

NON-KEY DECISION TAKEN BY A CABINET MEMBER UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

See over for instructions on how to use this form – all parts of this form must be completed. Type all information in the boxes. The boxes will expand to accommodate extra lines where needed.

1. Title of report and reason for exemption (if any)

Proposed waiting and loading restrictions in Rutland Drive area – statutory consultation

2. Decision maker

Councillor Martin Whelton, Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Environment and Housing.

3. Date of Decision

11th August 2016

4. Date report made available to decision maker

4th August 2016

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

6. Decision

- A) Notes the result of the statutory consultation carried out between 21 January and 12 February 2016 on the proposals to introduce parking controls (double yellow lines) in the Rutland Drive area.
- B) Notes and considers the representations received in respect of the proposals.
- C) Considers the objections against the proposed measures.
- D) Agrees to proceed with the making of the relevant Traffic Management Orders (TMOs) and the implementation of the proposed double yellow lines in, Litchfield Avenue, Rustington Walk, Rutland Drive (outside 2-68 and 81-129) and Claymore Close (except outside 1 and 2). To implement waiting restrictions at all the junctions as set out in the drawings and the turning circle at the end of Rutland Drive cul-de-sac
- E) Subject to future funding, to investigate further measures that allows pavement parking on Hartland Way, Amberley Way and Wentworth Close, but to only implement junction waiting restrictions at this time.

7. Reason for decision

Addresses safety issues in relation to dangerous and obstructive parking, but also London Fire Brigade concerns. To address daytime parking issues which at times sees cars parking on both sides of the road which is mainly due to commuters. Also takes into account representations made on Hartland Way, Amberley Way, Wentworth Close, Rutland Way and Claymore Close which do not support restrictions beyond junction restrictions. From observations I am

happy that the present position is not of sufficient significance to warrant full implementation of waiting restrictions on those roads.

8. Alternative options considered and why rejected

To not implement recommendations would not address safety concerns in relation to dangerous and obstructive parking.

9. Documents relied on in addition to officer report

Meeting and site visit with St Helier ward councillors on 10th August.

10. Declarations of Interest

None

11. Publication of this decision and call in provision

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

*There is no need to resend Street Management Advisory Committee reports.



Martin Whelton

Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Environment and Housing

11/8/2016

Cabinet Member for Environmental Sustainability and Regeneration:

Date: 31st March 2016

Agenda item:

Wards: St. Helier

Subject: Proposed Rutland Drive Area Waiting Restrictions – Statutory consultation

Lead officer: Chris Lee, Director of Environment & Regeneration

Lead member: Councillor Andrew Judge, Cabinet Member for Environmental Sustainability and Regeneration

Forward Plan reference number: N/A

Contact Officer: Paul Atie, Tel: 020 8545 3214

<mailto:paul.atie@merton.gov.uk>

Recommendations:

That the Cabinet Member considers the issues detailed in this report and:-

- A) Notes the result of the statutory consultation carried out between 21 January and 12 February 2016 on the proposals to introduce parking controls (double yellow lines) in the Rutland Drive area.

Roads	Restrictions
Amberley Way	Double yellow lines on both sides of the road.
Clayton Close	Double yellow lines on one side including Cul De Sac.
Hartland Way	Double yellow lines on one side
Litchfield Avenue	Double yellow lines on one side
Rustington Walk	Double yellow lines on one side
Rutland Drive	Double yellow lines on one side
Rutland Drive Cul De Sac end	Double yellow lines on both sides of the road.
All Junctions	Double yellow lines on both sides of the road.

- B) Notes and considers the representations received in respect of the proposals as detailed in Appendix 2.
- C) Considers the objections against the proposed measures.
- D) Agrees to proceed with the making of the relevant Traffic Management Orders (TMOs) and the implementation of the proposed double yellow lines in Amberley Way, Clayton Close, Hartland Way, Litchfield Avenue, Rustington Walk, Rutland Drive, and Wentworth Close as detailed in the drawing attached as Appendix 1.

- E) Agrees to exercise his discretion not to hold a public inquiry on the consultation process.
-

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 The report details the outcome of a statutory consultation conducted between 21 January and 12 February 2016 to introduce waiting restrictions as detailed in section A above.
- 1.2 It seeks approval to proceed with the making of the relevant Traffic Management Orders (TMOs) to introduce waiting restrictions in the roads named in section A above.

2 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 It is the policy of the Council to improve the environment by making it safer and maintaining access for both motorists and pedestrians. One way this can be achieved is by regulating the number of parked vehicles in the area, particularly at key locations such as at junctions, narrow roads, and cul de sacs and at bends. The aims of the proposed double yellow lines waiting restrictions are to improve visibility and to provide clear access for all road users, particularly vulnerable road users such as pedestrians, push chairs and wheelchair users who for example may wish to make proper use of the section of dropped kerb at junctions.
- 2.2 When considering road safety, S.122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 places a duty on the Council "to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway" when exercising any of its functions under the 1984 Act. Road safety is therefore a matter that the Council should have proper regard to when considering whether to make an Order under S.6 of the 1984 Act.
- 2.3 The Highway Code stipulates that motorists should not park within 10 metres of a junction. The failure by a person to observe any provision of the Highway Code does not in itself render that person liable to criminal proceedings, such a failure may though be relied upon by any party to proceedings (whether civil or criminal) in order to establish or negate liability (s.38 (7) Road Traffic Act 1988). Although a failure to observe the Code does not then itself amount to a criminal offence, and neither does it create a presumption of negligence, a breach of the Code may as a matter of fact amount to strong evidence to prove lack of proper driving. Given that not stopping within 10 metres of a junction or on a bend is an express provision of the Code it is of relevance when considering road safety in this area.
- 2.4 The Council routinely receives concerns from residents, motorists, and the Ward Councillors regarding vehicles parking obstructively, for example close to or/and at various junctions causing obstruction to flow of traffic and pedestrians and causing sightlines difficulties. There have been continuous demands for the introduction of parking restrictions at key locations to improve safety, visibility and access by keeping junctions and key locations clear. Upon receiving complaints, officers investigate the site conditions and determine the appropriate extent of the restrictions necessary. The proposed restrictions are kept to a minimum designed to improve access for emergency vehicles, refuse vehicles and for all other road users.

- 2.5 In July 2014 the Council carried out a statutory consultation on its intention to introduce double yellow line waiting restrictions at all the junctions along Rutland Drive. The Council distributed consultation leaflet to those within the vicinity of the junctions and posted Notices on lamp columns within the vicinities of the proposed parking restrictions in the area. Some residents wrote in opposing the restrictions, arguing that the consultation leaflet was not distributed to all the residents and that residents who have not seen the Notices would not be aware of the consultation taking place and that the Council has failed to consult properly. A decision was then taken to abandon the consultation on the advice of ward Councillors.
- 2.6 The ward Councillors then organised two meetings to discuss the proposed restrictions and the way forward. During the first meeting some residents from Litchfield Avenue and Rutland Drive argued that these roads are not wide enough for parking to take place on both sides of the roads and that if there is an emergency, the fire services will not be able to access the road but the Council is allowing the situation to continue. However, residents from neighbouring roads disagreed saying that there is no parking issue.
- 2.7 After the meeting, it was decided that for safety reasons, the fire service should be asked to carry out a route test. The Fire Brigade attended the roads on two occasions; the following is an extract from their report:
- Rutland Drive – Insufficient width to drive appliance down due to parked vehicles.
- Litchfield Avenue – Able to drive appliance down with caution on Saturday afternoon. This however would not be possible if vehicles parked opposite each other*
- Hartland Way - Able to drive appliance down with caution on Saturday afternoon. This however would not be possible if vehicles parked opposite each other*
- Claymore Close - Able to drive appliance down with caution on Saturday afternoon. This however would not be possible if vehicles parked opposite each other.*
- Rustington Walk - Insufficient width to drive appliance down due to parked vehicles.*
- Restricted parking on one side of the road, or pavement parking would alleviate these problems.*
- 2.8 The fire service report was shared with residents at the second meeting. Various options of parking restrictions including Controlled Parking Zone were discussed. Towards the end of the meeting, the ward Councillors asked for show of hands to determine the strength of feeling of what type of restrictions residents would like the Council to take forward. Majority of residents present indicated that they would like double yellow lines waiting restrictions on one side of the roads to be consulted upon. The CPZ option was rejected.
- 2.9 After the meeting some residents who were in favour of the CPZ option wrote to the local ward Councillors and Officers advising that although residents present at the meeting rejected the CPZ option, all residents of these roads should be given an opportunity to decide on options available to residents.

- 2.10 The ward Councillors wrote to the residents informing them of the outcome of the last meeting which took place on 6th November 2014. The letter asked residents to let them know if a CPZ option should be included in next consultation. Some residents had reservation on the content of the letter and wanted clarification.
- 2.11 On 9 April 2015, officers wrote to all residents in the area to clarify some points that were raised by residents to the ward Councillors letter. This letter is attached as Appendix 4. The letter gave residents two options.

Option 1 - double yellow lines only.

Residents were informed that for safety reasons i.e. to ensure free access for a fire engine etc it is the Council's intention to introduce "At all time" waiting restrictions and that this proposal would not be subject to a public consultation. The introduction of double yellow lines on one side would mean that parking would only be permitted on one side of the road. Although this option would address the access issue, it would not curtail commuter parking and therefore, residents would not have priority over available parking spaces.

Option 2 – CPZ include double yellow lines

The key objective of managing parking is to reduce and control non-essential parking and assist the residents, short-term visitors and the local businesses. Within any CPZ, only those within the zone are entitled to permits.

Option 2 was rejected by majority those who responded to the letter.

3 Consultation

- 3.1 The statutory consultation on the Council's intention to introduce double yellow lines was carried out between 21 January and 12 February 2016. The consultation included the erection of street Notices on lamp columns in the vicinity of the proposals and the publication of the Council's intentions in the Local Guardian and the London Gazette. Consultation documents were available at the Link, Merton Civic Centre and on the Council's website. A newsletter with a plan was also circulated to all those properties included within the consultation area.
- 3.2 The statutory consultation resulted in a number of representations from each road. These representations are detailed in Appendix 2. A petition was also received from residents of Amberley Way and Wentworth Close. A representation was also received from the Metropolitan Police with no comment or observation.

Petition received

- 3.3 The petitioners do not support the scheme layout of the yellow lines, particularly the double yellow lines on both sides of the road at the Cul De Sac ends. The layout of the scheme was designed to ensure access and safety. Some requests received from local residents have been accommodated where possible. Full representations and officers comments' are detailed in sections 3.4 and 3.7 of this report.

Amberley Way and Wentworth Close.

- 3.4 Double yellow lines waiting restrictions are proposed on both sides of these roads. The concern of the residents was that visitors would not have space to park. The petition letter that was received and detailed in appendix 2 is as follows *"I wish to object to the proposed scheme on the basis that the Cul de sac enclave in where we live including Hartland Way, Amberley Way and Wentworth Close should be treated a stand-alone consultation as it is subject to different criteria and should not be lumped in with a more general area that contains through roads.*

If this scheme goes ahead in its present form we believe it will be unworkable because if the yellow lines are on both sides of the road as in both Wentworth Close and Amberley Way, this will force everyone to park in Hartland Way and will cause gridlock with everyone fighting for a parking space with virtually no parking space available.

Apart from unsightly intrusion of yellow lines in a quiet residential area which has operated quite adequately under existing laws, we don't believe that it is in anyone's interest to create a new parking regime without any plans to deal with the consequences of your actions. We don't expect the Council to try and solve one problem and create another problem where Residents, visitors and deliveries are unable to park. Ward Councillors were provided with copies of the proposals and newsletters prior to the start of the statutory consultation. Given the nature of some of the locations and to remain cost effective not all residents in each street received a newsletter".

Officers Comment

Amberley Way and Wentworth Close have an average road width of 4.3 metres. The minimum running width required by a fire engine to access residential road is between 3 and 3.5 metres. With cars parked fully on the carriageway, on one side of the road, the average available road width for access is reduced to 1.3 metres and even less if a larger vehicle is parked. Also the footway is too narrow to allow footway parking. The photo provided by the resident (see below, the photo was taken in Amberley Way) which shows a small vehicle parked fully on the carriageway in Amberley Way and NHS ambulance vehicle trying to squeeze through. As it can be seen from the picture, a fire engine of any size will not be able to access this road without damaging the parked vehicles if it was required to attend the road. The Council will be failing in its duty if this type of situation is permitted to continue. When considering road safety, S.122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 places a duty on the Council "to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway" when exercising any of its functions under the 1984 Act. Road safety is therefore a matter that the Council should have proper regard to when considering whether to make an Order under S.6 of the 1984 Act.



See more photos in appendix 3

Rutland Cul De Sac end

- 3.5 The situation described in section 3.4` above also applies to the Cul De sac end of Rutland Drive which has the same width as Amberley Way.
- 3.6 Other objections received against the proposals are that there will not be enough parking spaces for the use of residents and their visitors. Majority of residents in these roads have off-street parking. The roads within the Rutland Drive area are not wide enough to accommodate parking on both sides and due to grass verges it is not possible to allow footway parking. These are residential roads with extremely limited on-street parking for residents and currently residents do try to park on only one side in majority of these roads.
- 3.7 During the working day parking takes place on both sides of some of these roads close to Epsom Road which cause obstructions and access difficulties for all road users' especially emergency services. During the two meetings residents were made aware of the impact that parking displacement may have in these roads once yellow lines are placed on one side of the roads. Some residents claimed that Hartland Way enclave and half way down Rutland Drive towards the Cul De Sac end do not suffer from parking congestion and currently do not park on both sides of these roads therefore the proposed waiting restrictions are unnecessary. They do not support proposed double yellow lines in those roads. Residents should understand that once parking restrictions are introduced into the roads close to Epsom Road, commuters will simply move to the roads with no parking restrictions. Residents also requested section of the carriageway by the Park to be cleared of foliage by cutting back the vegetation to create more parking spaces. This was acted upon and the foliage was cut back during the summer which created a parking space for several cars. Officers also suggested the CPZ option which would give priority to available parking spaces for residents and their visitors. This option was however rejected by residents. Taking the fire service comments into consideration and the simple fact that the roads are not wide enough for parking to take place on both sides of the carriageway, it is recommended that the proposed restrictions measures be implemented.
- 3.8 There are no objections or comments from Litchfield Avenue and Rustington Walk. These are the two roads that are mostly affected by commuter parking on both sides of the roads.

- 3.9 The Highway Code stipulates that vehicles should not park within 10 metres of the junction. However at the above junctions the restrictions need to be increased to achieve the required safety requirements. The restrictions will improve safety; keep the junctions clear of obstructively parked vehicles and increase visibility and access.
- 3.10 In considering the proposed measures, the Council must consider whether or not the problems currently being experienced is of sufficient significance for change to go ahead; whether or not the change proposed is proportionate to the problems experienced and is acceptable in consideration of the possible impact.

3.11 **STATEMENT OF REASON**

It would be irresponsible of the Council to ignore the manner of obstructive parking that is currently taking place. The Council has duty of care to ensure the safety of all road users and to maintain access at all times, particularly for the public service vehicles and the emergency services.

4 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

- 4.1 Do nothing. This would be contrary to the concerns expressed by the fire service, local ward Members and residents and would not resolve the dangerous and obstructive parking that is currently taking place.

5 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS & STATUTORY PROVISION

- 5.1 The Traffic Management Orders would be made under Section 6, of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended). 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). These regulations also require the Council to consider any representations received as a result of publishing the draft Order.

6 HUMAN RIGHTS & EQUALITIES

- 6.1 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 parking needs of the residents and visitors are given consideration but it is considered that maintaining safe access must take priority.
- 6.2 Bodies representing motorists, including commuters are included in the statutory consultation required for draft traffic management and similar orders.
- 6.3 The implementation of waiting restrictions 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 the transport planning policies of the government, the Mayor for London and the borough.
- 6.4 By maintaining clear access points, visibility will improve thereby improving the safety at junctions; bends and along narrow sections of a road and subsequently reducing potential accidents.
- 6.5 Regulating and formulating the flow of traffic will ensure the safety of all road users and improved access throughout the day.

7 RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 The risk in not introducing the proposed waiting restrictions would be the potential risk to all road users and to the residents in case of an emergency, and access difficulties will not be addressed. It would also be contrary to the support and concerns expressed and could lead to loss of public confidence in the Council. It could also place the Council at risk for not exercising its duties in ensuring safety and access.
- 7.2 The risk of introducing the proposed restrictions could lead to extra pressure on the current parking demand. However, the proposals will address safety concerns by improving access and visibility for both road users and pedestrians which outweigh loss of parking.

8 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 To introduce the proposed restrictions will cost approximately £7,000. This includes the making of The Traffic Management Orders. The set up costs will be funded from the budget identified for controlled parking zones within the Capital Programme 2016/2017.

9 TIMESCALES

- 9.1 The proposed waiting restrictions can be introduced and the Traffic Management Orders could be made soon after the made decision. This will include the erection of the Notices on lamp columns in the area, the publication of the made Orders in the Local Guardian and the London Gazette. The documents will be made available at the Link, Civic Centre and on the Council's website. A newsletter will also be delivered advising all consultees of the decision and operational date of the restrictions.

10 APPENDICES

- 10.1 The following documents are to be published with this report and form part of the report
- Appendix 1 – Plans of the proposals
 - Appendix 2 – Representations
 - Appendix 3 – Photos
 - Appendix 4 – consultation documents
 - Appendix 5 – Letter to residents.
- 10.2 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.

APPENDIX 1

<p>Ref.051 As a resident of Amberley Way the yellow lines can't come quick enough, do you have an idea of when the work will start?</p>
<p>Ref.002 Clayton Close I am writing to say that my wife and I fully support the proposals for parking restrictions which have been outlined for the Rutland Drive area. I have attached a couple of photos taken at the junction of Rutland Drive and Litchfield Avenue. As you are aware, there is no way an Emergency Services (Fire Brigade or Ambulance Service) vehicle would be able to access this road in the event of an emergency.</p>
<p>Ref.001 Clayton Close With reference to the above proposal we at 4 AMBERLEY WAY, are more than happy with said proposals due to the continuing problems in our cul de sac. We struggle daily getting on and off our drive way due to cars parked immediately opposite it, and when they park up on the pavement it is not possible for pedestrians to use the pavement either. It is always a hazard turning in and out of our cul de sac due to the volume of cars parked on the corner. We hate to think what would happen if there was an emergency and a fire engine or ambulance couldn't access. We have noticed an increased volume of cars and especially vans using our cul de sac for parking. We have witnessed people parking up and walking off down the road with packed lunch in hand. In fact there was a black van parked down here in excess of 3 weeks whom no one knew who it belonged to. Unfortunately, we after paying to have our driveway done and a drop kerb, are sometimes experiencing people parking across our driveway, so we are unable to get on or off, and when we approach whoever has done this, we are getting verbal abuse. The occasions this has happened the parking office at the council is closed, as its out of hours, and when we have contacted the police regarding the matter we have been told they do not deal with parking matters and to contact the council. We would be most grateful if these yellow lines were implemented as soon as possible.</p>

Representations and officers' comments - Against

<p>Ref. 012 Amberley Way I object very strongly to double yellow lines been put on both sides of the road in both Wentworth close and Amberley way. This will take away at least 8 parking spaces from Wentworth and about the same amount from Amberley. May I ask where on earth do all these park. This is not required as there are no problems as such from parking I have lived here 8 years and have not seen a problem. May I also ask where on earth do service people park when I have a boiler breakdown or my wife needs the nurse. May we please have someone from your department to answer all these and more questions at the Morden forum on Thursday evening. Officers comment See section 3.7</p>
<p>Ref. 006 Amberley Way We live in Amberley way and have lived there for the last forty years, and we do not agree with double yellow lines in the road, yes I feel that restrictions on one side would be sufficient, and still allow emergency services easy access. Putting double yellow lines again makes one feel that as we live in cul de sac we do not have a voice. Where are people visiting the road going to park ,we have careers and nurses visiting clients in the road so unless they can park in the drive where do you propose they park . I also feel that the Hartland way end of Amberley way some parking spaces could be left there on one side and still allow access for emergency vehicles. I trust you will read this and give it serious consideration In the years I have lived here people have always being very considerate in there parking and mostly parked on one side so I really think yellow lines on one side would work and give the residents who pay their taxes a feeling that they are being listened to. Officers comment See section 3.7</p>
<p>Ref.017 Rutland Drive Thank you for your communication in relation to the proposed anytime waiting restrictions Rutland Drive Area dated 21st January 2016. Firstly, may I state that I do not recall the council asking for my views on a proposal for a controlled parking zone option, to be included as part of the previously agreed waiting restrictions in April 2015. You have stated that the outcome was that residents of the area overwhelmingly rejected the CPZ option. Can you please let me know how you canvassed the views on a proposal for a CPZ and what information did you provide in relation to the pros and cons of a CPZ? I am 100% certain that I was not included in this and as I wasn't included were others left out? I am still in favour of a CPZ for this area and would still like you to consider this as part of the statutory consultation. My reasons for this are as follows:- It is your intention to introduce waiting restrictions on one side of each road as outlined in your consultation document. The issue in terms of parking in this area is solely commuters. We see them every morning mostly Mon – Fri parking their cars and either walking to Epsom Rd to catch the bus into Morden/Epsom and also accessing St Helier Station on</p>

Green Lane. The proof of this is that on Saturdays and Sundays there are hardly any parking issues in the area. Your proposals in your consultation document will not stop commuter parking, they will just park on the sides of the roads where there are no waiting restrictions. This will in turn mean that residents will be disadvantaged as less on street parking will be available to them and for those who have cross overs to enable them to park on their driveway what will happen if drivers park over their crossovers preventing them access to their driveways? Has it been clearly stated in documentation that residents will not be able to park on their own crossover if there are double yellow lines? (they will only be able to use their crossover to access their driveway). For anyone who does park illegally they will be issued with a penalty charge notice assuming that the parking enforcement department regularly monitors the area ie 3/4 times per day, unless LBM are prepared to install cameras to enforce the restrictions. However, because LB Merton does not tow away offending vehicles they will be able to stay there all day until the restrictions come into force the following day, thereby blocking the road for what could be a 24 hour period and this will possibly still prevent a fire engine /ambulance gaining access the road. The area has an ageing population with family and friends supporting them in their homes and some residents also child minding for their family, if the commuter parking issue was resolved there would be plenty of space for on street parking. If a CPZ is not implemented then residents who wish to use their car throughout the day will find themselves returning and not being able to park legally and if they park illegally they will receive a penalty charge notice. How will this help and support residents and do they fully understand the implications of not having a CPZ? Commuters parking in the affected areas often start from 6am onwards and stay until 6/7pm taking up on street parking. By putting in the double yellow lines less space will be available creating more problems for residents and their visitors/support workers but not addressing the issue of commuter parking. The only way to have factual statistics on commuter parking in the area will be to undertake a fully comprehensive survey on this issue. There are also shops at the entrance to Rutland Drive (ie Epsom Road), a Dental Practice and Doctors surgery further on Epsom Road (on Red Route, just past Lower Morden Lane) and the shoppers/patients are also coming into the area and parking to use these facilities, which has an impact on parking. In conclusion the proposed anytime waiting restrictions will cause more problems to residents than it will solve and I am not sure that residents fully understand this. The only way to address the issue and solve the problem will be to bring in a CPZ Mon – Fri (only 11 – 3 pm), or (in a similar way to the 'P's' just off Arthur Road in Wimbledon) which will put a stop once and for all to commuter parking and cut down on traffic control issues and improve air quality within the area. I look forward to your response and in particular to your response to my first paragraph in relation to the April 2015 consultation.

Officers comment

See sections 2.5 – 2.11

Ref. 046 Rutland Drive

I am emailing regarding the proposals for Rutland Drive with regard to parking restrictions. I would like to voice my objections to the implementation of double yellow lines along the entire cul-de-sac, on both sides of the road. I cannot see any benefit in this at all. As householders here we would be left with no visitor parking at any part of the cul-de-sac. There will be no available parking in Claymore Close, as the residents there will be using the very small available space. We currently have three people with registered disabilities in our home and it is vitally important that we are able to get as close to the property at all times. Whilst we have off street parking, this would leave other members of the family or visitors nowhere to park, the nearest point being down by the park, if any availability!! Whilst we do have rear access to our property, since the installation of the alley gates this has proved difficult to access. There is also a lack of other residents maintaining the alleyway!! I am also concerned as to the impact that the non availability of parking will have to the house prices, should we decide to relocate. It is a clear factor that this would be off putting for prospective buyers. Whilst I do agree in principle that parking is an issue in the main part of Rutland Drive, and the corners of Rustington, Litchfield and Hartland it is not something that is a problem in the cul-de-sac. We have a very close community feel here in the cul-de-sac and all work well to ensure parking is not an issue. I do not believe that this is a satisfactory solution to the parking issue, and that it is wholly unnecessary, we have never had an issue with dustcarts, ambulances or any other vehicle being able to ascertain access to the cul-de-sac. I look forward to hearing from you.

Officers comment

See section 3.7

Ref. 049 Rutland Drive

I am writing to advise that I am strongly objecting against the proposed double yellow line restrictions around Rutland Drive area. It is simply a no brainer. I am in a property without a driveway, with 2 young children working as a full time single mother. I require my car at hand to enable me to carry on juggling my very busy life. This has not been thought through. I am unable to put a drive way in as this is a rented property. This area is a residential road and there are other measures that can be put in place to enable emergency services to attend. By cutting all parking out is not an option. When I was originally notified of the proposed restrictions I was advised that it would be around the corners of the roads. I heard no more until a colleague today advised me of your intentions to now make the whole area blocked out from parking. I have read your leaflet now which advises that notices were placed on lamp post columns and in papers. Why did no one come around to speak as they did originally?? You have advised that you carried out careful consultation. I have heard nothing and if I had then I would certainly have rejected this ridiculous proposal Please can you give me the actual numbers of times emergency services have had difficulty in accessing an area. As a matter of fact last year I had cause to call an ambulance to my house and they did not have 1 ounce of trouble accessing the property or indeed parking. Can you give me actual numbers of wheelchair users using those roads on a daily basis – I cant even recall 1. Regardless, wheelchair users along with pedestrians with or without pushchairs have got to negotiate roads wherever

they go, or are you going to make the whole of Morden / Lower Morden a no parking zone??? What has made you single out this particular area? Further I have never found that traffic flow is a problem around this area. It seems that you will be creating problems by implementing these restrictions. It makes no sense what so ever to even consider this option. I would like to answers to my questions.

Officers comment

See section 3.4 and 3.7

Ref.003 Rutland Drive

We attended the consultation meeting regarding the above at St Lawrence church hall. At this meeting we were given 3 options and they were a) CPZ, b) double yellow lines down both sides of the road and c) double yellow lines down one side of the road but on both sides at junctions. Despite the majority of affected residents wanting no double yellow lines at all, it was voiced that of the three available options presented, option c was the only acceptable option.

We have now received the proposed restrictions and there are double yellow lines down both sides of the cul de sac end of Rutland Drive. This restricts drastically the amount of parking spaces in our area, in Claymore Close and for events such as Christmas, funerals, Easter, disabled visitors etc. There will be nowhere in the local area for these people to park nearby and one sided yellow lines would not restrict access for emergency vehicles but would provide access for the elderly and infirm.

Why has option b) been put through when it was announced at the meeting that "option c" (the only acceptable option) was the agreed upon proposal?

We look forward to hearing your comments.

Officers comment

See section 3.7

Ref. 014 Rutland Drive

We wish to make the following representation against the afore mentioned proposed waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) : Whilst we appreciate that Rutland drive does require some parking organisation we feel that parts of your proposal are extreme for a cul de sac and will cause some major problems. The problems that we can see are :
1). We live at the top end of Rutland drive at the junction of the cul de sac and Claymore Close, and as the area in front of the park are already in full. Use by the overflow from these houses after the installation of double yellow lines it will Leave about 6 to 8 spaces with no yellow lines between the end of the park and the end of Rutland drive and claymore close. This will just not work as it is not enough parking and what worries us is that if you get Home late in the evening or late at night if maybe a shift worker or similar and there is nowhere to park you very possibly will have to drive as far away as Elm Road West or Woodstock avenue and in our experience (having lived here for 30 + years) you Would be extremely lucky to find any parking in either of these roads, and what concerns Us even more is that you then have to walk home, which late at night or in the early hours and with a man exposing himself to a lady in Woodstock avenue a few Months ago and an attempted rape in a nearby park last summer is not very encouraging and quite worrying.

2). When you book repair engineers such as for washing machines etc. most of them will not attend nowadays unless you can guarantee them parking, which will be impossible ! People will not get many if any visitors at our end of the road as parking will be non Existent and this apart from being unfair to elderly or lone people will Possibly cause problems and arguments between residents as I am sure you will get ones that hog the Parking spaces and then of course you will get the ones who are frightened to move their Cars once parked for fear of not getting a space again. We cannot understand why you would need to put double yellow lines in a small recess in Claymore Close which was clearly put there for cars to park in, or why you need double yellow lines in claymore close at all as it is only forcing them out onto Rutland drive along with the people from the cul de sac in Rutland when there is not enough space. Whilst we are fortunate enough to have a good amount of off street parking we can see that we are going to have a hell of a time trying to get on and off of our driveway. We would re-iterate that whilst we understand these roads need something the requirement are not the same for both the top and bottom of Rutland drive and have to say that in 30 plus years of living here we have only once heard of a fire engine that could not get through. We would ask that you look again at your proposals for double yellows in both Claymore close and the cul de sac end of Rutland Drive.

Officers comment

See section 3.7

Ref.011 Rutland Drive

I am sending this email on behalf of my Mother and Father who live in Rutland Drive. They would like to object to the proposed AT ANY TIME WAITING RESTRICTIONS that are going to effect their property.

1) From 56-68 Rutland Drive cars do no park as everyone has their won driveway.

2) My Father is disabled and has a carer each morning, the carer will then have trouble parking resulting in time wasted which should be spread on my Father.

3) A devaluation of the property prices due to 24hour parking restrictions.

4) Residents paid for their drop kerbs and would not appreciate double yellow lines.

My Mother and Father have suggested a compromise either do not paint yellow lines over driveways and restrict parking to certain times say 7am to 6pm.

Can you acknowledge receipt of my parents objection.

Officers comment

See section 3.7

Ref.033 Rutland Drive

We are writing to object the proposed waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) at all times as sent to us in your Proposed at Any Time Waiting Restrictions - Rutland Drive area Statutory Consultation. You propose to restrict parking at all times by using double yellow lines for over 50% of all current available unrestricted parking. On your map showing the proposed restricted areas, most of the unrestricted parking areas contain a mixture of drives (dropped down kerbs) and kerbs so although showing an approx 50% restriction of parking this would actually be far greater due to the drives with dropped down kerbs preventing parking. Most of the roads in your plan are quiet suburban roads with some cul de sacs, not busy thoroughfares, so the restricted access and congestion you talk about is virtually non-existent. The busiest part of Rutland Drive is the exit into Epsom road and this is the only part where there are sometimes access problems due to double parking. The rest of the roads are quieter and it is rare that there are any access problems by emergency vehicles or other larger vehicles. Your paragraph stating that the proposed restrictions would improve safety visibility and provide clear access are untrue, these exist at the present time with the unrestricted parking due to the quiet nature of the residential roads. None of the roads on your plan are busy thoroughfares which would need parking restrictions but are quiet residential roads with very little traffic. I am sure that in your accident statistics for Merton Borough, accidents that have occurred in the roads on your plan would be less than 1% in any year due to the nature of the roads and therefore would not need parking restrictions. Why have parking restrictions 24 hrs and double yellow lines. If your intention is for clear access why out of business hours and all weekend when traffic use is mainly residential and not public service vehicles. We would understand more if the proposed scheme were single yellow lines for weekday daytime use i.e. 9am to 5pm for access by public service vehicles i.e. dustcarts but why 24/7 when mostly residential traffic and no public service vehicles at weekends and beyond the normal business day? The proposed parking restrictions instead of creating so-called less congestion would actually do the opposite as with restricted parking throughout the roads on the plan, visitors to the area would be searching all the available spaces for parking and would block the roads looking or waiting for parked cars to move thus causing congestion to roads where there is presently little or no congestion. This would block emergency vehicles which presently would not be blocked by the current unrestricted parking scheme. Also some residents are vulnerable and need carers/other regular visitors who at present have little parking due to the current parking arrangements but who under your proposed scheme would be spending precious time hunting for available parking space and thus reducing the amount of time they could care/look after them. We urge you to think again at your proposals and withdraw this current restriction plan.

Officers comment

See section 3.7

Ref.042 Rutland Drive

Double yellow lines proposal to Rutland Drive and nearby roads. We would like to oppose these restrictions because one side of Rutland Drive parking is ALREADY avoided for access and makes it difficult to park near to our homes.

Officers comment

See section 3.7

Ref.019 Rutland Drive

I live in Rutland Drive, in the cull de sac and have done for over 12 years. I am writing to you to object to the proposed any time waiting restrictions that are currently under consultation.

I fully support the parking restrictions that you plan to impose on the main stretch of the road and as someone who has to travel the length of it and negotiate the traffic on both sides and not been able to get through at times understand why this needs to be imposed.

I do not understand though why you have proposed double yellow lines the who way around the cull de sac and left us with no additional parking. Traffic moves though our section we do not have blockages that would impact on emergency services getting through to a property like you have on the main section of the road. Where you have proposed parking restrictions on the main section you have left the opposite side available for people to park. In our section you are taking all parking away. Every property has a drive and occasionally visitor cars are parked across them which does not restrict traffic flow. You are taking this away from all the properties and this is not acceptable. You have left us with approx. 4/5 car spaces on Claymore Close. This is simply not enough parking for this number of houses and is not a fair comparison to what you have proposed for all other residents

I know I am not the only resident to feel like this and want you to seriously consider our objections.

Officers comment

See section 3.4

Ref.023 Rutland Drive

I have some serious concerns regarding the proposed double yellow lines on our side of the road, and in general about the reduction in available parking space in the area.

I live in Hartland Way with my husband who, due to a severe stroke last year is receiving frequent visits from carers

(four times a day) and community nurses (twice a day). In addition we receive deliveries by the pharmacy and various suppliers.

Most of these require temporary parking; the carers come in twos, sometimes both bring cars, and stay for 30-40 minutes. Sometimes while they are here I myself have to take my car out for a quick shopping expedition, so cannot be blocked in. We have a driveway, at present adequate for one vehicle, and intend having it enlarged, along with the dropped kerb, to the maximum allowable in the space. [If this requires prior inspection and approval by the Council, I am wondering how quickly this can be arranged?

An additional complication in our case is that a ramp will have to be built from our front door to allow exit/access for my husband in a wheel chair, so this may reduce the driveway space available for an additional vehicle.

I should be grateful for the opportunity to discuss possible solutions to these problems with whoever might be able to help. One idea which could be considered is the widening of the road through removal on one side of grass verges and trees.

Officers comment

See section 3.7

Ref.040 Rutland Drive

With reference to the above proposals can you please confirm the current roadside parking spaces versus the reduced number as per the proposals for a CPZ as broken down into the affected roads.
At present I would like to confirm my formal objection to the proposal but will reconsider pending receipt of the requested information.

Ref 013 Rutland Drive

I am writing to advise that I am strongly objecting against the proposed double yellow line restrictions around Rutland Drive area. It is simply a no brainer. I am in a property without a driveway, with 2 young children working as a full time single mother. I require my car at hand to enable me to carry on juggling my very busy life. This has not been thought through. I am unable to put a drive way in as this is a rented property. This area is a residential road and there are other measures that can be put in place to enable emergency services to attend. By cutting all parking out is not an option. When I was originally notified of the proposed restrictions I was advised that it would be around the corners of the roads. I heard no more until a colleague today advised me of your intentions to now make the whole area blocked out from parking. I have read your leaflet now which advises that notices were placed on lamp post columns and in papers. Why did no one come around to speak as they did originally?? You have advised that you carried out careful consultation. I have heard nothing and if I had then I would certainly have rejected this ridiculous proposal Please can you give me the actual numbers of times emergency services have had difficulty in accessing an area. As a matter of fact last year I had cause to call an ambulance to my house and they did not have 1 ounce of trouble accessing the property or indeed parking. Can you give me actual numbers of wheelchair users using those roads on a daily basis – I cant even recall 1. Regardless, wheelchair users along with pedestrians with or without pushchairs have got to negotiate roads wherever they go, or are you going to make the whole of Morden / Lower Morden a no parking zone??? What has made you single out this particular area? Further I have never found that traffic flow is a problem around this area. It seems that you will be creating problems by implementing these restrictions. It makes no sense what so ever to even consider this option. I would like to answers to my questions.

Officers Comment

See section 3.7

Ref 018 Rutland Drive

Thank you for your communication in relation to the proposed anytime waiting restrictions Rutland Drive Area dated 21st January 2016.

Firstly, may I state that I do not recall the council asking for my views on a proposal for a controlled parking zone option, to be included as part of the previously agreed waiting restrictions in April 2015. You have stated that the outcome was that residents of the area overwhelmingly rejected the CPZ option. Can you please let me know how you canvassed the views on a proposal for a CPZ and what information did you provide in relation to the pros and cons of a CPZ? I am 100% certain that I was not included in this and as I wasn't included were others left out?

I am still in favour of a CPZ for this area and would still like you to consider this as part of the statutory consultation.

My reasons for this are as follows:-

- It is your intention to introduce waiting restrictions on one side of each road as outlined in your consultation document. The issue in terms of parking in this area is solely commuters. We see them every morning mostly Mon – Fri parking their cars and either walking to Epsom Rd to catch the bus into Morden/Epsom and also accessing St Helier Station on Green Lane . The proof of this is that on Saturdays and Sundays there are hardly any parking issues in the area. Your proposals in your consultation document will not stop commuter parking , they will just park on the sides of the roads where there are no waiting restrictions. This will in turn mean that residents will be disadvantaged as less on street parking will be available to them and for those who have cross overs to enable them to park on their driveway what will happen if drivers park over their crossovers preventing them access to their driveways? Has it been clearly stated in documentation that residents will not be able to park on their own crossover if there are double yellow lines? (they will only be able to use their crossover to access their driveway).
- For anyone who does park illegally they will be issued with a penalty charge notice assuming that the parking enforcement department regularly monitors the area ie 3/4 times per day, unless LBM are prepared to install cameras to enforce the restrictions. However, because LB Merton does not tow away offending vehicles they will be able to stay there all day until the restrictions come into force the following day, thereby blocking the road for what could be a 24 hour period and this will possibly still prevent a fire engine /ambulance gaining access the road.
- The area has an ageing population with family and friends supporting them in their homes and some residents also child minding for their family, if the commuter parking issue was resolved there would be plenty of space for on street parking.
- If a CPZ is not implemented then residents who wish to use their car throughout the day will find themselves returning and not being able to park legally and if they park illegally they will receive a penalty charge notice. How will this help and support residents and do they fully understand the implications of not having a CPZ?
- Commuters parking in the affected areas often start from 6am onwards and stay until 6/7pm taking up on street parking. By putting in the double yellow lines less space will be available creating more problems for residents and their visitors/support workers but not addressing the issue of commuter parking. The only way to have factual statistics on commuter parking in the area will be to undertake a fully comprehensive survey on this issue.
- There are also shops at the entrance to Rutland Drive (ie Epsom Road) , a Dental Practice and Doctors surgery further on Epsom Road (on Red Route, just past Lower Morden Lane) and the shoppers/patients are also coming into the area and parking to use these facilities, which has an impact on parking.

In conclusion the proposed anytime waiting restrictions will cause more problems to residents than it will solve and I am not sure that residents fully understand this. The only way to address the issue and solve the problem will be to bring in a CPZ Mon – Fri (only 11 – 3 pm), or (in a similar way to the 'P's' just off Arthur Road in Wimbledon) which will put a stop once a for all to commuter parking and cut down on traffic control issues and improve air quality within the area.

I look forward to your response and in particular to your response to my first paragraph in relation to the April 2015 consultation.

Officers Comment

Officers have looked through the responses received during the consultation asking residents if they would want a CPZ option to be included and it can be confirmed that there was a response from this address in Rutland Drive in support of a CPZ. However majority of those who responded do not support the CPZ option.

Ref 039 Rutland Drive

I wish to object to the yellow lines being implemented in Rutland Drive as I feel they are over long and will make no difference to whether the road is safe or not and the local residents and visitors will not be able to park which will result in any traffic problems just being moved to another location, in other roads in the local areas the grass verges have been reduced to allow parking this could be done in Rutland Drive, most of the houses have garages but people do not use them due to youths congregating and making the residents feel unsafe perhaps the council would be better off challenging this anti social behaviour? please feel free to contact me about this issues at any time.

Officers Comment

See section 2.5 – 2.11.

Ref 010 Rutland Drive

I am contacting you concerning the proposed waiting restriction for the above area. I object to the proposals as they stand partly due to the fact that they go well beyond the previous agreed waiting restrictions that were mentioned when the Controlled Parking Zone option was outlined, and there appears to be no justification for this.

My particular concerns are the cul de sac area of Rutland Drive, where it is now proposed to have double yellow lines down both sides, including the turning. I say this as I live in that area. I also have reservations for Amberely Way and Wentworth Close, but as I do not live in those areas, and it unfair of me to fully object. As mentioned the new proposal for this area (Rutland Drive Cul de sac) goes beyond what was mentioned last time, and there appears to be no justification for this. I accept the turning areas may require restrictions (though currently it is extremely rare that anyone blocks that are – and those that do, are usually council or other service vehicles). Having double yellow lines down to whole road will cause considerable difficulty as it means no stopping at all. I for example have an elderly mother that I collect from her house to come to mine on a regular basis. If I cannot stop at least to get her out of the car, this will cause problems. The nearest point that I could stop and park, providing room was available would be well over 100 meters away. She could not walk that. I can see no justification for double yellow lines, Cars do not park down this part of the road, as most houses have drop down kerbs. The fact of having double yellow with no restrictions will place a burden on the house owners which is not relevant. Everywhere else there is a option to park outside their houses or nearby – this is not the case hear. I am also concerned that having double yellow lines, would lead to the excuse of installing closed circuit TV in order to be able fine those who illegally park If double yellow lines are applied, would this reduce the band grade of our house, as no doubt it would reduce the house cost. To me, I do not consider the council has made the case for double yellow lines, I am not aware there have cases in the part of the road where emergency vehicles cannot get down. In fact, considering we already have a number of elderly and disabled residents in the area, we are used to having ambulances in the road. So where is the justification for this.

Officers comment
See section 3.7

Ref 029 Rutland Drive

Having been a resident in the cul de sac area of Rutland Drive for 32 years, I would like to strongly object to the proposal of double yellow lines being installed on both sides of the road in this section. Whilst I can agree with the lines being in the turning circle and on both the corners of the cul de sac area, to have double lines on both sides of the road is totally unnecessary and will cause problems and inconvenience to the residents of this section of the road. The emergency services including bin lorries have never had any problems gaining access to properties as the road is, generally speaking, clear. The majority of people who park down here are tradespeople and visitors, who in my experience are more than happy to move if asked to so. If the main section of Rutland Drive, which certainly is not clear of parked cars, is only to have yellow lines down one side of the road, I cannot see that it is necessary to have lines on both sides of the cul de sac section, which for the most part is clear of parked cars, and neighbours when asked, are more than happy to move any vehicles that are causing a problem. With one side of Claymore Close also to have yellow lines, this will further reduce the already very limited parkings paces for both visitors and tradespeople. The council appears to be intent on creating problems that at present do not exist and using tax payers money to do so. Might I suggest that members of the council leave their offices and walk down to the cul de sac section to see for themselves the problems that yellow lines on both sides of the road are going to create and consider changing this proposal to yellow lines down one side only.

Officers comment
See section 3.4

Ref 041 Rutland Drive

We are totally opposed to the Proposed At Any time Waiting Restrictions - Rutland Drive area.

1. There is no need for such aggressive parking restrictions. It will just force people to look elsewhere for parking - perhaps in the neighbouring borough of Sutton!!!! Merton will be creating parking problems when there are none.
 - 2 There has never been a problem with the emergency services gaining access. Residents and visitors always park considerately.
 - 3 People will be forced to turn all their front gardens into driveways. This will have an adverse affect on the environment - increasing the risk of flooding, which is already high, with more concreted areas.
 - 4 Unsafe for people with young children - they will not be able to park near their homes - children may be left unattended while cars are being loaded/unloaded.
 - 5 Unsafe for the elderly - having to go back and forth to cars that will be parked some distance away.
 - 6 The old and young rely on visitors - visitors will be put off as there will be no where for them to park
- Who is paying for this scheme, the staff to patrol it and the ongoing costs? Who will benefit from the revenue?
The Scheme should not be implemented.

Ref 043 Rutland Drive

I am writing to you, on behalf of my Mother who lives in Rutland Drive. She does not have access to email and has only just come out of hospital so is too late to write in and oppose the proposed parking restrictions in Rutland Drive and the

surrounding roads. My mother does not own a car, and doesn't have off-street parking, i.e., a dropped curb and paved front garden. However, with the number of cars parked on Rutland Drive, it has become increasingly difficult to park outside her house, which causes problems because she can't walk very far. She is not registered disabled, but her physical health has deteriorated alarmingly over the past 12 months, to the extent that she is not able to walk far, is unable to walk anywhere unaided, and to top it all off broke her hip on the evening of Christmas Day and has only just been able to come home from St Helier Hospital. Looking at the plans of the proposed parking restrictions - we can see that double yellow lines will not be put down on the road immediately outside my mothers house (they are proposed on the opposite side of the road), but looking at the very few parking spaces that are being left alone, it will be almost impossible for her family to park anywhere near her house. As stated above, it is almost impossible for us to do that as things are now - due to the number of cars being parked and many houses having more than one car per household - so it will only get worse. With the size of the area of double yellow lines you are proposing, we're not quite sure where you expect visitors, including health care workers, to park legally. It feels like you are making people, like my Mother, prisoner's in their own homes. She can't really walk anywhere, and needs taxis, family with cars, etc., to get her out and about and to continue to enjoy life as best she can. If we can't park anywhere even remotely near, legally, to pick her up and drop her off or visit for the day / weekend, then we will stop visiting, and she is going to become very isolated and depressed very quickly. We do understand the need to ensure the emergency service vehicles can get up and down the roads easily, but to put in the extent of double yellow lines you are proposing, to our mind, is absolutely ridiculous and is penalising those people who do not have a car, and are therefore able to leave it parked outside their house for days on end - ensuring no-one else can park there. We urge you to please rethink the plans, and if double yellow lines are necessary, to at least not have as many as you propose.

Officers comment

As you are aware, Rutland Drive is not wide enough to park on both sides of the road. Currently residents took it upon themselves to park on side of the road. However it has come to the Council notice that some residents park outside the houses on the even numbers in the evening because there are parking restrictions to stop them doing so. This manner of parking is not safe because it would stop the emergency services vehicles from getting through should there be an emergency in the road beyond the location where the offending vehicle is parked.

Ref 045 Rutland Drive

I came across this link:

http://www.merton.gov.uk/rutland_drive_area_statutory_consultation_newsletter

I personally think you shouldn't be doing this. rather you should be working on constructing better and wider roads with more parking spaces to accommodate the many cars we have. If you think i said all this because i park on the road myself. Then answer is no. I have a drive way to accommodate two cars but we just have one. May be we should fix the root problem rather than creating further problems. Your main aim should be to help residents and not the opposite. That's my personal opinion and i may be wrong but that what i feel unless you prove that what you are doing is helpful to residents. If my vote counts, I like to vote against it. We need to accommodate rather than restrict. We need to open our hearts rather than close it

Ref.007 Wentworth Close

I am writing to you about your proposal to put double yellow lines both sides of Wentworth Close, I agree we should have some kind of parking restrictions in this road ie on the bend where Wentworth close meets Hartland way (probably losing one parking space rather than eight and therefore giving enough room for the fire brigade to gain access to Wentworth close) and in the turning circle of Wentworth close as this is used as a parking area for the house at the end. I have a drive for my own car but what will happen if one of my family visit or I have workmen in, or large item deliveries, where are they supposed to park? I think what you are proposing to do is very severe and may even have a knock on effect on selling our houses in the future. I look forward to hearing from you.

Officers comment

See section 3.4

Ref 008 Wentworth Close

I acknowledge receipt of your letter re above dated 21.1.16 My first question is where are all the cars going to park ? If you wish to impose this, i presume you have come up with an alternative location for the cars/vans etc to park.....so please advise. Your reasons for this dramatic change are quite poor.....except for one The access for fire engines & ambulances must take priority. Parking on one side of the road only would solve this. Therefore i do not understand the need for yellow lines on both sides of the roads in Wentworth & Amberley So, please explain

Officers comment

See section 3.7

Ref. 050 Hartland Way

I wish to object to the proposed scheme on the basis that the Cul de sac enclave in where we live including Hartland way, Amberley Way and Wentworth Close should be treated as a stand alone consultation as it is subject to different criteria and should not be lumped in with a more general area that contains through roads. If this scheme goes ahead in its present form we believe it will be unworkable because if the yellow lines are on both sides of the road as in both Amberley Way and Wentworth Close, this will force everyone to park in Hartland Way and will cause gridlock with everyone fighting for a parking space with virtually no parking space available. In addition to the above, I have another separate issue affecting my property which prevents me from dropping the kerb to create a driveway to park my car. This is due to a big tree which sits in the middle of my driveway in front of my property. Hence if this scheme goes ahead this will leave me with no parking space which is very unfair. Apart from the unsightly intrusion of the yellow lines in a quiet residential area which has operated quite adequately under existing laws, we dont believe that it is in anyones interest to create a new parking regime without any plans to deal with the consequences of your actions. We dont expect the Council to try and solve one problem and create another problem where Residents, visitors and deliveries are unable to park.

Officers comment

See section 3.4

Ref.048 Hartland Way

I am responding the consultation on parking restrictions for the Rutland Drive area, with regard in particular to Hartland Way and its side roads. The only explanation of why this scheme is proposed appears to be the fourth paragraph of your consultation newsletter: "The proposed waiting restrictions will improve safety, visibility and provide clear access for all road users' particularly emergency services (fire brigade), [and] vulnerable road users such as pedestrians, push chairs and wheelchair users. The proposed restrictions will also ensure that congestion is minimised and access to assist the flow of traffic is improved." This paragraph is misleading. The second sentence is not a serious argument but just padding. Congestion is already minimal, and any delay to allow a car to pass in the opposite direction in any of these roads is rarely more than 2 seconds. The end of the first sentence ("vulnerable road users...") is also somewhat bizarre. It is hard to see any way that changing parking designations would change the experience for pedestrians, pushchairs or wheelchairs. There are adequate (if not perfectly flat) pavements now, and the pavements will remain, unchanged, if yellow lines are introduced. I can only suppose you mean that it would be easier/safer to cross the road. At junctions visibility could be currently improved by enforcing the existing law against parking close to junctions (I am certainly happy for you to put yellow lines around corners to make this clearer). Away from junctions it is not necessary to cross the road, but if you do want to, it might in future be easier to leave the pavement on one side of the road (the side with no parking), this would be irrelevant since you would not be able to gain access to the pavement on the opposite side of the road as cars would be parked so tightly that there would be no gaps between them big enough for a pushchair or wheelchair; that is not the case now. There is hence only one real reason for introducing yellow lines, which is to allow access for fire engines. I am surprised that they cannot access the road since the rubbish collection lorries achieve access successfully every week, but if this is indeed the case then that would appear to be a valid argument. But if that is the only reason say so. Do not try to hide this or make it seem a broader case than it really is. The majority of all the trips I take along these roads are as a pedestrian or a pushchair pusher, and these yellow lines would make absolutely no difference to me. This being the case, and given that many residents do need somewhere to park, the council will presumably wish to add the minimum amount of yellow lines to preserve the maximum amount of space for residents. However, it appears that these proposals introduce more yellow lines than are needed. There is no explanation for why yellow lines are proposed for both sides of Amberley Way and Wentworth Close. This is surely not necessary, as one side would suffice, as for the rest of the roads. Similarly, it is not necessary to have yellow lines around the whole turning circle at the end of Hartland Way. There are typically 2 or 3 cars parked around this circle, and that poses no problem to cars and small vans who use it to turn round in. On the other hand, the circule is not wide enough for large lorries to turn round in even with no vehicles present. I am not sure exactly the size of fire engines; it is possible they may be able to turn round in an empty turning circle using a 13-point turn, but that is an academic question in any case, as they wouldn't dream of trying - they would do exactly the same as the rubbish lorries and larger delivery lorries which currently use the road already do, which is to back into the end of Amberley Way and use that to do a 3 point turn. Therefore, making the turning circle no parking all the way round would achieve absolutely nothing that is not already possible with all the current parking spaces occupied. It is not necessary to make any of the circle no parking, but you could compromise by making one side (outside no. 38 and 40) no parking, but leaving the other side and the end available for parking.

Officers comment

See section 3.4

Ref 025 Hartland Way

I am writing to oppose the intended introduction of double yellow lines down Hartland Way (where I live) Wentworth

Close, Amberley Way. I do not see the reasoning behind this intended debacle. You state emergency services need free flow, there is that already. A fire tender for example is 2.55m wide, my car is 2.53m wide, and I do not have a problem. A road needs 3.7m width access, we have met that criteria. If more is needed, then do away with the grass verges, this impinges on no one. The **impact** for the residents here is enormous.

1 for example I have 3 cars, as it stands to reason for a 3/4 bedroom homes. I have off road parking for 2 cars, so, where will the 3rd go. Not everybody can have off road parking due to cost, or feasibility.

2 Where do visitors park, or do we do away with family and friends.

3 Where do tradesmen park when carrying out services to our homes.

4 Delivery drivers will have a problem.

5 But nurses and careers of ill and terminally ill people will have the biggest problems, when time is short and of the essence, trying to find a place to park, and in some roads that will be nowhere, is intolerable.

We are quite harmonious with most of our neighbours, but that will very quickly change, when parking is at an extreme premium, if any at all. Please give me a viable plan as to where all these vehicles, that belong to householders go. Other than off loading them onto other peoples roads, far from home maybe, and let's be realistic, that is not an option is it?.

The suggestion of having double yellow lines, just around the corners of junctions, is a more appropriate solution, to the one now being mooted. Examples are in Woodstock Avenue where the footprint and its side roads are the same as ours, and emergency services and pedestrians are not any different. I believe Sutton council is responsible for that. A good idea, if any was needed. Rutland Drive has completely different issues to our roads. And last but not least, this will have an effect on the value of our homes, the detriment being £20-30 thousand, as who wants to live in a road without parking and life NOBODY.

Officers comment

See section 3.4

Ref. 051 Hartland Way

Further to the receipt of the above, issue date 21st January 2016 I wish to advise you that the document titled, "Rutland Drive Area" is flawed. As residents of Hartland Way we should not be lumped in with other roads like Rutland Drive because these are thru roads and we are a cul de sac along with with 2 adjoining cul de sacs adjoining our road, namely Wentworth Close and Amberley Way. In conclusion we should be treated differently as the traffic data will give a completely false picture for our road. Please can you provide us with all the Traffic Data you used in your pre survey project or exercise which led you to the conclusion and outcomes for your new proposals, copy of these works in your 10 year plan and a copy of the approved and adopted Council Policy you are working to for compliance under, "The Freedom of Information Act" Also the above consultation document is out of date. We have a cross over at 27 Hartland Way, permission granted last year (18/8/15) not shown on this document. We've had about half a dozen new "Vehicle Crossovers" this year in this road as a consequence of your actions to inflict more parking restrictions on us in these roads. In the past we have written to you in detail about our wishes to maintain a traditional front garden which would underpin and support Council policy on protecting our environment but all this has fallen on deaf ears !!! Please can you arrange to have this above document amended and reissued to show our cross over and others you may have omitted to locate?

Sheet 2 of 2 letter dated 3rd February 2016.

As I stated in my last email objection dated 26th July 2015 we already have adequate laws to deal with parking and associated obstruction without more parking restrictions being imposed on us. We are a quiet residential road and these new Council measures will lead to the destruction of our highly valued "Peace and Quiet" that we are entitled in these suburbs. It could also lead to a drop in property values. These yellow lines do fit with the residential nature of these distinctive and unique cul de sacs and we further object to these unnecessary yellow lines splattered all over our roads and view it as disgusting Council Graffiti. On that note I attach report in the Daily Express dated 25th January 2016 advising that LA's like yourselves are creating Gridlock and I quote, ""Britain's traffic is worse than it has ever been yet Councils have spent billions on what can only be described as anti-car measures" It has also been noted that only around the corner the Fire Brigade have agreed to single yellow lines on only one side of the road and not both sides as you have shown for adjoining cul de sacs, Amberley Way and Wentworth Close on your drawing. We consider it a Duty of Care that in your proposals we do expect you to address the consequences of your actions. Clearly residents and visitors who need to park their cars in the adjoining cul de sacs will be pushed out of their roads to park in our Hartland Way leading to un-manageable parking problems in Hartland Way. It is noted we have more and more red routes, controlled parking zones, expensive parking ticket machines, off street parking policy etc and now yellow lines imposed upon us the long suffering residents. I pointed out to LBM Officers and Councillors at a meeting last year that this will lead to punch ups and pitching Neighbour against Neighbour. This is unacceptable and has to be dealt with as part of any new proposal by yourselves. We do not want to end up with your parking enforcement officers marching up and down our quaint roads dishing out fines because of a situation you have created and we have to pay for.

Officers comment

See section 3.4

Ref.028 Hartland Way

I wish to object to the proposed scheme on the basis that the cul de sac enclave in where we live including Hartland way, Amberley way and Wentworth close should be treated as a stand alone consultation as it is subject to a different criteria and should not be lumped in with the more general area that contains through roads. If this scheme goes ahead in its present form we believe it will be unworkable because if the yellow lines are both sides of the road as in both Wentworth close and Amberley way this will force everyone to park in Hartland way and will cause gridlock with everyone fighting for a parking space with virtually no parking spaces available. Apart from unsightly intrusion of yellow lines in a quiet residential area which has operated quite adequately under existing laws, we don't believe that it is in anyone's interest to create a new parking regime without an any plans to deal with the consequences of your actions. We don't expect the council to try and solve one problem and create another problem where residence, visitors and deliveries are unable to park.

Officers comment

See section 3.4

Ref 047 Hartland Way

Proposed At Any Time Waiting Restrictions - Rutland Drive Area - Ref ES/RUTLAND DRIVE

We refer to your Notice dated 21 January 2016 and statutory consultation paper and plans of similar date. Please accept this letter as our notice objecting to the proposals as set out in your proposal. Our objections to the proposal are as follows:

1. Commuter parking is limited to a small area on Rutland Drive and the junctions nearest to Epsom Road. It is unreasonable to extend waiting restrictions to the wide extent that you are proposing.
2. The current width of Hartland Way exceeds the width set out in Merton UDP Supplementary Guidance Notes for both Cul-de-sacs and local access roads meaning this reason alone is not a justification for introducing additional parking restrictions. We are of the opinion that this road at least exceeds the minimum width required for fire engines and associated appliances and this is evidenced by this road and associated cul-de- sacs being used by large HGV's to deliver all manner of heavy goods to properties in this area.
3. Your proposal does not include a risk assessment from emergency services regarding the requirement for clear road and removal of other obstructions. A stated desire by emergency services for clear roads is not in itself a risk assessment

Over the last 12 months the constant and present threat by the council to introduce either waiting restrictions or permit parking has resulted in a number of property owners removing their front gardens to create off street parking. This loss of soft landscaping has had a detrimental impact on both the character of the area and the environmental sustainability relating to the increase in hard surfaces for effectively managing water run-off. With the continued threats to implement changes to parking in this area these soft landscaping changes will continue.

5. With the increased number of dropped kerbs and off street parking in these roads this has reduced if not eliminated entirely your basis for these proposed changes, namely that emergency services are not able to access these roads. We request that you do not proceed further with these proposed changes and consult further to implement more reasonable changes, if any at all, possibly looking at waiting restrictions limited to road junctions only.

Officers comment

See section 3.7

Ref.022 Epsom Road

I am writing to lodge my appeal against the proposed plans to introduce waiting restrictions in the Rutland Drive area. I am a local Business owner and when I was looking for shop premises, parking was a key factor for me. I picked this shop, primarily for the local available parking. I own a bridal shop and most appointments are between 1.5 and 2 hours long. Parking is also essential for when the customers are collecting their wedding gowns, as these are bulky, expensive garments and are not suitable for carrying on public transport. If the parking is removed, then this will have a detrimental effect on my business and custom trade. I think this will also have an effect on local economy. My lease is up for renewal in January 2017 and I am not sure if I will be able to continue in this current area if there are no parking facilities.

Officers comment

Due to the obstructive parking that have been taking place in this area, the Council has received a number of complaints. To address the level of dangerous and obstructive parking, officers have been working with the Ward Councillors and residents. The proposal is to introduce yellow line restrictions which will ensure clear access and sightlines at all times. Epsom Road falls under TfL's jurisdiction as does the first few meters of Rutland Drive. There is a loading bays outside the business on Epsom Road and limited short term parking bays in Rutland Drive which is meant to cater for visitors. There is also a loading facility on Epsom Road only a few meters from this unit and a number of parking bays for visitors also on Epsom Road. Rutland Drive is not wide enough to accommodate parking on both sides and due to grass verges, it is not possible to allow footway parking. It is a residential road with extremely limited parking for residents. I would advise that your customers use the available free parking on Epsom Road.

Ref 053, 039, 056, 051, 055, 040, 054, 052

Ref; ES/RUTLAND DRIVE AREA, Proposed at Any Time Waiting Restrictions - Rutland Drive area Statutory Consultation.

I wish to object to the proposed scheme on the basis that the Cui de sac enclave in where we live including Hartland Way, Amberley Way and Wentworth Close should be treated as a stand alone consultation as it is subject to different criteria and should not be lumped in with a more general area that contains through roads.

If this scheme goes ahead in its present form we believe it will be unworkable because if the yellow lines are on both sides of the road as in both Wentworth Close and Amberley Way, this will force everyone to park in Hartland Way and will cause gridlock with everyone fighting for a parking space with virtually no parking space available.

Apart from unsightly intrusion of yellow lines in a quiet residential area which has operated quite adequately under existing laws, we don't believe that it is in anyone's interest to create a new parking regime without any plans to deal with the consequences of your actions. We don't expect the Council to try and solve one problem and create another problem where Residents, visitors and deliveries are unable to park.

Officers comment

See section 3.4

Ref.052

Thank you for your communication dated 21st January 2016 titled Proposed At Any Time Waiting, Restrictions - Rutland Drive area. We understand your desire to allow safe access in the area. As you are no doubt aware we occupy the ground floor premises at 51 Epsom Road, on the corner of Rutland Drive, where we have been trading for over 35 years and currently employ 18 people. The nature of our business requires our staff to have vehicles and vans as well as visitor parking being available for our clients. In addition we receive daily deliveries of materials including glass. We would be most grateful to be advised what you have proposed for the parking of these vehicles and the unloading of the delivery trucks once the one street parking in the locality is reduced so significantly. Currently parking for our vehicles and delivery vans is difficult enough as there are so few parking spaces near our premises and your proposals will reduce those spaces significantly and have a very serious and detrimental impact on this company's trading. For instance the only safe loading and unloading bay is that at the entrance of Rutland Drive to the side of our premises but that is invariably occupied by cars parked for up to the 1 hour allowed. This means that the trucks have to wait on Epsom Road until a space becomes available which can be up to that 1 hour. Using the loading / unloading bays on Epsom Road would mean carrying materials either across Rutland Drive or past a busy bus stop and then down Rutland Drive on a narrow footpath into our storage area at the rear of our premises, neither of which are practical. Your proposals will put very much more pressure on those 3 spaces beside our premises by removing most of the other on street parking in the area. Your proposals will not stop the commuter parking, those persons who park their cars in the locality and then catch a bus to Morden, one of the things that puts pressure on parking here. I am not aware that anyone has contacted us to discuss or consult on this and would be grateful to be advised of your intentions to allow us to continue our successful trading and employment. Residents in the area have the advantage that they can have 'off street' parking and so can park at least 2 vehicles off the road thereby avoiding being prohibited parking near their property. Many thanks for your assistance in this matter.

Officers Comment

Due to the obstructive parking that have been taking place in this area, the Council has received a number of complaints. To address the level of dangerous and obstructive parking, officers have been working with the Ward Councillors and residents. The proposal is to introduce yellow line restrictions which will ensure clear access and sightlines at all times. Epsom Road falls under TfL's jurisdiction as does the first few meters of Rutland Drive. There is a bus stop outside SCI Products on Epsom Road and limited short term parking bays in Rutland Drive which caters for visitors. There is also a loading facility on Epsom Road only a few meters from this unit and a number of parking bays for visitors also on Epsom Road. Rutland Drive is not wide enough to accommodate parking on both sides and due to grass verge, it is not possible to allow footway parking. It is a residential road with extremely limited parking for residents. It is not possible to allocate spaces to anyone road users / resident / business other than disabled parking bays for blue badge holders. The business has a rear access and it has been observed that they do conduct some deliveries via this access. However, it has also been observed that their drivers routinely obstruct the road which has generated many complaints.

Although the Council attempts to cater for the needs of local businesses, regrettably it is not possible to do so on this occasion and the business needs to develop a more workable loading / unloading plan using the little space that is available without causing obstruction and danger to other road users.





Representations**St George's junction with Cedar Avenue****Resident 12381708 - SUPPORT**

I know the deadline was 3rd July (yesterday) but I have been away for some time and only returned this morning so I hope this representation can be taken into consideration. We are in support of the proposals wholeheartedly as we believe that the current situation represents great risk to all drivers and pedestrians with the volume of vehicles that park on the corners of St Georges Road and Cedars Avenue on both sides. It makes it incredibly difficult to see oncoming traffic when pulling out of St Georges Road in both directions and this has resulted in several near accidents on my part and I know the same goes for several of my neighbours. I think alongside the consultation for double yellow lines in this location, the same should be done on the section of road opposite St Georges Road as well. Every day there are vehicles parking mostly on the kerb which doesn't cause traffic issues but it does make it increasingly dangerous to cross the road and has again resulted in several what could have been fatal accidents involving pedestrians not just that I have been involved in but that I have witnessed as well. My grave concern with adding double yellow lines is the negative impact it would have on the already deteriorating parking situation in St Georges Road. With the increase in residents dropping the kerb outside their house to create parking there has become fewer and fewer spaces in the road for other residents to park in. This wouldn't be a problem if it was just residents of St Georges Road that parked in the street. What we have witnessed on a near daily basis is people parking in the street, often on the corners and then walking across the road to the new development whose name I do not know. I know this was an issue that was raised by residents when planning permission was applied for and they were ensured that it wouldn't be an issue, I have seen the correspondence that states this. It clearly is an issue which I do not understand given how many empty spaces there seems to be in the new development. Is it a case of the permits being too expensive or people subletting illegally and therefore not eligible for a permit. This is a major issue that needs to be addressed as by my calculations by implementing the double yellow lines you would be removing in the region of 10 parking spaces in the road and these cars will just cause chaos in the rest of the street. On multiple occasions I have been able to park anywhere in the street, let alone in the vicinity of my own house and this is unacceptable when there is plenty of other parking available to the residents of the new build development opposite. I think the council should look at implementing permit parking for St Georges Road and I know I have the support of 100% of the residents of St Georges Road that I have spoken to about the issue so far. Another issue which compounds the parking problem is the social housing development next door to 2 St Georges Road. They all park on the street as well despite having a large car park that is empty 100% of the time. In 18 months of living here I have seen only a handful of cars ever park there. Can this be utilised in a more productive way? In summary as I appreciate this is a long e-mail. I support the proposals but think that as part of the implementation, further consideration should be given to the overall parking situation in St Georges Road.

Miles Road**Resident 12381699 – SUPPORT & OBJECTION**

As per your plan I have noticed that a double yellow line is to end just past my house, which prohibits me from parking outside my own home. I am very disappointed in this matter as I have been parking outside our home for 16 years and there has never been a problem, traffic passes freely and pedestrians pass freely too. I do understand the need for this action in certain areas, as at certain times Frimley Gardens on both corners are parked on which makes it difficult for vehicle users to pass, but I believe that the doctor's surgery is to fault. I also agree that it is needed at the beginning of Miles Road, as the road is very narrow, but there is a stretch of waste land by the side of the pavement, which I believe could be put to better use. I do hope that this matter is resolved soon, and that you can see my point. I look forward to receiving your reply.

Officer's comment – the extent of the restriction outside the property has been reduced. This object has, therefore been resolved

Garth Close

Representation received via a Ward Cllr on behalf of one of the residents: SUPPORT

I have just received a distressed phone call from Mr XXXX, XX Garth Close, Morden, an invalid who has to use walking stick. This morning he was unable to get a parcel delivered because of vehicles parked either side of Garth Close and delivery van was unable to get into the Garth Close. He is worried also of having to walk in the road because of parked vans on the pavement, so near the junction, if a car came round the corner he is unable to move fast enough to get out of the way. Please update me on any plans to resolve this dangerous situation.

Resident 12381690 - Objection

As you know they are proposing to introduce double yellow lines in Garth Close - including round to our property. Obviously I feel this would be totally wrong for our close and don't know of any problems caused by the parking or

pavement access. However there will be more issues by restricting where cars can park. Do you know if the double lines would go across our drive way or would we still be permitted to park in the road outside our property where the driveway is dropped? I think there will be strong feelings against this proposal in the Close and feel it would be good to have a meeting to get everyone's views. My daughter uses a wheelchair and we haven't had issues with using the pavement up and down Garth Close. A problem that I have been experiencing recently is large vans and trucks stopping at the top of Garth Close to empty their rubbish into cars and then avoid the charges at the dump. I have noticed this happening on a number of days this week. I would be grateful if you are able to help on the above information and pass on my comments and answer the above question re parking outside our drive.

Resident 12381695 Objection

With regards the proposed measures of double yellow lines being implemented into Garth close, we would like to strongly object to the proposal. My husband and I appreciate something needs to be done as the visibility and safety at the entrance to the road and coming round the corner in the close can be difficult with cars parked on both sides of the road, although to implement double yellow lines down the entire one side of the close is not the solution. It has been our observation that people who do not live in Garth Close park their cars in the Close. People who work in the Garth Road industrial area park in our road. It has also been observed that people from Lynmouth Avenue park in Garth Close and use the access over the river to return to Lynmouth Avenue. Whilst I appreciate the information is available to view at the Morden Council's office between 9am and 5pm Monday to Friday, the website link doesn't appear to be updated and the information can't be located. Please could you advise when the information will be available online and where we will be able to publicly view the responses provided in relation to either the objections or agreement with the proposal with the outcome of this proposal. Where your proposal outlines the double yellow lines, in the attached picture taken at 5.30am shows no-one parking, yet on the pavement is where the cars park on the opposite side of the road, therefore these areas should be better marked with either parking bays or residents only parking. With the restrictions proposed, there will be a lack of parking for visitors, resulting in them having to walk long distances to get from their parked cars to our property. If we were to have any services to the property (British Gas or Virgin as examples), they would not be able to access the property. British Gas always asks whether there are any restrictions to the property and this could be an issue if we were to advise the parking restrictions. Another main concern would be the devaluation to property if we were ever to move. The double yellow lines with restrictions would pose as a highly likely issue in the decision for a potential buyer when viewing the property. The street isn't a main road or through road and is relatively quiet. Children feel safe playing in the streets and the issue of not being able to cross or walk safely with pushchairs isn't an issue. An alternative suggestion to your proposal would be to implement the following: Extension of the yellow lines on the south side of Garth Close to the first lamppost, round the corner only. Marked parking bays between the lamppost and the dropped kerb. Residents permit parking for areas – This would stop any non-residents parking in the Close. Designated marked parking bays, therefore allowing sufficient pedestrian access.

Resident 05-15 050 Objection

My wife and I are residents in Garth Close and object to the proposal to put double yellow lines on the south side of the close for a number of reasons. Firstly and most importantly my wife has a number of medical conditions which impact on her ability to walk. This may come on at any time without warning. Very often she is taken out by other members of our family of friends to give me some respite and they come and collect her from our home and therefore need to be able to park. The proposed parking restrictions, if approved and implemented, will mean that we are unable to have visitors of any type to our home. This will leave us isolated. Furthermore, we will be unable to have any deliveries to our house. Garth Close is not a busy road. It is a quiet residential street with very little traffic flow. Residents and visitors park considerately and ensure there is space to allow larger vehicles such as the Council refuse vehicles to access. Residents have not had any difficulties in accessing their drives, nor as far as I am aware have there been any accidents or problems caused by visibility problems. Surely, the more sensible option is to put such restrictions on the busier Garth Road where parking does hold up both traffic and public transport and is more significantly more dangerous.

Resident 05-15 057 Objection

I am writing to raise an objection in relation to the proposal to implement parking restrictions (double yellow lines) in Garth Close. My parents live in Garth Close, Morden Surrey, SM4 4NN. My mum has a number of medical conditions which impact on her ability to walk. Very often in order to give my dad a break I, my husband and other friends and family often help by taking mum out. To be able to do this we need to be able to come and collect mum from her house and to be able to park without any restrictions. The proposed parking restrictions, if approved, will make it significantly more difficult to continue to help mum as we have done thus far. I am hugely concerned that this will leave her isolated at home and about the negative effect this will have on her overall health and wellbeing. Furthermore, I worry about the future and how my parents will access any help they may need when the time comes if for example carers are not able to park. My husband and I lived in Garth Close for 18 years and know that it is a quiet residential street with little traffic. We never had any difficulties in accessing the street due to parked cars. Implementation of these plans will simply mean that residents park out on the already overcrowded Garth Road which I believe to be more dangerous to the public as it used by public transport.

Cartmel Gardens**Resident 12381688 Objection**

I have lived at Cartmel Gardens for 24 years now and am opposing your intention to introduce waiting restrictions in Cartmel Gardens. I do not understand after 24 years why at this time you feel it necessary to introduce such restrictions to our parking facilities. None of the other gardens off of Canterbury Road are subject to these restrictions, although the lay out is the same. I would like to understand how or where you consider the 12 cars currently parking around the circle will be able to park. There is no more parking in Canterbury road or on St. Helier Avenue as there is limited parking on these two roads like there always has been. I pay my road tax and my council tax and do not feel that my rights, as a tax payer are being acknowledged. My household will be severely affected by these restrictions as I work in London, my daughter works in Theatre and therefore I leave the house at 7am in the morning and return around 7.30pm. By the time I arrive home there will be no parking spaces. My daughter working in Theatre obviously works late into the night and therefore with your restrictions, potentially will have to park at least 3 streets away. This causing her to walk home in the dark and is very stressful for myself. As most of the residents in Cartmel Gardens are non-tax payers and therefore are unemployed or claiming benefits they have the opportunity to be at home all day and therefore will have the parking spaces all the time. In your statement you say that there is not enough parking to accommodate cars on both sides of the carriage way which I agree. However, have never experienced this situation in my 24 years where cars have parked on both sides. It would have been correct for you to consult with the residents first before proposing these restrictions in the first place, as we would have been able to consider alternative options such as, reducing the size of the circular green and putting in potential parking bays for all residents. We could have considered each household having up to one car parking, even though they already have more than one car per household; in order for this to be fair to all residents in the gardens. I would like you to take this email as my objection to your proposal and please reconsider your actions. In proposing these waiting restrictions you are also devaluing the cost of my property as I will be unable to sell my property as a home with off street parking.

The Bungalows**Resident 12381710 Objection**

I wrote to you last month with my objection to the proposed double-yellow lines the council wish to put outside my property. I do know a member of the council spoke to my neighbour regarding her objection but to date my objection has not been acknowledged. Would you please let me know you have received my objection on the grounds that both myself & my neighbours family who drive have no problem with turning our vehicles at the end of the Bungalows. PS Just to remind you there is no number 15 The Bungalows.

Officer's comments

All the proposed restrictions are in response to complaints and concerns received and restrictions are drawn up to address obstructive and dangerous parking. Every effort is made to minimise the extent of the restrictions but within any proposed measures safety and access is given priority. Requests / complaints from some residents are often about inconsiderate and obstructive parking with vehicles blocking driveways and footway forcing pedestrians into the road.

It is appreciated that parking is at a premium and loss of parking will cause inconvenience to some residents. However, the Council has a statutory duty to ensure safety and access for all road users including refuse vehicles and emergency vehicles and this takes priority over loss of parking. The restrictions will help to improve safety for all road users and will ensure that access is maintained at all times. It will also improve visibility and provide clear access for all road users' particularly vulnerable road users such as pedestrians, push chairs and wheelchair users who for example may wish to make proper use of the footway and section of dropped kerb at the junctions.

Merton Council - call-in request form

1. Decision to be called in: (required)

--

2. Which of the principles of decision making in Article 13 of the constitution has not been applied? (required)

Required by part 4E Section 16(c)(a)(ii) of the constitution - tick all that apply:

(a) proportionality (i.e. the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome);	
(b) due consultation and the taking of professional advice from officers;	
(c) respect for human rights and equalities;	
(d) a presumption in favour of openness;	
(e) clarity of aims and desired outcomes;	
(f) consideration and evaluation of alternatives;	
(g) irrelevant matters must be ignored.	

3. Desired outcome

Part 4E Section 16(f) of the constitution- select one:

(a) The Panel/Commission to refer the decision back to the decision making person or body for reconsideration, setting out in writing the nature of its concerns.	
(b) To refer the matter to full Council where the Commission/Panel determines that the decision is contrary to the Policy and/or Budget Framework	
(c) The Panel/Commission to decide not to refer the matter back to the decision making person or body *	
* If you select (c) please explain the purpose of calling in the decision.	

4. Evidence which demonstrates the alleged breach(es) indicated in 2 above (required)

Required by part 4E Section 16(c)(a)(ii) of the constitution:

5. Documents requested

6. Witnesses requested

7. Signed (not required if sent by email):

8. Notes

Call-ins must be supported by at least three members of the Council (Part 4E Section 16(c)(a)(i))

The call in form and supporting requests must be received by by 12 Noon on the third working day following the publication of the decision (Part 4E Section 16(c)(a)(iii)).

The form and/or supporting requests must be sent **EITHER** by email from a Councillor's email account (no signature required) to democratic.services@merton.gov.uk **OR** as a signed paper copy (Part 4E Section 16(c)(a)(iv)) to Democracy Services, 7th floor, Civic Centre, London Road, Morden SM4 5DX.