# NON-KEY DECISION TAKEN BY A CABINET MEMBER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE OF THE REPORT</th>
<th>20mph Speed Limit – Claremont Avenue area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DATE REPORT MADE AVAILABLE TO CABINET MEMBER AND CHAIR OF OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMISSION AND OF RELEVANT PANEL:</td>
<td>1 OCTOBER 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECISION:</td>
<td>To approve a 20mph speed limit for the Claremont Avenue area. The boundary of the speed limit area is Burlington Road (excluded), Malden Way (excluded), Claremont Avenue (included), Stanley Avenue (inclusive) and West Barnes Lane (between Blakes Lane and Claremont Avenue).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REASON FOR DECISION:</td>
<td>To implement the proposals before March 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND WHY REJECTED:</td>
<td>The report to be presented at the next SMAC meeting but was rejected as an agreement was reached with Ward Councillors for a decision on the scheme to be made by the Cabinet Member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOCUMENTS RELIED ON:</td>
<td>Included in the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST:</td>
<td>Signed ……………………………………………</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cabinet Member for …………………………………………</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date (at least 5 clear normal working days after receipt of report) ……………………………..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IF DECISION WAS SUBSEQUENTLY CALLED-IN, DATE OF OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMISSION MEETING AND OUTCOME**

N/A

**NOTE:** Once the decision has been taken this form, together with a copy of the report, must be given to the Democratic Services Manager in the Corporate Resources Department so that the decision can be published to all Members of the Council.
Recommendations:
The Cabinet Member for Planning and Traffic Management:

A. Consider the issues detailed in this report and approve the introduction of a 20mph speed limit for the Claremont Avenue area. The proposed speed limit area is bounded by Burlington Road (excluded) Malden Way (excluded), Claremont Avenue (included), Stanley Avenue (inclusive) and West Barnes lane (between Blakes Lane and Claremont Avenue).

B. Notes the outcome of the formal consultation carried out in July 2009 on the proposed 20mph speed limit for the Claremont Avenue area as shown in Appendix 4.

C. Notes the summary of representations received and officer’s comments as detailed in Appendix 3.

D. Considers the objections against the proposed measures and the arguments for their implementation.

E. Agrees to proceed with the making of the Traffic Management Order (TMO) and the implementation of the proposed 20mph speed limit as detailed in drawing number Z73-207-01 in Appendix 1, at an estimated cost of £40k to be met from the Merton Capital allocation of 3340k for 20mph programme for 2009/10 financial year.

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to inform the Cabinet Member for Planning and Traffic Management of the outcome of a formal consultation conducted in July 2009, in the Claremont Avenue area for the introduction of a 20mph speed limit, as shown on plan Z73-207-01 in Appendix 1.

1.2. It sets out the officer’s responses to objections received from interested parties during the statutory consultations for consideration by the Cabinet Member before making a decision on the scheme. The summary of all responses received with officers’ comments is included in Appendix 3.

1.3. It recommends that the Cabinet Member, subject to consideration of the objections, gives approval to proceed with the implementation of the 20mph speed limit for the Claremont Avenue area. The proposed speed limit area is bounded by Burlington Road (excluded) Malden Way (excluded), Claremont Avenue (included), Stanley
Avenue (inclusive) and West Barnes lane (between Blakes Lane and Claremont Avenue). The proposals are as shown on plan Z73-207-01 in Appendix 1.

1.4. It seeks financial approval for the implementation of the proposed measures at an estimated cost of £40k to be met from Merton Capital allocation of £340k for the 2009/10 financial year.

2 DETAILS

2.1 Under the Borough “20’s Plenty” 2008/09 Programme, funding (£100K) was secured for 20mph zone and speed limit areas to be implemented in a number of residential roads across the borough.

2.2 The aims of the “20’s Plenty” plan are to promote safe journeys to school and improve the local environment and safety for all road users. In doing so, reduce vehicle speeds, rat running and the severity of any inherent accidents.

2.3 During the preparation of the 20mph programme, roads with existing traffic calming measures were identified and reviewed in order to determine the need to convert these areas into a 20mph zone or 20mph speed limit. These traffic calmed roads were initially grouped into 18 different areas, including four existing 20mph zones. Additional areas have been included following the implementation of 11 areas during the 2008/09 financial year. The plan, which shows the various areas, is included in Appendix 2.

2.4 In a 20mph zone, traffic calming features in the form of road humps, speed cushions, road closures, one way systems, pedestrian refuge islands and road narrowing are required to achieve a legal and self-enforceable zone. A 20mph speed limit, however, does not require any form of traffic calming features as part of the legal process if the mean speed is lower than 24mph; otherwise additional traffic calming measures would have to be included. Traffic signs and road markings are mandatory within both zones and limits.

2.5 The Council has received correspondence from residents including a petition with 102 signatories, comprising 97 addresses in Byron Avenue within the proposed area, to reduce the speed limit in this road to 20mph.

2.6 Claremont Avenue is the only road within the proposed area with existing traffic calming features.

2.7 The proposed area is mainly residential in character. Sacred Heart Catholic Primary School and Tesco Supermarket are located on Burlington Road, which forms the boundary of the proposed speed limit area.

Traffic volume and speed survey

2.8 In June 2009, traffic volumes and speeds surveys were carried out as part of the data collection exercise for the introduction of a 20mph speed limit. The survey was for a period of 24 hours, for 7 days. The table below shows the recorded traffic volumes and speeds.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Average Volume of vehicles/day</th>
<th>Average speed (mph)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>Southbound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claremont Avenue</td>
<td>1231</td>
<td>821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavendish Avenue</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont Avenue</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consfield Avenue</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryon Avenue</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobham Avenue</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley Avenue</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Barnes Lane (no. 455)</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>921</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.9 As most of the recorded speeds are lower than 24mph, a 20mph speed limit can be introduced in these roads without additional traffic calming features. However, in West Barnes Lane and Byron Avenue where the recorded speeds were higher than 24mph, additional traffic calming features would have to be considered to convert this area into a 20mph speed limit, as per the regulations.

2.10 Although the average speed on most of the roads were within the existing speed limit of 30mph, the highest recorded speed on all the roads within the proposed area were higher than the speed limit. Table 2 below shows the recorded highest speeds on the individual roads within the area, where the traffic surveys were conducted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>*Highest recorded traffic speed (mph) over 7 days</th>
<th>Number of vehicles travelling at this speed over 7 days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>Southbound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claremont Avenue</td>
<td>51 – 56</td>
<td>41 – 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavendish Avenue</td>
<td>51 – 56</td>
<td>51 – 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont Avenue</td>
<td>41 – 46</td>
<td>41 – 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consfield Avenue</td>
<td>46 – 51</td>
<td>46 – 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryon Avenue</td>
<td>46 – 51</td>
<td>51 – 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobham Avenue</td>
<td>36 – 41</td>
<td>36 – 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley Avenue</td>
<td>41 – 46</td>
<td>36 – 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Barnes Lane (no. 455)</td>
<td>46 - 51</td>
<td>46 - 51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Highest recorded speed is recorded in speed bands
2.11 In Table 2, the number of vehicles, which travelled at the highest recorded speed in the southbound direction in Claremont Avenue, was 2 vehicles, which was over a period of 7 days and not a day.

Collisions data

2.12 In the 5 years period up to 30 June 2008, there were 5 recorded personal injury collisions within the proposed area. Table 3 below shows the classification of these collisions.

Table 3 – Collisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Parties involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serious</td>
<td>Slight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont Avenue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consfield Avenue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Barnes Lane / Barnes End</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Barnes Lane / Claremont Avenue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.13 Most of the collisions within the proposed area involved vehicles turning right colliding with other vehicles travelling ahead. Contributing factors to accidents of these nature are sightlines being obscured or traffic speeds being too excessive.

2.14 Approximately 60% of the collisions within the proposed area involved vulnerable road users within the road hierarchy.

3 PROPOSALS

3.1 It is proposed to convert the area bounded by Burlington Road (excluded) Malden Way (excluded), Claremont Avenue (included), Stanley Avenue (inclusive) and West Barnes lane (between Blakes Lane and Claremont Avenue) into a 20mph speed limit area. It is anticipated that the reduction in speed limit will reduce the number and severity of any accidents when they occur.

Advantages of 20mph speed limit

- Lower speeds reduce the number of collisions, as 9 out of 10 pedestrians and cyclists fatalities occur in residential areas; hence a lower speed limit will reduce the number and severity when they occur.
- Lower speeds will encourage more people to cycle and walk.
- Lower traffic speeds make pedal cycle turning manoeuvres easier. For example, turning right can be difficult when you have to cross a lane of fast moving traffic. If the speed is reduced to 20mph, it becomes much easier.

Disadvantages of 20mph speed limit

- Extra traffic signs required, as part of the legal requirement will increase street clutter.
- Enforcement of the speed limit area will be a problem, if speeds are high as the Metropolitan Police is responsible for its enforcement.
CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN OR PROPOSED

FORMAL CONSULTATION

4.1 Informal and statutory consultations were carried out between 24 July 2009 and 4 September 2009. The consultation leaflet is included in Appendix 4.

4.2 It should be noted that all representations received after the closing date have been included in this report. The consultation included the erection of street notices on lamp columns in the area, the publication of the Council’s intentions in the Local Guardian and the London Gazette. Consultation documents were also available at Merton Link in the Civic Centre, on the Council’s website and local libraries in the area. Additionally, a newsletter with a plan as shown in Appendix 4, was also circulated to all properties included within consultation area. Local Ward Councillors were contacted by email for any comments and suggestions in the process prior to the local area consultation exercise.

4.3 The Council received 120 (including a petition from 97 addresses in Byron Road) representations out of 1086 consultation leaflets distributed. A breakdown of this is shown in Table 4.

Table 4 – Results on consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Against</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 The results show majority of residents in favour of the proposals. Although a high number of residents did not respond to the consultation, we cannot regard them as in favour of the proposals.

4.5 OBJECTIONS FROM STATUTORY GROUPS AND RESIDENTS GROUPS

4.5.1 Metropolitan Police

Police note the mix of some streets with traffic calming and some without traffic calming in an area subject to the same speed limit.

The continued introduction of 20mph speed limits in different manners and with different signage across the borough can, in our opinion, only serve to provide greater confusion as to what the speed limit is and therefore can only have an adverse effect on compliance, which is at odds with the DfT guidance. It also appears clear to us that the proposed speed limit, or at least certain areas of them, is unlikely to meet DfT guidance that a “successful 20mph speed limit should be generally self-enforcing”.

Given that the proposals as it relates to Claremont Avenue do not appear to break the law and that there will be a legal speed limit in force, it might be more usual for police simply to state that they do not support this proposals. However, with the level of deviation from published guidance, the likely lack of compliance with the new proposed limit, the level of signing variation this will add to across the borough and the likely knock-on effect that this may have on the effectiveness of such schemes in adjoining boroughs, police believe it is right to object to this scheme.
Response

Department for Transport (DfT) Local Transport Note 1/07 recommends that 20mph speed limit should be imposed over an area consisting of several roads and not just an individual road to have any significant effect on speeds or collisions.

DfT guidance also recommends that a 20mph speed limit should be considered on roads where the average speed is less than 24mph, with no additional traffic calming features. Only Claremont Avenue has existing traffic calming measures; hence the recorded average speeds are lower than 24mph. Although the other roads do not have any traffic calming measures, the recorded average speed were approximately 24mph.

4.7 JUSTIFICATION

4.7.1 The proposals considered in this report are in accordance with the objectives of the Mayor’s Transport Strategy – Road Safety, which are reflected within the Council’s Local Implementation Plan (LIP).

4.7.2 Chapter 6 of the LIP contains the Council’s Road Safety Strategy, which details initiatives to make borough roads safer for all road users.

4.7.3 The environmental effects on the local community if the proposed measures are implemented are listed below:

Advantages
- Improve the local environment and road safety for all road users – particularly vulnerable groups such as children
- Promote safe journeys to schools
- Reduce the number and severity of injuries to road users
- Reduce accident levels, especially for vulnerable road users
- Ensure fewer drivers break the speed limit

Disadvantages
- Increase perception of noise pollution and risk of non-compliance
- Traffic calming can result in delayed attendance times for emergency vehicles.

4.7.4 The area under consideration is mainly residential with a school and supermarket located on the boundary of the area. Although the school and the supermarket are not located within the proposed area, residents will be making trips to these places. The area can therefore be considered as a vulnerable road area, where 20mph speed limit can be introduced as recommended in the DfT guidance.

4.7.5 The guidance also recommends that a 20mph speed limit should be considered over a wider area consisting of several roads to have any significant effect on speeds or collisions. As the Claremont Avenue area covers several roads with existing traffic calming measures (on Claremont Avenue, which carries the majority of traffic within the area), the proposals will have significant effect on speeds and collisions, should approval be granted and the scheme is implemented.

4.7.6 Most of the recorded traffic speeds on the roads within the proposed area were lower than 24mph, which as recommended in the guidelines can be considered for a 20mph speed limit area with no additional traffic calming measures. However, Cavendish Avenue, Bryon Avenue and West Barnes Lane recorded average speeds higher than 24mph. Both Cavendish Avenue and Bryon Avenue are used as rat runs.
from the A3 into West Barnes and beyond. As these roads are mainly residential with parking on both sides of the road, the approximate useable carriageway width is 3.5 metres, which prevents very high speeds.

4.7.7 Although the average recorded speed is within the existing speed limit of 30mph, the highest recorded speed was in the region of between 51-56mph; only a small number of vehicles were recorded travelling at this speed.

4.7.8 There were 5 recorded collisions within the proposed area in the 3 years period up to June 2008. Of these, 60% involved vulnerable road users. Contributing factors to collisions of this nature are sightlines being obscured or driver speeds being too high. As sightlines cannot be improved within the proposed area, reduction in speed limit will reduce the number and severity of any collisions, should they occur.

4.7.9 Although a statement was included in the consultation leaflet requesting representations for and against the proposals to be forwarded to the Council, the consultation exercise still recorded a very low return of only 120 (including a petition from 97 addresses in Byron Avenue) responses out of 1086 leaflets distributed to residents within the proposed area. The high number of residents who did not reply to the consultation exercise cannot be regarded as being in favour of the proposals. However, the majority of those who responded were in favour of the proposals to address the traffic issues within the proposed area.

5 TIMETABLE

5.1 If approved, the Traffic Management Orders for the proposed measures would be made and the measures implemented by 30 March 2010.

6 FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS

6.1 The Merton Capital settlement for 2009/10 included an allocation of £340k for the delivery of a number of 20mph zones/speed limits across the borough.

6.2 This proposal will be funded from this allocation and the cost of implementing the scheme is estimated to be £40k.

7 LEGAL AND STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

7.1 The Traffic Management Orders for a limit would be made under Section 84 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.

7.2 The Cabinet Member must consider the factors set out in the results of the formal consultation set out in Appendix 3. While the views expressed by local residents must be considered, Cabinet Member is not bound to decide in accordance with the majority view and must take the other legal relevant factors into account.

8 HUMAN RIGHTS, EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY COHESION IMPLICATIONS

8.1 The Council carries out careful consultation to ensure that all road users are given a fair opportunity to air their views and express their needs. The needs of the
residents are given consideration but it is considered that improving safety on the borough roads take priority over environmental issues like noise and pollution.

8.2 Organisations representing motorists and commuters are consulted as part of the statutory consultation for draft traffic management and similar orders.

8.3 The implementation of 20 mph speed limit affects all sections of the community especially the young and the elderly; and assists in improving safety for all road users as well as achieving Merton’s commitment in reducing speed, casualty and severity of road traffic accidents.

9 CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

9.1 N/A

10 RISK MANAGEMENT AND HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

10.1 The risk in not introducing the proposed 20mph speed limit will not address the concerns raised by some residents regarding excessive speed. The introduction of these facilities is likely to result in reduction in traffic flows, speed and casualty.

10.2 The road safety implications/risks during construction and maintenance have been fully considered at each stage of the design process.

10.3 As this is a Merton Capital funded scheme, TfL are not obliged to undertake a road Safety Audit. No Safety Audit has been undertaken by external consultants, however one will be required in accordance with the Highways Agency design note on Road Safety Audits.

10.4 The Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 1994 apply to this scheme. Therefore when undertaking its duties as Client and Designer under these regulations, the Council follows the Approved Code of Practice, ‘Managing Health and Safety in Construction’, published by the Health and Safety Commission. The Planning Supervisor appointed for this scheme is F.M.Conway Ltd.

10.5 Potential risks have been identified during the preliminary and detailed design stages. Therefore, the measures have been designed accordingly to manage them; these are detailed in the table below.

Management of Health and Safety Risks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Measures to Reduce Risk</th>
<th>Information on Residual Risk Passed To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volume of traffic during peak</td>
<td>The appropriate traffic management would be put in place to ensure access and maintain</td>
<td>Highways Project Officers undertaking detailed design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>periods</td>
<td>periods through traffic Every effort will be made to undertake construction outside</td>
<td>Planning Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas outside school</td>
<td>morning and after school peaks.</td>
<td>Bus operators and emergency services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDICES

The following documents are to be published with this report and form part of the report:

- Appendix 1 – Plans of proposals drawing no. Z73-207-01
- Appendix 2 – Borough wide plan of proposed/identified areas.
- Appendix 3 – Representations and officers’ comments.
- Appendix 4 – Consultation documents.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

The following documents have been relied on in drawing up this report but do not form part of the report:

Department for Transport’s Traffic Calming - Local Transport Note 1/07 March 2007

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

Plans of proposals drawing no. Z73-207-01

KEY
- PROPOSED 20mph BOUNDARY
- EXISTING TRAFFIC CALMED ROAD
- PROPOSED REPEATED SIGN ON EXISTING LAMP POST
BOROUGH PROPOSED / OPERATIONAL 20MPH ZONES/LIMITS

KEY
- PROPOSED 20MPH SPEED LIMIT
- PROPOSED 20MPH ZONE
- EXISTING 20MPH PRI 2008
- EXISTING TRAFFIC CALMED ROAD
- BOROUGH BOUNDARY

AREA NAMES

2008
1. HILTON PARK AREA (ZONE)
2. NEWFINGER ROAD AREA (ZONE)
3. PECKHAM ROAD AREA (ZONE)
4. TRINITY ROAD (LIMIT)
5. MEADOW ROAD AREA (LIMIT)
6. OLIVER ROAD AREA (LIMIT)
7. MOTION PARK AREA (LIMIT)
8. MELROSE AVENUE AREA (LIMIT)
9. FARM ROAD AREA (LIMIT)
10. Wandle Road Area (LIMIT)
13. ASHINGTON ROAD AREA (LIMIT)
14. PARKWAY AREA (ZONE)
15. IRKLE ROAD AREA (LIMIT)
16. RIDDEN WAY AREA (ZONE)
17. OTLEY ROAD AREA (ZONE)
26. EDGE HILL AREA (LIMIT)
27. LAKE ROAD AREA (ZONE)
30. HILLMORE (ZONE)

2009
15. CAMBRIDGE ROAD AREA (LIMIT)
17. WEST BARNES AREA (LIMIT)
19. POLLARDS HILL AREA
21. CLAREMONT AVENUE AREA (LIMIT)
22. EASTEELS AREA (ZONE)
25. EDWORTH ROAD AREA (LIMIT)
28. WADillation AREA TRAFFIC STUDY
31. CANNON-HILL LANE AREA (LIMIT)

Reproduced from/Added upon the Ordnance Survey's 1:2500 maps with the permission of the Controller General of Her Majesty's Stationery Office. Reproduction forbidden. Ordnance Survey is a registered trademark of the Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution if not proceeding under licence. Updated June 09
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPRESENTATIONS</th>
<th>APPENDIX 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Claremont Avenue area</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUPPORT

#### 22015207

20mph seems a good idea in this area. To make things even safer, how about putting double yellow, 'No Parking' lines directly opposite Erroll Gardens between Nos. 58/66 Belmont Avenue. Vehicles parked here, cause blind spots and cause drivers to drive on the wrong side of the road when travelling south down Belmont Avenue. Vehicles parked between 60/66 Belmont Avenue make it difficult to see when it is safe to emerge from Erroll Gardens. 

'Give way' lines painted across the end of Barnard Gardens may encourage people emerging from Barnard Gardens into Erroll gardens to slow a bit and take a look before driving out.

**Officer comments**

Comments noted.

The waiting restrictions at the junction of Errol Gardens / Errol Gardens will be investigated but cannot be introduced as part of this proposals, as a traffic regulations order for this waiting restrictions will have to be advertised as part of the statutory obligations.

#### 22015203

I would like to respond with regards to the proposed 20mph speed limit by saying that I cannot understand why it has taken so long to put anything in place.

All you had to do in my opinion was to post notices in and around the area and post through resident’s post boxes that you are lowering the speed limit.

Drivers would have taken note and just done it. What is there to consult about? If that is the decision of the Council for the safety of local children and people who would agree? Its all nonsense.

Most of the people driving around this area at the busiest times do not, as I am sure you are aware, not residents.

**Officer comments**

Comments noted.

As we are in a democratic society, there are steps which has to be followed before a scheme is implemented, hence the consultation with residents and advertising of the traffic regulations order. We are aware it's time consuming and faustrating, however this has to be done before the scheme can be implemented.

#### 22015194

We would like to record our support for the proposals. In addition to the signage, have road painted circled ‘20’ markings been considered, if not, I would like to ask for these to be considered in the consultation.

**Officer comments**

Comments noted.

The road markings are included as part of this proposals, however they are limited to only the entrances into the proposed boundary. If there need to be additional markings within the proposed area we will incorporate them.

#### 22015181

I have just received the leaflet about reducing the speed limit in Claremont avenue, it's a brilliant idea! As a resident I can tell you there is a problem of young people racing up and down the street late at night, as well as high volumes of traffic using Claremont avenue as a cut through to the A3.

Recently there has been quad bikes speeding up and down the street, can you clarify whether this is allowed? Apologies if you are not the correct person to ask but I obviously got your details off the recent leaflet,
Officer comments
Comments noted.
Quad bikes are only allowed to use the road if they are licensed.

22015179

First, may I thank you for informing me regarding the proposal in regards to the 20 mph speed restriction in Claremont and surrounding roads.

I would like to point out that although one concurs with a 20 mph restriction being enforced for safety reasons. Would it not be practical to also introduce road humps to these areas in effort to slow down the traffic using these roads as a rat run on to the busy A3 road that adjoins this area? In particular as some two to three schools fall within this zone?

A 20 mph speed zone is welcomed however, realistically traffic will not keep to this limit and as mentioned in your recent correspondence, will be difficult to police. Hence road humps may assist in calming this traffic down as is the case in Blake’s Lane in the next borough of Kingston where road humps do slow the traffic attempting to speed down this road when crossing the border into Merton. This I witness on a daily basis given that my property sits on the boundary of both local authorities and at the intersection of Blake’s Lane, Blake’s Terrace and West Barnes Lane.

I trust that my comments will be considered when deciding this application.

Officer comments
Comments noted.
Road humps cannot be introduced at this stage as the average speed are lower than 24mph for which cosideration can be given for a 20mph speed limit without additional traffic calminf features.

We will monitor the proposed scheme if it is approved and implemented. If it is found that speeds are high, additional traffic calming measures will be considered, where possible.

22014985

I refer to your newsletter dated 24 July and wish to state that I am in full sympathy with these proposals and would welcome them. I have just a couple of minor comments to make on the plan.

1. I consider an additional entry sign should be installed in West Barnes Lane (adjacent to Motspur Park Station) advising traffic from the north-east of the change.
2. The traffic on the approach road to the A3 is subject to 30 mph whereas your plan indicates it to be 40 mph.

Obscured sitelines near road junctions

In connection with the statement that PIAs mostly occur at junctions with obscured sight lines, I would ask that the Council consider putting double yellow lines at such locations. As one who lives in Barnard Gardens and regularly drives, when I am returning home I often feel I am taking my life in my hands at the bend in Belmont Avenue which is near the junction with Errol Gardens because of a van or another vehicle which are often parked there. I shall be glad to know if the latter can be implemented in the not too distant future.

Officer comments
Comments noted.
West Barnes Lane from its junction with Crossway to Motspur Park is included in the West Barnes 20mph speed limit and the Claremont Avenue area 20mph speed limit will commence from Motspur Park. Hence no sign will be installed at Motspur Park but at the junction of West Barnes Lane and Claremont Avenue.

The existing speed limit on the slip road from the A3 will not be changed.
The double yellow lines will have to be investigated and implemented at a latter stage, possibly during the monitoring stage of the scheme, if it is approved and implemented.
In suggesting the 20mph restriction reduces the number and severity of accidents, presupposes that motorists will drive at 20mph or less. In my opinion, they won't. At best they will do 25 - the majority will totally ignore the restriction. My own experience last month in a 20mph zone (Church Road, Worcester Park) when keeping to 20mph, a following motorist saw that there was no oncoming traffic, so put his foot down and shot past me, causing

I suggest - a more hazardous situation than travelling with a 30 limit. 20mph is good in theory, but will only work if it is strongly monitored, and as you rightly say, enforcement will be a problem. Bearing in mind that Claremont Avenue takes the bulk of the morning and evening rush hour traffic, I really can't see commuters are going to drive at 20, which we have to acknowledge is a crawling pace. I think that Claremont Avenue benefits from the 11 humps in its length, which prevent any sustained speeding and my recommendation would be to proceed as planned for the other more minor roads, but to leave Claremont Avenue with the status quo.

Officer comments
Comments noted.
The scheme will be monitored if it is approved and implemented. If it is found that the measures are not achieving its objective, additional traffic calming measures will be introduced, where possible.

I refer to your newsletter to residents of this street informing us of the proposed 20 mile per hour speed limit proposal that the Council are thinking of introducing in Claremont Ave. & surrounding roads I have no objection to this proposed new speed limit that you are hoping to introduce in the near future.

The reason for my letter is more to do with a letter that I wrote to the Council way back in Jan. 09 (copy enclosed) which was never acknowledged nor answered by anyone at Merton Council. I have looked at the chart dealing with traffic flow down the various roads written about in your newsletter I see that Claremont Avenue do have a disproportional amount of traffic in comparison with other residential roads in the area.

This bring me back to my letter of 26th Jan. 09 in which I asked the Council to look at the possibility of making Claremont Avenue one way street. I had said East to West you are saying that the traffic flow is North to South I got my traffic directions wrong, however the fundamental problem is that the traffic flow in Claremont Avenue, which is a residential street is too high and out of proportion to other streets in the area. Would the Council now be willing in view of the high proportion of traffic and the double parking in the street from Burlington Road to Belmont Avenue due to these houses not having large front gardens to have a dropped kerb to allow parking in the front garden?
I look forward to your reply & comments to my proposal.

Officer comments
Comments noted.
The one way option will have to be investigate to find where the displaced traffic will have on the surrounding road network. If residents require dropped kerbs to allow parking in their front gardens, they will have to apply to the Council.

I am replying to your consultation document received from the Council regarding traffic calming measures on Claremont Avenue to say I am in agreement with 20mph speed limit, as lots of people drive at high speeds between the humps and it is a very busy through road.

We now have lots of children living on Claremont Avenue who walk to the local schools.

Officer comments
Comments noted.

Please find enclosed a copy of a petition that the residents of Byron Avenue completed in January/February of this
year. Most of the residents who signed (over 95% of the street), spoke in favour of a reduced speed limit in our streets.

I do hope that will serve as a sufficient evidence to you that there is overwhelming demand for 20mph speed limits in our area.

Officer comments
Comments noted.

22015456
I write in support of the Council’s proposals to introduce a 20mph speed limit for the Claremont Avenue area in west Barnes ward. It is considered that the advantages of a speed limit far outweigh the disadvantages.

I wish to make two further proposals-
1. A repeater signs should be erected on a lamp post at the junction of Errol Gardens with Barnard Gardens. It is exceedingly difficult for pedestrians leaving the alley-way between numbers 5 and 7 Barnard Gardens to cross the road as irresponsible drivers speed down Errol Gardens into Barnard Gardens. As the Council failed to provide double yellow lines at this dangerous bend of the road, it is important to remind drivers that a lower speed is essential.
2. Merton Council should liaise with the Royal Borough of Kingston to extend its 20mph zone in Blakes Lane so that it joins onto the one proposed for West Barnes Lane.

It is hoped that the Council will agree to the 20mph speed limit and to my additional suggestions for this part of West Barnes ward.

Officer comments
Comments noted.
All the repeater signs will be installed on existing sign post. A repeater sign at the junction of Errol Gardens and Barnard Gardens will be insignificant as these roads are very short in length and impossible to drive more than 20mph.

22015469
I agree with the 20mph speed limit proposed outside Sacred Heart School, and also extending the 20mph zone in Blakes Lane to join the new 20mph limit in West Barnes Lane.

Officer comments
Comments noted.

22015473
I am delighted that residents are at last being consulted about this vital issue. Many of these streets are used as rat-runs to and from the A3. I visit most of these streets at least once a week, and I have often seen vehicles traveling far too fast. The sooner the 20mph zone is implemented, the better.

I am disappointed that Burlington Road is not part of the scheme. It is used by many parents and children going to and from the Sacred Heart School and it would be good to encourage more of them to walk, rather than drive. I suggest that flashing 20mph School signs are installed on Burlington Rd. They can be switched off for most of the time allowing traffic to move at up to 30mph but can be switched on in the morning and afternoon when children are entering and leaving school. I have seen these signs used to good effect in other parts of the country and it would be good to have them here and would improve road safety. They might also be used outside Raynes Park high School and West Wimbledon Primary School.

My second suggestion concerns West Barnes Lane. A 20mph limit there will be a major safety improvement but it would be better if the Royal Borough of Kingston could extend their 20mph zone to the junction of Blakes Lane with West Barnes Lane and Blakes Terrace. Currently vehicles coming from New Malden speed up on Blakes Lane when they leave Kingston’s 20mph zone and then approach the junction with West Barnes Lane and Blakes Terrace far too fast. This junction is on a bend with very poor visibility in both directions.
Apart from the humps in Claremont Avenue, the rest of the streets are not been fitted with any physical speed deterrents. It will therefore be important for the police to be present with their hand-held speed monitors at rush hours when the zone goes "live" and thereafter to carry out random speed checks in these roads.

Officer comments
Comments noted.

22015475

Regarding the above I write just to confirm that I am in favour of a 20mph speed limit in the Claremont Road area and would also like to see road humps in this and surrounding areas. Especially West Barnes Lane, Blake’s Terrace and Blake’s Lane area.

Officer comments
Comments noted.

AGAINST

22015206

With reference to the speed consultation document received I have to say that the exercise of installing a 20mph zone seems a bit excessive and a waste of public funds. The consultation document showed the average speed to be below 25mph if I recall correctly with only 5 incidents in the past 5 years - some of which probably had nothing to do with the speed of the vehicle. There does not seem to be a problem with the average speed individuals drive at in the area so do not see a justification for speeding public money trying to fix a problem that doesn't exist.

I would rather suggest the funds are spent on planting trees along the pavements of Claremont Avenue (and surrounding roads), as this would at least be a worthwhile green exercise. Trees add to the general feel and aesthetics of an area so don't know why they have not been planted as yet.

Officer comments
Comments noted.

The Council has a duty under the Highways Act to reduce the number of collisions on its roads. The objective of the scheme is therefore to reduce the number and severity of any collisions within the proposed area should they occur. It seem like 5 collisions within 5 years is not a lot, however the cost to implement the scheme is less than the cost of a life saved in the event of a fatal collision.

22015197

I would like to respond to the proposal to introduce a 20mph speed limit in the area bounded by Burlington Road (excluded), Malden Way (excluded), Claremont Avenue (inclusive), Stanley Avenue (inclusive) and West Barnes Lane (between Blakes Lane and Claremont Avenue).

From the statistics provided in the newsletter dated 24th July 2009, it is clear that existing actual speeds do not exceed the proposed limit by a significant amount. Please see Diagram 1 in the attached document for backup. In fact, the average speed in the considered roads is only 2.6 MPH above the proposed limit. This hardly appears to be "excessive or inappropriate" and therefore falls outside the scope of the programme mentioned in the newsletter.

I do not believe there is sufficient statistical evidence from similar 20Plenty schemes in the Borough to support the proposed advantages. Significantly, the newsletter states that in the 5-year period up to 30 June 2008, there were five slight recorded personal injury accidents (PIAs). And that most of these accidents involved pedestrians and cyclists and occurred at junctions due to obscured sightlines, not excessive speeds. Further, the scheme will not be enforceable, as I understand that the Metropolitan Police have indicated that they will not be able to resource monitoring.

The budget of £40,000 does not appear excessive in itself, but when the supposed benefits of the scheme are unproven, I consider it to be £40,000 too much.
Considering the observations made above, I strongly oppose the scheme as currently proposed.

**Officer comments**

Comments noted.
The average speeds on most of the roads within the proposed area were lower than the speed limit of 30mph, however the highest recorded speed was between 51 and 56mph.

The 20mph zones/speed limits, which were implemented in 2008/09 financial year will be monitored this year to compare if the proposed measures have achieved its objectives, if they have not, additional traffic calming measures will be considered where possible.

Contributing factors to the collisions within the proposed area were sightlines being obscured and speeds being too high. If the speed of a vehicle is reduced, obscured sightlines will not be too much of an issue, as the reaction time to any danger will be more.

Most of the recorded average speeds within the proposed area were lower than 24mph; hence enforcement will not be required.

The Council has a duty under the Highways Act to reduce the number of collisions on its roads. The objective of the scheme is therefore to reduce the number and severity of any collisions within the proposed area should they occur. It seem like 5 collisions within 5 years is not a lot, however the cost to implement the scheme is less than the cost of a life saved in the event of a fatal collision.

**22015178**

I am writing to you in response to the proposed 20mph speed limit for the Claremont Avenue area.

I have reviewed the information you have provided through the post to local residents and would appreciate it if you would provide me with information surrounding the cost of implementing this measure.

I am aware that there is a large volume of traffic on Claremont Avenue during the morning rush hours and I feel that the presence of speed humps along Claremont Avenue is appropriate. I am also aware that some of the surrounding roads have to accommodate peak time traffic however I read with interest that the highest average speed on any of the roads is 26.1mph. The mean recorded speed for the collective roads in both the north and south directions is 22.6mph. I don't feel that this is excessive and believe that in an area where the speed limit is 30mph, drivers are already aware and considerate of the need for a reduced speed in such a residential area. The aim would therefore be to reduce the speed by 2.6mph, which I feel I must question in terms of cost-effectiveness.

There is no history of reckless driving and accidents due to speed within the area and your data of '5 slight recorded personal injury accidents' within the 5 year period up to 30 June 2008 supports this. Please provide me with further information as to why this measure is deemed to be necessary for the area.

**Officer comments**

Comments noted.
The cost to introduce the scheme is estimated at £40k. Although the average speed was 22.6mph, the highest recorded speed was between 51 and 56mph. At this speed impact with a child will be very serious if not fatal.

The Council has a duty under the Highways Act to reduce the number of collisions on its roads. The objective of the scheme is therefore to reduce the number and severity of any collisions within the proposed area should they occur. It seem like 5 collisions within 5 years is not a lot, however the cost to implement the scheme is less than the cost of a life saved in the event of a fatal collision.

**22014982**

Firstly I am rather concerned that the letter dated 24th July 2009 is the first time we as residents are notified of such a proposal. I take it that there has been no formal consultation period.

However with reference to the above I wish to express my objections and concerns to this proposal as follows: -
• The average speed in my road is not excessive at 21.1mph.
• The average speed in the proposed area is also not excessive at 22.6mph.
• The statistic regarding 5 accidents in the period up to June 2008 does not even say that these involved 'Cars' I and even if they did - who was at fault and if speeding was a factor. (Is this just scare mongering using unsubstantiated statistics). Any enforcement of speed violation would be by The Metropolitan Police Service and as a resident for the last 20 years - I can say that I am not aware of any 'Speed traps' ever being carried out in this area.
• So why should we have such a costly project implemented.
• In these days of 'Cutbacks' I feel that the money for the erection of 40 plus signs would be far better spent in other areas within the community.

The implementation of speed limits I understand is a Government concern and I obviously agree with the requirement to impose some restrictions. But Claremont Avenue already has 'Speed bumps' and for those who do drive in excess of the current speed limit of 30mph is not going to adhere to 20mph.

I therefore hope that common sense prevails and the money saved by abandoning this project can be put to better use in the community. I would also like to be notified when the next public meeting regarding this proposal is due to be heard in order that, if possible, I could attend.

If you wish to discuss this matter further, please do not hesitate to contact me. I look forward to receiving an acknowledgement of my concerns and an assurance that they will be taken into consideration when this proposal is next discussed.

Officer comments
Comments noted.
The Council has a duty under the Highways Act to reduce the number of collisions on its roads. The objective of the scheme is therefore to reduce the number and severity of any collisions within the proposed area should they occur. It seem like 5 collisions within 5 years is not a lot, however the cost to implement the scheme is less than the cost of a life saved in the event of a fatal collision.

If the speed limit is 30mph, drivers will travel at 34-35mph. But if the speed limit is 20mph, they would travel at 24-25mph and that 10mph reduction can make a big difference when impacting on a young child.

I write in response to the proposed 20 mph speed limit in the Claremont Avenue area. The newsletter issued on 24 July 2009 is very clear and professionally prepared. Moreover, the conclusions as to speeds and hazards match my own experience as a resident who walks and drives in the area covered.

However, the information provided fails to make the case for the proposed scheme, for the following reasons:
1. The minor accidents recorded are attributed to obscured sightlines at junctions. Since the proposed scheme is intended to reduce vehicle speeds between junctions, the scheme cannot reduce the likelihood of this type of accident.
2. The speeds measured in the area are 20 mph or slightly above, even though the roads have an implied speed limit of 30 mph. The reason for this is obvious to any resident: the roads are narrow and lined with parked cars-any speed much in excess of 20 mph feels 'fast' because of the limited space. Modern cars do not naturally drive at much below 20 mph and the effect of the scheme will therefore be to reduce average speeds from slightly above 20 mph to slightly below.

The data on speeds and accidents collected by the council seems entirely plausible to me, but merely demonstrates that the proposed scheme will not significantly reduce speeds and cannot reduce the type of accident that actually seems to occur in this area. There will be a financial cost associated with the scheme, and enforcement need will be created where none existed or was necessary before, and the encroachment of street furniture on the lives of residents will increase. I am unable to see how any objective cost-benefit comparison could favour this scheme. In these challenging financial times, I oppose the apparent waste of council funds on such an ineffective scheme.
If the council wishes to pursue the laudable aim of reducing the rate of personal accidents in the area then its own data suggests that addressing the sightlines at junctions would be an effective method.

**Officer comments**

Comments noted.

Thank you for the comments regarding the professional nature of the newsletter.

1. Contributing factors to the collisions within the proposed area were sightlines being obscured and speeds being too high. If the speed of a vehicle is reduced, obscured sightlines will not be too much of an issue, as the reaction time to any danger will be more.

2. If the speed limit is 30mph, drivers will travel at 34-35mph. But if the speed limit is 20mph, they would travel at 24-25mph and that 10mph reduction can make a big difference when impacting on a young child.

The Council has a duty under the Highways Act to reduce the number of collisions on its roads. The objective of the scheme is therefore to reduce the number and severity of any collisions within the proposed area should they occur. It seem like 5 collisions within 5 years is not a lot, however the cost to implement the scheme is less than the cost of a life saved in the event of a fatal collision.

All proposed repeater signs will be erected on existing lamp post to minimise street clutter.

**2201204**

As I live in Claremont Avenue, I do feel that it is rather a waste of money to make it a 20mph area as from survey, most cars travel at this speed anyway. We already have speed humps, which act as a deterrent, and it is unlikely that anyone would enforce the limit anyway. If most accidents occurred at junctions because of obscured sightlines, adding more signs could increase the risk.

At a time when councils are facing severe financial difficulties in their budget, I would have thought that the money that this exercise is going to cost could be used for a more worthwhile cause.

**Officer comments**

Comments noted.

The Council has a duty under the Highways Act to reduce the number of collisions on its roads. The objective of the scheme is therefore to reduce the number and severity of any collisions within the proposed area should they occur. It seem like 5 collisions within 5 years is not a lot, however the cost to implement the scheme is less than the cost of a life saved in the event of a fatal collision.

The existing speed humps in Claremont Avenue are achieving their objective, hence the reduce traffic speeds on this road even though this road carries the highest volume of traffic within the proposed area. Enforcement of the speed limit will not be required as most of the speeds are lower than 24mph. The traffic signs will also be located away from the junction to improve sightlines at these locations.

**22015206**

With reference to the speed consultation document received I have to say that the exercise of installing a 20mph zone seems a bit excessive and a waste of public funds. The consultation document showed the average speed to be below 25mph if I recall correctly with only 5 accidents in the past 5 years – some of which probably had nothing to do with the speed of the vehicle. There does not seem to be a problem with the average speed individuals drive at in the area so do not see a justification for spending public money trying to fix a problem that doesn’t exist.

I would rather suggest the funds are spent on planting trees along the pavement of Claremont Avenue (and surrounding roads), as this would at least be a worthwhile green exercise. Trees add to the general feel and aesthetics of an area so don’t know why they have not planted as yet.

**Officer comments**

Comments noted.
The proposals are to introduce a 20mph speed limit and not a 20mph zone. The Council has a duty under the Highways Act to reduce the number of collisions on its roads. The objective of the scheme is therefore to reduce the number and severity of any collisions within the proposed area should they occur. It seems like 5 collisions within 5 years is not a lot, however the cost to implement the scheme is less than the cost of a life saved in the event of a fatal collision.

If the speed limit is 30mph, drivers will travel at 34-35mph. But if the speed limit is 20mph, they would travel at 24-25mph and that 10mph reduction can make a big difference when impacting on a young child.
Dear Resident

The Council has a commitment to manage excessive or inappropriate speeds in residential roads through a programme of 20mph speed limits/zones. This programme is known as the “20 plenty” work programme. As part of this programme, the Council has agreed to fund the introduction of a 20mph speed limit for the Claremont Avenue area in West Barnes, during the 2009/10 financial year. The proposed area is bounded by Burlington Road (excluded), Malden Way (excluded), Claremont Avenue (inclusive), Stanley Avenue (inclusive) and West Barnes Lane (between Blakes Lane and Claremont Avenue).

As part of the traffic data collection exercise for the introduction of a 20mph, a traffic volume and traffic speed survey was carried out from 8 June 2009 to 14 June 2009, to determine the average speeds at which drivers travel on some of the roads within the proposed area. The table below shows the recorded speed on the roads where the surveys were carried out.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Average volume of vehicles/day</th>
<th>Average speed (mph)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>Southbound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claremont Avenue</td>
<td>1231</td>
<td>821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavendish Avenue</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont Avenue</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consfield Avenue</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryon Avenue</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobham Avenue</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley Avenue</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Barnes Lane (no. 455)</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>921</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the 5 year period up to 30 June 2008, there were 5 slight recorded personal injury accidents (PIAs). Most of these accidents involved pedestrians and cyclists and occurred at the junctions due to obscured sightlines.

**PROPOSALS**

Convert the area bounded by Burlington Road (excluded), Malden Way (excluded), Claremont Avenue (inclusive), Stanley Avenue (inclusive) and West Barnes Lane (between Blakes Lane and Claremont Avenue) line into a 20mph speed limit area (see plan overleaf). This will involve the installation of signs at the entrance and exit to the zone in addition to smaller repeater signs along the roads within the proposed area.

**Advantages of a speed limit area**

1. Lower speeds reduce number of accidents, as 9 out of 10 pedestrian and cyclist fatalities occur in residential area; hence a lower speed limit will reduce the number and severity of PIAs.
2. At lower speeds, collisions are far less likely to be serious or fatal.
3. Lower traffic speeds will encourage more people to cycle and walk with confidence.
4. Lower traffic speeds allow easier cycle turning manoeuvres. For example, turning right can be difficult when you have to cross a lane of fast moving traffic. If the traffic speed is reduced to 20mph it should become much easier.

**Disadvantages of a speed limit**

1. Enforcement will be a problem if there is a sudden increase in traffic speeds, as enforcement is the responsibility of the Metropolitan Police.
2. Extra signs may increase street clutter.
WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

A Notice of the Council’s intentions to introduce the above measures will be published in the local newspaper and posted on lamp columns in the vicinity. Representations for and against must be done in writing to the Head of Street Scene and Waste Management Division, Merton Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, Surrey, SM4 5DX by no later than 4 September 2009, quoting reference ES/SGE/CLAREMONTAVENUE20MPHLIMIT.

Officers’ comments and recommendations will be reported to either the Street Management Advisory Committee on 3 November 2009 or, if appropriate the Cabinet Member for Planning and Traffic Management for a decision.

Please note that responses to any representation received will not be made until a final decision is made by the Cabinet Member. The Council is required to give weight to the nature and content of your representations and not necessarily the quantity. Your reasons are, therefore, important to us.

A plan identifying the area affected by the proposal can be inspected at West Barnes Library and at Merton Link, Merton Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, Surrey during the Council’s working hours, Monday to Friday, between 9am and 5pm.

CONTACT US

If you require further information, please contact Edward Quartey on 020 8545 3835 or email edward.quartey@merton.gov.uk. Alternatively you can visit our website using the following www.merton.gov.uk/claremont20mph.