Street Management Advisory Committee

Date:
Agenda item:
Wards:
Subject:

Lead officer: Chris Lee, Director of Environment \& Regeneration
Lead member: Councillor Andrew Judge - Cabinet Member for Environmental Sustainability \& Regeneration.

Forward Plan reference number: N/A
Contact Officers: Mario Lecordier / Edward Quartey

## Recommendations:

The Street Management Advisory Committee considers the issues detailed in this report and recommend that the Cabinet Member for Environmental Sustainability and Regeneration:
A. Notes the outcome of the informal consultation to introduce an experimental traffic management scheme in the Belvedere area carried out between 11 June 2012 and 9 July 2012.
B. Agrees NOT to proceed with the implementation of the experimental traffic management scheme in the Belvedere area.
C. Agrees for officers to consider and develop alternative options to return through traffic onto the main road network.

## 1. PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 This report details the outcome of the informal consultation and recommends that the proposed experimental traffic management scheme for the Belvedere area (Z36/24/19-2), as consulted on 11 June 2012 is abandoned. It also recommends that officers consider other alternatives to address traffic issues in the area.

## 2. DETAILS

2.1 For a number of years, some residents and Resident Associations in the area have emphasised that traffic volumes and speeds within their residential roads are at unacceptable level. This has lead to the Council investigating and consulting on a number of traffic management proposals for the Belvedere area, all of which have been rejected following public consultations.
2.2 At the Street Management Advisory Committee meeting in June 2011, it was agreed that the Cabinet Member for Environmental Sustainability and Regeneration meet with local ward members to agree and develop suitable proposals for the area.
2.3 Following meetings with the Cabinet Member, Ward Councillors, officers and some resident groups, it was agreed that an experimental traffic management
scheme to address residents' concerns is developed and considered for the Belvedere area to gauge its impact on the surrounding road network, before a final decision is made. Traffic volume and speed surveys were carried out between 25 September 2009 and 1 October 2009 on a number of roads within the area to assist officers develop a number of proposals. These proposals were issued to ward members to discuss with resident groups before an agreement was reached to consult on an agreed proposal.
2.4 Experimental traffic management schemes (ETMS) are used to assess whether a particular proposal would produce the desired result, or to check what consequences would arise from the imposition of a proposal, before it is made permanent. No consultation is required prior to the experimental Traffic Management Order (TRO) coming into force. This Order can remain in force for a maximum period of 18 months by which time the Council must confirm, amend or remove the scheme. During this period, modification can be made to the proposal. The statutory consultation period commences once the experimental scheme has been implemented and all road users can either object or make representations on the proposals.
2.5 The proposals form part of an overall set of measures for the Wimbledon area, but only provide details of proposals for the Belvedere area aimed at returning through traffic to the main road network.

## 3. PROPOSALS

3.1 The proposed experimental traffic management scheme aims to return through traffic to the main road network by restricting access to a number of roads during certain periods of the day. The proposed measures would operate from Monday to Saturday, between 6.30 and 8.30 am and between 5 and 7 pm . Pedal cyclists will be exempt from these restrictions. The proposals, as shown on plan Z36/24/19-2 are as follows:

### 3.1.1 Alan Road/St Mary's Road junction

Proposed 'no entry' from St Mary's Road into Alan Road during the restricted periods. This proposal will remove all south-westbound traffic entering Alan Road from St Mary's Road. Residential access into Alan Road will be from either Church Road or Highbury Road.

### 3.1.2 Highbury Road/St Mary's Road junction

Proposed 'no right' turn from Highbury Road into St Mary's Road and 'no right' turn into Highbury Road from St Mary's Road during the restricted periods. The proposed 'no right' turn from St Mary's Road will ensure that those drivers who are prevented from using Alan Road (due to the proposed 'no entry' in Alan Road) would not be able to use Highbury Road instead. Residential access into Highbury Road will be from Church Road or north-westbound on St Mary's Road.

### 3.1.3 Belvedere Drive/St Mary's Road junction

Proposed 'no left' turn from Belvedere Drive into St Mary's Road and 'no right' turn into Belvedere Drive from St Mary's Road during the restricted periods. These proposals will prevent direct access for drivers from the High Street through Belvedere Drive and St Mary's Road into Arthur Road and vice-versa. Residential access into Belvedere Drive will be from Church Road, High Street, Wimbledon Hill Road or north-eastbound on St Mary's Road.

### 3.1.4 Belvedere Drive/Belvedere Avenue junction

Proposed 'no entry' from Belvedere Drive into Belvedere Avenue during the restricted periods. This proposal will prevent drivers from Wimbledon Hill Road using Belvedere Drive, Belvedere Avenue and Highbury Road as a cutthrough to Arthur Road. Residential access into Belvedere Avenue will be from Church Road or Highbury Road.

### 3.1.5 Belvedere Avenue/Belvedere Grove junction

Proposed 'no entry' from Belvedere Grove into Belvedere Avenue and 'no right' turn into Belvedere Grove from Belvedere Avenue during the restricted periods. These proposals will remove north-eastbound traffic from Belvedere Grove and south-westbound traffic from Church Road into Belvedere Grove. Residential access into Belvedere Grove will be from the High Street or northwestbound from Belvedere Avenue.

### 3.1.6 Woodside/Lake Road junction

Proposed 'no entry' from beyond the junction of Lake Road for northeastbound drivers travelling toward Leopold Road. This will reduce the volume of north-eastbound traffic into Woodside; however, a change in volume of south-westbound traffic is believed to be unlikely. Residential access beyond the proposed 'no entry' will be from Leopold Road.

### 3.2 Advantages of the experimental traffic management proposals

B It will provide an opportunity to monitor the proposed measures and assess if the desired outcomes are achieved.
B It will put the majority of through traffic from the Belvedere area onto the main road network.

B It will improve road safety within the Belvedere area by reducing the number and severity of any personal injury collisions when they occur,
B Reduce pollution in the area.

### 3.3 Disadvantages of the experimental traffic management proposals

B Traffic congestion on the main road network is likely to increase
B An increase in pollution on the main road network.
B Traffic related problems can be moved onto other local roads within the area,
B Increased travel time,
B Increased delays to emergency service vehicles.
B Limited access for residents during the restricted period

## 4 CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN

## INFORMAL CONSULTATION

4.1 Although an informal consultation is not required for an experimental Traffic Management Order, the Council in this instance informally consulted on the proposals, prior for the Cabinet Member making a decision. The boundary of the consultation was agreed with Ward Members and includes Alexandra Road (northern properties only) to the south, Leopold Road to the east, Arthur Road and Church Road (Including Rectory Orchard, Steeple Close and Welford Place) to the north and Wimbledon Hill Road to the west.
4.2 The Metropolitan Police was the only member of the emergency services consulted and no response was received from them.
4.3 The informal consultation was carried out between 11 June and 9 July 2012. A copy of the consultation leaflet together with the questionnaire posted to 2240 properties within the consultation boundary is included in Appendix 2. A summary of the consultation result is shown in Table 1 with the complete results included in Appendix 3.

Table 1 - Results of Consultation

| Number <br> consulted | Returned |  | Support |  | Against |  | Undecided |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. | $\%$ | No. | $\%$ | No. | $\%$ | No. | $\%$ |
| 2240 | 701 | 31.3 | 79 | 11.3 | 587 | 83.7 | 35 | 5 |

4.4 A total of 701 responses were received by the close of the informal consultation period, which equates to a response rate of $31.3 \%$. The overall result shows $11.3 \%$ of respondents in support of the proposals, $83.7 \%$ against and $5 \%$ undecided. A major concern raised by the majority of respondent was an increase in traffic volumes on the surrounding road network, especially Church Road, which they believe will not be able to accommodate the increase in traffic volume.
4.5 The complete consultation results (attached in Appendix 3) shows that the majority of respondents (in roads where the experimental measures are being proposed) from Alan Road, Belvedere Grove, Clement Road and Belvedere Avenue were in favour of the proposals. However, respondents from Belvedere Drive, St Mary's Road (between Alan Road and Belvedere Drive), Belvedere Square and Highbury Road were against the proposals.
4.6 A number of respondents from Alan Road were pleased that the proposals were being considered, as the problem with traffic had worsened over the years. In addition, they would prefer the mini-roundabout at the junction of St Mary's Road to be removed.

## Officer response

It is not advisable to remove the mini-roundabout, as it serves to maintain road safety at the junction of St Mary's Road/Alan Road.
4.7 Some respondents from Belvedere Grove have requested that if the experimental proposals are implemented, the period of restrictions be extended and measures be undertaken to prevent the possible rat-run from northwest to southeast through Lake Road, Church Hill, Highbury Road, Belvedere Avenue and Belvedere Grove.

### 4.8 Officer response

The periods of restriction was agreed with resident groups' in order not to impact on the morning school run, therefore extending it may not be acceptable. Although some amount of traffic would use Lake Road, the ' 20 mph zone' with traffic calming measures which was implemented in Lake Road, Church Hill Road and St Mary's Road during the 2008/09 financial year, is likely to be a deterring factor.
4.9 Respondents in Belvedere Drive and St Mary's Road who objected to the experimental proposals were concerned about the traffic congestion on the surrounding road network; whilst others were concerned that the proposals would restrict travel through the area and would prefer the area to be left as it is.

## Officer response

The traffic impact on the surrounding road network is addressed in the analysis section of the report.
4.10 The majority of respondents from Belvedere Square and Courthope Road were concerned that the experimental proposals will only benefit a small minority of the community and would force traffic onto other roads within the area, which are also residential roads.

## Officer response

The experimental proposals would achieve its objective of returning through traffic to the main road network; however the impact on the surrounding road network is addressed in the analysis section of the report.
4.11 Highbury Road respondents who objected to the proposals were concerned that traffic will be re-routed onto their road if approval is given to the experimental traffic management scheme. They would, however, support the scheme if Highbury Road has similar proposals to Alan Road, i.e. replace the proposed 'no right' turn from St Mary's Road with a 'no entry' into Highbury Road to prevent north-westbound traffic on St Mary's Road from entering Highbury Road.

## Officer response

This is addressed in the analysis section of the report.
4.12 A response was received from Belvedere Estate Residents Association (BERA), which has approximately 143 registered members in the area bounded by Wimbledon Village, High Street, the top of Wimbledon Hill Road, Belvedere Drive, St Mary's Road, Church Road, and the "Lancaster Roads" objecting to proposal that seek to reduce the volume of traffic in certain streets at the expense of an increase in traffic in other streets and greater inconvenience for all residents. The great majority of the traffic will find other routes and will not simply 'evaporate'. BERA, however, will support the imposition of a 20 mph speed limit throughout the area together with "traditional" traffic calming measures in the Belvedere Roads, similar in concept to those now proposed in place of road closures in the Burghley Road scheme, which they think is sensible. Slower moving traffic is less intrusive and less dangerous.
4.13 The consultation results also show that the majority of residents (in roads on the peripheral of the proposed experimental measures) in Church Road, Wimbledon Hill Road, High Street, Leeward Gardens, St Mary's Road (Belvedere Drive and Woodside), Woodside, Church Hill and Lake Road were against the experimental traffic scheme.
4.14 Respondents in Church Road, who objected to the experimental proposals, are concerned about the traffic congestion on the main road network, which they believe cannot accommodate the existing traffic volumes. Others were concerned that parking for visitors to the shops would be difficult and there is no justification to spend this amount of money.
4.15 Respondents in Leeward Gardens were also concerned with the restriction on travel through the area that the proposals will create and the experimental proposals will only protect a small minority of residents in the area.
4.16 Respondents in Lake Road who objected to the proposals are concerned about the increase in traffic volumes in Lake Road and subsequent road safety implications with a school located mid-way along the road.
4.17 The consultation results show that the majority of residents (in roads within the consultation boundary but away from the area) in Alexandra Road, Worcester Road, Compton Road, Arthur Road, Leopold Road, etc are against the proposals. The majority of the comments relate to the increase in traffic volumes on the surrounding road network if the experimental proposals are implemented.
4.18 Responses were also received from roads outside the consultation boundary (Vineyard Hill Road, Home Park Road, Haydon's Road and Cromwell Road) who are concerned that they will be affected by the proposals but have not been included in the consultation.
4.19 A response was received from Wimbledon House Residents Association, Parkside Residents Association and 83 residents in Marryat Road who were not within the consultation boundary, objecting to the proposals as it will impact on the wider community.

## Officer response

As with any consultation exercise relating to traffic management proposals the challenge is to strike a balance between consulting those within close proximity to the proposals who would be directly affected and those who could potentially be affected by the proposals. It is not possible to reach all road users by direct contact, but the Council has made every effort to ensure that the information on the proposals is available through ward councillors, resident associations and the Council's website.

## ANALYSIS

4.20 Although the majority of respondents are against the experimental traffic management scheme, the proposals will remove peak period rat-run and return through-traffic onto the main road network thereby providing relief for residents.
4.21 Various comments were received from respondents during the informal consultation, with the majority of residents in roads where the proposals are to be implemented commenting that these proposals are long overdue, as traffic volumes have increased in these residential roads over the years. Respondents on the peripheral and away from the area are concerned about the increase in traffic volumes on the surrounding road network; local traffic through the area would be heavily affected and the restrictions should only apply from Monday to Friday instead of Monday to Saturday.
4.22 In 2009, traffic volume and speed surveys were carried out in roads within the area to determine the volume of vehicles that use the various roads. The survey did not determine the volume of vehicles that use the roads as a cut through. A summary of the result for some of the roads in the are is shown in Table 2.

Table 2 - Total weekly traffic volume on some roads (2009 data)

| Road | Total weekly traffic volume |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | North-eastbound | South-westbound |
| Alan Road | 14059 | 16789 |
| Belvedere Avenue | 14644 (North-westbound) | 14651(South-eastbound) |
| Belvedere Drive | 12486 | 11184 |
| Belvedere Grove | 20734 | 20451 |
| Church Road | 22044 | 23523 |
| Highbury Road | 3588 | 3074 |
| St Mary's Road (Highbury and <br> Arthur Road) | 6293 (North-westbound) | 7481 (South-eastbound) |
| Woodside (East of Lake Road) | 10659 | 10747 |
| Lake Road (Woodside end) | 1666 | 3476 |

4.23 All the roads listed in Table 2 above are residential roads with Church Road, classified as a 'Local Distributor Road', a bus route and one that accommodates a number of businesses on its southern section. The traffic data shows that Belvedere Grove and Church Road carries most of the northeast to south-west traffic and vice-versa. It may, therefore, be reasonable to accept that the traffic condition in Church Road reflect its designation as a Local Distributor, whereas those of Belvedere Grove, Alan Road, Belvedere Avenue and Belvedere Drive do not reflect their designation as residential roads.
4.24 The proposed changes to the road layout to any of the roads listed in Table 2, is likely to influence traffic volumes on the other roads within the area. The true extent can only be measured when the experimental proposals are implemented. However, a summary of traffic volumes based on the 2009 survey data on some of the roads in the area during the periods when the experimental traffic management scheme is being proposed is shown in Table 3.

Table 3 - Existing traffic volumes on some roads during the periods of ETMS

| Road | South-westbound |  | North-eastbound |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM (6:30-8:30) | PM(17:00-19:00) | AM (6:30-8:30) | PM (17:00-19:00) |
| Alan Road | 269 | 419 | 430 | 315 |
| Belvedere Avenue | $302(\mathrm{seb})$ | $370(\mathrm{seb})$ | $489(\mathrm{nwb})$ | $316(\mathrm{nwb})$ |
| Belvedere Drive | 252 | 325 | 319 | 260 |
| Belvedere Grove | 557 | 473 | 391 | 511 |
| Church Road | 577 | 446 | 464 | 517 |
| Highbury Road | 69 | 90 | 71 | 68 |
| St Mary's Rd (Highbury and <br> Arthur Rd) | 147 (seb) | $189(\mathrm{seb})$ | $143(\mathrm{nwb})$ | $131(\mathrm{nwb})$ |
| Woodside (east of Lake Rd) | 294 | 244 | 218 | 283 |
| Lake Road (Woodside end) | 85 | 73 | 55 | 32 |

4.25 During the consultation, the majority of respondents were concerned with the increase in traffic volumes on the surrounding road network, hence a number of assumptions have been made to determine the predicted traffic volumes on some roads within the area based on the experimental proposals. A summary of which is shown in Table 4 with the complete analysis in Appendix 4 of the report.
Table 4 - Predicted change in traffic volume analysis from 2009 traffic data

| Road | South-westbound |  | North-eastbound |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM (6:30-8:30) | PM (17:00-19:00) | AM (6:30-8:30) | PM (17:00-19:00) |
| Alan Road | $-100 \%$ | $-100 \%$ | $-84 \%$ | $-83 \%$ |
| Belvedere Avenue | $-56 \%(\mathrm{seb})$ | $-72 \%(\mathrm{seb})$ | $-65 \%(\mathrm{nwb})$ | $-59 \%$ (nwb) |
| Belvedere Drive | $-45 \%$ | $-44 \%$ | $+113 \%$ | $+74 \%$ |
| Belvedere Grove | $-62 \%$ | $-77 \%$ | $-100 \%$ | $-100 \%$ |
| Church Road | $+31 \%$ | $+40 \%$ | $+48 \%$ | $+53 \%$ |
| Highbury Road | $+137 \%$ | $+44 \%$ | $-75 \%$ | $-89 \%$ |
| Woodside (east of <br> Lake Rd) | 0 | 0 | -99 | -99 |
| Lake Road <br> (Woodside end) | 0 | 0 | $+861 \%$ | +1629 |

A (+\%) indicates the percentage increase compared to the existing and a ( $-\%$ ) indicates a percentage decrease.
4.26 The predicted traffic volumes percentages in Table 4 show that the majority of through traffic using the residential roads will be returned to the 'local distributor road' (Church Road), except Highbury Road and Belvedere Drive. Similar traffic predictions were made in a report prepared by JMP Consulting in June 2006, which was also included in the report to the Street Management Advisory Committee on 15 January 2008. The peak periods for this study were AM (07:00-10:00) and PM (16:00-19:00). The JMP's traffic proposals were similar to the one being proposed and based on restricted traffic movements on Belvedere Grove, Belvedere Drive, Highbury Road, Alan Road and Belvedere Avenue. It showed that the most significant increase in traffic volumes in the various roads would be on Church Road by approximately 31\% during the morning peak hour and approximately $51 \%$ in the evening peak hours.
4.27 Although some roads within the area would be affected, Church Road is of most concern to respondents. Church Road (between High Street and St Mary's Road) is approximately 450 metres long with the narrowest part of the carriageway being approximately 5.5 metres, which makes it impossible for two buses travelling in opposite direction to pass each other without one waiting at the wider section on the road. From Table 4, during the evening peak period for the north-eastbound direction on Church Road, there are approximately 5 vehicles/minute in Church Road and with a predicted increase of approximately $53 \%$, this will rise to approximately 8 vehicles/minute. With the average length of a vehicle being approximately 5 metres, the predicted traffic queue length will be approximately 40 metres. This implies that it will take approximately 11 minutes for Church Road to be completely blocked if there is any traffic incident at the start or end of this road. However, this
estimated time would be reduced if the incident occurs in the middle of Church Road.
4.28 The predicted traffic volume increase in Highbury Road is also of concern but not considered as alarming, as the existing traffic volumes were very low. If however, the request from Highbury Road respondents to replace the proposed 'no right' turn from St Mary's Road with a 'no entry' into Highbury Road to prevent north-westbound traffic on St Mary's Road from entering Highbury Road is considered, the predicted traffic volumes in Highbury Road would be almost the same as Alan Road, whilst that of Church Road in the south-westbound direction during the evening peak period would be approximately $49 \%$. However, if the proposals for Highbury Road is not amended, but instead the 'no right' turn into Belvedere Grove from Belvedere Avenue is replaced with a 'no entry' (as requested by some residents in Belvedere Grove), there would still be a predicted increase in traffic volumes in Highbury Road for the south-westbound direction, as the traffic into Highbury Road would filter either into Church Road or Belvedere Drive. This would further increase the predicted traffic volumes in Church Road.
4.29 The predicted traffic volume increase in Belvedere Drive is also a concern as this predicted volume would be almost the same as the existing traffic volumes in Church Road.
4.30 The predicted traffic volume increase in Lake Road is also a concern, as there is a school located mid-way along the road. A 20 mph zone with traffic calming measures was implemented in 2009 to improve safety in this road, which has proven effective as there has been no recorded personal injury collision since the speed restrictions and measures were implemented. In addition, traffic speeds have also been reduced to an average of approximately 17 mph . It is unclear if the predicted traffic volume increase in this road would change driver behaviour; hence increase speeds on this road.

## CONCLUSION

4.31 The following conclusions have been drawn:

B The majority of respondents are against the experimental traffic proposals for the Belvedere area. Major concerns by respondents are that the proposals will increase traffic volume on the surrounding road network especially Church Road, which is likely to be the case, as shown in the predicted traffic volume analysis.
B Respondents are also concerned that local traffic would be affected by the proposals. This is likely to be the case as the majority of the local traffic through the area is via Belvedere Grove and Belvedere Drive (data from JMP report). Hence closing Belvedere Grove would divert almost all of northeastbound local traffic onto Church Road.
B The primary objective of the proposals is to restrict travel through the area and return through traffic back onto the distributor road would be achieved. However, this will result in increased traffic volume in Church Road, which is of concern, as it may not be able to accommodate the predicted increase in traffic volume due to its constricted layout.
4.32 Based on the key points raised above, it is recommended not to proceed with the experimental traffic management scheme but to consider further investigations to restrict through traffic from using the area.

## 5. TIMETABLE

5.1 If agreed further investigations will be carried out within 2012/13 financial year.

## 6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 The further investigations for the alternative measures will be funded from Merton's 2012/13 Capital Programme allocation.
7. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS
7.1 None at this stage.

## 8. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

8.1 To proceed with the proposed experimental traffic management scheme but would be against the wishes of majority of those who responded to the consultation.
8.2 To proceed with the proposed experimental traffic management scheme but with changes to the operation of the junction of Belvedere Grove/Belvedere Avenue, by replacing the banned right turn from Belvedere Avenue into Belvedere Grove with a 'no entry' into Belvedere Grove. This will remove south-westbound traffic from Belvedere Grove at its junction with Belvedere Avenue. This will, however, have an adverse impact on Church Road.
8.3 To proceed with the proposed experimental traffic management scheme but with changes to the operation of the junction of Highbury Road/St Mary's Road by replacing the 'no right' turn from St Mary's Road into Highbury Road with a 'no entry' into Highbury Road. This will remove the south-westbound traffic flow from St Mary's Road through the area and address concerns raised by residents in Highbury Road. This will, however, have an adverse impact on Church Road.

## 9. HUMAN RIGHTS \& EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

9.1 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 and businesses are given careful consideration when taking decisions.
10. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS
10.1 Not applicable

## 11. RISK MANAGEMENT AND HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

11.1 The road safety implications/risks during construction and maintenance will be fully considered at each stage of the detailed design process, if an alternative scheme is agreed.
11.2 A road safety audit will be carried out by independent consultants before any scheme is implemented.
11.3 The Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 2007 will apply to any proposal. 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 CDM Co-ordinator for this scheme is F.M.Conway Ltd. Potential risks will have to be identified during the detailed design stage.

## 12. BACKGROUND PAPERS

The following background papers have been used in the preparation of this report:
B Street Management Advisory Committee report dated 9 th June 2011.
B Street Management Advisory Committee report dated $10^{\text {th }}$ February 2011.
Appendices - the following documents are to be published with this report and form part of the report
B Appendix 1 - Proposals Z36-24-19-2
B Appendix 2- Consultation leaflet
B Appendix 3 - Consultation results
B Appendix 4 - Predicted Traffic Volume Analysis

## Contacts

## i.Report Author:

Name: Edward Quartey
Tel: 02085453690
email: edward.quartey@merton.gov.uk
ii.Meeting arrangements - Democratic Services:
email: democratic.services@merton.gov.uk
Tel: 0208545 3356/3357/3359/3361/3616
iii.All press contacts - Merton's Press office:
email: press@merton.gov.uk
Tel: 02085453181
iv.London Borough of Merton:

Address: Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, SM4 5DX
Tel: 02082744901

## 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.



## ISSUE DATE: 11 JUNE 2012

Dear Resident / Occupier,
Over the years, the Council has investigated numerous traffic management proposals to prevent through traffic from using the residential roads in the Village and Hillside Wards, all of which have been rejected members of the committee recommended that the Cabinet Member for Environmental Sustainability and Regeneration meet with local ward members to agree and develop suitable alternative proposals for the area.

Following subsequent meetings between the Cabinet Member, local ward members and senior Council officers, new proposals have been developed to prevent through traffic from using the residential roads in the Belvedere area.

PROPOSALS
The proposals for the Belvedere area seek to reduce traffic volumes within the area by restricting access implement these restrictions on an experimental basis under Section 9 of the Road Traffic Regulations implement these restrictions on an experimental basis under

Experimental Traffic Management Orders are used to assess whether a particular restriction would produce the desired result, or to check what consequences would arise from the imposition of a restriction, before it is made permanent. Anyone can object and make representations within the first six months (the formal consultation period) of the experimental order coming into force. No consultation
is required prior to the order coming into force. The regulations also allow modifications to be made to the scheme during the experimental period, after the scheme has been implemented. Experimental Traffic management Orders can remain in force for a maximum period of 18 months by which time the Council must confirm, amend or remove the scheme.

The proposals form part of an integral package of measures where all the individual elements contribute to the overall success of the scheme. Therefore the measures are interdependent and cannot be amended without impacting on the overall scheme.

LET US KNOW YOUR VIEWS - WE ARE AT THE INFORMAL CONSULTATION STAGE
We are at this stage seeking your views to implement the proposals on an experimental period of 6 months and would like to know if you support the principle of the proposals. Please complete and return


 statistical information to your ward members and the Cabinet Member for Environmental, Sustainability and Regeneration, who will then make a decision on the whether or not to proceed with the proposals.
Your views will be considered proportionately depending on issues such as how likely you would be affected by any of the proposals. Other relevant factors, such as the Council's own statutory duties will

We regret that due to the number of responses received during a public consultation it will not be possible to individually respond to each respondent. However, all returned questionnaires will be analysed
and the results reported to the Cabinet Member for Environmental, Sustainability and Regeneration.


We therefore welcome your comments on this proposal, which will be noted and included within the proposed measures where appropriate. What happens next The results of this informal consultation along with officers' recommendations will be reported to the Street Management Advisory Committee (SMAC) for a decision to proceed or not to proceed with the If the proposals are approved, the Council will proceed with the making of the Traffic Management
 will commence. The Experimental Traffic Management Order will allow the Council to enforce the measures.

Once the scheme has been implemented, you would have a further opportunity to make detailed commens during the first six months when the ects of the proposals wo la be better understood. received during this period will be reported to local ward councillors, the street Management Advisory Committee and to the Cabinet Member for Environmental, Sustainability and Regeneration who will decide to either remove, amend or make the scheme permanent.

During the formal consultation stage (first six months), traffic volume surveys will be carried out and measures against the existing data to determine whether the scheme has been successful or not. CONTACT US

Please contact Edward Quartey via email at trafficandhighways@merton.gov.uk if you need further also view the plans at Wimbledon Library and Merton Link at Merton Civic Centre, Morden during our workings hours, Monday to Friday between 9am and 5pm.


# Wimbledon Area Traffic Scheme <br> Proposed Belvedere Area - Experimental Traffic Management Scheme <br> We would like to know your views. 

Please tick the appropriate boxes and return this card by 9 July 2012
Please write in BLOCK capitals


Please tick if you would like the above information to be confidential.

1. Do you support the introduction of the proposed experimentalNo traffic management measures, as outlined in the attached plan?
2. Do you have any additional options/comments regarding the proposals? (Please write in BLOCK capitals).
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
Please Note: In view of the large number of responses received during a public consultation it will not be possible to reply individually to each respondent.
It will be appreciated if you would complete the monitoring information requested below.
Equal Opportunity Monitoring Information
This information is requested so as to enable the Council to develop its understanding of the response rate from the different sections of the community and hence to test whether or not the channels of communication which we are currently using are effective


Age Group (please tick one box)

| 15 or under | 20-24 | 30-34 | 40-44 | 50-54 | 60-64 | 70-74 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16-19 | 25-29 | 35-39 | 45-49 | 55-59 | 65-69 | 75 or over |

Ethnic Origin (please tick one box)








