

Committee: Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel
Date: 07th July 2010
Agenda item: N/A
Wards: Village, Hillside and Wimbledon Park
Subject: Wimbledon Area Traffic Model
Lead officer: Chris Lee, Director of Environment & Regeneration
Lead member: Cabinet Member for Environmental Sustainability & Regeneration – Cllr. Andrew Judge
Contact Officer: Waheed Alam (020 8545 3200)
Key decision reference number: N/A

Recommendations:

That the Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel:

- 1) Notes the previous Cabinet Member's decisions dated 6th May 2010 regarding the Wimbledon Area Traffic Study (attached as appendix 1).
 - 2) Notes the background to the proposals and all relevant committee reports to date. Reports can be provided upon request.
 - 3) Notes the requested additional information regarding the implications of each aspect of the various proposals.
-

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide the additional information as requested for the 'Call in' of the Cabinet Member for Planning & Traffic Management's decision dated 6th May 2010.

2. DETAILS

- 2.1 Over the years there have been complaints regarding the volume of traffic and rat running through some roads in the Village. Following the investigations of a number of concepts and proposals in agreement with all the Ward councillors and the Cabinet Member the Council carried out an area wide informal consultation during August 2009. Upon considering the results the previous Cabinet Member approved the undertaking the formal consultation. The results were reported directly to the Cabinet Member who on the 6th May 2010 made a final decision which is attached as appendix 1.
- 2.2 Following this decision the Cabinet Member stepped down and prior to the appointment of the new Cabinet, four councillors called-in the decision.

3. IMPLICATIONS OF PROCEEDING/ NOT PROCEEDING WITH DECISION OF 6TH May 2010

- 3.1.1. The Wimbledon Area Traffic Study contains a number of different proposals covering a large area of the Village, Hillside and Wimbledon Park Wards. The elements of work

referred to below are those which considered as the Option 8 proposals which were formally consulted upon during February and March of 2010. It should be noted that this is the amended Option 8 rather than the Option 8 which was informally consulted upon in August/September 2009.

- 3.1.2. As per requirements of a formal consultation, the council is obliged to put forward a 'Statement of Reasons' for each proposal that requires the making of a Traffic Management Order. The statement serves to provide a brief information detailing reasons for the proposal and its objectives. The following sections highlights the 'Statement of Reasons' for the various items within the Wimbledon Area Traffic Study along with the decision and officer's comments.
- 3.1.3. It would be advisable for the Panel to also consider the Officer report of 4th May 2010 when taking account of the Cabinet Member decision of 6th May 2010.
- 3.1.4. For drawings showing the latest proposals to which the Cabinet Member decision relates to, please refer to the Consultation material forming part of the Statutory Consultation attached as Appendix 2.

Notes

- 1 – ***Proposals detailed in section 3 of this report are as per consultation document attached as appendix 2.***
- 2 – ***The Statement of Reasons and Cabinet Member comments are quotes/extracts from the relevant documents.***

3.2 PROPOSAL 1 (refer to consultation booklet)

3.2.1. Church Road Waiting and Loading Restrictions 'Statement of Reasons'

The proposals aim to:

- a) allow the smooth and safe flow of two-way traffic during peak hours and in turn enable Church Road to better perform its important function as a Local Distributor Road.
- b) enhance the vehicular carrying capacity of Church Road during peak hours.

3.2.2. Cabinet Member Comments

a) Decision

I agree this decision But wish the disabled bay to be relocated in Courthope Road.

b) Reason for Decision

It is clear there is a need to ensure Church Road has the capacity to handle a little more traffic.

c) Alternative Options Considered and why rejected

Without this change it is impossible to seriously handle the traffic problem before me.

3.2.3. Officer Comments.

- 3.2.4. The southern section of Church Road outside the parade of shops suffers from a bottleneck due to the Pay & Display bays. During off-peak hours, when traffic volumes are lower, vehicles passing through this section are able to give way to each other without causing tailbacks, however during peak hours when traffic volumes are higher, the bottleneck causes longer tailbacks giving an impression of congestion to drivers down stream. Additionally, larger vehicles such as buses also have problems in

accessing this section of Church Road. This is one factor which may discourage more drivers from using Church Road and seek alternative routes such as the Belvedere roads. It is considered that the proposed measures will smooth the flow of traffic and make it a more attractive option for drivers. With the removal of the need for larger vehicles having to mount the footway, it would also make it safer for all road users.

3.2.5. Proceeding with the decision

Improving journey times along Church Road would contribute toward achieving the overall objectives by encouraging through-traffic to use Church Road. The voluntary shift of traffic from the Belvederes to Church Road would help in achieving the scheme's objective i.e. through-traffic to use the Distributor Roads. Though the rat running problem in the Belvederes can be resolved through more targeted and direct means such as road closures or banned movements etc, improvements on Church Road is likely to reduce the possibility of any traffic that may choose to shift to other roads such as Woodside and Marryat Road.

The consultation has shown there is generally overall support for this proposal.

3.2.6. Not proceeding with the given decision

Not implementing the 'Waiting and Loading' restrictions in Church Road would do nothing to improve the flow of traffic along this local distributor road.

3.3 **PROPOSAL 2**

3.3.1. Church Road Traffic Calming 'Statement of Reasons'

To manage and effectively control the relatively high vehicular speeds in Church Road and in turn enable the council to meet its duties to secure the safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians).

3.3.2. Cabinet Member Comments

a) Decision

Agree this item.

b) Reason for Decision

I accept the concern that residents have that this is the road that should be able to carry more traffic but I do not accept this should be unmanaged traffic and consider the proposals here to be appropriate.

c) Alternative Options Considered and why rejected

I note the majority of those stating a view on this object, but not only are numbers low but also I believe I have a responsibility to ensure I manage the impact of increasing volumes in Church Road. This need not discourage this route when combined with items 1-3. (NOTE: The referred Items 1-3 make up Proposal 1).

3.3.3. Officer Comments.

3.3.4. The proposed measures would be an effective way of reducing speed of traffic. However, it is acknowledged that a treated road (traffic calmed) could cause drivers to use alternative routes. In this instance, this could mean that drivers may continue to use Belvedere Grove as their preferred choice of route.

3.3.5. Speed data, in close proximity where a speed table is being proposed in Church Road was collected during October 2009. The 85th percentile speeds in the Northeast and Southwest directions were 30.5 and 32.1 mph respectively. Although this may be considered not excessively high, considering the narrowness of both the road, footways and volume of traffic including HGV's and LGV's, the current speed could be considered high for its environment.

3.3.6. However, given the close proximity of properties to the road and the nature of the properties, noise and vibration caused by large volumes of traffic passing over a speed table at this particular location along Church Road (outside no. 42) may warrant the Cabinet Member to reconsider the earlier decision. It is considered that the noise and vibrations associated with such features is likely to cause unnecessary inconvenience to the residents. Given this and the associated high cost involved, the disadvantages outweigh any possible benefit.

3.3.7. Proceeding with the decision

To proceed with the proposal would help to reduce speeds along Church Road and increase road safety. However, there are certain environmental drawbacks to the proposal which are given in the above section.

3.3.8. Not proceeding with the given decision

There will not be a physical feature in compelling drivers to reduce speed of traffic.

3.4 **PROPOSAL 3**

3.4.1. Belvedere Grove Traffic Calming (Speed Cushions) 'Statement of Reasons'

Through the implementation of the traffic calming measures in the roads, the Council wishes to ensure that speed of vehicles within the area are lowered which in turn will help to increase journey times. An increase in journey times will assist in discouraging their use by through-traffic. The raised 'junction entry treatments' will also raise awareness amongst drivers of the 'residential character' of the roads in the Belvedere area.

3.4.2. Cabinet Member Comments

a) Decision

To invite my successor to decide, but with my advice that I do not believe a more viable option exists.

b) Reason for Decision

c) Alternative Options Considered and why rejected

I would like my successor to consider the viability of time limited no entries on the junctions with St Mary's Road that control commuting e.g. 7-9 am, 4.30-6.30pm. I have not had long enough to explore this possibility.

3.4.3. Officer Comments.

3.4.4. The given 'statement of reasons' also relates to the proposed 'Raised Entry Treatments' at the junction of Belvedere Drive with Wimbledon Hill Road and Belvedere Avenue with Church Road. The implications for not proceeding with the 'Raised Entry Treatments' is dealt with separately in this report.

3.4.5. As detailed in the Officer's report dated 4th May 2010, the results of the formal consultation show that the residents of the local roads directly affected by this proposal do not support the proposed speed cushions in Belvedere Grove. This is also consistent with the results of the earlier informal consultation carried out in August 2009 during which traffic calming was initially proposed over a wider area through out the Belvederes. At the time, in order to further restrict traffic flows within the Belvederes a width restriction in Belvedere Grove at its junction with Belvedere Avenue was also proposed. However, following lack of support from residents during the informal consultation stage, this feature was rejected prior to the formal consultation. The Cabinet Member's decision following the informal consultation results was to also limit the proposed speed cushions to Belvedere Grove only. By limiting the speed cushions to just one road, and rejecting the earlier proposed width restriction, the desired impact of deterring rat running along the route have potentially been greatly reduced.

3.4.6. Proceeding with the proposal

3.4.7. To proceed with implementing speed cushions in Belvedere Grove would have a limited effect on deterring rat-running along this route. A large number of objections have been received to this proposal both during the informal and formal consultation. Objections were mainly from residents of Belvedere Grove and neighbouring roads.

3.4.8. It would be necessary to overrule all objections, which is very likely to be challenged by residents through a judicial review thereby placing the Council at risk. To proceed with this proposal would not be in the interests of the Council or residents and is unlikely to have the desired affect.

3.4.9. Not Proceeding with the given decision/proposal

It would be reasonable not to proceed with this proposal which would be in line with the wishes of the majority of the residents.

3.5 **PROPOSAL 4 & 5**

3.5.1. Conversion of Permit Parking to 'Pay & Display Shared Use' and provision of new parking bays in Belvedere area and Lancaster Road. 'Statement of Reasons'

The proposed changes aim to:

- a) maximise potential usage of the bays in the area and in turn ensure they are occupied for most of the time. This in turn will make it difficult and discourage the movement of through-traffic in the roads affected.
- b) increase parking provision within the area and compensate for that lost during peak hours in Church Road as a result of the Council's traffic calming proposals for Church Road.

3.5.2. Cabinet Member Comments

a) Decision

To reconsult with a view of allowing only 2 hr P&D in addition to residents bays for most locations.

b) Reason for Decision

I had not appreciated fully the risk of business parking (as opposed to shopper parking) causing an unreasonably dominant effect on roads near the Village.

I accept there is a concern that maximizing passing places risks passing gap problems & difficulties in exiting driveways but believe the principle would manage parking pressures and delay rat runners. Nevertheless, for the same reasons as proposal 4, I

do not believe this should be Shared bays but rather 2hr P&D and residents parking only.

c) Alternative Options Considered and why rejected

3.5.3. Officer Comments.

3.5.4. The results from the formal consultation appear to be consistent with those found during the informal consultation in 2009. The residents within the roads where the changes are proposed continue to be strongly opposed to this proposal for a number of reasons. Residents of the affected roads have written in length opposing this particular proposal with concerns over the likely adverse effects on their quality of life. Within their comments, residents also have expressed grave concerns to the problems if they were forced to share the bays with Pay & Display and business customers. Officer view is that even if the proposal was amended in accordance with the Cabinet Member decision, this would not alleviate the concerns being expressed by residents.

3.5.5. Officer recommendation as per delegated report dated 4th May 2010 to the Cabinet Member is not to proceed with the implementation of this item or the idea that a new round of consultation should be carried out on an amended parking plan.

3.5.6. Residents have commented that the proposal contravenes the commitment made by the Council in its consultation document dated 7 July 1998 on the introduction of the CPZ to the area; the key points made by the Council included that residents can normally park within 50m of their home. If necessary, shared P&D spaces will be converted to bays for permit holders ONLY so as to achieve this performance level'.

3.5.7. The conversion of Permit Bays to allow P & D will add to the traffic problems within the area as visitors will be continually driving in and out of these roads looking for spaces.

3.5.8. Officer view remains that the suggested amendment by the Cabinet Member will not be enough to remove the large number of objections received during both the informal and formal consultations. The proposal would cause hardship for residents and should not be taken further.

3.5.9. Proceeding with the decision

To proceed and re-consult on an amended parking plan which would allow the existing resident bays to be shared with P&D customers would not be the best use of limited available resource and is likely to be challenged by the local community. The implications of proceeding with this item, is likely to lead to legal challenge/s. additionally, the change in use of the bays is likely to increase traffic in these roads.

Not Proceeding with the decision

It is considered that following a series of consultations and comprehensive reviews of the CPZs throughout the Village area, there is currently a fine balance in meeting the needs of all road users. The existing CPZs are currently operating at their best and any change would have a negative impact.

3.6 **PROPOSAL 6**

3.6.1. Provision of a raised Entry Treatment within Belvedere Drive at its junction with Wimbledon Hill Road 'Statement of Reasons'

Through the implementation of the traffic calming measures in the roads, the Council wishes to ensure that speed of vehicles within the area are lowered which in turn will help to increase journey times. An increase in journey times will assist in discouraging

their use by through-traffic. The raised 'junction entry treatments' will also raise awareness amongst drivers of the 'residential character' of the roads in the Belvedere area.

3.6.2. Cabinet Member Comments

a) Decision

I agree this proposal.

b) Reason for Decision

This treatment marks the boundary between 30mph & 20mph and reminds motorists this is a residential area.

c) Alternative Options Considered and why rejected

Doing nothing would not be considered with the approach adopted elsewhere in the borough.

3.6.3. Officer Comments.

3.6.4. No Comments

3.6.5. Proceeding with the decision

This proposal will assist in making drivers aware that Belvedere Drive is a residential road. This would be in line with most boundaries between a 30 mph and 20 mph speed limit area. A number of objections were received to the proposal which would need to be addressed. In the event that the proposed 20 mph speed limit for the area is implemented, officer's view would be that this feature would complement the introduction of the 20mph speed limit.

3.6.6. Not Proceeding with the decision

Not to proceed with this proposal would not have any significant implications and could be taken as a saving in resources. This feature would be unnecessary if other measures in the Belvederes are to be reconsidered.

3.7 **PROPOSAL 7**

3.7.1. Provision of a raised Entry Treatment within Belvedere Avenue at its junction with Church Road 'Statement of Reasons'

Through the implementation of the traffic calming measures in the roads, the Council wishes to ensure that speed of vehicles within the area are lowered which in turn will help to increase journey times. An increase in journey times will assist in discouraging their use by through-traffic. The raised 'junction entry treatments' will also raise awareness amongst drivers, of the 'residential character' of the roads in the Belvedere area.

3.7.2. Cabinet Member Comments

a) Decision

Do nothing.

b) Reason for Decision

I am not convinced this is necessary. Unnecessary use of resources.

- c) Alternative Options Considered and why rejected

3.7.3. Officer Comments.

- 3.7.4. Agreed with above comments .

Proceeding with the decision / Not Proceeding with the decision

The introduction of this feature will not be of great benefit to the area.

3.8 **PROPOSAL 8**

3.8.1. 7.5 Tonne Lorry Ban Review 'Statement of Reasons'

The existing Lorry Ban is an environmental measure to protect residents against the disturbance and nuisance caused by vehicles of 7.5T and above. The proposed amendments are to enhance the current restrictions by providing further protection to residents between 8pm to 6.30am every day of the week. As well as minimising the environmental impact caused by lorries on the residential area, the amended restrictions will minimise any breach by providing easy to spot violation of the Traffic Order.

3.8.2. Cabinet Member Comments

- a) Decision

I agree this proposal.

- b) Reason for Decision

This has caused few concerns from respondents. I don't consider this to be anything other than reasonable.

- c) Alternative Options Considered and why rejected

3.8.3. Officer Comments.

- 3.8.4. No Comments

3.8.5. Proceeding with the decision

To proceed with implementation of the Cabinet Member decision would benefit the environment of the area by banning entry/exit of large vehicles during the prescribed hours. The consultation has shown good support for this proposal. This, however, would have enforcement implications and the current level of support cannot ensure effective enforcement.

3.8.6. Not Proceeding with the decision

This would be against the wishes of the majority of those who commented on this proposal during the informal and formal consultations. It is recognised that enforcement of the new ban could continue to be an issue, however it is accepted that violation would be easier to identify. By not proceeding with this proposal, residents would continue to suffer from the detrimental impact of large vehicles entering the area during night times.

3.9 **PROPOSAL 9**

3.9.1. Maximum 20mph Speed Limit 'Statement of Reasons'

In accordance with the borough's "20 is plenty" programme, the council intends to introduce a maximum speed limit of 20mph within the area as detailed in drawing number Z36-24-12. The objectives being sought from a lowered maximum speed limit are as follows:

- a) To discourage through-traffic from using the area as a cut-through; encouraging such traffic to use Alexandra Road, Parkside, High Street and Wimbledon Hill Road which in accordance with the council's UDP are classified as 'London Distributor Roads'.
- b) To make the relevant roads safer for all road users as higher speeds often result in both a greater number and severity of accidents

3.9.2. Cabinet Member Comments

a) Decision

I agree this proposal.

b) Reason for Decision

This will go some way towards discouraging rat running. It should be noted the Capital budget of the council offers support for enforcing this. I believe the broad consensus supports this.

c) Alternative Options Considered and why rejected

3.9.3. Officer Comments.

3.9.4. No Comments

3.9.5. Proceeding with the decision

To proceed with implementation of the Cabinet Member decision would improve road safety in general. The consultation has shown good support for this proposal. However it should be noted that as for all 20mph speed limit roads (roads which are not classed as part of 'zones'), regulations require the erection of 300mm round repeater signs on existing lamp columns at regular intervals. In the absence of the appropriate speed reducing features there would also be enforcement implications for the Police.

3.9.6. Not Proceeding with the decision

This would be against the wishes of the majority of those who responded on this proposal during the formal consultation. It is recognised that enforcement of this speed limit could be an issue as found in other parts of the borough. To not proceed with the proposal would be against the wishes of the majority of those that responded.

3.10 **PROPOSAL 10**

3.10.1. This item is covered under proposal 2.

3.11 **PROPOSAL 11**

3.11.1. Raised Junction of Burghley Road and Marryat Road Traffic Calming 'Statement of Reasons'

To reduce the currently measured high vehicular speeds in these roads and in turn enable the council to meet its duties to secure the safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians). The proposals are shown in drawing number Z36-24-11

3.11.2. Cabinet Member Comments

a) Decision

I agree this proposal.

b) Reason for Decision

This is a severe junction and while some would like me to close the road, a raised junction does go a long way towards managing the way traffic covers this junction.

c) Alternative Options considered and why rejected

Do Nothing – speed and volume.

Road Closure – I do not believe this is viable at this location given the potential knock on effects.

3.11.3. Officer Comments.

3.11.4. This feature would assist in making the junction more conspicuous and improve sight lines for both pedestrians and drivers. The tightening of this four-arm junction will reduce crossing distance for pedestrians, provide more standing area and ensure that vehicles turning do so slowly and with care. The effect of the changes to this junction will be greatly enhanced if other proposed traffic calming measures for Burghley Road as set out below is also progressed.

3.11.5. Proceeding with the decision

This measure would improve road safety for all road users particularly for pedestrians and it will reduce speed of traffic.

3.11.6. Not Proceeding with the decision

This would be against the wishes of the majority who responded and will do nothing to address the speeding problem.

3.12 **PROPOSAL 12**

3.12.1. Officer Comments.

3.12.2. These proposals relate to the traffic calming (priority working buildouts) in Burghley Road and Calonne Road. The building out of kerblines, (kerb realignments) do not require Traffic Orders and therefore are not subject to a formal consultation. This means that there is no 'Statement of Reasons', which relates to the buildouts themselves. However, the proposed build outs affect some existing parking bays, thereby necessitating a formal consultation on the necessary changes to the parking bays.

3.12.3. During the informal consultation stage in 2009 the residents raised speeding as a major concern and supported the proposed traffic calming measures (kerb buildouts/realignment). Speed surveys taken at three different locations confirmed that a large proportion of vehicles travel at high speeds (with the 85%ile ranging between 35.7mph and 42.7mph) in Burghley Road.

3.12.4. The Cabinet Member accepted officer's recommendations in relation to the changes to the parking bays to accommodate the proposed build outs. The decision/s relating to individual sites has not been reproduced for this element of work so as to not distract

from the main traffic calming proposal which this item relates to. The implications of proceeding or not proceeding with the traffic calming are given below.

3.12.5. A decision to not proceed with the traffic calming feature in Calonne Road was also made. This was as a result of fresh speed surveys carried out in Calonne Road which confirmed that speeds at the earlier proposed site were not high.

3.12.6. Proceeding with the decision/traffic calming (Burghley Road)

It is considered that to reduce speed of traffic it is necessary to introduce speed reducing features which will serve to improve the overall safety and perception of safety.

3.12.7. Not Proceeding with the decision (Burghley Road)

This would be against the wishes of the majority and will do nothing to address the speed and safety concerns.

3.12.8. Proceeding with the decision (i.e. No traffic calming for Calonne Road)

For clarity it should be noted that the Cabinet Member decision is to not provide traffic calming for Calonne Road and so the parking changes have not been approved. To proceed with the decision i.e. not traffic calm Calonne Road would be appropriate when considered in light of the relatively low speeds recorded at the site and the wishes of the majority.

3.12.9. Not Proceeding with the decision (i.e No traffic calming for Calonne Road)

It would not be the best use of available limited resources.

3.13 **NEW PROPOSAL** - PROPOSAL 1

3.13.1. St Mary's Road Traffic Calming and Removal of Double Mini Roundabouts. 'Statement of Reasons'

To manage and effectively control movement of traffic out of Alan Road and St Mary's Road (south eastern arm), the council is to make junction priority changes to the Alan Road/St Mary's Road and Arthur Road/St Mary's Road junctions. The section of road will also have a raised junction table which in turn will ensure the Council continues to meet its duties in securing the safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians).

3.13.2. Cabinet Member Comments

a) Decision

I agree this item.

b) Reason for Decision

I believe this proposal will make the Church Road, St Mary's Road, Arthur Road route the natural route and while it will be costly, is fundamental to reprioritizing this route.

c) Alternative Options Considered and why rejected

I note the opposition but cannot accept the role of the mini roundabouts in causing rat running here.

3.13.3. Officer Comments.

3.13.4. During the 30 September 2009 SMAC meeting, requests were made by the public in attendance to consider further proposals as part of the current scheme. This item was one of two, which the Cabinet Member approved for consultation. The proposed removal of the two existing mini-roundabouts at the Alan Road / St Mary's Road junction and their replacement with a raised surface treatment maintaining priority from Arthur Road into St Mary's Road could help reduce the rat running in the Belvederes as exiting Alan Road onto St Mary's would become more difficult. .

3.13.5. The existing mini roundabouts were installed some years ago as part of an accident remedial scheme. They have been effective in reducing accidents at this location. Residents are not convinced that the proposal to remove the roundabouts would be enough to resolve the rat running problem in the Belvederes.

3.13.6. Proceeding with the decision

This is a relatively expensive proposal, which may at best reduce rat running in one direction. Residents are not convinced that this proposal is enough to resolve their plight and so other more cost effective solutions to tackle rat running within the Belvederes would be worthy of consideration.

Not Proceeding with the decision

This would generally be in line with the view of residents, however, it would necessitate other more effective solutions to reduce rat running through the Belvederes.

3.14 **NEW PROPOSAL - PROPOSAL 2**

3.14.1. Marryat Road Traffic Calming 'Statement of Reasons'

To reduce the currently measured high vehicular speeds in Marryat Road and in turn enable the council to meet its duties to secure the safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians).

The proposals are shown in drawing number Z36-24-11-2.

3.14.2. Cabinet Member Comments

a) Decision

I agree this item.

b) Reason for Decision

The need to manage speed in this location.

c) Alternative Options Considered and why rejected

We have an obligation here to manage speed sufficiently so doing nothing is not an option here.

3.14.3. Officer Comments.

3.14.4. Generally, this proposal has been well received by residents and the school in Peek Crescent. The speed data for Marryat Road showed that the 85th percentile speeds in both the Northbound and Southbound directions to be 35mph. According to the personal injury collision records over the past 3 years there have not been any personal injury accidents along Marryat Road.

3.14.5. As a result of feedback from Parkside Residents Association and ward councillors it was agreed that a limited number of speed tables should be introduced. This has resulted in the proposed spacing between speed tables to be approximately 133 metres. This is generally twice the normal recommended distance and may require further features in the future. It should be noted that this proposal was not consulted on during the informal consultation. Additionally, Marryat Road is the secondary emergency route and an identified route by the ODA (Olympic Delivery Authority). It would, therefore, be necessary to consult with all emergency services and seek the approval of ODA.

3.14.6. Proceeding with the decision

3.14.7. The proposed measure will reduce speed of traffic on Marryat Road but there are concerns regarding the impact of noise and vibrations associated with speed tables particularly since this road is part of the All England Tennis Club route and it is expected to accommodate larger vehicles.

3.14.8. Not Proceeding with the decision

3.14.9. The speeding problems would not be addressed.

4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

4.1 The work is being funded through Merton's 2010/11 Capital within which a sum of £555k has been allocated for the Wimbledon Area Traffic Study.

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 The Traffic Management Orders for a 20mph speed limit would be made under Section 84 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended).

5.2 The proposed vertical deflections (speed cushions and speed tables) can be introduced under powers conferred by Section 90A of the Highways Act 1980 (as amended). No Traffic Order is required.

5.3 The TMO's for the amendments to the parking bay would be made under Section 6 and Section 45 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended).

5.4 The TMO's for the Waiting and Loading restrictions would be made under Section 6 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended).

5.5 The TMO for the Weight Limit Order would be made under Section 6 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended).

5.7 The Council is required by the Local Authorities Traffic Order (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 to give notice of its intention to make a Traffic Order (by publishing a draft traffic order). This was done as part of the formal consultation exercise recently completed. The regulations also require the Council to consider any representations received as a result of publishing the draft order. The Cabinet Member is required to consider all representations received and now attached in Appendices 1 and 2 in this report.

5.8 All road markings and signage will be in accordance with TSRGD 2002.

6. HUMAN RIGHTS & EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

6.1 The implementation of the proposals will affect all sections of the community. The proposed measures aim to improve conditions for the residents of the area together with

those using Wimbledon Hill Road. This is to be achieved by discouraging through-traffic from the residential roads onto the Distributor Roads.

- 6.2 The Council carries out careful consultation to ensure that all road users are given a fair opportunity to air their views and express their needs. The needs of the residents are given consideration but it is considered that improving safety on the borough roads take priority over environmental issues like noise and pollution. The undertaking of a formal consultation will provide a further opportunity for the local community to air their views.
- 6.3 Bodies representing motorists, including commuters are included in the statutory consultation required for draft traffic management and similar orders.
- 6.4 The implementation of 20 mph speed limit affects all sections of the community especially the young and the elderly; and assists in improving safety for all road users as well as achieving Merton's commitment in reducing speed, casualty and severity of road traffic accidents.

7. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 Not applicable

8. RISK MANAGEMENT AND HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 The introduction of the proposed speed cushions/speed tables within some of the areas may result in an increased in noise levels. This depends on driver behaviour and type of vehicle. Speed cushions will be constructed in such a manner so as to allow larger vehicles to straddle thereby minimizing noise and vibration.
- 8.2 The road safety implications/risks during construction and maintenance will have to be fully considered at each stage of the detailed design process.
- 8.3 A Stage 2 Road Safety Audit has been undertaken on majority of the proposals.
- 8.4 The Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 1994 will apply to these proposals. Therefore when undertaking its duties as Client and Designer under these regulations, the Council follows the Approved Code of Practice, 'Managing Health and Safety in Construction', published by the Health and Safety Commission. The Planning Supervisor appointed for this scheme is F.M.Conway Ltd. Potential risks will have to be identified during the detailed design stage.
- 8.5 One risk that has been identified are the impact of one of the measures on cyclists. Currently pedal cyclists have a comparatively safe environment on the approach to the junction of Wimbledon Hill Road and Woodside. This is in the form of a marked advisory cycle lane. However the proposed changes to this junction will require this short stretch of cycle lane to be removed which could expose cyclists to an increase in risk of conflict with the mainstream traffic.

Appendices – the following documents are to be published with this report and form part of the report

- Appendix 1 Cabinet Member decision dated 6th May 2010
- Appendix 2 Consultation material.

Background Papers – the following documents have been relied on in drawing up this report but do not form part of the report

- Street Management Overview & Scrutiny Panel report dated 26th November 2003.

Street Management Overview & Scrutiny Panel report dated 30th March 2005.

Cabinet Street Management Committee report dated 20th July 2005.

Cabinet Street Management Committee report dated 29th September 2005.

Cabinet Street Management Advisory Committee report dated 15th January 2008.

Cabinet Street Management Advisory Committee report dated 17th June 2008.

Cabinet Street Management Advisory Committee report dated 13th March 2009.

Cabinet Street Management Advisory Committee report dated 8th June 2009. Cabinet Street Management Advisory Committee report dated 8th June 2009.

Cabinet Street Management Advisory Committee report dated 30th September 2009.

Cabinet Member report dated 4th May 2010.

Cabinet Member decision dated 19th June 2009

Cabinet Member decision dated 28th October 2009

Cabinet Member decision dated 6th May 2010

Contacts

- Report author:
 - Name: Waheed Alam
 - Tel: 020 8545 3200
 - email: waheed.alam@merton.gov.uk
- Meeting arrangements – Democratic Services:
 - email: democratic.services@merton.gov.uk
 - Tel: 020 8545 3356/3357/3359/3361/3616
- All press contacts – Merton's Press office:
 - email: press@merton.gov.uk
 - Tel: 020 8545 3181
- London Borough of Merton:
 - Address: Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, SM4 5DX
 - Tel: 020 8274 4901

Useful links

Merton Council's Web site: <http://www.merton.gov.uk>

Readers should note the terms of the legal information (disclaimer) regarding information on Merton Council's and third party linked websites.

<http://www.merton.gov.uk/legal.htm>

This disclaimer also applies to any links provided here.