehicles passing through.
5. Parking daytime seems sufficient. Out of hours visitors fill every available yellow line space anyway. Raised entry tables are a matter for residents in the streets affected.
6. These proposals will not reduce rat running significantly if at all.
7. Measures to reduce speed in Q8 are welcome but not encouraging MORE cars to seek/find car parking spaces.
8. but always with the approval of these roads residents
9. Anything that can be done to reduce traffic would be welcome. However it is unlikely as the council already knows, that these raised entry do reduce traffic or even speed. Please give us some proposals to reduce volume. You have spent enough money on consultants. You must be able to come up with some alternative proposals which will reduce volume.
10. None of these proposals address the problem of traffic volumes. There is already a raised platform at the Alan Road/St Marys road entrance and all it does is increase noise and make a dangerous corner worse.
11. It is hard enough to find a permit holders space within 100 meters (Courthope Road) often we already now have to go to Clement Road (250 meters away). Shared use could make it impossible to find one at all - Particularly if restrictions are launched on Church Road.
12. Zone VOn is already available to zone VC and converting resident's bays to P&D will negate the Councils own intention in July 1998 that "we intend that residents can normally park within 50m of their own home. If necessary P&D spaces will be converted to permit holders only" Please at least leave Clement Road for residents only --Please, please!
13. If you do this residents will never be able to park. Some bays must remain residents only. I have a disabled mother and am dependant on bays being available nearby. My neighbour is also disabled. Previously when bays were of mixed use we could not find parking spaces during the day and had to park in other streets well outside 50 metres from the house. Greater parking in my view will not affect the volume of traffic. It may just slow it down and in any event will not effect morning rush-hour as many shops are not open until 9.30am. We would be willing to compromise on parking to some extent if volumes were reduced.

Belvedere Square

1. Raised entry treatment damages cars & vehicle, slows down emergency services, and are noisy. They do little to slow down the traffic.
2. Any of the above proposals would result in more noise, pollution and from traffic slowing down and revving up, thus be detrimental to the village atmosphere

3. As a current resident with a car, the parking is already difficult enough - if these bays become shared there will inevitably be less places for residents to use. Furthermore Belvedere Square is a difficult place to park, unless you are used to parking there. Increased use by non-residents will cause problems
4. Belvedere Square is a small congested area where none of the residents have garages and have to pay for parking which "shared use" would make much more difficult. In addition, Belvedere Square is a no through road which many motorists fail to notice. This means there are frequent occasions when cars are trying to turn round in a small space, which is often difficult for large vehicles.
5. Belvedere Square is too narrow for pay and display parking. (2 times this year I've had to repair dents to my car) 1. There are not enough resident's spaces at the moment in Belvedere Sq and Old House Close. 2. We want to discourage non-residents entering Belvedere Sq. It is too narrow and we have a permanent problem with UNSKILLED non-resident motorists looking for parking who get stuck, can not park, cannot 3 point turn, cannot reverse in a straight line to exit the Square. Everyday especially Thu/Fri/Sat evenings and Sundays and Bank Holidays we have people getting stuck and causing noise and damage to residents cars as they try to park or exit the street. It should be a quiet secure street.
6. I live in Belvedere Square, pay for a parking permit and drive to work. Presently due to the 8.30am-6.30pm restrictions (Monday to Saturday) I very often do not get to park down my street (that I have paid a permit for) because I have to work late and get back after 6.30pm Therefore those using the restaurant / bars are parking in my bay that I have paid for. Additionally this is even worse on Sundays. The new shared rules will ensure that the situation will get considerably worse for residents. If this goes ahead the residents should be given 'free' permits due to the considerable inconvenience this will cause, Alternatively the times should be 8.30am-8.30pm from Monday- Sunday and then be shared use.
7. Parking space in Belvedere Square is already insufficient. This deteriorated noticeably, when parking for non-residents was allowed after 6.30 pm as it is quite attractive to visitors of the Firestable or other adjacent Pubs/Bars/Restaurants. It should be noted that it is a very narrow road and the frequency by which our car is damaged by other drivers (broken side mirror, broken rear lights, numerous scratches, etc.) is simply unacceptable, especially given that nobody feels obliged to pay for the damages caused. If the number of "anonymous" cars increases, the frequency of damages is bound to increase. Furthermore it is very difficult, if not impossible, to handle situations like returning from shopping with two little children and not being able to park anywhere near your house. Lastly, I understand the reason for introducing shared parking is to encourage parking in the roads affected to calm traffic. Obviously this is pointless in a cul-de-sac, why Belvedere Square should be definitely excluded from this rule.

Bernard Gardens

1. Basically, every "traffic calming" measure in the past 4 years has ended up increasing traffic on other roads. It is unrealistic to think that people will be forced on to only a couple of main roads. For example the recent "slalom course" installed on St Mary's Road from Woodside to Church Road proved to be quite hazardous during the Wimbledon Fortnight. Crazy taxi driver were constantly passing people trying to obey the new regulations. I genuinely fear what might happen if there was need for a major evacuation (e.g. a significant fire, terrorist bombing etc. One need only research the Oakland Hills fire in California 1992 to understand how people died because the twisting, narrow streets made exit impossible and kept emergency vehicles from responding at speed. Please, leave well enough alone.

Burghley Road

1. There is no point in 'raised entry treatments' motorists have to slow down when 'entry or exit ' to a busy main road.
2. This disadvantages residents seeking to park. A maximum period of 9 paying hours so close to the station makes the Belvederes a commuter car park and encourages commuters to drive to those roads at peak hours possibly via Burghley. This proposal could INCREASE traffic volume for the whole area.
3. These are expensive and unless evidence shows that they definitely decrease volume the increased air and noise pollution outweighs unproven benefit.

Calonne Road

1. These features are unnecessary with no proven benefits for local or through traffic.

2. See comments under 2
3. See comment on questions 3 & 4
4. Raised entry treatments visually discourage through traffic and are less dangerous to vehicles and cyclists than speed humps
5. Entry treatments are totally unnecessary and a waste of money. Junctions are very clear.
6. There is no speeding in these roads so we do not understand the reason for these 'entry treatments' - the traffic has to go somewhere.
7. This measure will lead to problems for residents who should have a right to park outside their own house. Mothers with young children who need to do a school run will have constant difficulties finding a space and loading and unloading their children. Disadvantaging residents to 'solve' a traffic issue does not make any sense

Church Road

1. The size of the parking bay must be large enough for a family estate car. In recent years the length of the bay has been reduced
2. I think there are plenty of parking bays already but I am against more being withdrawn to create off street parking/entrances for houses etc in future (eg Lancaster Gdns). Also ensure that skips do not take up spaces for more than a few days - there has been one in Lancaster Rd for months.
3. Changes to Old House Close parking for residents would be catastrophic. My house is part of the close & my back gate opens onto a parking space I can use for my car my garage in the garage area is too small & positioned where if all residents tried to park I could not reach it. I am disabled & would have to sell my car.
4. We agree with all traffic calming activities. except the narrowing to 6'6' in Belvedere Grove.
5. Driving is difficult enough without further complications.
6. 6. I think that there should be more disabled bays in the Wimbledon area, generally
7. We agree with all traffic calming activities. except the narrowing to 6'6' in Belvedere Grove.
8. Keep unrestricted pay and display in Church Road etc to eliminate the need. Businesses and residents have restricted parking and we know where we can/can't park and it works OK. Visitors to the area should have specific designated pay and display areas/ partially shared-use areas rather than a free for all as this is not fair to residents/businesses otherwise.
9. This is a ludicrous suggestion. Most of the permit holder bays are off the main road and their occupancy or otherwise will have no effect whatsoever on traffic movement. What possible justification can there be for local residents (and there are a huge number of families with small children and the elderly in the area) to lose the certainty they currently have that they will be able to park somewhere near where they live.
10. Please build a car park under the common or on the never used S Mary's church parcel of land. The Church could make money everyday not just in the tennis fortnight. This will help the local people park near their house or flat as the permit bays wont be taken up by people wishing to shop, as is proposed in Belvedere Square, and let's people wanting to visit the shops park without thinking I'm not going to Wimbledon village because i cant find a space. You have already ruined all the small independent shops with extortionately high rates and a lack of parking. Soon all there will be is KFC,Burger King and Carphone Warehouse.How dumbed down can we go.
11. For those of us living in the small, and mostly terraced house without drives, on or around the High Street end of Church Road, competition between residents and visitors for parking is already keen. I live on Church Road and am lucky if I can get a space in Belvedere Square (my nearest residents only option). I often have to use Lancaster Road or Lancaster Gardens and because most of the spaces there are "shared" it is not infrequently impossible to find a space. There is some confusion as to whether Old House Close is available to me (this goes back some years and has never been clarified) so my next option is Belvedere Avenue, which is also mostly share and quite a long way from my house. I feel very strongly that all the existing residents only bays should be retained and that only the additional bays

Clement Road

1. Current raised entry hasn't helped, only caused chaos at peak times
2. Again, these proposals are totally inadequate to deal with the extraordinarily high level of rat-running; only road closures or signage with equivalent effect will work. You should trial this and see the effect of 'evaporation' which you are wrongly ignoring.

Coach House Lane

1. I don't see how these alterations help

Courthope Road

1. I have photographic evidence of parking bays full of residents only at 11.45am Friday 7th August - this is normal in Courthope Road. Shared use will cause more traffic looking for spaces - residents will not be able to park near their own premises. We will be just in line for shoppers in the daytime and restaurants and pub visitors in the evening as we are nearest the Village - more noise and a lack of security. As the road is very often fully parked with residents at present the new proposals will contribute nothing to traffic calming - quite the opposite.
2. I have a very specific comment in relation to Highbury Road and regarding one parking bay within it: I currently live at 14 Courthope Road but am soon due to move into 1 Highbury Road which I now own. My comments beneath relate to 1 Highbury Road, therefore. In summary, your drawing no. 2 shows a parking bay on what is currently an existing crossover for the driveway into 1 Highbury Road. The crossover has been there for many years and when we move in we will of course need to use it. 1 Highbury Road's driveway has hardly been used for 3 years because no-one has lived there. This will now change. The parking bay in question is the fourth and most northerly of the 4 bays outside 1 Highbury Road in drawing no. 2. I have no objection the other three bays being used either for residents or on a shared use basis, but as things stand when we move into our new house we will not be able, because of the fourth bay on your drawing no. 2, to access our driveway in the way that all other Highbury Road residents can. We will of course be able to park both of our cars in our driveway assuming we have access whereas a bay built on our crossover would only accommodate one car - so all ways round I would suggest that the council is better off amending its plans and removing entirely from drawing no. 2 the fourth bay.

Currie Hill Close

1. As a motorist and pedestrian I find these serve no effective purpose and are a waste of money.

Dora Road

1. These entry treatments do not stop and or slow down cars. Just cost money.
2. Traffic calming features in a minor road at an entry to a major road are a distraction and divert the driver's attention from traffic on the major road. Similarly, the exit from the major road over a raised entry in a minor road is likely to cause sharp braking and possibly accidents.
3. Do not see the point of raised entries.
4. All these measures serve no purpose and are a waste of resource. Improve the 20mph limit and police it!! use cameras if necessary.
5. To what purpose do raised entry treatments offer? They are not any different from what was there already.
6. Raised junctions strike me as a complete waste of money. I see no benefit to them at all.
7. We do not need too many 'raised entries'
8. 7. Definitely that junction is dangerous you cannot see the traffic coming from the top of the hill, as one tries either to turn left down to Centre or, worse up hill to the Village (in that case, would be nice to have the help of a big mirror)
9. These parking bays are usually occupied throughout the day. I use this road a lot as due to traffic restrictions in Woodside one can no longer turn right up the hill. Lots of people have this problem & thus

use Belvedere. Turning right up Wimbledon Hill was never a problem for anyone as there is a constant queuing here in any ?.

Glendale Drive

1. Current 'raised entry treatment' between St Marys Road Belvedere Drive is dangerous when there are cars parked on the bays in Belvedere Drive closed to the entry point. Visibility is limited by parked cars

High Street

1. More parking desperately needed.
2. The reality is that Courthope Road is full most of the time, 24/7. One wonders if all the current users are actual resident and not business users. If you add up the housing units on the block bounded by the High Street, Courthope Road and the bits of Church Road and Belvedere Grove adjacent to those spaces allocated to Resident use and compare that number with the number of Resident's Permits sold by Merton Council, I suspect that there is a questionable practice already; and now you want to take more money to sell those spaces again!

Highbury Road

1. We would also strongly support raised entry treatment at the junction of Highbury Road and Belvedere Avenue.
2. I am against shared use bays. I favour segregated use bays in this mainly residential area with preference given to residential permit holders whilst admitting some increase in permit holder bays. However no bay please opposite 14 Highbury Road crossover. If such a bay was allowed the turning area for backing a car out of ? would be very tight indeed. For this reason the bay opposite no. 17 crossover on the 14 side was disallowed. Highbury Road is somewhat narrower than other roads in the area.
3. We need appropriate road closures at the junction of Belvedere Grove and Belvedere Avenue and no left turn from the Hill into Belvedere Drive and no left turn at the junction of Belvedere Avenue and Church Road. No right turn from Belvedere Drive onto the Hill
4. In particular we object to the indicated reintroduction of parking bay outside 3 Highbury Road in July 07 the council agreed either we had obtained the unanimous support of all residents of Highbury Road that the parking bay outside 3 should be removed we trust you have retained records to confirm this (we have!) we assume therefore that the proposed recreate such a bay is and oversight
5. I have seen no evidence in driver behaviour that indicates that raised entry treatments reduce traffic volume.
6. Raised entry achieved very little. Road narrowing more effective. Need this in Highbury Rd too.
7. 6. There is absolutely no need for further parking. There is already ample for the Village and the area should not be turned into a car park. On the contrary, the Council should be trying its best to improve its environmental credentials by discouraging driving and encouraging the use of public transport, consistent with universal policy as set out in PPG13.
8. See attached letter
9. I object to the conversion of existing "Permit Holder" parking bays to "Shared Use" parking bays in Highbury Road. This encourages non-residents to use the road as a car park, especially for Wimbledon Station. I also object to the placing of 2 posts outside number 11 Highbury Road as shown on drawing 2 as 2 red dots. The character of the village is profoundly affected by the over-zealous use of signs, and to have 2 outside a single house is completely unacceptable.
10. This is absolutely wrong. It will positively add to traffic congestion as it will encourage new drivers (non-residents) to drive into the roads, effectively using them as car parks, especially for Wimbledon station. It will also deprive residents of their parking amenity, which they already pay for, and so raises the question whether this is really a back door revenue raising scheme for the Council? Finally, and most importantly, encouraging parking will create serious safety issues by significantly reducing both pedestrian and vehicle visibility in these small roads. Accidents are bound to occur.

Home Park Road

1. 7. Dangerous turn right off Wimbledon Hill Road already, Raised entry will not allow you to get off the fast road safely
2. I would support this proposal if it includes cycle provision. Major issue is that there is no provision for cycling in this street proposal or the Wimbledon area traffic study proposal as a whole. This is a major oversight of strategic proportions. This scheme is about balancing the through traffic needs with needs of businesses and residents. How can it not include any cycle provision which would reduce car usage and facilitate local mobility. I for example cycle my children from my Home park road to a school off the Ridgeway. There is no cycle provision (Cycle lanes etc) along this route even though there are about nine schools off the Ridgeway! The school runs traffic is a major traffic generator and this proposal does not include anything to facilitate safely to the schools (through the area this proposal covers). In fact if I have read it correctly this proposal removes cycle provision (e.g on Wimbledon hill road!). This scheme needs to redesign to include cycle lanes through the roads this scheme covers. For example the below get you to schools along the Ridgeway from the east of the Belvederes 1 cycle lane along Arthur road, Alan Road, Belvedere avenue, Bevedere grove, and Ridgeway 2 cycle lane along Arthur road, St Mary's road, Church road, Bevedere grove, and Ridgeway, Southside common and back down some roads to Ridgeway (e.g Clifton Road)
3. I believe this will lead to the terrible risks which exist now in Home Park Rd. during the day when drivers cannot see small children or animals crossing by mistake. My dog was killed immediately outside the gates of Wimbledon Park in Home Park Rd. The driver said that due to the cars parked on both sides of the road, he could not see my dog.

Homefield Road

1. 7/8A & B These all seem unnecessary. Traffic does not rush in and out of these junctions, least of all Wimbledon Hill Road/Belvedere Drive. Such treatments seem to over complicate junctions which presently work well.

Kenilworth Avenue

1. I don't believe it is safer or will calm traffic. I think it will just make manoeuvring at these junctions more difficult and slow the flow of traffic.
2. 20mph limit better
3. It should also be made clear whether or not pedestrians have right of way on raised crossings.
4. Parking bays appropriate in retail areas, re close to shops. The ? of house conversions to flats has created excessive numbers of resident cars and therefore there is no capacity for parking bays in residential streets
5. I do not see the need for this
6. See comment on Q 2,3,4 above. Ineffective & costly. Added danger for some travellers.

Lake Road

1. Any slowing/ reduction of traffic welcomed
2. As I always walk to the village (instead of using my car) I see my route from a pedestrian perspective. I believe the residents of these roads are far better qualified to answer these questions as they have first hand knowledge of who uses these parking bays
3. If it has been proved that entry treatments lead to an overall reduction in through traffic then they get my vote. However I am against the addition of unproven traffic calming measures that inconvenience the local residents
4. Removing residents only parking bays very unfair to residents as parking opportunities so limited in area already. Residents pay for the right to park in front of their houses (up £10 in 2 years, and increase of 10% per year) they should at least have available parking spaces.

Lambourne Avenue

1. It is already difficult enough to get through Belvedere Ave because of parking. Often there is gridlock there so more parking places would be very difficult. I would prefer more cycle lanes - none are proposed at all. I would like my children to cycle to school but feel it is too dangerous.
2. I think the use of 'raised entry treatment' traffic devices should be increased. They force all traffic to slow down before entering an intersection without causing undue obstructions.

Lancaster Gardens

1. 16 spaces for shared parking in Lancaster Gdns and now only 3 for Resident Parking. 2/3 more needed out-side nos.2-6 for Residents only. Have written to Council since 2007 about this.
2. In many areas, residents rely on these parking spaces for their own cars. Parking zones are small therefore many people live near the boundaries of zones, which adds to the difficulty of finding spaces. Conversion of parking bays would be a particular problem in Lancaster Road, as spaces are used by residents of Church Road as well as residents of Lancaster Road. Only new parking bays should be designated as shared use.

Lancaster Place

1. Wimbledon Village is a famously attractive area of London. These proposals for speed cushions, speed tables, build outs, lollipop signs saying 20 this and 30 that, ugly surface marking and so on may be a bureaucrat's delight but they deliberately despoil the local environment. The Council should not be wasting time and money on this sort of thing and instead spend our money on adequately maintaining the Borough's roads.
2. I live in Lancaster Place which is a private road which is much impacted by these proposals. I suggest the parking space outside 3 Lancaster Road should be for loading only to serve the 12 or so businesses in Lancaster Place and thus help reduce congestion for the 30 odd frontagers in Lancaster Place.

Lancaster Road

1. I strongly support proposal 7. This road junction is very difficult to cross safely, but is quite heavily used by pedestrians
2. Traffic moves to quickly
3. Converting the parking to 'shared use' will massively increase traffic in these roads and will encourage people to drive to the shops, knowing they can use these streets for parking. Some of these streets are currently safe for children to play because of low traffic volumes. These proposals will destroy that. I am strongly opposed.
4. It is already very difficult to park in Lancaster Road, even with a resident's permit as so many businesses park here. It will be impossible to park close to the house if residents are converted. This appears to be a money making exercise by the council. We already have to pay to park outside our own house. We should be able to continue to do so.
5. Re-Lancaster Road-We already have difficulty parking in bays now- imagine if we have to share with non residents. At weekends we find it virtually impossible to get in and out of our drives because of the cars on the road. The refuse collectors would suffer as would the delivery lorries who turn into Lancaster Avenue. (Reversing). More cars would mean more noise and we share the road with the elderly and the very young who play in the street. The ambulance needs to stop in the road for the elderly - where would they stop and start.
6. the only space I can find near where I live in 43 Lancaster Road is in permit bays. You must preserve bays for people who live in the various roads. You must increase the number of bays to take the parking load caused by rush-hour closures in Church Road. May I suggest that any new shared bays in Lancaster Road are capped at 2 hours, not 5 hours to prevent blocking of bays for residents and businesses who need a degree of protection from the onslaught. You must create new bays in the empty sections of the road, as projected in your Map 3. By all means allocate these to shared use but please save my space for the daily home usage.

7. As residents of Lancaster Road, there are already not enough bays even for residents. We have huge problems trying to park outside our house even though we have paid for our permits in Lancaster Avenue. It is a quiet road with an old people's home opposite. Shared bays would increase traffic and make road unsafe for elderly who wake up each day. Lorries with supplies turn into Lancaster Avenue would make it impossible to use pavement. Our house is an old Edwardian house - the front garden and drive are not large enough to have more than 1 small car in it. We do not wish to pave over the garden either, against current government policy and also it would ruin the look of the street. We therefore need our residents permit space and should be entitled to keep it.
8. Lancaster Road is a cause for concern because of the large number of families with young children and the existence of two care homes for the elderly in the area. Many homes have recently changed hands and many families with young children have moved into the area (including ours). The neighbourhood children ride their bikes on the road and run from house to house playing. They walk along the road to and from school and to walk their dogs. The addition of pay and display parking bays would increase the number of cars using the road. Impatient drivers late for appointments in the village would turn the road into a cut through which would threaten the safety of the children. The elderly residents of the two care homes on the road use their Zimmer frames to walk into the village to shop or have coffee. They have to cross Lancaster Road to get to the village and are moving at a very slow pace which makes them easy targets for cars. The most dangerous point on Lancaster Road is where it bears left (a right turn brings cars into Lancaster Gardens). It is here that cars travelling from Church Road turn very quickly into the road which is a blind spot and an accident waiting to happen. An increase in traffic will increase that risk of an accident. 2)

Currently it is a struggle for residents of Lancaster Road to find parking close to our homes.

Particularly during the school year there is competition with business permit holders for the spaces close to our homes. When you have small children a space close to your house is essential. As it stands it can be difficult to get parking close to home. We pay a large sum to have residents' parking permits and shared use bays would discriminate against those who have paid a considerable amount to have residents' parking. And what about the guest permits that we have paid for? Those would become almost useless with the pay and display spaces being taken up by others. 3) Late night noise and nuisance would increase on Lancaster Road with shared use parking and additional parking. Currently there is a problem on the road with patrons of Village bars and pubs parking on the single yellow lines and returning to their cars late at night when residents are already asleep. These bar and pub patrons return to their cars noisily, yelling and loudly banging car doors without any consideration for the residents who have young children sleeping and jobs to go to in the morning. 4) Currently the recycling lorry and rubbish disposal lorry park on a yellow line on Lancaster Road about half an hour before commencing collecting recycling and then rubbish. Should you turn that into additional parking there will be no place for the lorry to park and wait. It would be forced to park in the middle of the street thus holding up traffic on the road. 5)

Additional parking on Lancaster Road would also affect our ability to get in and out of our drives. This is clear on Sunday when the road is full of cars parking on the single yellow line. Negotiating the way in and out of our drives becomes extremely difficult when there are cars parked on either side of the entrance and across the street as well. 6) Lancaster Avenue is a private road where Lee house, a car home for elderly women, is located. The care home has regular food service deliveries by large trucks. These trucks have to carefully negotiate turning through automated gates in and out of Lancaster Avenue from Lancaster Road. Additional parking on either side of the entrance of Lancaster Avenue on Lancaster Road would limit the trucks' ability to turn safely into the road. 7) There are a number of Council-run homes for the elderly at the top of Lancaster Road on the Wimbledon High Street end. Many of the residents of these houses have hot meals delivered. The vans have to have a place to stop and park so that they can unload the hot meals and deliver them to the residents. Replacing the residents parking with shared use would mean that those spaces providing a safe place for the van to stop and deliver would no longer be guaranteed.

For all of these reasons we feel that replacing the current parking with pay and display shared use would create major problems for the residents of the road as well as for the services that should be able to access them without delay. This would occur all along the road. If you want to slow cars down please consider speed bumps but please do not give drivers a reason to enter roads and create new problems.

Landgrove Road

1. Not required. Additional 'visual pollution'.

Leeward Gardens

1. My reply is from a pedestrian's point of view

2. Waste of money.
3. With regard to question 7, would the 'raised entry treatment' affect the traffic flow on Wimbledon Hill Rd adversely?

Leopold Avenue

1. Again, make sure that they're effective against 4x4s
2. 6aT THE MOMENT i CAN WALK REASONABLY well - but the time might come when I cannot and so would be grateful for as many parking bays as possible. 7. Unnecessary expense. 8. Unnecessary expense
3. 7 - 8 Totally unnecessary waste of money
4. As you can see I am undecided since there are some parts e.g. Old House Close where they do not have room for off road parking and so using their car might not find a parking place on their return, making it necessary to drive some distance to find one.

Leopold Road

1. More parking bays encourage more traffic, encouraging the destruction of the neighbourhood, visually and environmentally. See attached - ten reasons

Margin Drive

1. Raised entry treatment at 7.8(a) & (b) above will not serve any purpose and it is dangerous to install these at junctions with a main road.

Marryat Road

1. See 2
2. Please see comments to 3 & 4 above
3. On condition Marryat road gets similar treatment
4. Again - great that you are putting in these calming measures but you need to consider that this will just move the issue to other surrounding roads and again to my earlier point Marryat Road where speeding is a significant issue.
5. 7. It will / might obstruct the Wimbledon Hill Road through traffic. 8. Through traffic St Mary's Road not to be obstructed.
6. Absolutely not. Residents have to park near their homes for all the obvious reasons. These bays are already abused, privileges are sadly lost at night when the majority of working residents return home to park and then struggle to do so anywhere near their homes. Abuse of bays by traders or people working in Village using residents addresses continues unchecked despite me bringing it to the attention of the relevant council dept.

Newstead Way

1. I have commented on so called traffic calming in my attachment to question 1. The same comments apply with increased force in this case since 'entry treatments' serve only to deter entry and do not calm traffic

Old House Close

1. I do not consider raised entry treatments to be the same as speed tables or other raised treatments on the road. Raised entry treatments are the same as lateral extensions of the pavements and can be an

attractive feature. I would support raised entry treatments at as many junctions as possible but only when entering / leaving a 'main' road with a 'side' road.

2. 6 But resident's welfare must be paramount and businesses must not suffer. Traffic flow should be the least consideration unless it affects residents. 7 & 8 Speed cushions at junctions and entry points are pointless as traffic already slow here. Put them in middles of streets instead to have a beneficial effects but preferably don't use any
3. No costings provided, so cannot assess whether expenditure worthwhile. In general we should be saving money and reducing Council Tax, not spending it on frivolous schemes like this.
4. Answers to 7 and 8 are qualified by the over-riding comment that similar speed restrictions must be implemented in Church Road.
5. Old House Close was one of four roads in the area where it was agreed that Residents only parking was appropriate given the density of housing in the area and lack of off road parking. This concession was established when controlled parking was introduced and this concession should remain, as all spaces in Old House Close are still regularly occupied. Residents of each street in the area should speak for themselves.
6. especially against the Old House Close parking proposal. Parking is already quite difficult for people living in the close and opening the parking spaces to public will increase traffic making the close more dangerous. Many roads have off road parking, but in Old House close we only have our spaces in front of the garage (too small for a normal size car), so extra traffic will result in less spaces for residents, especially the ones who arrive home from work later in the evening.
7. As a resident of 5 Old House Close I and my family vehemently object to this. We already take cars from residents of Walnut Tree Cottages, Church Road and Belvedere Square who cannot park in their streets. We are not a through road, but a close of families with children, and elderly residents and have difficulty in finding space for our own cars. Nos 38 and 36 Church Road have back access to Old House close which parking already prohibits and should be made specific to those houses (one resident is disabled). We would be plagued by a flow of cars looking for parking spaces, noisy and dangerous
8. 1. It is not fair to residents of Church Road to increase traffic on this road. The road is not designed to take more traffic. In addition the pavements are too narrow and it is dangerous enough already as a pedestrian.
2. As a resident of Old House Close (fronting on Church Road) I do not agree with proposals to make the parking bays in Old House Close Shared Use parking for the following reasons: a. there is no rat running traffic in Old House Close so the measure is not necessary b. parking is already very difficult in Old House Close. Increasing its use would make it very difficult indeed. This should already be known as only 2 years ago we were given an extra parking bay because of the difficulty in parking. To take this away and make the parking shared use is unreasonable. It should be noted that the 12 bays in Old House Close service around 20 properties as residents of Church Road use Old House Close to park. c. The proposal is unfair particularly to residents in Old House Close as there is no suitable off-road parking which residents of other roads in the area benefit from (the garages we have are too small to accommodate modern cars and if the owners of the first garage in the forecourt park outside them then access to all other garages is blocked). d. Making the parking Shared Use would increase traffic flow in Old House Close when the purpose is to reduce traffic in affected roads. With about 70% of houses in the road home to young children, it would make it particularly dangerous. In conclusion, you would achieve in Old House Close everything you are trying to avoid in other roads and this is just not right.

Parkside

1. Not necessary! Loads of roadwork's again.
2. I believe raised entry is a waste of money it does not slow traffic significantly and makes it harder for those walking (esp. children) to mark the end of pavement & start of road
3. Stop wasting money on these schemes
4. There needs to be more parking but maybe there needs to be a small, concealed car park to allow local people to shop in the village and keep it alive. (NOT a large car park that brings in lots of people and thus changes the character and nature of a village and causes more congestion).

Parkside Avenue

1. Q7. This would increase minor accidents for left turning traffic off Wimbledon hill Road (to no particular advantage). Q8. Alan Road cushion would again increase accidents. Belvedere Avenue cushion would displace much needed parking.
2. SEE ABOVE

Parkwood Road

1. Difficult for low cars which I have.

Peek Crescent

1. Waste of money. Expense not justified.

Pine Grove

1. They raised entries don't seem to do much at Belvedere Drive/St. Mary's Rd. I agree with them if there is nothing better such as width restrictions or lights.

Somerset Road

1. Q6. More free parking. Drivers are taxed enough. q7. Costly and ineffective.
2. Q 7-8b: It would be a waste of money.
3. I consider 9 hours max is too long for a parking meter
4. Against traffic calming - see above
5. Too many unnecessary bumps.
6. Same comments as above
7. Totally unnecessary either to keep speed low or deter through traffic. These junctions are perfectly adequately controlled at present. Waste of money too
8. Do not agree with the statement '.....thus making the passage of through traffic inconvenient...'. Depends on what's meant by 'through-traffic' but to reach where we live, we need easy access to these roads

Springfield Road

1. Raised entry treatment achieves nothing other than to cause blockages, traffic should flow,

St Aubyn's Avenue

1. No need to spend any more ratepayers' money on further obstructive & wasteful road changes.
2. There is no logic in increasing parking bays if they are not already full, doing so and making it pay and display to impede the flow is dangerous and wrong. Driving around the area to get home or to get out is very difficult already.
3. More parking bays for residents would benefit them. ' Raised entry treatments' are totally unnecessary as drivers have to go slowly at road junctions.
4. What you are proposing is to deliberately increase congestion and inconvenience in the area by making it 'parked-up' on both sides by paying meter users and making roads effectively impassable by two way traffic. This is dangerous and inconvenient to residents, there is no logic to it, and the misery is not a price local residents wish to pay for a dubious reduction in traffic flow.

St Mary's Road

1. 6) More parking bays would make the roads even narrower than they already are. 7) The raised entry should be slightly further in along Belvedere Drive because cars driving UP the hill, and intending to turn into this road, have to negotiate the distance between the car travelling DOWN the hill (at speed mostly) and the entrance to Belvedere Drive, sometimes necessitating a dash across the down lane of Wimbledon Hill Road. Having to brake at the entrance would be extremely unsafe.
2. We think the only raised entry necessary is off Wim Hill Road where drivers are entering a 20 mph zone - all other proposed raised entries are within the 20 mph zone and therefore totally unnecessary. Re No 6 - parking bays create obstacles to any traffic moving too fast without ugly build-outs, signage etc.
3. Raised entries are vastly superior to speed cushions - see my answer to Q3 above.
4. 6. I don't think we should be clogging up the streets of Wimbledon Village with too much parking as it will detract from the look and feel of the area, some of which is Conservation Area. Also, parked vans (of which there seems to be many!) restrict visibility of motorists entering/leaving their properties. 7. There is an opportunity here to build out to stop cars turning left into Belvedere Drive so quickly. This is a difficult junction to cross as a pedestrian and has seen several accidents over the years! (There are similar issues with the junction of St. Mary's Road and Church Hill, where drivers do not even indicate that they are turning left into Church Hill. A pedestrian island on Church Hill would be very helpful.) 8a. There is already a raised entry treatment here. 8b. I do not think the traffic flows at this junction justify the use of a raised entry treatment.
5. I do not think that these treatments are necessary. Traffic volumes are not very great and neither is traffic speed at these junctions.
6. There is already one at Alan Road & it is too high for sports cars so may also affect fire engines
7. 6. More in Lancaster Roads only. 7. Raised section at Belvedere Drive / Wimbledon Hill Road not necessary - there is good visibility - its clogged & there is no speeding. 8.a. There already is a raised element here! b. Not necessary. What is the purpose.
8. Many residents in the area have insufficient off-street parking (eg Belvedere Close) and rely on the nearby residents bays, including local families and the elderly. Such residents should be given priority over other issues such as traffic calming and availability of parking for shoppers etc. I think that all existing resident bays should remain
9. I agree that additional pay and display parking is required if the bays on Church Road are restricted, but not all resident bays in the area need to be converted, particularly those furthest away from the southern end of Church Road. I understand the desire to be consistent throughout the area, but I don't think it is necessary as there is no consistency at the moment and clear signage is always the best way to explain parking restrictions. In particular, if you allow people to park for 9 hours, this allows commuters to park in the village for the day and use the train station. A blanket change to resident parking seems unfair on local residents.

Vineyard Hill Road

1. 'raised entry treatment' , as shown at the top of Lake Road, is pointless
2. I don't understand the reasoning behind raised entry treatment. Once people are over it, what does it mean?
3. Raised entries cause more problems than they solve
4. Helps define the 20mph zone. Slow entry into roads.
5. I cannot see any problem with leaving it as it is. If there is a problem (what is it!!!) then remove central road markings.
6. See my response to 2 above
7. Waste of money

Waldemar Road

1. Area is hard enough to drive around at the moment anyway - this will drive custom elsewhere and is a complete waste of money . Roads hard enough to navigate already!

Walham Rise

1. Belvedere Drive is an essential through route / access route for houses bounded by Wimbledon Hill Road & Woodside. For example, my elderly parents live in Leeward Gardens, there is no easy taxi route for them from the station - nor could I get shopping to them easily by car if this proposal is implemented.

Walnut Tree Cottages

1. This is largely a residential area, so parking bays are needed. There is sufficient traffic to warrant 'raised entry treatment.'

Welford Place

1. No if it means even more traffic using Church Road. We already have a constant flow of ? passing to & flow from the All England Tennis Club.

Wimbledon Hill Road

1. Is 8b really necessary?
2. It will fragment the feel of the area. WE do not want these cut offs in Village. They also look ugly.
3. I feel 9 hrs on a timeplate is a bit long to let people park for. I would prefer 5hrs or 2hrs. If people are residents they have to have priority parking. It is unacceptable for someone who lives in the area and who has paid for a permit to not be able to park near their homes.
4. These measures are designed to limit speed, but speed is not the issue in the Hillside area. The issue is excessive through traffic. The proposals which are the subject of this consultation do nothing to limit through traffic. they are, therefore, a total waste of public money and should not be implemented.
5. Living opposite Belvedere Drive & driving along it quite often I am aware that drivers are very ? of others on the road & also careful at the junctions with Wimbledon hill Road

Woodside

1. Raised areas don't reduce speed or make motorists more careful
2. These proposals to increase bays are a good idea. Life for the motorist is hard and this will bring some help to the residents. I am opposed to all the other treatments, the council wasted money ? ? type of thing
3. Q7: concerned that a 'raised entry treatment' at the junction of Belvedere Drive and Wimbledon Hill Road would cause traffic to move slower on Wimbledon Hill Road.
4. raised entry treatments are a complete waste of time and money-they do not reduce volume or speed of traffic as evidenced by residents in latest zone: junctions at St Mary's/Woodside and St Mary's/Church Rd
5. If raised entry treatment is added at Belvedere Drive & Wimbledon Hill Road, it needs to be included at Woodside and Wimbledon Hill Road so that this does not become adversely affected.
6. Raised entry treatment is expensive and has delivered no change at the St. Mary's/Woodside junction. Question number six it is unclear why I would again choose for these local access roads.
7. These measures are designed to limit speed, but speed is not the issue in the Hillside area. The issue is excessive through traffic. The proposals which are the subject of this consultation do nothing to limit through traffic. they are, therefore, a total

Comments in relation to Question 9&9A**Alan Road**

1. 9a. The buildout at this junction will spoil the road and have more street furniture.
2. there are more then enough speed cushions and street furniture already
3. Again the measures are aimed at speed; that is not the problem. The problem is volume.

Alexandra Road

1. Again cannot see that this is necessary or desirable
2. This is a question for the householders affected in Burghley and Calonne Roads. Traffic calming measures are usually welcome
3. See previous responses.
4. Didn't have a view one way or another

Alwyne Road

1. Local schools should provide disincentives to people driving able-bodied children to school.
2. I am totally fed up with speed cushions. Isn't there any other way to ensure that drivers adhere to the speed limit?

Arthur Road

1. Speed cushions do not necessarily slow cars down, but do ensure that they drive in the middle of the road and are a problem for cyclists.
2. Road narrowing traffic calming is extremely dangerous. Speed cushions are quite sufficient
3. I have very little experience of this area as the roads are not ones that I use except for v11 Burghley/Church/St. Marys Rds. This jct seems to work perfectly well at present (and nearly all car drivers are very courteous) Please no more bumps.
4. There is already too much traffic calming in the area. It is like living on a roundabout run by nannies.
5. in the wimbledon area the historical and traditional street patterns have grown naturally with the development of the town and village. to wilfully disrupt this pattern exclusively in one area just, as has been proved, increases disturbance, delay, noise, and pollution in these areas and other adjacent areas, achieving no advantage to the local community as a whole. the local population must all share the burden of necessary movement around the town. most of the day there are no problems of any significance, just at peak times. all local streets are part of the problem and collectively part of the solution. The council is not able to stop traffic coming into the area from afar. the visual amenities have already been considerably devalued by the unsightly obstructions and endless signage around the village, to no definitive advantage so further messing about will only make matters worse.
6. only: vii). This proposal just seems to add tarmac and no new solution to an already complicated junction.
7. I use Burghley Rd/ Somerset Rd every day of my life and really don't see the need for all this work and disruption of traffic flow

Atherton Drive

1. i-ii-iii: Would prefer raised junction Burghely Rd/Calonne Rd. Cars would slow down more for that than speed cushions - which some cars can take with ease. Steep hills to consider! vi: Excellent !!! vii: Excellent !!!

Belvedere Avenue

1. The proposed measures do not address the biggest problem in Somerset and Burghley Roads which is volume and which is contrary to the Manifesto commitments given by the Village Ward councillors
2. Roads affected by traffic should decide
3. I am not interested in Burghley/Calonne etc. I just want less traffic on our road.
4. his is an ineffective attempt to dramatically reduce traffic volumes and speed in the area
5. pointless

Belvedere Drive

1. Please see earlier comments. ? difficulty at junction does not deter motorists but it does increase danger.
2. All traffic-calming procedures are completely 'out of hand'. St Marys Road is a perfect example. Obstructions put into the road to limit the flow of traffic. Totally unnecessary!
3. Outside my immediate area so difficult to comment.
4. Again, will these measures really help reduce volume and speed? We cannot answer questions about individual roads because we have little knowledge of their individual problems.
5. none of these measures will stop volume of traffic
6. I think all these roads should be left alone - People speed down hill - Burghley Road to the junction of Calonne Road and anything would make things worse.
7. we hadn't noticed that the builders at the northern junction of Belvedere Drive & St Marys had any effect what so ever and where there are existing traffic buildouts people drive permanently in the centre of the road forced in by parking on either side of the road
8. I believe these measures are a matter for the residents of Burghley Road, Marryat Road and Calonne Road in the same way that the measures in the Belvedere Roads are a matter for the residents of those roads (and closely adjacent roads) only. My only comment is that the proposals should be effective either to completely eliminate rat-running traffic on residential roads, or significantly reduce the traffic volume and slow down such traffic as continues to use them. These principles are entirely consistent with my views in relation to the Belvedere Roads. Inviting residents from all over Wimbeldon Village to express views on the very local issue of traffic in the Belvederes is completely inconsistent with previous consultations - I was not even consulted about the raised entry treatment at Belvedere Drive/St Mary's Road when the 20mph zone was introduced earlier this year. If you invite views from residents in other roads, whose principal concern is traffic volumes in their own roads and their own convenience, it is unsurprising that there will be strong opposition to effective measures (and strong support for ineffective measures) dealing with the Belvederes problem of through traffic. The Council should strongly discount the views of consultees the further away from the Belvedere Roads they live.
9. I really doubt the effectiveness of these measures.

Belvedere Grove

1. Traffic coming this way should be re-directed to Parkside.
2. Speed cameras would be acceptable to slow traffic slowing, impacting & speeding up creates damage, Increased wear & tear and increases emissions dramatically as well as putting up fuel consumption. I am happy to drive at 20 mph on a flat smooth road.
3. All proposals above are good and long overdue to restrict through traffic to main roads. Creative planting softens and slows when added to traffic calming. 20mph is too much aim at 10mph to achieve best results.
4. These should all be decided by local residents in these roads, not by us outside their area.
5. All are matters for residents of these roads alone. We have no right to comment - and they have no right to comment on controls in our Belvedere roads!
6. I don't feel i should comment on other peoples roads
7. No comment

8. I don't know the traffic situation in these roads to comment. The residents of these roads should decide.
9. frankly none of these proposals in my business it is up to the residents of these roads to chose i do not want them choosing measures for my road!
10. I believe these should be put to the residents of these roads their traffic volumes are not as great as the Belvederes and their concerns are probably different.
11. All of these suggestions will increase pollution in the affected area and will also increase the likelihood of accidents.

Burghley Road

1. A General: Proposal does not deal with Somerset Road which has to deal with similar numbers of cars cutting through iv) 15 Burghley Road: This will cause a traffic queue up Burghley Road to Church Road junction during rush hours. As well as existing queue at junction crossing to St Mary's Road. Also gives priority to cars coming up the hill against principles of Highway Code vi) Marrayat Road: pedestrian island protects pedestrians against cars coming down Marrayat Road turning right into Burghley Road. For 40 years this has been an accident blackspot. Proposal does nothing to help pedestrians.
2. the issue on Burghley Road is both speed and volume. I do not believe that most of the measures proposed will deal with these two issues sufficiently. Indeed any measures should be with the caveat that they be revisited at a later date to review their effectiveness. I, on an all too regular basis, have cars overtake at speed as I am trying to turn right into my drive.
3. We are not convinced that this will significantly reduce the volume of traffic along Burghley road, although it should be effective in reducing speeding traffic. We feel that in order to achieve a significant reduction in traffic it may be necessary to close the road at one end, depending on the success of this scheme.
4. The proposed solutions do not sufficiently address either of the key issues of speed and volume highlighted in Councillor Brierly's summary letter. There is also a discrimination between the solutions for Burghley road and those being offered to the Belvederes, who are being offered 40-60% reductions in volumes, despite Burghley Road being identified as having similar issues and in fact greater speed concerns than the Belvederes in Councillor Brierly's report.
5. Motorcycles are the fastest travelling vehicles - especially downhill - I would like to see full width road bumps in Burghley Road as the motorcycles can slip through the middle of split bumps, A raised full width table would stop the enormous speed that the motorcycles travel.
6. This would not address the volume or speed problems we experience
7. I support making one or more of the junctions one way to limit the rat running. That will address the speed as well as the volume issue as local people do not speed. Also given the volume issue in Burghley why is there no commitment to 40/60 pct reduction in volume given to the Belvederes
8. The proposals are neither sufficient to deliver a reduction in speed and/or volume, nor has Burghley Road received consistent/equitable treatment with the Belvederes despite the Council acknowledging we have a similar if not worse issue
9. More needs to be done to slow down motorcycles, which travel at speeds in excess of 60mph down Burghley Road. Also, the proposals do not address the volume problem. The cut-through Parkside via Burghley Road to Church Road needs to be made even less attractive for commuter traffic.
10. None of these proposals is necessary, and all would result in inconvenience to residents out of all proportion to their effectiveness in reducing traffic flow.
11. I live at ?? I would not like to have ? outside the traffic calming built which ?
12. Measures to slow motorcycles need to be considered also for Burghley Road
13. these measures do not sufficiently address either speed or volume and are inconsistent with the solutions proposed elsewhere such as the Belvederes.

Calonne Road

1. I am concerned that the width restriction proposed for Calonne Road and Burghley Road will cause more congestion when the Buddhist festivals are on and large coaches are arriving

2. Proposed changes in Calonne Road are unnecessary and certainly do not reflect the preferences of any of the roads residents.
3. See comments under 2
4. If traffic calming was installed in Calonne Road as proposed I would then agree to the traffic calming measures proposed in Burghley Road. If traffic calming is not to be put into Calonne Road I would not want traffic calming outside numbers 35 and 38 Burghley Road
5. Proposals for Calonne Road are unnecessary since excess speed on the road is not common; they are in any event disproportionate and badly sited. Proposal at no 32 Calonne Road will cause stationary traffic to block gateways at nos 28, 30 and 32 and is likely to cause rather than reduce accidents. No need for further measures on Burghley Road; once measures introduced outside no 35 and 38 no other steps needed.
6. Speed in Burghley/Calonne is dangerously high - speed calming is essential
7. vi - much better for pedestrians @ this intersection at the moment traffic sweeps round the corners. vii - Could we also have the reinstatement of the traffic island that was removed when the EELTCC started work on the new Centre Court. It was meant to be removed temp - but now appears to be permanent!
8. My view is that the situation in Calonne Rd should remain as it is to save money and consequently rise in council tax.
9. I do not favour build outs into roads. Copse Hill has shown that these cause accidents. I also do not believe speed cushions are an effective deterrent to speeding, they cause problems for cyclists. I WOULD FAVOUR RAISED ENTRY TREATMENTS AT EACH END OF EACH ROAD & SPEED TABLES IN BURGHLEY ROAD
10. Level of traffic makes any alteration to Calonne Road unnecessary. Speed cameras would be a better way of controlling occasional speed in Burghley Road.
11. We think that traffic calming is totally unnecessary in Calonne Road since there is not much traffic and speeding is NOT a problem.
12. These measures are unnecessary and appear to be a consequence of likely diversion of traffic flows from measures proposed elsewhere which are also unnecessary.
13. The area is very closely connected its all or nothing as traffic always follows the path of least resistance
14. I agree with the change to the Calonne road burghley road junction as this junction is so sweeping in nature that it almost encourages cars to race around the corner. The traffic calming in Calonne road is unnecessary it is generally a quiet road. The traffic calming on Burghley Road will make my local journeys more difficult
15. I would support a raised hump extending across Calonne Road just above the bend near the Thai Temple - where it is most needed. The proposed traffic calming outside 32 Calonne Road is highly dangerous.
16. believe without the narrowing of the corner between Calonne and Burghley Roads, there is a real danger of traffic coming up Calonne from Burghley will have an accident as we in 36 Calonne back out of our driveway. It will also slow the traffic for the full length of Calonne Road.

Camelot Close

1. I loathe any traffic calming- as a smart car driver, they ruin my car- as a resident of the borough since 1962, I fail to see the necessity- spend your money on redoing the pavements in Arthur Road: it looks like a third world country!

Church Road

1. All traffic calming is unnecessary and unsightly and ruins this attractive and prestigious environment in which we live/work. One minute it is suggested that the area is too congested and the next minute we are told we need to slow traffic down - it makes no sense. Often the drivers you really need to slow down will not give a damn about any calming measures.
2. Ugly and a total waste of my money.
3. Not sufficiently familiar with these roads

4. Traffic calming create more friction/irritation with drivers.

Clement Road

1. These proposals will have little effect on the excessive number of vehicles using Burghley Road as a rat-run.

Coach House Lane

1. There are quite enough speed 'cushions' already. The eccentric bollards in Copse Hill are better if one must do something but these are expensive and may cause accidents.

Currie Hill Close

1. Narrowing of roads means more braking / acceleration. i.e. more pollution. St Mary's road narrowing downright dangerous.
2. Strongly opposed to vii. I frequently pass here and find the traffic well behaved. A waste of money.

Deepdale

1. Doubtful whether, in view of the proposed treatment of the Belvedere area, these proposals will be sufficient to protect Marryat Road, Parkside Gardens and Peek Crescent from an increase in rat-running traffic travelling at excessive speeds. Surprised you are not proposing traffic calming for Peek Crescent to safeguard school users.

Dora Road

1. In my experience of driving along these roads, all the above would appear to be either unnecessary or actively harmful. Either way, a complete waste of money.
2. vii - no objection, but do not see purpose
3. 9. Too many traffic calming measures & speed cushions make driving for local motorists an unpleasurable experience & my mother who is elderly often feels physically sick going over all the bumps even at low speed.
4. Waste of resource.
5. In my opinion, traffic flow in this area works perfectly well as it is so why interfere? It would be an unnecessary use of tax-payers money.
6. Again these measures are dangerous and should be avoided.
7. If 'Traffic Calming' includes speed cushions - NO Buildouts - YES
8. is there really enough speeding traffic on Burghley Road for cushions to be needed in the context of the other measures

Glendale Drive

1. Burghley / Church / St Marys Road junction does not need these alterations
2. I hate speed bumps.

High Street

1. Mostly unnecessary, junction of Burghley / Church / St Marys Road should be altered to stop traffic cutting across Burghley, existing roundabout is easily driven over diagonally.

2. detail B - are the parking spaces to be removed ever used? detail D & A - again parking spaces? detail C - I'd like to keep the Islands.
3. Will not help flow of traffic.

Highbury Road

1. We think you should just implement a lower speed limit of 20mph. Perhaps with speed cameras in each of the two dips in the road

Home Park Road

1. Yes but most effective would be a 25mph limit.
2. Priority give ways are confusing for motorists and frequently ignored, causing more delays and sometimes accidents. Agree with traffic calming in Burghley and Calonne (eg speed bumps) but not use of priority give ways.
3. Need to use these roads to get through village population is too vast to cope with traffic in Church Road only. Must dilute traffic down multiple roads
4. No speed cushions : they damage tyres and vehicles
5. I would support this proposal if it includes cycle provision. Major issue is that there is no provision for cycling in this street proposal or the wimbledon area traffic study proposal as a whole. This is a major oversight of strategic proportions. This scheme is about balancing the through traffic needs with needs of businesses and residents. How can it not include any cycle provision which would reduce car usage and facilitate local mobility. I for example cycle my children from my Home park road to a school off the Ridgeway. There is no cycle provision (Cycle lanes etc) along this route even though there are about nine schools off the Ridgeway! The school runs traffic is a major traffic generator and this proposal does not include anything to facilitate safely to the schools (through the area this proposal covers). In fact if I have read it correctly this proposal removes cycle provision (e.g on Wimbledon hill road!). This scheme needs to redesign to include cycle lanes through the roads this scheme covers. For example the below get you to schools along the Ridgeway from the east of the Belvederes 1 cycle lane along Arthur road, Alan Road, Belvedere avenue, Bevedere grove, and Ridgeway 2 cycle lane along Arthur road, St Mary's road, Church road, Bevedere grove, and Ridgeway, Southside common and back down some roads to Ridgeway (e.g Clifton Road)

Homefield Road

1. Speed cushions outside 32 Calonne Road - yes. Narrowing of road - no. See comments under 11

Kenilworth Avenue

1. I think the traffic flows perfectly adequately on these roads. Normal jct rules apply. I can't see why you need to spend the money and introduce so many controls when the normal highway code rules are adequate.
2. 20mph limit works better
3. Why do you need a buildout at Marryat/Burghley. It will just create queues if you put it down to one lane.
4. Bumps and raised junctions - see previous comments. I really don't see what these proposals would add and they are expensive and have many down sides. The proposed give way signs on Burghley Road are a good idea (assuming the priority is to those going uphill, which is as i read it). But please DON'T introduce speed bumps and do leave a cycle lane and rather than building out. We should be encouraging cyclists and prioritising their (and pedestrian) safety.
5. As a Regular user of wimbledon and home park road with traffic calming measures in place, i do not see them increasing road safety or improving traffic flow at busy times therefore question the effective of the council in monitoring them more widely. i would prefer to see the resources spent on policing and schools

Lake Road

1. Anything to benefit residents.
2. I have spoken with many residents of Burghley Road who feel that these measures are not sufficient. They would rather have detailed discussions to come up with a more comprehensive plan to calm traffic on their road where it is clear from anyone who uses
3. Concerned about displacement of traffic onto Woodside/Lake Road
4. Leave it as it is. I have lived in Wimbledon for 25 years and there is no need to change this
5. As I use these roads very rarely I believe I am not qualified to give a reasoned response.

Lambourne Avenue

1. I haven't noticed speed tables making any difference clearly marked speed limits and a speed camera or two would work better than these changes which make driving an effort especially for the elderly who are more reliant on cars.
2. I think the use of the proposed buildouts and speed cushions is unnecessary. In fact, the layout is extremely dangerous for cyclists, as all traffic is funnelled into a small gap. As an experienced cyclist who uses the local roads every single day, such buildouts create a dangerous situation where cars try to overtake the cyclist, even though there isn't any room. I would imagine that even though I would have right of way when travelling north up Burghley Road through the build-out near No 58, cars travelling down the hill in the opposite direction would be unlikely to give way, creating a dangerous situation between cyclist and car. PLEASE DO NOT CREATE THESE BUILDOUTS ON THIS ROAD!

Lancaster Gardens

1. I understand why pedestrian refuges are being removed at the Marryat/Burghley Junction. The council must ensure that the footways are sufficiently wide to ensure traffic is slowed and it does not become any more dangerous for pedestrians and the many joggers who use that route.

Lancaster Road

1. Only width restrictions no speed cushions, as they damage low cars & make them dangerous even when driven slowly, where width restrictions do not.
2. (vi) I witness almost daily cars that do not stop travelling along Burghley Road when they cross Marryat Road. It is a dangerous intersection.
3. There is too much traffic calming already.
4. I have spoken with many residents of Burghley Road who feel that these measures are not sufficient. They would rather have detailed discussions to come up with a more comprehensive plan to calm traffic on their road where it is clear from anyone who uses it that cars and trucks habitually travel at great speed along this road.

Landgrove Road

1. Build outs are dangerous and cause more accidents, not less. Speed cushions would be more sensible, safe and effective. Refuge islands should not be removed. No consideration to pedestrians.

Leeward Gardens

1. I am commenting just as a pedestrian
2. See above re speed cushions, width restrictions
3. Waste of money.
4. If there are too many speed restrictions in Burghley Rd, will it cause more traffic to go down Church Rd and then turn left into Somerset Rd or Bathgate Rd?

Leopold Avenue

1. 9A. Because of the hills this would be advantageous. 9A. vii Would not improve situation, traffic lights needed since poor views especially from Burghley Road.
2. 9A vi No. This would make a fairly safe junction more dangerous & hazardous for pedestrians. 9A vii A raised table is unlikely to improve this dangerous junction. It needs traffic lights.

Leopold Road

1. Detail E. It is not at all clear that the changes to the junction will make it any easier for vehicles leaving Burghley Road to join St Marys Road or Church Road. This is a very awkward junction Detail B & D. The existing parking bays in Burghley Road already act as effective speed restrictors.
2. Agrees with buildouts but not cushions.
3. See attached - ten reasons

Margin Drive

1. How are these restrictions going to be policed? What stops cars speeding up between calming measures. The restriction isn't maintained now.
2. Drawing 1B detail B(i), (ii) - narrowing on this road is dangerous as demonstrated often when there are parked cars on either side of the road. Drawing 1B detail D as above Detail E - this is a very busy junction and cars from St. Mary's Rd coming down Church Rd then into Burghley, having to slow down at jct will be dangerous to traffic on or entering roundabout at top of hill.

Marryat Place

1. I don't think humps / tables deter traffic from using the road. Simply makes it worse for residents

Marryat Road

1. The most important are: speed - must be cut down, The junction at Marryat / Burghley - cars often pull across probably because they do not see the cross roads. Very dangerous.
2. See 2. Traffic calming has little effect on large vehicles, White vans or 4x4s ? is a huge disadvantage for small cars (electric) & bicycles
3. It is essential to reduce speed on Marryat Road
4. Yes, on the condition that that the proposed changes to Belvedere / Lancaster are implemented. If they are not, then no. As said, our preference is for none of these measures to be implemented, but if Belvedere / Lancaster proposals are implemented, then so must the Marryat / Burghley also to prevent traffic from just moving to these roads.
5. Unless traffic calming is introduced onto Marryat Road - the road will become a race track.
6. See comment 12
7. Although I agree with traffic calming measures in all the other roads, this leaves Marryat road as rat run and I would like "Raised entry treatment junction Marryat/High Street - "20 MPH" restriction signs" are NOT enough - the same measures for Marryat road as all the others to give a balanced and equal treatment to all the village roads.
8. If implementation of proposals 1-8 come about then it is imperative that there is some form of traffic calming in Marryat Rd - probably 2 or 3 raised platforms
9. As comment Q2
10. Would like to see speed bumps in Burghley and Marryat Roads to deter Rat-Run speeding.

11. I disagree with the whole lot as this just drives more traffic down Marryat Road and speeding. Also I see no value in the proposed changes at the junction of Burghley and Marryat Road - other than at tennis time crossing this road is fine and safe going across Burghley Road. If you look at cars at this junction going from Burghley into Burghley (ie crossing Marryat) they are quite slow to cross as traffic comes down the hill so fast and it is useful to have a left filter lane. This change will make no real difference to pedestrians as the cars are stationary here but will create small queues of traffic at times.
12. Unless traffic calming is introduced onto Marryat Road - the road will become a race track.
13. Marryat Road misses any traffic calming measures identical as Burghley Road.
14. I have indicated agreement in the hope that something will at last be done. However, I would like to see more chicanes as these seem to be the only effective method of enforcing the slowing of traffic speeds.

Newstead Way

1. See previous comments on traffic calming. In addition, the proposed highway changes are unjustifiable on cost-benefit grounds. The present junctions work perfectly well.
2. Not a day too early. Burghley Road is presently a racing track. However the traffic calming feature on Calonne Road (A) seems unnecessary.
3. (signed by other residents of Burghley Road) I put a petition into the council about 8 years ago regarding the horrendous problems with speeding cars on this road. Still (and I hear them from my house) cars & other vehicles speeding up & down Burghley (& top of Somerset too) Road - doing well over, it seems, around 50-60mph sometimes. It is very frightening & worrying when crossing the road with small children.
4. A speed camera carefully positioned on Burgle Road would have the necessary control without all the disruptive and expensive measures proposed.

Old House Close

1. No to the speed table for the reasons given in my answer to question 2. Also, there are no problems at this junction due to the comparatively low volume of vehicle flow here. Please stop tinkering.
2. Speed cushions work well to slow traffic.
3. Buildouts of Burghley & Calonne would be very dangerous because of the gradients - speed cushions would be better but nothing is best. The buildouts on Calonne (picture B) and the Marryat/Burghley junction (picture C) are unnecessarily restrictive and a waster of money. Likewise for the junction on (e). Just leave them alone and leave more space, not less
4. No costings provided, so cannot assess whether expenditure worthwhile. In general we should be saving money and reducing Council Tax, not spending it on frivolous schemes like this.
5. Response is qualified by the requirement that speed restrictions must be implemented in Church Road.

Parkside

1. Everything except the cushions - prefer solar signs reminding drivers of their speed or happy or sad face signs are really effective. This will cause problems.
2. ENOUGH. You are turning the Hill & Village into an assault course
3. I am not in favour of priority give way features.

Parkside Avenue

1. The speed cushions at Burghley Road / Church Road / Marryat Road will require careful detailing to ? adequate visibility on the uphill approaches.
2. SEE ABOVE

Parkside Gardens

1. (vi) Install roundabout (vii) Remove old buildout, posts Burghley Rd, Church Rd, and install new roundabout

Parkwood Road

1. 'buildouts' make for difficult driving - ? have done in ? wheels - evidenced by my garage - and expensive for drivers.

Peek Crescent

1. Expense not justified

Somerset Road

1. Traffic calming does not 'calm' drivers. It aggravates them and makes accidents more likely. It wastes taxpayers money which could be spent on more important benefits.
2. One or two measures would be enough
3. Any plan to reduce speeding
4. This is progress but I honestly believe that a temporary closure at the junction of Church & Arthur Roads would considerably improve the safety as it is a dangerous junction & deal with the tremendous quantity of traffic using it as a rat run.
5. Against traffic calming generally in these roads.
6. I drive around all these roads on a daily basis and while there is a natural tendency by a few drivers to drive at 35 / 40mph down Burghley Road toward Marryat Road, there is no justification to spend taxpayers' money on expensive roadworks. Perhaps the cost of a simple flashing speed warning sign 'similar to those in Parkside) a few yards down from the junction with Somerset Road might be justified.
7. Speed tables - across the road are better than humps as large SUVs or 'Chelsea Tractors' can whizz over bumps without noticing them. It is only the smaller (more economical & eco friendly) cars that suffer / have to slow down. This is what happens on all the roads off the Ridgway where bumps have been installed.
8. All unnecessary - waste of money
9. The roads are calm as they are. Please do not waste my council tax.
10. I believe the proposed highway changes at Burghley / Church / St Marys Road will not solve the current issues and more radical proposals are required. This is dangerous junction at any speed.
11. I can see not point in the width restrictions, speed cushions etc (as a ??? users of theses roads on foot as well as driving) I agree to Callone/Burghley adjustment. Some change is needed at Burghley Calonne junction where I have been hit by a car crossing the junction. The ???????? seem useful but not if they mean losing the refuses - perhaps this is a matter of extend of ?????? i thinkg raised table does not help (see above)
12. Anything that will make the Burghley Road/Marryat Road junction safer and make it clear which road has priority and ensure that users know this, will be enormous advantage.
13. I would not support any proposal which would have the potential to increase any traffic using Somerset Road as a 'rat run by pass'
14. the proposals do not sufficiently address the issues of speed or volume of traffic. Also the proposals are not consistent with the target range of a 40-60% reduction being proposed for the Belvederes.
15. All unnecessary and their installation would only create more problems and will be very difficult for residents in those roads, particularly Burghley Road. It is appreciated that Burghley Road is sometimes used as a 'roller coaster' route. However, subject to 'closures' for construction work etc, the traffic moves freely, which it would certainly not do under your proposals. In fact, they would be irritants for local residents. I am not aware of any accidents, as a result of the present arrangements or that they create a noise nuisance for residents in these roads, particularly, once again, Burghley Road. Where we live - Somerset House, Somerset Road - Burghley Road and Calonne Road are the two easiest throughways for

us. Somerset Road past AELTC is always difficult because of the parked vehicles and visiting vehicles to do with the construction work at the AELTC. We understand the necessity for this but it does mean that we have to avoid it during 'working hours'. Somerset Road, the other way, up to Park Side is, once again, by necessity very slow moving. Bathgate Road is also difficult, particularly in recent times because of the redevelopment of properties - all understood. This leaves, for us, the easiest, at the moment, option of Burghley Road, Calonne Road and Marryat Road.

16. As a resident of Somerset Rd, I am opposed to any changes which will bring heavy traffic or large lorries down Somerset Rd which is already a rat run. These changes need to consider the impact on this private road which has a 20mph unenforced speed limit but no traffic calming.
17. I don't think this is fair in isolation as it is likely to force more traffic to use Somerset Road / Bathgate Road. I think 6'6" width restrictions would be preferable and should be applied to all roads, otherwise it is discriminatory
18. these measures do not sufficiently address either speed or volume and are inconsistent with the solutions proposed elsewhere (eg Belvederes)

Springfield Road

1. Traffic moves freely. the only road in Merton where persistent speeding takes place is Alexandra Road. A speed camera would solve the problem. The entrance restriction treated (Rostrevor road) has caused one accident recently. There will be more. Turning in from Alexandra Road you have to back onto the busy road instead of moving to the side.

St Aubyn's Avenue

1. All these are a waste of ratepayers' money & make life more difficult for us, the long suffering local residents.
2. Please do not put any more prioritised working road narrowings in this area - they are turning a pleasant neighbourhood into a nightmare. We have not heard of any accidents in the Burley Rd area or around. How about trying 'Slow Down' signs along here first? Having to drive through 'prioritised working' road narrowings is really horrible, they feel unsafe, are not policed and you would not want it where you live.
3. The Wimbledon Village is a residential area and already the proliferation of road humps & tables is making driving a nightmare. Let commuter traffic through & out of the way as quickly as possible.

St Mary's Road

1. Re 1B detail B - the high paving stones on either side of the road keep traffic very slow at the Somerset Road end of Burghley Road. Re 1B detail D & A - I feel that the owners and near residents should have the final say on this as they will have to listen to traffic slowing down and increasing speed constantly right outside their respective front doors.
2. Re 1B details C & E - unless there is a change of mph we don't feel that raised junctions are necessary. Drivers will know that they are in a 20mph zone and that should be sufficient.
3. 1B
4. 9 vii When traffic goes from St. Marys Rd to Burghley Rd at this jct, they rarely signal their intended direction, thus causing uncertainty to any car coming up from Burghley RD. The erection of a junction table at this point will be an added and unwelcomed distraction, which is why I oppose to it.
5. I support traffic calming on Burghley Road and Calonne Road in the positions shown in Fig 1A, but with speed cushions rather than build outs.
6. We do not support 'buildouts' & 'priority give ways' at ? points; they cause frustration which is more dangerous than what exists now - we would support traffic slowing measures, such as raised sections, which do not restrict width to the extent of becoming a single lane.

Vineyard Hill Road

1. These alterations / buildouts would be very distracting & too many notices and restrictions
2. See previous comments.
3. Is there any proof that the proposals represent good value for money
4. I strongly believe that none of these are necessary. I have never had a problem, I drive these routes several times a day. I feel these suggestions have been made by someone with nothing better to do. I feel they would be a waste of community charge money. Have you earned so much money from parking in Wimbledon that you need to spend it on something!!! Leave well alone.
5. See my response to 2 above

Waldemar Road

1. TRAFFIC DOESN'T NEED CALMING - LAYOUT DOES NOT CURRENTLY ENCOURAGE SPEEDING AS STRETCHES too short and traffic automatically reduces speed at rush hour & school open / close time.

Walnut Tree Cottages

1. Unnecessarily Complex - this is not an area of excessive traffic.

Welford Place

1. May be this is where my comment on refuges should have been placed! Could such refuges be added to all streets of detail 'E'?
2. Whilst agreeing with moderate calming measures all these proposals represent a highly expensive overkill requiring a forest of traffic signs which will blight the environment for all. Navigation of these measures will seriously increase levels of noise and pollution.
3. A top priority must be to reduce the dangers at the Church / Burghley / St Mary's junction where vehicles go too fast. Because it is not a symmetrical cross roads, pedestrians can't tell whether vehicles are turning or going 'straight' on.

Wimbledon Hill Road

1. 9A (vi) Refuge islands should be retained at Burghley/Marryat Road junction with modified (reduced) build out on corners 9A (viii) Proposed junction table will make little useful difference in the specific context. It would cover a large area and be correspondingly expensive. Therefore poor value
2. Priority give way and speed cushions are absolutely useless.
3. I don't really know the area well enough to comment.

Woodside

1. Again this is simply a waste of money, my council tax is too high. - as a result of proflically on ineffectual / unnecessary parking / driving restrictions. Please do not waste my money on this
2. Strong disagreement with speed cushions. They are dangerous for pedestrians.
3. 1. Waste of money. 2. Cause noise & waste fuel. 3. We do not want anymore roadworks. 4. Ruin the feel of the area.
4. There is a clear speed problem on Burghley Road where the road goes into the dip. However surely one measure would suffice here. In addition the junction with Marryat Road needs to be made safer. So the purpose of measure.
5. Residents in above roads should work with traffic dept to decide measures needed

6. I think that proposed priority give way arrangements in this area are a good idea- I think this would work without the speed cushions which are unnecessary and create noise, disturbance etc. Raised junctions also seem unnecessary here as people already seem to slow down.
7. These do not address the real problem of volume in the Woodside/ Belvedere area Wimbledon.
8. These measures are designed to limit speed, but speed is not the issue in the Hillside area. The issue is excessive through traffic. The proposals which are the subject of this consultation do nothing to limit through traffic. they are, therefore, a total waste of public money and should not be implemented.

Comments in relation to Question 10&11**Alan Road**

1. A waste of money, will spoil the road and have more street furniture
2. Again the measures are aimed at speed; that is not the problem. The problem is volume.

Alexandra Road

1. See comments at 9
2. Absolutely not. See Q2. Such speed cushions damage vehicle tyres to a dangerous degree. Surely the council are aware of media opinion on this issue.
3. Didn't have a view one way or another

Alwyne Road

1. The air quality in the centre of Wimbledon is so bad that I can hardly walk along the main road. I would be very pleased if the whole of Wimbledon town centre were only open to delivery vehicles, public transport and cars for the disabled.

Arthur Road

1. See above
2. All this pushes traffic onto other adjacent roads to the detriment of other council tax payers. Local resident have got to live in the area and do not deserve to have their regular progress disturbed to the extent proposed. How can the council spend precious tax money on this kind of survey around the area anyway. Each time the findings are wholly unacceptable to the majority residents.
3. I'm against all speed cushions. If they are not wide enough cars 'straddle' them, don't slow down and may not be aware they are wearing out the inside of their tyres which could cause a blow out- v dangerous if on a motorway. If they are wide they cause noise and fume.

Belvedere Avenue

1. Traffic goes too fast in Calonne & particularly Burghley
2. This is an ineffective attempt to dramatically reduce traffic volumes and speed in the area
3. Pointless

Belvedere Drive

1. As above
2. Traffic control gone mad!!
3. As for question 9.
4. See above - we really don't know enough to decide
5. See comments on question 9

Belvedere Grove

1. Please see earlier comments.
2. Square speed cushions do not stop drivers weaving and speeding only full width steep sleeping policemen as in private estate work.
3. Answer as 9 above

4. Both matters for their residents only - as for 9 above
5. No comment
6. See above comment
7. Not my business as above
8. See above comments 9A
9. Increased noise and pollution for nearby houses.

Burghley Road

1. 11. 3 abreast speed cushions force cars into the middle of the road and cause dangerous driving.
2. Same as previous comment motorcycles are the noisiest and fastest vehicles down these hills. Only full width bumps (tables) will stop their speed
3. This must be an issue for the residents of Calonne Road to decide by majority.
4. Totally unnecessary, and unjustified by traffic flows or speeds in Calonne Road
5. These are all expensive and unproven measures which do not address the problem of volume. There should be experimentation as in the Belvederes.

Calonne Road

1. Ugly design, prefer to have similar to Ernle Road at the beginning & end of the road if necessary
2. There is no significant traffic problem in Calonne Road. The proposals put forward here seem designed to create a problem where none presently exist.
3. The flow & speed of traffic down Calonne Road do not warrant these, particularly when combined with the reduced speed limit envisaged.
4. It is not at all clear who asked for such changes (we know most local residents and it was not the!), why such changes are being considered and what are the assumed benefits. We are opposed to any speculative traffic changes on Calonne Road.
5. See comments under 2
6. There is a speeding and safety issue with vehicles speeding from the Parkside end of Calonne Road into the blind bend. For example last year 2 Council employees were hit by a car coming up the hill outside numbers 24/6 because it swerved to avoid a car travelling at speed coming down the hill into the blind See above comments re 9 and Calonne Road.
7. Road narrowing would be sufficient - cushions are unnecessary.
8. A table at the entrance of Calonne after the Parkside Gardens turning would be more effective. You will have to consider all these proposals that Calonne Rd is a major feeder road to the construction vehicles and materials delivered to AELTCC and the build up & breakdown access for the tournament every year.
9. My view is that the situation in Calonne Rd should remain as it is to save money and consequently ri
10. Please see comments above. I really do not consider there is any need for this type of restriction. A raised entry treatment at each end of Calonne Road, couple with the 20 mph speed restriction should be sufficient.
11. se in council tax.
12. Not necessity for any of these measures in this road. Traffic is light and speeding only very occasional. Suggested measures would be totally disproportionate and to the detriment of the residents. As it is outside the 7.5 tonne limit and used by lorries and coaches (for the Temple) Safety risks would be caused by their moving to, and holding, the crown of the road.
13. These proposals, which were not in the original consultation, are totally unnecessary, expensive and would cause extra pollution. There is NOT a speeding issue in Calonne Road nor is there volume of traffic. Proposal No 10 would also limit the parking which is required for visitors to the Buddhist Temple.

Proposal No 10 would also limit the parking width

14. As a resident/owner of 17 Calonne Rd item 10 concerns me as there are no drawings. Also as we have electric gates this will mean that cars entering through our gates will have to wait in the middle of the road narrowed area while the gates are opening. Th
15. As a resident/owner of 17 Calonne Rd item 10 concerns me as there are no drawings. Also as we have electric gates this will mean that cars entering through our gates will have to wait in the middle of the road narrowed area while the gates are opening. This will more than likely be hazardous and cause congestion as cars will not be able to pass either side of our waiting while our gates are opening. It is also difficult to fully assess the impact of such a measure without a diagram showing the exact positioning of the road narrowing.

As noted above, Calonne Road is generally a quiet road and does not need traffic calming. It will simply make my local journeys more difficult.

Camelot Close

1. Think again!!

Church Road

1. Narrowing is potentially dangerous and damaging to vehicles (regularly seen on Copse Hill) and withdrawing parking in order to make these irrelevant changes is the icing on the cake.
2. As above.

Clement Road

1. Don't waste my taxes! By comparison with the Belvederes, Calonne Rd has no traffic problems whatever!

Coach House Lane

1. I can't think of any roads in Wimbledon which seriously require narrowing.

Dora Road

1. Unnecessary
2. I reiterate my comments at 9, and would add that although I am aware that cars do go too fast in this area, the houses are set back from the road and it is definitely not a busy pedestrian area. I am concerned about the way some drivers overtake cars which are slowing down to pass over speed cushions as this creates a very dangerous situation, so in some ways it would be safer not to have the speed cushions in the first place. this is particularly a problem on Church Road between Southfield's and the junction with St Mary's Road.

High Street

1. For my support, I'd need to see some drawings of what would be affected.
2. It has been shown that speed cushions help no one, least of all the environment

Highbury Road

1. Speed cushions might slightly reduce traffic speed but do nothing to reduce traffic volume.

Home Park Road

1. See my previous comment, please

2. Narrowing of roads is not a good idea as it spoils the look and feel. Speed bumps are effective in reducing speed.
3. No speed cushions : they damage tyres and vehicles.
4. I would support this proposal if it includes cycle provision. Major issue is that there is no provision for cycling in this street proposal or the Wimbledon area traffic study proposal as a whole. This is a major oversight of strategic proportions. This scheme is about balancing the through traffic needs with needs of businesses and residents. How can it not include any cycle provision which would reduce car usage and facilitate local mobility. I for example cycle my children from my Home park road to a school off the Ridgeway. There is no cycle provision (Cycle lanes etc) along this route even though there are about nine schools off the Ridgeway! The school runs traffic is a major traffic generator and this proposal does not include anything to facilitate safely to the schools (through the area this proposal covers). In fact if I have read it correctly this proposal removes cycle provision (e.g. on Wimbledon hill road!). This scheme needs to redesign to include cycle lanes through the roads this scheme covers. For example the below get you to schools along the Ridgeway from the east of the Bevederes 1 cycle lane along Arthur road, Alan Road, Belvedere avenue, Bevedere grove, and Ridgeway 2 cycle lane along Arthur road, St Mary's road, Church road, Bevedere Grove, and Ridgeway, Southside common and back down some roads to Ridgeway (e.g Clifton Road)

Homefield Road

1. I lived for many years in Parkside Gardens and know Calonne Road well. Some traffic calming mid-way down it may be justified but actual road narrowing/one way working seems excessive given the calming measures which will be working in

Kenilworth Avenue

1. Completely unnecessary. Who is this suppose to help? These seem like work projects - waste of council tax.
2. This is a quieter area
3. If road narrowing, please don't put speed cushions and do make cycle lanes. Otherwise road narrowings add to cycle danger. Indeed, please check out cycl best practice for all such proposals available from CTC (Cycle Touring Club) and elsewhere.
4. as above

Lake Road – Remainder

1. I use these roads very rarely I believe I am not qualified to give a reasoned response.

Lancaster Gardens

1. Why, why, why?

Lancaster Road

1. No speed cushions anywhere
2. All proposals are nonsense

Landgrove Road

1. Burghley Road is a fast road. Speeding drivers will only see the road narrowing via build outs as a challenge, not a deterrent. Road humps/speed cushions work well- why else would the council have introduced elsewhere?

Lawson Close

1. Have not seen that speed cushions succeed. Cars just weave across even more dangerously at same speed. Priority passage and road narrowing better.

Leeward Gardens

1. Comment as for question 1
2. See above re speed cushions, width restrictions
3. Waste of money.
4. I think there is a danger in implementing too many speed / traffic calming schemes which may cause further problems. I fear, if we live in the London area, we have to accept that traffic problems may not all be unavoidable.

Leopold Avenue

1. I am not knowledgeable about this area.

Leopold Road

1. See attached - ten reasons

Margin Drive

1. 20mph limit should be sufficient here.

Marryat Road

1. See above
2. 10. and 11. The reason for being undecided is that this could cause additional traffic to move to Marryat Road which already has a speeding problem. We would support further speed cushions in Calonne Road if these were matched by speed cushions in Marryat Road.
3. See comment 12
4. Calonne Rd is already so bumpy that speed cushions are irrelevant. Why not raised platforms?
5. As comment Q2
6. I do not understand why after years of problems with extremely fast traffic in Marryat Road there is still nothing done to change this. This traffic management scheme is likely to exacerbate existing problems on Marryat Road. Put some cameras up and check the speeds on Marryat Road out.
7. Why are there no similar projects for Marryat Road
8. These roads are not saturated with traffic and I again question the legitimacy of these ongoing revisions of proposals, new studies etc. Yes its bad during Wimbledon fortnight and in the build up to and break down afterwards. Far more important is to limit the majority of buses travelling to the championships, very many empty or near empty, which are noisy and polluting from 07:00 to 21:00 or later if play is extended. This would have a far more positive impact on the quality of life of residents. Some residents seem to think that they should live in traffic free residential roads and that is never going to happen.

Newstead Way

1. See previous comments on traffic calming
2. As above - one only has to live here to know about the speeding - happening even as I complete this form- The only concern is the constant revving engines as drivers are forced to slow down so the speed limit

(with a camera) should be clearly (large signs) marked at 20mph. Council at the moment earn buckets of money from fines!

3. Three abreast speed cushions if they are similar to those in Southfields cause motorists to swerve to bridge them and motorcyclists speed through the gaps.

Old House Close

1. No for the same reasons as my answer to question 2.
2. They are dangerous and produce noise as cars bump over them. Cushions are better, speed cameras the best, but I don't believe any are necessary. No one has been hurt. Let the traffic flow.
3. No costings provided, so cannot assess whether expenditure worthwhile. In general we should be saving money and reducing Council Tax, not spending it on frivolous schemes like this.

Parkside

1. One, two and three abreast speed cushions are a nightmare for scooters and bicycles and quite dangerous. Please instead a slightly raised feature, across the whole of the road (like raised entry) is much safer.

Parkside Avenue

1. Speed on Calonne Road is not usually a problem.
2. SEE ABOVE

Parkside Gardens

1. A speed restriction of 20mph should suffice
2. Speed cushions outside house cause great noise and banging need some other form of traffic calming what about a permanent speed camera?

Parkwood Road

1. It just leads to further aggression. A fair number of drivers challenge one to go first.

Peek Crescent

1. Expense not justified

Pine Grove

1. Absolutely not, these cause more problems than resolve them.
2. Only if speed cushions actually work. Surely width restrictors and lights are better.

Somerset Road

1. Would be more important to improve road surface in Calonne Road first!
2. Calonne is fine. The bigger issue is the rat run through Burghley & Somerset to Parkside & vice versa.
3. No 11 seems rather excessive - this road is much less used than Burghley Road.
4. Against traffic calming - see above

5. No motorist will ever agree to speed limiting humps as a means of limiting speed. They cause too many problems.
6. There is no need for traffic calming on Calonne Road. The traffic uses Somerset Road, not Calonne Road, to access Parkside (and from Parkside). As a resident of Somerset Road I generally use Calonne Road to avoid the queues at the end of Somerset Road.
7. Totally unnecessary & a complete waste of money
8. Three abreast speed cushions will encourage drivers to take the middle cushion and become a dangerous impediment as well as an unnecessary distraction to drivers.
9. See comments for 9
10. I don't agree with any measures which would drive more traffic down Somerset Rd which is considerably narrower than Calonne, Burghley or Marryat Road which can all handle greater volumes of traffic and larger vehicles. Somerset Road has not been considered at all, so I oppose these changes.

Springfield Road

1. A waste of money. if this is all about road safety, where are the statistics showing numbers of accidents on these roads. Where is the proof that in some of these quiet residential roads this is all necessary.

St Aubyn's Avenue

1. Current traffic arrangements work - do not spend any more money tinkering with wasteful projects.
2. As above, please, no more 'prioritised working' road narrowing.
3. There are too many speed cushions already making driving very uncomfortable, especially for older residents like myself

St Mary's Road

1. I don't live in the vicinity and rarely use this road for travel.
2. Again we feel that the owners and local residents should have final say on this.
3. 11. If one does have speed cushions at all, THREE ABREAST are the WORST POSSIBLE. Cars go over just one such cushion, they do not go over two of them with one wheel on each. Three cushions thus force cars to veer to the left or the right, both undesirable, not to say dangerous manoeuvres.
4. Again we support traffic slowing but not width restrictions which may be dangerous & bring cars to a standstill

Vineyard Hill Road

1. Don't use Calonne Road
2. Is there any proof that the proposals represent good value for money
3. Do not know the benefit of three abreast speed cushions - please explain
4. I completely disagree
5. I think prioritised working is very dangerous. White vans always think they have priority regardless

Waldemar Road

1. Road is quiet enough, never seen anyone speeding along it. Complete waste of money - just makes life harder for motorists.

Welford Place

1. Not many such narrowing.
2. There is very little traffic on Calonne Road. I don't think these measures are necessary.
3. See comments to questions 3 and 4

Woodside

1. Absolutely no. Speed cushions only ? effect is to ruin the suspension of cars. They bring no value for money and improved safety for the residents / children / pensioners
2. I have not seen a speed problem on Calonne Road but residents would be better informed.
3. Residents in above roads should work with traffic dept to decide measures needed
4. Not eliminating through traffic. Also, for the Calonne residents to decide.
5. These measures are designed to limit speed, but speed is not the issue in the Hillside area. The issue is excessive through traffic. The proposals which are the subject of this consultation do nothing to limit through traffic. they are, therefore, a total waste of public money and should not be implemented.

Worcester Road

1. Road narrowing only No to all speed cushions

Comments in relation to Question 12**Alan Road**

1. Stick to one speed limit swapping from 20 to 30 is very confusing - it spoils the area as there is too much street furniture - and remember this is a conservation area. Open up the Woodside and Wimbledon Hill Road entry for cars going North from the town centre - closing this junction caused most of our problems.
2. However, this will in no way reduce the traffic problem in the Belvedere Area.

Alexandra Road

1. Will need filter on right turn buses (Alexandra road)
2. These proposals will further increase traffic along Alexandra Road. The turn right for buses prevents the 493 stopping outside Sainsburys - and adds to the danger before the current layout. There were many accidents on that corner. It is best as it is.
3. It is necessary to remove cycle lane? Would like to see return of ability to turn right from Wimbledon Hill Road in to Woodside
4. Note should be taken that if Waitrose open a superstore in Alexandra Road, it will increase considerably the flow of traffic into and out of Alexandra Road from all directions.
5. I think the layout as it is very sustainable and sensible.
6. Never happy with kerb cut backs. Everything else (new proposed changes) look good. A pedestrian crossing on Alexandra, St Georges, Wim. Hill Rd should be included.

Alwyne Road

1. I agree with keeping traffic to main roads so we can cleaner air down the side roads
2. I object to the loss of the cycleway.
3. Whether or not they work depends crucially on the timing of the traffic lights, particularly with the proposed new yellow box opposite Worple Road. Is it possible to get these computerised so that they are responsive to different traffic flows at different times of day?

Arthur Road

1. The no right turn for anything but buses into Alexandra Road will force more cars through Wimbledon Village, as no other way to reach Gap Road area etc
2. Any road narrowing should be avoided
3. Definitely
4. Would revert to how it was 5 years ago
5. We are already experiencing heavy, noisy traffic and object that further allowing large vehicles within this residential zone will make that even worse. Please, we ask that you leave the ban in place.
6. Just seem to be adding further complications. The restrictions on access into Woodside from Wimbledon Hill Road, introduced some time ago, has caused significant traffic issues elsewhere in the area, A yellow box & new timings may help but the main problem is that by closing Woodside off, traffic is now forced via Belvedere when exiting up Wimbledon Hill Road
7. I don't understand it fully!!
8. Signal timings at junction of Woodside & Wimbledon Hill are ok at the moment. If you live on the North-East side of Wimbledon you need to be able to use your own residential roads to access Wimbledon and not be forced to go to Wimbledon Village and back down again. What is the point of having roads at all if you cannot use them.
9. certainly the main through route axes of main roads needs attention to ensure the maintenance of flows through the town to reduce pressure on the side roads. the local population as a whole must share the burden of necessary movement around the town and these traffic peaks are generally all during short

morning and evening peaks during the weekdays, whereas all local residents are blighted all the time by the inconveniences proposed by this traffic survey.

10. They sound quite sensible if you believe they would reduce congestion elsewhere and attract through traffic. We do not use Wim. Hill Rd and are unlikely to do so. We use our car mostly to and from the A3
11. Buses going right from Alexandra road into Wimbledon Hill Road will increase traffic congestion. Some of the proposed changes are not very clearly explained with the key map!
12. Why does the cycle lane need to be renewed@?
13. I'm not in favour of the Woodside/Wimbledon Hill Road junction I regret not being able to turn R into Woodside as in the past. I am in favour of a yellow junction box at Wim Hill Rd/Worple Road junction

Belvedere Avenue

1. The principle objective of the Study was to prevent rat running traffic through the Belvederes and Somerset and Burghley Roads. These measures fail to achieve the objective, despite all the time and tax payers money that has been spent. They will introduce a high degree of air and noise pollution into affected areas with the consequent health problems. Speed bumps in neighbouring towns as well as other parts of the Borough have failed to reduce rat -running traffic problems
2. This will not have a material impact on increasing traffic flow and no substantial impact on the north/south traffic blighting Wimbledon Village

Belvedere Drive

1. Support only for Church Road parking restrictions. All other measures are useless / dangerous. The problem is the poor traffic flow through Wimbledon on the A217. Fix that and none of these measures will be necessary.
2. We live on Wimbledon Hill Road and have absolutely no desire to see more traffic on the road thus increasing noise levels. The tranquillity is what we regard as being one of the key benefits of paying one of the highest council tax in London (£210)
3. We now hope that a yellow box would discourage bus drivers turning right from Worple Road, straddling lanes, impeding traffic coming from down the hill
4. The speed cushion between Wimbledon Hill Road and Belvedere Drive: this is the only approach to Belvedere Drive from Wimbledon Hill Road since the right hand turn into Woodside was abolished so do not make it more difficult.
5. There should be a right turn from Alexandra Road up Wimbledon Hill for all vehicles - This is the main artery not the Belvederes area.
6. I do not support any of the proposals
7. I think that the naming of the road going down hill at the junction with Woodside road should be removed then the buses and the cars can continue down in their own lane and the traffic flow will be continuous
8. The closure of Woodside to traffic wanting to turn right from Wimbledon Hill Road is largely responsible for the traffic problems in the Belvedere Estate and should be re-opened.
9. Access to Belvedere Drive in and out to Wimbledon Hill Road is a 'must' people are careful going in and out and ? knowledge there have been no accidents there for the past three years.
10. 11. I am strongly of the view that the proposals for Wimbledon Hill Road would be significantly enhanced if there was a no right turn at the junction with Belvedere Drive, so encouraging traffic from Wimbledon Town and Worple Road to use Alexandra Road as the London-bound route, rather than the Belvedere Roads or other residential roads in the Village. The current arrangements force traffic up Wimbledon Hill Road, with a view to turning right into Belvedere Drive, which is a completely inappropriate route for the current volumes of through traffic. I also think the Council should investigate an unrestricted left turn from Wimbledon Hill Road into Alexandra Road, to smooth the flow of traffic from the Village in a London bound direction, cutting out the Belvederes and Woodside.
11. most problems were caused by road closures to Woodside and Worcester road introduced some years ago

Belvedere Grove

1. See earlier and following comments
2. Should be helpful for through town traffic but will not help reduce volume in the Belvederes
3. Yes, but we believe it will have no effect on the volume of traffic in the Belvedere area.
4. n
5. The bus lane has been very useful in speeding up Buses. Consideration should be given to reducing traffic backing up between the Worple Rd and Alexandra Rd junctions, a simple solution would be to minimise buses turning right out of Worple Rd. Buses 163,164 and 219 should terminate in the Cyril Black Way ,Hartfield Rd area and the 57 and 131 going East should turn right into St Georges Rd and right again into The Broadway.
6. Proposals to reduce rat running through the Belvedere Estate are VITAL. The volume of traffic through the Belvedere Estate is excessive.
7. these seem sensible and should be helpful to the main road traffic flow through the town it has no relevance however to the belvedere problems
8. I do not believe that this is going to help the rat running in the Belvedere roads. The problem is that due traffic moving slowly through the town centre people use roads like ours (which are only access residential roads) to circumnavigate problems with free flow of traffic in the town. We should not have to take this displaced traffic which has resulted from bad decisions in other roads
9. It is to be hoped that the altered traffic light timing at the junction of Wimbledon Hill Rd and Worple Rd will take into account the fact that far more traffic coming down the hill needs to turn right into Worple Rd as compared with traffic coming from the South needing to turn left into Worple Rd
10. Easier east west flow is desirable but it does nothing to reduce traffic volumes in the village area. When considering the boxed junction at the Worple Road Wimbledon Hill Road extend it to cover both the East and West Bound directions. Busses sitting across the westbound lane cause as much disruption as cars waiting in the east bound direction.

Belvedere Square

1. I think the yellow boxes are a good idea. I am undecided on the other proposals as I don't use the area in my car on a regular basis.

Brockham Close

1. Changes at wimbledon hill road/ woodside make crossing wimbledon hill road harder for pedestrians @ removal or existing traffic islands and their new location appears to cause a more dangerous crossing though i cant tell exactly from the map. 2 eastbound lanes of traffic instead of one encourages cars through the centre of wimbledon already jammed and makes crossing the road even harder. kerb cutbacks and changes in signal timings will presumably favour vehicles not pedestrians walkers are already the most vulnerable road users

Burghley Road

1. Yes to a degree. But again; where are the cyclists to ride??
2. Do NOT support yellow box opposite Worple Rd because current congestion caused by buses turning right from Worple Road to Wimbledon Hill Rd would not be prevented by box. In fact would worsen as traffic on Wimbledon Hill Rd would not be able to move ahead, leading to continuous blocking by buses turning right.

Calonne Road

1. Do not approve the removal of the cycle lane
2. See comments under 2
3. So long as there is access for emergency vehicles into Mansell - W'don High Street.

4. I would like to point out that the current traffic islands in W'don Hill road prevent emergency vehicles access to Wimbledon High School. Shifting them as indicated would further narrow the turning circle. If this occurs then radical No Parking anytime areas surrounding the Mansel Rd, Raymond Rd intersection MUST be implemented. Apart from Wimbledon High (over 1000 persons) there is also a Church with conference centre (200+ persons) and a language school in the old xxxx building
5. Excellent proposals
6. And the present bus lane should be made open to all traffic to improve flows down the hill . (N.B. I am a bus user)

Camelot Close

1. No speed cushions

Church Road

1. Take out the bus lane it has made it worse and as a result more traffic use other roads to get down the hill
2. I am not so familiar with the workings of the Town traffic system and do not have any particular issues but anything to allow wider lanes and easier flow should be considered as this is the opposite to restrictions which most of the consultation seems to concentrate on. Bus traffic should not have a negative effect on traffic flow.
3. I fear the effect will be to encourage even more traffic to use Church Road ? going East. It is already overloaded & the proposals ? Belvedere Roads will exacerbate the ? anyway.
4. We suggest that consideration should be given to providing bus - parking for buses such as 163, 164 and 219 - which currently park in Worple Road - within the bus station in Hartfield Road to reduce the number of bus movements from Worple Road to Wimbledon Hill Road and across Alexandra Road.
5. We suggest that consideration should be given to providing bus - parking for buses such as 163, 164 and 219 - which currently park in Worple Road - within the bus station in Hartfield Road to reduce the number of bus movements from Worple Road to Wimbledon

Clement Road

1. Kerb cutbacks would be dangerous with so many school children using these crossroads (Woodside/Mansel)
2. The bus lane is waste of space - at busy time traffic is back up the hill. The past closures and changes in Woodside, Compton road etc have contributed to the Belvedere traffic problem. The changes do not address this.

Coach House Lane

1. If the changes speed up traffic a little I support them.

Compton Road

1. Dangerous for cyclists going down Wimbledon Hill to station as St Georges Road because of the lane arrangement.
2. no account is take of pedestrians pavements need widening of pedestrian safety improved railings need to be removed

Currie Hill Close

1. No right turn into Alexandra Road will not help the flow of traffic. Ask taxi drivers they know.

2. High priority! Inconsiderate bus drivers turning at exit of Worple Road cause an almost constant block. But dont do anything you are not prepared to monitor and enforce.

Deepdale

1. I agree with all the proposals except that the proposed keep clear yellow box at the junction of Wimbledon Hill Road and Worple Road should be extended to carry the whole of the junction. As proposed it would still allow buses from Worple Road to stop halfway across the junction trying to turn right blocking traffic coming down the hill waiting to turn right, and traffic going up the hill including the buses using Wimbledon Hill Road in both directions.

Dora Road

1. Review of signal timings should not reduce length of green signal exiting Alexandra Road or Woodside as these are short already.
2. Concerned about turning left out of Woodside - will traffic lights and slow left turns - traffic light phasing currently ? short and does not allow many cars out at one time especially as pedestrians cross road when lights are green preventing exit onto Wimbledon Hill.
3. You seem to be speeding up traffic through ? the turn. While cars etc are travelling slowly pedestrians are at less danger from being struck. You could stop the buses from pushing in at the traffic lights at the top of Worple Road they hold up the traffic flow far more than anything else. THEY ALMOST ALWAYS GO THROUGH the red light & prevent cars going down the hill and onward.
4. Have you ever tried to drive from Wimbledon town centre to Dora Road without turning right? Its bad enough not being able to turn into Woodside. Those of us who live in Wimbledon Park are not rat-running through residential roads - were just trying to get home by the shortest route with a load of heavy shopping. The rat runs go along Arthur Road and Leopold Road and these have not been addressed at all in these proposals.
5. Driving through Woodside is not rat running, but you must synchronise traffic lights St Georges Road, Worple Road & Woodside
6. As before. Complete folly.
7. I feel strongly that a lot of the problems in the Belvedere Drive area have been caused by the changes made in the Woodside / Wimbledon Hill Road / Worcester Road junctions. I'm sure the residents of Compton Road, Alwyne Road & Woodside are happy their through traffic was now gone up to Belvedere Drive but it seems rather unfair.
8. Yellow box junction unnecessary - simply another opportunity to impose fines.
9. Whilst no school this month. Would it not be prudent to resurface Lake Road
10. I'm broadly happy to see traffic-calming measures but 1) those proposed normally have drivers speeding then braking repeatedly, which is environmentally unsound, so why not 2) enforce a 30mph zone with cameras so that cars can do a STEADY 30mph and 3) do more for cyclists? this proposals does nothing to encourage drivers onto bikes.
11. As a parent who walks from Dora Road to Wimbledon High school every day with her daughter I am very concerned about the proposed widening of the Woodside/Wimbledon Hill Road junction and the removal of the traffic island which currently acts as an unofficial crossing point for the many tens (if not hundreds) of school children that cross from the Woodside side at peak times. If the proposals go ahead children crossing from that side will have to cross three lanes of traffic with no respite safe area in the middle of the road.

I would support a revision of the traffic signal timings for that junction as they seem to be out of sync with each other and with the traffic flow further down the road.
12. In 1BH I think there is still a westbound exit from Woodside left into Wimbledon Hill Road? This seems essential to me. Any improvement in movement at 'Elys corner' would be most welcome.
13. It is a pity to remove the cycle lane at the junction of Wim Hill and Woodside
14. I don't agree with proposed right turn for buses only at the traffic lights of Wimbledon Hill Road / Alexandra Road. It is already not possible to turn right along Woodside or go along Alwyne Road (as Woodside is blocked near Willington School). It makes life difficult and causes an unnecessarily long journey from Wimbledon for those driving to Wimbledon Park and towards Southfields.

Glendale Drive

1. The no right turn at Woodside / Wimbledon Hill Road is a major inconvenience to me, and this junction has been ruined.

High Street

1. Junction with Woodside excellent idea. Proposed yellow boxes excellent. Alexandra Road junction should not have bus turn right feature, two straight on lanes would be more beneficial
2. would like to see the bus lane disbanded
3. Suggest we restrict the number of buses at any one time which can turn into WHR from Worples Rd
4. I am concerned to see the loss of a bicycle lane however short.
5. Provided the traffic lights are re-sequenced. Present arrangements are a disaster.

Highbury Road

1. Plus would like to see the right turn from Woodside onto the Hill Road-opened
2. Not sufficient

Home Park Road

1. Local traffic will be badly affected & journey times will be increased as Wimbledon Hill Road could become 1 long traffic jam. It is bad enough at present, even with residents using local roads.
2. The road is wide and there is speeding now.
3. Too much altogether
4. Any speed cushions and narrowing of roads are dangerous, in the middle of the roads they are hazards and dangerous to all users eg bikes, motorbikes, cars, they also damage cars and cost tax payers money to fix and repair, they create more pot holes Merton already has too many. All these things make life harder for people
5. Traffic movement down Wimbledon Hill Road to the station / Broadway is bad. Cannot see any explanation to improve it. Extra traffic will only make it worse.
6. Suggest right turn into Alexandra Road be available for all traffic
7. I would support this proposal if it includes cycle provision. Major issue is that there is no provision for cycling in this street proposal or the Wimbledon area traffic study proposal as a whole. This is a major oversight of strategic proportions. This scheme is about balancing the through traffic needs with needs of businesses and residents. How can it not include any cycle provision which would reduce car usage and facilitate local mobility. I for example cycle my children from my Home park road to a school off the Ridgeway. There is no cycle provision (Cycle lanes etc) along this route even though there are about nine schools off the Ridgeway! The school runs traffic is a major traffic generator and this proposal does not include anything to facilitate safely to the schools (through the area this proposal covers). In fact if I have read it correctly this proposal removes cycle provision (e.g on Wimbledon hill road!). This scheme needs to be redesigned to include cycle lanes through the roads this scheme covers. For example the below get you to schools along the Ridgeway from the east of the Belvederes 1 cycle lane along Arthur road, Alan Road, Belvedere avenue, Belvedere grove, and Ridgeway 2 cycle lane along Arthur road, St Mary's road, Church road, Belvedere grove, and Ridgeway, Southside common and back down some roads to Ridgeway (e.g Clifton Road)

Kenilworth Avenue

1. Only on the basis that it is aimed at diverting traffic from the rat run. It does seem to make the road less safe for cyclists.
2. 20mph limit works better

3. But not the no right turn (except buses) from Wimbledon Hill Road to Alexandra Road.
4. It is very difficult to follow what is being proposed here
5. We could spend the money on more important projects or reduce the council tax.
6. You propose a Keep Clear area where Worple Road meets Wimbledon Hill Road on the eastern side - it should be on the west side to prevent those STUPID bus drivers from coming over partially. They are terrible - they start turning right as lights change and they block the road - you should have the box nearest to them. If you have it on the eastern side it will effectively stop traffic turning right.

You also mention "a review of signal timings on Wimbledon Hill Road and Woodside. If you make it even longer for people to leave Woodside it will be ridiculous - the wait is too long already. Often drivers are prevented from turning left from Woodside into Wimbledon Hill road as the traffic is so blocked they can't move even though the lights are green for them

7. I support yellow boxes and am unsure about new lanes at junction with Alexandra Road. At the Woodside junction, kerb should not be cut back. It is already dangerously overcrowded on this pavement at certain times eg. when schools come out or in. If you put two lanes here, why not make one for buses and cycles and traffic turning left? When reviewing cycle of lights here, I trust you will make it easier to get a lot through. Woodside: the cycles are extremely large here. NB Please keep the cycle through route which is very useful and part of a long distance route, used by school children and locals visiting to avoid the Broadway.
8. I am unfamiliar of maintaining all cycle lanes. this promotes more environmentally friendly transport and there are currently insufficient lanes in London

Lake Road

1. Why remove cycle lane? Cannot understand rationale for or effects of installing two east-bound lanes through Woodside/Wimbledon Hill Rd junction.
1. It is unclear to me how these changes will assist my car journeys round Wimbledon.

Lambourne Avenue

1. I disagree with removal of cycle lane down Wim Hill. I am concerned about reducing the kerb width at the Mansel Rd/Wim Hill/Woodside jct as many people are using them especially to get to Wimbledon High School, and they get extremely busy already.
2. You are discouraging cycling by removing the cycle lane on Wimbledon Hill Rd. In fact, if you want to reduce the traffic you should be installing MORE bicycle lanes around Wimbledon.

Lancaster Gardens

1. I would not like to see pedestrians being de-prioritised by getting less time to cross these roads. There is already quite often a large build up of pedestrians waiting to cross Alexandra Road and Wimbledon Hill Road and it would be wrong to make them wait longer. Also, some elderly and disabled have difficulty in completing the crossing in the time currently allowed. If the pedestrian refuges on the crossing are being moved, they should not be reduced in size, especially for crossing Alexandra Road as there is often too many people squeezed into the pedestrian refuges there. Also, the pedestrian refuge at the Woodside junction is used by lots of school children and if made less safe, would discourage parents from allowing their children to walk to school.

Lancaster Place

1. I object to the hideous mess of signs and road markings

Lancaster Road

1. Something extra: The jct between Wimbledon Hill Rd & Belvedere Drive is dangerous for pedestrians. There is NO visibility when crossing because of grassy area which is raised. Bus lane is unnecessary. Buses constantly exceed the speed limit.
2. It still seems that this road has been negatively affected by the closure of Woodside Road and we would like to see the reversal of that closure considered.

Landgrove Road

1. Additional traffic calming measures increase noise & are unnecessary
2. Right turn facility for buses in Alexandra Road not agreed. Bus stop too close to junction- buses will block the road for other road users.

Leeward Gardens

1. See comments on Belvedere Drive access from Wimbledon Hill Road as the inability to gain access from Alexandra Road to Woodside because of closure except buses, from Wimbledon Hill Road affects Leeward Gardens. The existing no right turn from Wimbledon Hill Road into Woodside has led to regular illegal use of entry to 65 Wimbledon Hill Road as a turn around to make left access to Woodside. Double route in Woodside to the East will foster more problems. Why not make traffic lights continuous green except when button controlled?
2. The effects of many of the proposals are very difficult to predict. More traffic wardens equipped with speed cameras entitled to impose speeding fines would ensure better results.
3. I support the new yellow box junction at Wimbledon Hill Road / Worple Road junction. I am not sure about the future proposal for a new right turn facility for buses only out of Alexandra Road into Wimbledon Hill Road as it is useful to have a stop in Worple Road opposite Sainsburys it is only one bus route. I write as a pedestrian.
4. -In relation to new yellow box at WHR/Worple Road junction, this must be enforced for buses (as well as cars). Buses currently cause much of the congestion through blocking WHR as they wait to turn right out of Worple Road. Please get TFL/London Buses to
5. Waste of money. I agree with the proposed yellow boxes to control junctions.

Leopold Avenue

1. How much money do you intend to waste removing new road features? Why not do something about the over aggressive taxi drivers at the station
2. 1. Undecided about new traffic islands. I am told that parents children rushing to get to Wimbledon High School will use the present island at base of Wimbledon Hill (not the one further down where there is a pedestrian crossing). The possible parking for the parents is along the northside of Woodside ? St Marys Road. i.e. on the side where the islands are. An argument is that if they use the correct pedestrian crossing they then have to cross Mansel Road to WHS and that since the children are all in a hurry, they will cross without due care. It seems that cars approaching the hill have been seen to swerve into Mansel Road. Which is almost at a right angle so ? to be aware of children crossing. 2. No proposed keep clear yellow box unless it avoids buses coming out of Worple Road blocking east bound traffic as they sometimes do now.
3. 1. I object to the proposal to remove the island at the Wimbledon Hill/Woodside/Mansel Road junction. It is a valuable refuge for pedestrians. 2. I would welcome a 'yellow box' at Worple Road/Wimbledon Hill only if it prevents buses coming out of Worple Road from blocking eastbound traffic as they do now.

Leopold Road

1. I own a flat on WHR & could reduce volume if changes are made.
2. Disagree with removal of cycle lane and cutback of kerbs. Agree with yellow boxes.

Margin Drive

1. Yellow box introduction is an excellent idea. It is the buses which block these junctions & stop traffic movement. Perhaps the right hand bus turn facility should be withheld until Waitrose planning is decided - as traffic problems in Alexandra Road will change. This road is necessary drop off point for station users.
2. Wimbledon Hill Road to be WIDENED to accommodate clear lines uphill and another lane if possible on bus lane side. The pavement takes up too much space on Belverdere Rd side. This should be cut down to create a new lane. If more traffic is directed onto the Hill the backlog will go into the Village, especially with the bottle next outside Wimbledon Library.

Marryat Place

1. Reassignment of carriageway space at junction of Wimbledon Hill Road / Alexandra Road.

Marryat Road

1. Yes These changes should be implemented alone. Once these have done we can evaluate the impact on the rest of the traffic flow. It could be that these measures alone solve the problem. In the meantime - leave everything else as it is.
2. Marryat Rd needs some form of additional traffic calming for it to have equitable treatment with other roads in the consultation area.
3. Too confusing. The weighting of the traffic lights (all 3 sets) does not work - the timing needs to be reassessed as frequently NO traffic moves, the roads are empty, all cars are stuck at red lights signals.
4. Remove bus lane
5. All - do not see a problem with the current position
6. Parking la highlights a major problem in Marryat Road if proposals proceed as planned - It needs additional traffic calming of some form - to be given equitable treatment.
7. Wimbledon Hill Road's traffic flow is of greatest importance

Newstead Way

1. The proposed yellow box at the junction with Worple Road is an excellent idea as this junction is frequently blocked by buses.
2. I question the term "speed cushion" it is a gross euphemism for speed 'bump' because inspite of approaching them carefully well below speed limits, I have sustained expensive damage to my vehicle. My garage confirms that this sort of problem is not uncommon. These speed cushions, have little or no control on vehicles with greater road clearance, i.e. 4 x 4's and commercial vehicles who harass those driving more vulnerable vehicles.

Old House Close

1. There is no need to modify the junction of Woodside and Wimbledon Hill Road to allow 2 eastbound lanes. The illegal traffic lights installed here must be removed and the junction controlled by a signalled pedestrian crossing in its former location eight metres further east on Wimbledon Hill Road, allowing a right turn into Woodside (and removing the illegally closed junction at Woodside with Worcester Road imposed at the same time). These lights were installed illegally by previously employed traffic officers through wilful distortion and suppression of consultation data, misrepresentation of accident data (overstating its case when there was no accident problem at this junction), falsely claiming the use of Woodside as a 'rat run' in lieu of Alexandra Road, ignoring numerous detailed submissions from residents that presented the true facts for this junction, and withholding this data from councillors and all others, including a detailed traffic flow survey based on video evidence, distorting and otherwise misrepresenting the so called benefits to bus timings in conjunction with JMP, the external consultants employed to 'assist' in these proposals and completely ignoring the effect on traffic flow at this junction by the extending of traffic light sequences at the neighbouring junctions, i.e. of Wimbledon Hill Road with Worple Road and St Georges Road / Alexandra Road, these changes having the effect of massively reducing the potential traffic flow through these

junctions by extending a complete cycle from 60 seconds, through 80 seconds to 112 seconds per cycle. Yes, the carriageway must be remarked between Alexandra Road and Worple Road. The current reduction in eastbound flow from two lanes to one lane was imposed in 2004 when the scheme was introduced, including the pointless left turn only lane for buses from Wimbledon Hill Road into Worple Road that cannot be used by buses due to the turning circle being too tight. These concerns were pointed out at the time and as usual were ignored. Changing this back must happen immediately and is not dependent on any other proposal put forward as part of this consultation. The new yellow box junction will only catch buses turning right from Worple Road. Improving the traffic light sequence by shortening it, and reimplementing two lanes will mean that there would be no reason for a yellow box in any event. When the traffic light timings were changed in 2004 and the cycle increased in length, for some unexplained reason (despite requests to find out why), the westbound (uphill) lane at Wimbledon Hill Road with Worple Road remains at green for 12 seconds longer than the eastbound lane despite traffic wishing to turn right here from Wimbledon Hill Road into Worple Road. And the corresponding light at Wimbledon Hill Road with Alexandra Road /St Georges Road being at red for these 12 seconds, so no traffic goes eastbound at this time, and this can be easily evidenced by the complete lack of traffic in the small stretch of Wimbledon Hill Road between these two junctions. Due to the lack of response to my previous complaints I believe that this mistiming was done deliberately to maintain the illusion of the necessity of the bus lane on Wimbledon Hill, through the creation of wholly unnecessary queues at the eastbound direction here. The bus lane on Wimbledon Hill has resulted in the narrowing of the previously wide uphill lane on Wimbledon Hill resulting in it becoming dangerous for cycles. Note: the Woodside junction was falsely claimed to be on a cycle route to divert funding for the scheme when this money could rightly have been spent on a proper cycle route - along with all the other deceptions that I can prove have taken place. The signal timings at the two remaining controlled (and linked) junctions, the incorrect lights at Woodside having been removed, should be returned to an 80 second cycle, which reflects the generally steady level and fairly equal flows of traffic that utilise these junctions. Note: the original scheme was also justified on its ability to reduce traffic flow, however, the artificial blockages on the main road (along, sadly, with many others newly introduced in the surrounding area) have diverted traffic from this artery to the side roads. But, over and above all this, there has been a one off considerable reduction in traffic flow in the area when controlled parking was introduced over the last 10 years (100s of cars used to park in the area and take public transport into central London - all this has gone). Further, the peak traffic flow in Wimbledon is between 3:30pm and 4:00pm reflecting the large number of schools in the area. Traffic generally is low in the area compared to neighbouring parts of London. Another of the catalysts to the problems in the "Wimbledon Area Traffic Study" area was due to the restriction on through northbound traffic on Queen's Road - this problem must also be addressed. General note: it would be appreciated if the spell check could use English English, and not American English (thank you).

2. Object to the right turn only for buses at Alexandra Road. All traffic should be able to turn right here and get rid of the silly system of having to around St George's Road
3. In general we should be saving money and reducing Council Tax, not spending it on frivolous schemes like this.

Parkside

1. Only agree with review of signal timings - this whole area has been a mess since the council closed off Mansell Road / Wimbledon Hill Road 10 years ago. Don't believe current charges will make any better - this whole junction is a nightmare now, and this won't improve it.
2. None are acceptable.

Parkside Avenue

1. I suggest that initially the Northbound section particularly is retained as two lanes. A single lane would tend to increase speeds and perhaps accidents. This section works well at present.
2. REOPEN MANSELL/WOODSIDE BOTH WAYS RE OPEN WORPLE/ALEXANDRA STOP EXPORTING TRAFFIC UP THE HILL.

Parkside Gardens

1. 1) with greater use of Wimbledon Hill Road, ensure proper protection for cyclists (up and down hill). 2) speed up green lights for through traffic.

2. The council would do better to revisit their decision of some years ago regarding the 'closing off' of through traffic in Queens Road and also Woodside instead of spending more and more money trying to put right a hopeless situation, channelling all traffic through the town centre.

Parkwood Road

1. Ugly experience is that aggressive drivers become ? justified, not less, of force their way through regardless of the calculating 'treatments'(sic). Waste of effort.
2. Would like to see bus go & right hand turn must be axed

Peek Crescent

1. Unfair to nearby residents

Pine Grove

1. The whole scheme need a complete rethink and leave well alone as traffic does not speed along smaller roads
2. rat run argument - unsure about
3. None of the proposals can be justified on cost grounds. The previous changes at the junction of Wimbledon Hill Road, Woodside & Mansel Road were unnecessary and poorly designed but there is no benefit from the further changes proposed.
4. it is not clear to me whether the proposed changes will make anyway easier to access from Wimbledon Hill Road into Woodside. If the access into Woodside is not to become easier than now, then I would agree with all the proposed changes.
5. Not enough detail.

Rectory Orchard

1. Disagree with 'right turn for buses' from Alexandra Road. 1) traffic flows would be adversely affected at junction. 2) Bus 493 would no longer stop in Worple Road. This would disadvantage passengers (eg the elderly or mothers with push chairs) who use this stop outside Sainsbury's (with heavy shopping bags)

Ricards Road

1. Wimbledon Hill Road bus lane unaffected has arrows to wrong places. No provision for cyclists, instead more provision for cars and further kerb cutbacks for pedestrians.

Rostrevor Road

1. You are going to re-direct the Belvedere traffic down Woodside, This should be discouraged. Alexandra Road is the designated through fare
2. Do not agree with new right turn for buses. It will be confusing for traffic & pedestrians, Car & motorcycle drivers unused to area could take advantages. Serious accidents may be caused. This addition is unnecessary.
3. I note the proposal to change the review of the traffic lights at the junction of Woodside & Wimbledon Hill Road. As a resident of Rostrevor Road, I often find I have a long wait to turn left out of Woodside, even when there is little traffic on Wimbledon Hill. This can persuade me to use St Marys Road and Belvedere Drive instead of the more direct route onto Wimbledon Hill Road.

Somerset Road

1. Please do not remove the bus lane. As a cyclist it is great to have this. Two lanes for cars will only displace the traffic back up - it won't solve the problem. And two lanes of traffic will make it a dangerous cycle route
2. Wimbledon Hill Road traffic is very slow going down to town. Taking away rat - runs will make it worse for locals. Others do not use rat runs, so there is no problem.
3. The analysis of problems and proposals is either these are welcome (though the Eastside section of Wimbledon Hill Road between Worple Road and Alexandra Road see to me to operate as two?????????? Can we use the bus lane which appears to have slowed down rather than improved flow?
4. I totally support a continuation of the bus lane down Wimbledon Hill Road. It has great improved traffic flow and prevented a huge build up at the junction with Woodside. Plus given buses priority and so making journey times more reliable and predictable. The bus lane should definitely...

Springfield Road

1. Unnecessary

St Aubyn's Avenue

1. Do not waste ratepayers' money on these ill thought - out schemes which make life more difficult for local residents.
2. Yes to all except carriageway remarking. As not that many cars turn left into Alexandra Road. Here there would be a building/bottleneck on the B'way lane (illegible on your map so most people responding to this surely will have missed it) making it pointless to create 2 lanes further back. A joint forward/left turn in the left lane would be better.
3. Any proposals to encourage traffic to use Wimbledon Hill road and not residential roads is welcome.

St Mary's Road

1. The proposals appear to prohibit northbound cars from turning right into Alexandra Road. Since they cannot turn right into Queens Road either, I consider this to be a bad proposal.
2. I do not support the use of the yellow box junction at the junction of Wimbledon Hill & Worple Road as it would then be extremely difficult to turn right into Worple Road from Wimbledon Hill. I don't know whether this issue could be overcome by having a right turn traffic light?
3. Although I agree with the proposed road layout changes, I think that pedestrian needs at the northerly junction of Wimbledon Hill Rd/Woodside/Mansel Rd needs to be considered further, with perhaps pedestrian crossing lights introduced at the jct. As one of the many parents walking my child to Wimbledon High, I feel that vehicles and even cyclists are higher priority at this jct than pedestrians. It is a dangerous jct to cross, with no help from crossing lights and could be made even more dangerous under the proposals.
4. But we do not think these measures will be enough to solve the chaos involving Worple Road / Alexandra Road junctions. The original survey was supposed to deal with this & it hasn't.
5. It will be interesting to see if these proposals have the desired effect

The Green

1. Unecessary & purely anti motorist

Vineyard Hill Road

1. There should definitely be a right turn for car & taxis from Wimbledon Hill Road into Alexandra Road particularly as there is no right turn from Wimbledon Hill Road into Woodside(this should be allowed). Do

not alter the signal timings from Woodside left into Wimbledon Hill Road. They are already too short so there is barely enough time for 3 cars to go left when lights and there are too many signs at this junction.

2. The traffic lights are a huge problem and traffic builds up quickly. At times it is impossible to turn left at Woodside despite its light being green. Buses MUST NOT enter the crossing if they cannot get through - they can really hold things up. PLEASE CAN WE TURN LEFT AT WOODSIDE (limit hours if you want) GOING UP THE HILL AND ALSO TURN LEFT AND GO STRAIGHT DOWN QUEENS ROAD NOT JUST TO THE CAR-PARK. SURELY BY USING MORE ROADS TO GO EAST THEY WILL BE LESS TRAFFIC ON THE ROADS CURRENTLY ONLY ABLE TO BE USED e.g. Belvedere and trinity
3. Don't understand why some of the changes are being proposed
4. Generally I agree, but from the drawings it is unclear whether there will still be a right turn into Alexandra Road from The Broadway (is it only for buses?) I do not feel that buses need preferential treatment here, nor do I think that cars should not be able to turn right. The other proposals I agree with.
5. The original restrictions put in recently made no sense.
6. If the no right turn into Woodside from Wimbledon Hill Rd was removed, the Belvedere's area would not be over-run & traffic calming would not be necessary. That was a ridiculous 'King Canute' measure & the price is now being paid by village residents putting up with the rat-running and the rest of us having to contend with intermediate calming measures

Waldemar Road

1. Hard enough to drive down this road since the changes to the town centre & junction with Alexandra & Worple Roads - has caused huge increase in delays. Don't need anymore.

Walnut Tree Cottages

1. I am convinced that many of the traffic problems in this area arose from the turning instructions into Compton, Alwyne Rds and particularly Woodside. Only if these instructions are removed and political manifestos must be valuable to change circumstances, will the Wimbledon Hill Rd problems be resolved. Drawing 1B (H) is too small & too complex.

Welford Place

1. Yes if it means one lane will be for buses. The problem with congestion in the Belvederes all started when Woodside was made one way, school traffic which went directly along Woodside now has to do a detour through the Village
2. Modification of Woodside/Wimbledon Hill Road - not supported.

Wimbledon Hill Road

1. The proposals should incorporate reinstatement of right turn from Woodside to Wimbledon Hill Road (westward). This restriction has caused a large increase in through traffic through the Belvedere Estate roads. It is unfair to export through traffic from one set of residential roads to another
2. Wimbledon Hill is often blocked with cars. Wimbledon Hill is also a residential area. No more traffic needs to be encouraged. Furthermore the Ridgeway would also get more traffic and this is already an area with significant jams at peak times. I am wholly opposed to the removal of the cycle lane. I and many others use it frequently. The 'rat' running will be faster than sitting in even more congestion on Wimbledon Hill.
3. Would be concerned it would create more traffic and large vehicles using the Ridgeway. If the measures would also reduce traffic along the Ridgeway I would be in favour
4. No, because your proposal would increase traffic in Wimbledon Hill Road dramatically. The same holds true for the pollution!
5. Sounds fine in print but I'm not so sure that the proposals are going to make too much difference as traffic is so heavy on Wimbledon Hill Road & if the ? areas are going to join in, the effects of changes could be negated

Windy Ridge Close

1. I suggest island etc be removed from junction Mansell / Woodside / Wimbledon Hill Rd.

Woodside

1. Woodside/Wimbledon Hill Road junction modification to accommodate eastbound lanes: Do not support
2. The current arrangement of access from Wimbledon Hill Road into Woodside is most inconvenient to residents of Woodside living between St Mary's Road and Wimbledon Hill Road. There is no access for people driving away from the Station and wanting to turn I
3. Lanes of traffic instead of two outside Woodside three will lead to increased pollutants. There are so many schools / nurseries around here, this doesn't sound safe. The review of signal timings at this junction will undoubtedly cut pedestrian green lights drastically
4. Concern over turn right for buses only from Alexandra Road - may mean more traffic 'rat runs' through residential streets in order to head towards the Village. Also difficult to turn right from Wimbledon Hill Road to Worple Road & a yellow box will make it more difficult.
5. 1. Right turn for buses from Alexandra Rd into Wim Hill Rd. unnecessary for only 493. 2. Keep Clear yellow box junction Wim Hill and Worple Rd. Right turn ability will be compromised by lack of time to turn right. One can't turn right to go towards Raynes Park from anywhere else.
6. Reassignment of carriageway for a right turn on Alexandra Road will cause problems. Cars coming down the hill use the left lane to avoid cars turning right on Worple Road. It does not make sense to change to the left lane to cross the Alexandra Road / St George's junction. \\\\\\\\\\\keep clear yellow box near the library only helps buses turn from Worple Road, it is too large a junction to avoid entering from the hill. Right turn from Wimbledon Hill onto Alexandra Road should have a dedicated signal.
7. However, I do not support the proposed ban on right turns except buses at Alexandra Road. This item is on the map but omitted from this survey. This measure would drive more traffic down Woodside and other residential streets.
8. Would be concerned if buses could turn right from Alexandra Road into Wimbledon Hill as this suggests that these bus routes would only stop at the bus stop on Wimbledon Hill (missing out the stop on Worple Road). The bus stop on Wimbledon Hill is already very busy and causes pavement congestion.
9. these proposed changes will not solve the problem of excessive volumes of through traffic
10. I generally agree, but disagree with the right turn lane for buses from Alexandra Road into Wimbledon Hill Road- This will only serve 493 route in one direction, saving perhaps 2 mins- this is not a busy route- why reduce capacity at this junction by narrowing it for other traffic? it is against the aim of reducing rat running.
11. It is particularly important to ensure that stationary buses do not block traffic in both direction on the Hill when then cannot execute a right turn from Worple Road without clearing the junction completely.
12. I do not believe these will eliminate the volume of traffic on Woodside and its adjacent roads or in the Belvedere area.
13. These measures are designed to limit speed, but speed is not the issue in the Hillside area. The issue is excessive through traffic. The proposals which are the subject of this consultation do nothing to limit through traffic. they are, therefore, a total waste of public money and should not be implemented.
14. I strongly oppose the right turn facility for buses only proposal for Alexandra Road. This will additionally restrict my access to Woodside and from Woodside. Also do not cut back the road at the end of Woodside. Hundreds of children use this for access to Wimbledon High School in the morning. Cars do U turn in the area (illegally & highly dangerous) this would facilitate this.
15. The current arrangement of access from Wimbledon Hill Road into Woodside is most inconvenient to residents of Woodside living between St Mary's Road and Wimbledon Hill Road. There is no access for people driving away from the Station and wanting to turn into Woodside. These people are forced to turn right onto Alexandra, left onto Parkwood and left again onto Woodside. Similarly, people exiting Woodside can not turn up Wimbledon Hill Rd but must instead turn up St Marys to Belvedere or Church. Very inconvenient and creates extra traffic for those side roads.

Comments in relation to Question 13-14**Alan Road**

3. 20mph is a waste of time, there have not been any prosecutions for speeding >30mph
4. 14. Whats the point of a 20mph speed area when no one ? 30mph Wimbledon Hill Road and Church Road frequently have vehicle in excess of 50mph.
5. enforcement is a big problem as many do not observe speed limit at present
6. 13 Lorries are a problem here.

Alexandra Road

1. Extend 20mph limit to Alexandra Road- some very dangerous driving (speeding) along this road
2. Excellent Work!! I hope buses and trucks conform! Its really busy and dangerous for pedestrians on Alexandra Rd so I like these changes.
3. But it will increase speeding traffic on Alexandra Road which is never considered in these proposals while at the same time the ? depart increasingly grants conversion nights to racketeers in that road adding to the parking problems.
4. I would like to see this extended to Alexandra Road as there are significant problems which will only increase as a result of these proposals. It seems as though you have made a decision to ignore our environment altogether.
5. Agree with speed limit very much.
6. Issue will force traffic onto roads immediately bordering area in 1a so causing problems for residents there?

Alwyne Road

1. All proposals to prevent us breathing polluted air are welcome. Please do what you can and thanks for asking us.
2. I am currently untroubled by large lorries so don't have strong views on this. I wholly support the 20 mph limit on residential roads. If they are not agreed on for the whole area, please can you retain for the Alwyne Rd/Worcester Rd/Compton Rd "island" - these are "family" roads, with children, pets and parked cars. 20 mph is plenty fast enough for this patch.

Arthur Road

1. 14. During daylight hours, it is usually automatically enforced. How do you propose to enforce it in the evenings and early mornings?
1. Every opportunity should be made to help the use of bicycles in the area. Besides bike lanes where possible, there should be more places to park and secure bicycles.
2. 20mph speed limit would be impossible/expensive to enforce. It will have no practical effect, and will be a waste of money.
3. 20 mph would be acceptable-- WITHOUT-- the accompanying obstructions and interference. NOT BOTH. It cannot be afforded anyway.
4. The existing 7.5 tonne limit is not currently enforced and lifting it after 8 p.m. seems to add no benefit.
5. Volume of traffic in the area at peak times has a natural calming effect. Outside peak hours, 30mph seems reasonable
6. In my experience of the area which I travel every day speeding is not a problem and while it is unlikely that 20mph is ever exceeded in most of the area most of the time a 20mph limit would be unnecessarily restrictive
7. We pay very high rates of council tax to live here are surely entitled to reasonable use of our own residential road system.

8. Any further measures to restrict or slow down traffic in Arthur Rd (hilly bit leading to the Arthur Rd shops) would be most welcome. Traffic frequently speeds in this area.
9. Provided 7.5 tonnes does not preclude school coaches this is fine
10. Fully support both these proposals
11. I also believe it is necessary to introduce measures to slow traffic at the lower end of Arthur Road. There are traffic humps at the top half & not the bottom. A 20mph warning sign would be a minimum.
12. I believe some calming or enforcement will be needed in Arthur Road, up from Home Park junction. Speeds are high in both directions.
13. It will achieve nothing in Arthur Road, unless a raised traffic calming ramp is created at the Home Park Road junction. Cars accelerate forcefully too often up the hill and often come down too quickly.

Atherton Drive

1. I live in the area and have tried to drive 20mph, IMPOSSIBLE on downhill roads!! Why impose new speed limit which most cars - even when trying! - cannot adhere to! Please be reasonable about this! Just remind people to speed limit with flash boards

Belvedere Avenue

1. However this will have little impact on overall volumes in the area
2. The lorry ban should be 7.30am - 9pm - keep them out during the day when they clog up the High Street and encourage traffic onto the 'rat run' roads
3. 20mph needs to be monitored by camera

Belvedere Drive

1. ban on all the belvedere roads should be implemented unless delivering 20mph is fairly imminent still DOESN'T REDUCE VOLUME OF TRAFFIC
2. Would like to know how the 20mph limit is going to be enforced?
3. In principle, these sound like a good idea, but would only approve of these if properly enforced with speed cameras (or police with speed guns) . My preferred option is to use width restrictors, as already stated, to contain lorry size, and slow people down.
4. There seems to be no enforcement of the existing 20mph zone - or indeed the 30mph limit on Wimbledon Hill Road. The Council should ensure that there is some police enforcement, as in a number of roads in the area, either there are no physical restrictions, or such physical restrictions as exist or are planned will not be sufficient to be self-enforcing. Known existence of regular police presence would be more effective than increasing physical restrictions.
5. This is a good idea, but the present ban is not working - in fact many heavy lorries passing through that I am sure there should be a ban on buses using Belvedere Drive to go to and from schools - Wimbledon High bus comes this way (for excursions not run to and from school) and others
6. you are not delivering. So we hope the new boxes can be effectively policed.

Belvedere Grove

1. Through traffic no thank you, but considerate unloading ok.
2. I am all for reducing the speed limit in residential roads and keep large commercial vehicles out. I cannot and will not support changes that create damage, pollution and prevent tax paying residents from moving around freely and safely
3. The 20mph limit alone should moderate speeds in the area and obviate the need for humps
4. One step in the right direction- add speed cameras with clear warning and whole area problem over.

5. The speed limit change will have no effect unless it is policed.
6. It is VITAL to reduce speed throughout the area - it increases safety for all - particularly children the elderly and cyclists.
7. How do you enforce the ban? We have enormous lorries crossing the area and our road including articulated lorries which are just passing through the area.
8. Re the proposed 20 mph speed limit, we need numerous speed cameras to enforce this.
9. A 20mph limit seems unnecessary in addition to the speed calming measures proposed. Where is evidence to support the reasoning behind this.
10. here is a need for lorries to have access to the neighbourhood, but it is the though lorries that cause the problem. Stop the trough traffic and there will be no need for a local ban.

Burghley Road

1. 13) Existing lorry ban in Burghley Road is not enforced. It is pointless to make new rules and not to enforce the existing ones
2. The suggested measures in the rest of the proposal are more than enough to ensure a safer environment. A reduction of the whole area to 20mph is not reasonable. Currently people ignore 30mph so rather enforce that, than put up 20mph, which only residents would adhere too. To my knowledge (especially around Burghley road) there are no grounds (i.e. junior schools) which justify it.
3. Why is not a wider area included in the Lorry Ban, ie the other side of Church Road through to Parkside?
4. Residents will need to know how these restrictions can be enforced. Self policing on lorry ban has never been effective.
5. 30mph.
6. A 20mph speed limit will have a major impact in itself by limiting the effectiveness of rat-running. This should be implemented now, with other traffic calming measures at least delayed until the effectiveness of the 20mph limit can be assessed, or preferably cancelled altogether.
7. Lorry ban should extend to include all roads between Church Road and Parkside.

Calonne Road

1. But these bans are frequently ignored & nothing is done to enforce the ban, just ugly ineffective signs.
2. I have lived in Wimbledon for almost 10 years, previously at top of Kenilworth Ave. The most dangerous driving area is Kenilworth/Woodside?leopold Rd area and nothing has been done. This should have priority.
3. The carriage way markings are unsightly and unnecessary, particularly within a conservation area. Until 2002 there wasn't a single item of signature or street furniture on Calonne Road. The introduction of meters changed all that - the detriment of the environment.
4. Lorries are not a problem but the time limits are out of line with modern internet shopping and deliveries. 14. 20 mph zone not required - traffic is usually within 30 mph limit and such measures only increase time of throughput, increasing annoyance to residents.
5. Excellent proposals
6. A 20mph speed zone is a good idea to reduce traffic speeds.
7. I support 20 mph speed limits in particularly dangerous or accident-prone locations e.g. outside junior schools . However I do not agree with blanket application as it tends to lead to non-compliance . I am not aware of any evidence of abnormal accident rates in this area to justify the lower limit .
8. See comments under 2
9. I am concerned that the restrictions will cause lorries to travel to Wimbledon and then to wait outside the area until the right time causing problems for those outside the area
10. The 7.5 tonne ban will only work if it applies to all England traffic down Calonne - otherwise it will not work - it will be seen as unfair.

Camelot Close

1. Strongly support 20mph on Arthur Road between Leopold Road and Wimbledon Park tube. Traffic calming measures should also be considered on this stretch as cars currently exceed current 30mph limit on a regular basis. "Raised entry treatment" should be considered at entrance to Camelot Close to deter drivers entering the close and give protection to the young children (students) who frequently play in the close.

Church Road

1. 13, Church road should be included in 7.5 tonne lorry ban- it is not suitable AT ALL for the large sized lorries which currently use it. 14, Do not know whether it is necessary to drop to 20MPH in every road? DO NOT think necessary.
2. I am not a lorry driver so cannot comment from that point of view but I have not encountered negative issues with lorries and would not wish for their travel to be hindered unnecessarily especially as many businesses/residents rely on large lorry deliveries etc. The 20mph speed restriction is unnecessary as the consultation makes out that the area is congested, in which case how can people be driving too fast? Also, those who drive too fast already will continue to do so and all these calming measures are an incentive to buy a 4x4 which allows ramps etc to be easily encountered with reduced discomfort/potential damage and higher speeds maintained.
3. Nothing in the supporting material indicates that there is a problem with lorries using the side roads.
4. I strongly support the lower speed limit to improve safety.
5. General Comment : Particularly pleased at 20mph proposals shown on Fig 1A. 2. How do you propose to police this sensible proposal. 3 Congratulations on overall proposal
6. Re No 13, would like to know whether this will have any detrimental affect on Church Road traffic Re No 14 - strongly believe this needs to be implemented as a first priority
7. In general the 7.5 tonne vehicles along Church Road between 8pm-6.30 am is extremely limited. 7.5tonne vehicles should be restricted during the weekdays and weekends. My main concern is parking and speed limitations. Re parking permits I strongly request that the cost of parking permits for 2 x 4 cars are charge twice as much as for the small cars (as per Richmond Borough) The 2x4 take up parking space double of a small car and its just not fair that they pay same parking fee. Agree with 20mph speed limits
8. This ban will push all heavy traffic onto Church Road. We shouldn't consider any scheme that favours some roads over others.
9. Lorry traffic in the Belvederes has not, as far as I am aware, been a significant issue in the Belvederes. Many lorries use Church Road.

Clement Road

1. But they are not very important compared with the elephant in the room ie the massive rat-run through the Belvederes

Coach House Lane

1. Area in Q14 is a prime residential area. 20mph is better than 'cushions' or width restrictions but no speed cameras please.

Compton Road

1. How does one get from Gap Road to Wimbledon Village.

Courthope Road

1. There is no need for speed tables in Courthorpe Road as with left turn only at Church Road end it is not used as a through road by lorries.

Currie Hill Close

1. Shops have unloading facilities. Most will flout any regulations. Tesco at the top of Wimbledon Hill Road unload wherever they feel like it - usually parked on the bus stop. Loading between 6.30 - 8am might work. 20mph will not help congestion or safety.
2. but please enforce it

Deepdale

1. 20 mph limit fine in 'pure' residential (i.e. most) roads but not Church/Arthur/Marryat i.e. use 20mph limit selectively to reduce traffic flow in pure residential roads

Dora Road

1. 20mph speed limit across whole area is not necessary. If any required, should be limited to narrow double parked streets (such as Woodside currently)
2. The 7.5 tonne restriction does not go far enough. There is considerable construction traffic on roads at 6.30am, these are very noisy and dangerous, frequently obstruct access and should be banned until 8.00am ie after people have left for work and school runs.
3. Clogging the roads with heavy lorries causes more chaos between 8.30am - 6pm than earlier or later
4. Drivers should always at safe speeds regardless of speed limits. Having speed limits diminishes their responsibility for safe driving
5. A 20mph restriction throughout is unnecessary.
6. I hope you get a good response as competing the form responsibly takes at least half an hour.
7. 13. How are people going to take delivery of furniture? How will people move house? How will people be able to take delivery of building materials for home alterations? How will the council collect rubbish? 14. Yes, in full favour of the speed limit. Police it! Do not waste our resource on these other ridiculous proposals.
8. 13. Can you do anything to stop drivers of skip trucks from hurtling through Wimbledon particularly in the Leopold Road / Strathearn Road area at excessive speeds? 14. In principle I support the idea, but I think it would be ignored and impossible to enforce.
9. 14. 30mph limit is enough
10. I strangely support measures that restrict traffic along strathearn/ home park road and to arthur road as this is a heavily used rat run and people reach high speeds despite the speed cushions which are to widely spaced. I am sceptical the 20mph or load restriction will be obeyed without some additional measures eg electronic speed monitoring
11. How will this be enforced. eg Lake Road, Bishop Gilpin school, vehicles travel too fast
12. I would support any traffic calming in Home Park Road / Strathearn Road as vans and taxis and traffic generally travel over speed humps at great speed. 20mph would be great.

Glendale Drive

1. I'm alarmed at the amount of tax payers money that is being used for these meddling schemes, the printing & distribution of these maps and this survey.

High Street

1. 20MPH also much needed on Ridgeway re 16 or so schools

Highbury Road

1. isn't it better for large lorries to access the area for loading / unloading when no one else is about, ie at night. what do you mean by 'Vehiculars pollution'? if noise then yes if chemical pollution, better at night then during the daytime.
2. Must enforce 20mph
3. It should not apply to B roads ie Church & Arthur Roads

Home Park Road

1. Excellent idea to lower speed limits as most situations don't allow for 30mph anyway. However some through roads should remain as people will be frustrated and not keep to speed limits. Arthur Road should remain a 30mph zone. It makes no sense to lower to 20mph
2. suggest traffic calming in Strathearn and Home Park Road be reviewed for possible reinforcement as increasingly they are used as a cut-through to Durnsford Road and nature of the road is encouraging dangerous speeding and careless driving resulting in an increased incidence of damage to parked vehicles. Perhaps make Strathearn Road One Way.
3. Omit Home Park Road no houses down one side of most of it
4. I would support this proposal if it includes cycle provision. Major issue is that there is no provision for cycling in this street proposal or the Wimbledon area traffic study proposal as a whole. This is a major oversight of strategic proportions. This scheme is about balancing the through traffic needs with needs of businesses and residents. How can it not include any cycle provision which would reduce car usage and facilitate local mobility. I for example cycle my children from my Home park road to a school off the Ridgeway. There is no cycle provision (Cycle lanes etc) along this route even though there are about nine schools off the Ridgeway! The school runs traffic is a major traffic generator and this proposal does not include anything to facilitate safely to the schools (through the area this proposal covers). In fact if I have read it correctly this proposal removes cycle provision (e.g on Wimbledon hill road!). This scheme needs to redesign to include cycle lanes through the roads this scheme covers. For example the below get you to schools along the Ridgeway from the east of the Belvederes 1 cycle lane along Arthur road, Alan Road, Belvedere avenue, Bevedere grove, and Ridgeway 2 cycle lane along Arthur road, St Mary's road, Church road, Bevedere grove, and Ridgeway, Southside common and back down some roads to Ridgeway (e.g Clifton Road)
5. Waste of time.

Homefield Road

1. There is a danger here of an excessive and too widespread application of a 20mph limit. It may be justified in a more limited area, say Church Road to Welford Way and in the Belvederes but indiscriminate application of 20mph will lead to it being ignored

Kenilworth Avenue

1. I am concerned at the number of excessive and stupid signs polluting our roads. Any changes should replace old signs not just add them!
2. 20mph speed limit a very good idea. Instead of some of the physical barriers though, consider spending savings on flashing lights to remind people of the limit eg on Burghley and Arthur Roads. Lorry ban for night deliveries will only add to daytime congestion.
3. I am concerned that limiting access during the quieter part of the evening will simply create more noise, pollution and congestion up to 8pm. Perhaps limiting access from 10pm to 7am would be better
4. for many cars particularly older cars. driving at 20mph lengthens journey times and increases pollution. also there does not seem to be sufficient evidence that such a slow speed limit reduces road accidents or deaths

5. If the speed limit changed between quiet periods (eg. school holidays / night time etc)

Lambourne Avenue

1. I think if the 20mph zone were very clearly marked then drivers wouldn't exceed 30mph which would be marked improvement. Introduction of speed cameras in particular problem roads would solve the speeding without all the width restriction proposals

Lancaster Gardens

1. Most definitely
2. The speed limit must be enforced with speed cameras.

Lancaster Road

1. 30mph is enough
2. We support these measures as quality of life and safety measures for the community. However, with so many schools located along The Ridgway it seems odd that this road is not included in the 20mph zone. Like Church Road, The Ridgway is a road where trucks and cars habitually "make up time" that they have lost on slow-moving roads. So, in essence, by leaving The Ridgway out of these proposals it becomes a road where cars will rush after being held back in the other area of the Village. Although there are signs which suggest slowing down there are no traffic calming measures that would help keep the young children who walk to and from school every day along The Ridgway safe.
3. I do not support speed monitors or additional posts which clutter the pavements and create an eyesore

Landgrove Road

1. Lorry ban should continue. Not properly enforced now anyway. Overall comment- proliferation of signs and other 'usual pollution' is, unfortunately, continuing. Speeds are not monitored or enforced anyway, therefore these additional signs are redundant.
2. I strongly support the 20mph speed limit. Leopold Rd is very dangerous and indeed could benefit from another zebra crossing at the bottom of the hill otherwise an accident involving a pedestrian will surely happen.

Lawson Close

1. Would like lorry ban in area in drawing 1A. But useless unless enforced and penalised

Leeward Gardens

1. I fear there is a danger of imposing too many restrictions and putting up too many road signs that drivers will become confused, which might cause accidents.
2. Re 13: Proposal will mean that access/offloading to shops/pubs will be in daytime, which will increase traffic further. So please either 1) amend map area to exclude shops/pub areas or 2) amend things to provide evening/morning slots for this.
3. Re 13 - It is not fair to attempt to provide night time relief for some residents at the expense of others. We face Wimbledon Hill Road and the proposals would increase HGV traffic at our expense.
4. I do not feel that 20mph limit is justified for Home Park Road, Arthur Road, Marryat, Calonne and Burghley Roads

Leopold Avenue

1. This would be an unreasonable restriction for local shops and create more daytime congestion. 14. Unnecessary and unenforceable waste of money. The only drivers who observe 20mph limits are responsible people who drive sensibly anyway.
2. 13. It will make problems for the shops nearby. 14. Unnecessary and unenforceable.

Leopold Road

1. Leopold Road would benefit from buildout to restrict large vehicles from entering the area. How will 20mph be enforced? speed cameras? Will there be a 20mph sign on entry & Leopold Road from Alexandra Road to warn motorists and discourage cars from entering road.
2. I live on Leopold & its too busy - We are a cut through - please reduce the traffic
3. But without extra signage anywhere except at the entrances to the zones. i.e. not within the zone.
4. 13. Not inconvenienced by deliveries after 20.00. However extremely inconvenienced by the constant stream of banned lorries rat running 24 hours a day.

Lincoln Avenue

1. Not required on Parkside

Marryat Road

1. Too many heavy & unsuitable vehicles on residential roads.
2. Reducing the speed limit to 20mph will only mean that at any time there will be more cars on the road leading to more congestion, pollution and noise.
3. This area excluded Marryat / Burghley / Calonne which is not fair as it risks just pushing the heavy traffic onto these roads.
4. What monitoring is proposed? There has been a 7.5 sign at the entrance to Marryat Rd for many years. Heavily overloaded lorries do not take any notice. Particularly, before, during & after tennis
5. Remember Marryat Road, outside area highlighted, already has 7.5t lorry ban must be retained.
6. Would like to see lorry ban area extended to include Burghley/Marryat /Calonne Road.
7. Again really bad for surrounding roads - you are creating and moving problems elsewhere. Please look at Marryat Road - its a straight and direct road why nothing being done here to deal with existing problem on speeding. Please introduce traffic calming measures - this has been an issue for years. Is the reason that you do not change Marryat Road because of the tennis 2 weeks a year?
8. implement and check ? to these measures.
9. 13. These additional restrictions, to assist enforcement, should be extended to the entire area of the study as soon as possible. Marryat Road is wide and straight and as one of the main North/South cut-through routes, it is particularly attractive to commercial vehicles.
10. Somerset Road from Church Road to Marryat Road and up to Burghley Road junctions is subject to excess speeding in spite & this hazard of double unrestricted parking - which effectively reduces such traffic to a single lane. Careless parking, everyday, impedes the junction of Marryat Road & Somerset Road blind turning each way) added to which the congestion & learner drivers and the local motorcycle school performing 3 point turns etc makes this road very dangerous.

Newstead Way

1. 14 - Speed limit should be 30mph
2. I understand that, pressures have been placed on the Council to stop 'rat running' in certain areas, but it is necessary to make all these costly changes in a time of recession? If all these measures are implemented it will deter motorists from shopping locally taking their business elsewhere.
3. The lorry ban is another obstacle to business for little or no benefit

4. Traffic calming measures will reduce speed. However speed limits of themselves will do NOTHING unless drivers are monitored and prosecuted for speeding. In Somerset Road on almost any day you will see several vehicles going at up to 25mph above the speed limit.
5. Definitely a good thing, but how should it be supervised?
6. Absolutely reduce the speed. It is a supposedly 'quiet' residential area, and because of this & the good quality roads, drivers (probably using some of the roads as shortcuts) speed making it dangerous for pedestrians crossing road etc

Old House Close

1. Why change - there is a longstanding width restriction at Wimbledon Park station on Arthur Road. I fail to see what other problems there can be. No - 20mph is the speed of a funeral cortege, and 20mph is a level where noise and pollution from emissions is relatively greater than at 30mph. Merton has implemented a widespread scheme of 20mph zones throughout the borough. All of these are wrong, and the addition of a further one does not help matters.
2. Unnecessary and unenforceable. Just a nuisance for everyone. How many road deaths have there been on these roads? None!! Let us be!! Ease the traffic, don't restrict it! Ridiculous idea.
3. Only a few roads will show 20 mph signs, so that drivers will get confused, and the limit will be unenforceable and a waste of Council Tax money.
4. Traffic calming features must be included in Church Road for this to be effective in Church Road

Parkside

1. Too slow - 30mph is better
2. PLEASE can we have a consistent 20mph restriction throughout the marked area in 1a. (I see some proposed 30mph signs in drawing 2 at Church Road and Lancaster Rd). It will confuse drivers, and will be impossible to police if there are some roads with 30mph.
3. Parkside is a very busy road. 20mph limit will increase the air pollution affecting all the houses facing the road. There has been almost no safety issues which will be benefited by reducing the speed limit.

Parkside Avenue

13. I am not aware of any concentrations of heavy traffic. This proposal appears to be cosmetic only (if the restriction is on width at Wimbledon Park is maintained).
14. Try the proposed speed cushions first without the speed limit.

Parkside Gardens

1. 30mph is perfectly safe.
2. 1) ensure that the speed limits are policed and enforced. 2) provide better protection and space for cyclists on Parkside (allow cyclists to use the parallel path on the common)

Parkwood Road

1. 25mph is slow enough

Peek Crescent

1. I frequently see lorries using these roads as 'rat runs' through roads. This should be policed more effectively. It is clear that unless it is in the run up to the Tennis there is no real need for Marryat Road to be used
2. Not justified

Pine Grove

1. unnecessary
2. But it MUST be enforced properly. The speed limits on St Mary's Rd are just ignored currently.

Ricards Road

1. Considering to making a full 2 way cycle path up & down Wimbledon Hill should be given.

Rostrevor Road

1. Does this include removal lorries. Lorries delivering furniture etc for residents, skip lorries for residents etc.

Somerset Road

1. I live on the junction Parkside/Somerset Road. Traffic (especially buses) currently take little notice of current speed restricts. Traffic coming from the Village would speed up on leaving the 20mph zone thus increase noise outside out property
2. Q14 How will the speed limit be enforced
3. 13. Yes but the lorry ban should also take in Burghley & Somerset, especially with all the building works at Wimbledon. 14. 20mph is fine provide it is policed.
4. Q14: It would increase the number of cars in the area at any given time.
5. Again the impact on Somerset Road needs to be considered. We do not want to be left with speeding motorists in a narrow road and lorries coming through to the AELTC.
6. Seeing overly restrictive.
7. Q14. Absolutely not. It is ridiculous & unnecessary. Many roads(e.g. Somerset Road, Burghley Road, Calonne Road, Arthur Road, Church Road, Home Park Road) are wide roads with very few cyclists or pedestrians. The current 30mph speed limit is quite safe on these roads. Many other roads have an effective speed of 20-25 because of parking / traffic volumes. No changes needed.
8. How will the 20mph speed limit be enforced.
9. Re 13 - can we extend this to Somerset Road - heavily used by construction lorries Re 14: Behaviour of drivers for the AELT at appropriate speed is the key - we already have a well ??????speed limit ??????. To impose 20mph over a wide area will merely irritate people. (Very well sometimes???????? school. Outcomes may be different) ??????????relevant periods of time)
10. Was not drawing 1a (when flow links while completing this questionnaire, all previous answers were deleted and had to start all over again). If it is the same area as 7.5 tonne lorry ban then I would not object to a 20 mph limit.

Springfield Road

1. Unnecessary

St Aubyn's Avenue

1. Abandon all these wasteful & inconvenient poorly thought - out schemes.

St Mary's Road

1. As the 30mph speed limit is unenforced, there is no point in considering a 20mph speed limit. The critical issue in the area is the through traffic of heavy goods vehicles.
2. Area shown is far too wide. On roads where houses are close to the street and housing is more dense (eg. Church Road, Belverdere Grove), then 20mph is relevant. For roads such as Arthur Road, Home Park Road, Burghley Road etc. it is not necessary. Traffic calming measures will reduce speed appropriately.
3. 13. We think this is a very minor problem. 14. We see no reason for this in the burghley Road / Calonne Road / Marryat Road area.

The Green

1. 20 mph limit is excessive and duplicative given the above changes

Vineyard Hill Road

1. ...but how to enforce them?
2. Absolutely not. 20mph zone may be slower, but people pay too much attention to their speedometer. Furthermore roads like Vineyard Hill / Dora / Home Park Road are too long and hilly to realistically be made into enforceable 20mph speed limits.
3. 20mph is really, really slow - totally unnecessary - 30 is fine - apart from when 100 yards from school entrances when '20 is plenty' during term/day time.
4. The 20mph limit should be extended to include Wimbledon (Village) High Street from the bend at end of Parkside to the top of Wimbledon Hill. 30mph is too fast in the High Street.
5. Please stop Foxtons minis monopolising the parking in Woodside, St Mary's Road. There's a ridiculous number of them. They restrict parking for shoppers we need to support our local shops.
6. If a 20mph zone is introduced into the whole area, all the traffic calming measures become avoidable. I am fed up of negotiating speed humps, cushions, road width restrictions & I am fed up of seeing zillions of metal poles with parking information on them. The whole area is being ruined.
7. The council should spend its limited funds on improving road surfaces on residential roads rather than wasting it on these proposals.
8. N.B. speed calming measures are required in Vineyard Hill Road to restrict vehicle speeds - many cars ? into VHR of speed fun Home Park Road and continue accelerating up the road - with the bend in the road and lots of school children this is very dangerous.
9. I generally feel that most people drive at a modest speed when pedestrians are about & that at night people who speed will speed anyway. 20mph is very slow when there is nothing in the street. I favour removal of road markings to make people think more.
10. 20MPH sign need at entrance to Vineyard Hill Road. How will the speed limit be enforced?

Waldemar Road

1. No evidence of speeding in area - 20mph speed limits are very confusing in an area with none at present and lots of 30/40s. Will cause unnecessary prosecutions & fines.

Walnut Tree Cottages

1. See my answer to Q2 A speed limit is only effective if it can be enforced, cameras are vital

Welford Place

1. Not sure what we would gain by decreasing from 30 to 20mph enforcing 30 might be better

Wimbledon Hill Road

1. NB 14) 20mph speed limit should start at entrance to Village from Parkside - should include the High Street and Wimbledon Hill Road especially as the restrictions at the bottom are being lifted. Also there would be fewer unsightly 20/30mph signs
2. Yes, all deliveries to shops should be made by small vans. The Dutch Flower lorries have been notable offenders as oversized for deliveries to Village shops
3. See above (no 12)
4. 20mph limits are pointless they are ridiculous
5. But would support this if it didn't mean more traffic using the Ridgeway

Windy Ridge Close

1. Some roads make 20MPH seem ridiculous e.g. Marryat, Arthur and Calonne and thus will mean the limit is ignored there and thus where it is really needed e.g. outside schools etc.

Woodside

1. Except for emergency vehicles in attendance
2. speed is not the real problem--excessive volumes of through traffic will only be discouraged by restrictive measures, eg banned turns/no entries as implemented by Merton Council on many other roads in the Borough: South Park Area/ Queen's Rd/South Wimbledon
3. The 20 mph speed limit will require appropriate enforcement.
4. 20mph limits are irrelevant and will cause residents far ? ? than the out of town visitors. An ineffectual waste of (my) money.
5. Changing the speed limit is fine. Speed tables are fine. Speed cushions are dangerous
6. Lorries should be banned from using local access roads. The 20mph limit will not result in a reduction of through traffic or necessarily a reduction in speed. The speed cushions already in the area do not seem to have reduced volumes or speed. I don't believe this will either.
7. These measures are designed to limit speed, but speed is not the issue in the Hillside area. The issue is excessive through traffic. The proposals which are the subject of this consultation do nothing to limit through traffic. they are, therefore, a total waste of public money and should not b