THE CABINET STREET MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
29th March 2006

SUBJECT: REVIEW OF WIMBLEDON VILLAGE CONTROLLED PARKING ZONES

LEAD OFFICER: Director of Environment and Regeneration - Richard Rawes.

The Chair of the Cabinet Street Management Committee – Councillor Andrew Judge
Leader of the Council

KEY DECISION REFERENCE NUMBER: N/A

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Committee considers the issues detailed in this report and:

1) Notes the results of the formal consultation conducted in February 2006, on proposals to introduce a series of modifications to improve the operation of the existing controlled parking zones in Wimbledon Village.

2) Notes the representations received to the formal consultation and Officers’ comments as detailed in appendices 1, 2, 3, 4

3) Agrees to convert the pay and display shared use bays in Belvedere Grove (zone VOn) outside Nos. 16/18 and 23/25 to resident permit holder only bays and reduce the maximum stay of the pay and display shared use bays in Belvedere Grove near its junction with Belvedere Avenue from 9 hours to 5 hours. (For details see drawing Z78/112/05E displayed at the meeting).

4) Agrees to convert existing pay and display shared use bays/permit holders, in Lingfield Road and The Green (zone VC) to pay and display shared use bays/resident permit holders. (For details see drawing Z78/112/01E displayed at the meeting).

5) Agrees to convert permit holder bays in The Grange, Lauriston Road, Wilberforce Way and Murray Road (except for those permit holder bays outside Nos 68/70 Murray Road) zone VOs, to resident permit holder only bays. (For details see drawing Z78/112/04F displayed at the meeting).

6) Agrees to convert permit holder bays outside No. 2 The Grange and Nos. 4/6 Lauriston Road (zone VOs) to pay and display shared use/permit holder bays. (For details see drawing Z78/112/04F displayed at the meeting).

7) Agrees to introduce 3 additional pay and display shared use bays in The Grange outside No. 25 The Grange, outside the flank wall of No. 2 Southside Common and outside No. 29 the Grange (For details see drawing Z78/112/04F displayed at the meeting).

8) To proceed with the making of the Traffic Management Orders and the
implementation of the above recommendations.

9) Agrees that a public enquiry is not held.

10) Officers to review the changes of the above measures, 9 months after implementation, and a further report to be presented to Cabinet.

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 This report presents the results of the formal consultation upon the review of the controlled parking zones in Wimbledon Village, carried out in February 2006. It seeks approval to make the Traffic Management Orders and proceed with the implementation of the above recommendations.

2 INTRODUCTION

2.1 The policy of the Council is to improve the environment by regulating the number of parked vehicles in the area and increase safety for both motorists and pedestrians. The key objective of this review is to fine tune elements of the existing controlled parking zones in Wimbledon Village to improve the parking arrangement for both resident permit holders, business permit holders and their visitors by prioritising access to the space that remains available for parking and to improve safety for all road users. This is in line with the Mayor's Transport strategy, which aims to tackle congestion and reduce traffic and specifically supports Controlled Parking restrictions.

2.2 A controlled parking zone (CPZ) aims to provide safe parking arrangements whilst giving priority access to parking space to residents. It is a way of controlling the parking whilst improving and maintaining safety for all road users. A CPZ comprises of various types of bays such as permit holder bays (to be used by resident / business permit holders and those with visitor permits); shared use bays (permit holders and pay and display) and pay and display bays (all users will have to pay and display). The measures also include 'At any time' waiting restrictions at key locations such as junctions; bends and along lengths of a road where parking impedes flow of traffic. Within any proposed controlled parking zone the Council aims to reach a balance between the needs of the residents, businesses and visitors. It is normal practice to introduce such measure if and when there is majority in support. In addition the Council should also take into account the impact of introducing parking controls in assessing the extent of those controls and whether or not they should be implemented at all. In the absence of support for a CPZ, the Council often considers proceeding with the implementation of 'At any time' waiting restrictions, as detailed within the CPZ proposals, to improve safety for all road users particularly pedestrians.

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 As part of the Wimbledon Village controlled parking zones review, during May and June 2004 a public consultation was carried out on a series of modifications to the existing zones. The outcome of the public consultation was reported to Street Management Overview and Scrutiny Panel dated 27th October 2004 and
the Cabinet Member for Community Services and Community Engagement approved the following recommendations subject to a formal consultation:

- To allow Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) VC resident permit holders south of the High Street to park in zone VOs and those north of the High Street to park in zones VOn and VN.
- To include The Green in zone VC, as it does not abut other roads in zone VOn.
- To convert pay and display shared bays in Murray Road outside 18-22 and 29-33 to resident permit holder bays and reduce maximum stay of pay and display shared bays in Murray Road at its junction with Ridgway from 9 hrs to 2 hrs.
- To convert pay and display shared use bays in the Grange at its junction with Ridgway to pay and display only bays
- To convert permit holders only bays in Parkside Avenue outside No.10 Peek Crescent to pay and display shared use bays
- To introduce resident permit holders parking bays outside No.2 Marryat Road.
- To introduce double yellow lines for a minimum of 10 metres at each arm of all junctions in Wimbledon Village zones.
- That the Wimbledon Village zones hours of operation remain as at present.
- To reduce the maximum stay for pay and display shared use bays in Belvedere Avenue between its junction with Church Road and Belvedere Grove, from 9 hours to 5 hours.
- That business parking permits shall be valid only in pay and display shared use/permit holder bays and not shared use/resident permit holder bays.

2.2 In September 2005 the formal consultation to implement the above various changes to the Wimbledon Village controlled parking zones was carried out. The outcome of the formal consultation was reported to the Cabinet Street Management Committee on 6th January 2006. The Committee approved the implementation of the above measures and also instructed Officers to undertake a further formal consultation on the following recommendations before implementing the above agreed measures.

- Zone VOn - To convert the pay and display shared use bays in Belvedere Grove outside Nos. 16/18 and 23/25 to resident permit holder only bays and to reduce the maximum stay of the pay and display shared use bays in Belvedere Grove at its junction with Belvedere Avenue from 9 hours to 5 hours.
- Zone VC - To convert the existing pay and display shared use /permit holder bays, in Lingfield Road and The Green to pay and display shared use/resident permit holder bays.

- Zone VOs - To convert permit holder bays in The Grange, Lauriston Road, Wilberforce Way and Murray Road (except for those permit holder bays outside Nos 68/70 Murray Road) to resident permit holder bays only.

- Zone VOs - To convert permit holder bays outside No. 2 The Grange and Nos. 4/6 Lauriston Road to pay and display shared use / permit holder bays.

- To introduce additional pay and display shared use bays in The Grange.

- To review the changes 9 months after implementation, and a further report to be presented to Cabinet.

3 Formal Consultation

3.1 The further formal consultation on the proposed improvements to the existing Village controlled parking zones (CPZs) was carried out by advertising the Council’s intention of making the Traffic Management Orders in the London Gazette and the local Guardian newspaper and by erecting notices on lamp columns in the roads concerned. For an overview plan of all the Wimbledon Village zones see appendix 6. At the same time, newsletters were circulated to all the properties within the existing CPZs. The newsletters detailed the outcome of the previous formal consultation, the Cabinet Street Management Committee’s decision and the Council’s intentions. The newsletters for zones VC, VOn and VOs only, are attached as appendices 7, 8 and 9. The draft Traffic Management Orders were published on 2nd February 2006 with the representation period ending on 24th February 2006. The newsletter and the Notices invited anyone to make a written representation in support or opposition to the proposal. Additionally the documents were also available at the Link (Civic Centre); at the Wimbledon Library and on the website.

3.2 The formal consultation concluded with a total of 25 representations received, of which 8 were in support and two were against. Details of each representation and Officer’s comments are detailed in appendices 1, 2, 3 and 4. The remaining 15 representations included 13 against and 2 in favour of the measures that were approved by the Cabinet Street Management Committee on January 2006. Details of each representation and Officer’s comments are detailed in appendices 3 and 4.

3.3 Of the 8 letters in support of the proposals, 3 were from Lauriston Road; 2 from Marryat Road; 2 from Lingfield Road and 1 from Bevedere Grove. These, in general, supported the proposals. For a summary of the representations and Officer’s comments see appendix 1.

3.4 One of the 2 objections received was from the Chair of the Grange Residents’ Association concerning the proposed new bay outside No. 26 The Grange near to the large mature tree and build out. It must be noted that the actual location of the proposed bay is outside No. 25 The Grange and not outside No. 26 as stated in their letter. His concerns are that with a car parked in the proposed bay, a
vehicle egressing no. 2 or/and 25 The Grange would find it difficult and dangerous. For a summary of the representations and Officer's comments see appendix 2.

3.5 Officer’s Comments:
At the various meetings that were held with the representatives of the Zone VOs roads, it was agreed that the permit holder bay outside No. 2 The Grange could be converted to pay and display shared use bay and also 3 single additional bays could be introduced outside Nos. 25 and 29 The Grange and adjacent to the flank wall of No 2 Southside Common in The Grange. Officers have investigated the concerns raised and it is considered that the proposed bay outside No. 25 The Grange is unlikely to cause sightline problems to vehicles entering and exiting this property nor will it cause danger and manoeuvring difficulties to vehicles exiting No. 2 The Grange. However, in the unlikely event that the residents find it difficult the matter will be further investigated and the appropriate action will be taken at that time.

3.6 The Metropolitan Police had no observation to make provided that the scheme is correctly signed and that the Traffic Orders are properly made using the appropriate legislation. A copy of their letter is attached as appendix 5.

3.7 Zone VOs
3.7.1 10 representations were received from Zone VOs. 4 were in support of the current formal proposals, 2 were against, as mentioned in paragraphs 3.4 and 3.5, and the remaining 4 objected to the measures already approved in January 2006. These were from the residents who reside near the junction of The Grange and Ridgway and oppose the approved conversion of the existing permit holder bays outside No.11 The Grange and the pay and display shared use bay near its junction with Ridgway being converted to pay and display only bays. The residents claim that they were not consulted about these proposals and that The Grange is the only road in Zone VOs with pay and display only bays, which means that the residents especially those in the vicinity, will not be able park on these bays. For a summary of these representations see appendices 1, 2 and 4.

3.7.2 Officers’ comments
The initial proposal that was put forward to the Residents Associations was to convert most of the permit holder bays in Zone VOs to pay and display shared use bays. This was to assist the businesses along the Ridgway who have been campaigning for years that their businesses are suffering due to insufficient pay and display bays on / near Ridgway to meet the parking demand of their customers. Most of the permit holder bays in zone VOs especially those in The Grange, which are the closest to Ridgway, where the businesses are located, are empty during controlled parking hours. At that time, the Residents Associations took the proposals to discuss with their members. During the meeting with its members, it was agreed that each road should discuss its needs separately with Officers. In January 2004 a representative from The Grange informed Officers that the proposal to convert most of the permit holder bays to pay and display shared use bays was not accepted but as a compromise it was agreed that the permit holder bays outside No. 11 The Grange and the pay and display shared use bays at its junction with Ridgway be converted to pay and display only bays. Also according to our records the residents were provided with the initial consultation documents and one of these residents had in fact replied to the consultation at that time.
3.7.3 Part of the proposals put forward during the informal and formal consultations carried out in June and September 2005 respectively, was to allow all the Village business-permit holders, regardless of the zone, to park in any pay and display shared use \ permit holder bays throughout the Village zones. This will free up permit holder bays for residents, especially in roads where there is a high level of demand for residents’ parking compared to available parking bays. If these bays in The Grange were left as pay and display shared use bays, the bays are likely to be fully utilised by Business permit holders making parking for visitors extremely difficult.

3.7.4 It is recognised that there may be occasions when some of the proposed bays may be empty and resident permit holders would have to park further up the road. However, it should be noted that currently the residents do not have any parking difficulties in The Grange. The majority of the properties have off-street parking facilities for at least two cars and as a rule of the 48 permit holder bays most of the bays remain empty during the zone operational hours. It is considered that converting these bays to pay and display only bays would not cause adverse parking difficulties for the residents of this road and will provide available short-term parking for customers using the nearby businesses and shops. As already mentioned the conversion of these bays has already been approved by Committee and did not form part of the formal consultation that was carried out in February 2006. For photos of the existing parking arrangement in The Grange see appendix 15.

3.8 Zone VC
3.8.1 9 representations were received from within zone VC. 2 were in support of the current formal proposals; 2 supported the measures approved in January 2006 and 5 were in opposition. The 5 letters of opposition to the approved measures comprised of representations from the businesses in Church Road, who are concerned about the effects the changes may have on the operation of their businesses and that the Council did not consider the majority view expressed by the residents and businesses for no change to the current parking controls. For a summary of the representations see appendices 1, 3 and 4

Officers’ comment
The newsletter that was distributed to all the residents and businesses within the Village controlled parking zones generated comments and objections against the approved measures which aim to improve usage of the existing parking bays. The businesses are concerned about preventing business permit holders from parking in zone VC and object to the approved resident permit holder only bays for that zone. Presently VC business permit holders can only park in zones VC and VOn but under the approved proposals, business permit holders will be able to park on all pay and display shared use \ permit holder bays in all the existing Village zones thereby providing them with more options. It is accepted that business permit holders may have to walk 5 –10 minutes in some cases to get to the nearest pay and display shared use bays. The Business Association in the Village supported the proposal and wants the nearest bays to the Village Centre to remain purely for zone VC residents and visitors to the businesses. It has been acknowledged that VC cannot cope with the current parking demand and that the residents must be given priority.

3.8.2 One letter of opposition was also received regarding the proposed pay and display only parking bays in the High Street, between Marryat Road and the War
Memorial. It should be noted that these bays did not form part of this consultation but are subject to a different formal consultation that is currently in progress.

3.9 It is common for people to be skeptical about the proposed changes but the Cabinet Street Management Committee has authorised Officers to implement and monitor the approved measures and a further report presented to Committee 9 months after implementation.

4. OFFICERS’ RECOMMENDATION

4.1 From the detailed analysis of all the representations received during the formal consultation, a majority of residents are in agreement that the Village controlled parking zones has worked very well and every effort should be made to maintain this success.

4.2 In order to ensure the continued effective working of the Wimbledon Village controlled parking zones and to enable the implementation of the previously agreed measures it is recommended that the following be approved for implementation:

4.2.1 2 additional pay and display shared use bays in The Grange; one outside No 29 The Grange and one adjacent to the flank wall of No 2 Southdown Common.

4.2.2 Conversion of the existing pay and display/permit holder shared use bays in Lingfield Road to pay and display/Resident permit holder shared use bays. See section 3.6 and drawing Z78/11/04F (on display) for details.

4.2.3 Conversion of the permit holder bays in The Grange, Lauriston Road, Wilberforce Way and Murray Road (except for those permit holder bays o/s Nos 68/70 Murray Road) to resident permit holder bays as per drawing Z78/112/04F. For photos of the existing parking arrangements in parts of these roads see appendices 10, 11, 13, 14, and 15

4.2.4 Conversion of the pay and display shared use bays in Belvedere Grove outside Nos. 16/18 and 23/25 to resident permit holder bays only and reduce the maximum stay of pay and display shared use bays in Belvedere Grove near its junction with Belvedere Avenue from 9 hrs to 5 hrs. For details see drawing Z78/112/05E.

4.2.5 Conversion of the permit holder bays outside No.2 The Grange and Nos. 4/6 Lauriston Road to pay and display shared use bays. For details see drawing Z78/112/04F. For photos of the existing parking arrangements in parts of these roads see appendices 10, 11, 12 and 16

4.2.6 It is also recommended that the Council should proceed with the making of the Traffic Management Orders and the implementation of the above recommendations as set out in plans Z78/112/01E, 02D, 03D, 04F and 05E.

4.3 If approved the recommendations could be implemented by July 2006.

5. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS
5.1 To do nothing. This, however, will not address the parking difficulties faced by Zone VC; some of the residents from the other zones and visitors. And it will not resolve the enforcement difficulties that currently exist due to lack of signage. The Council has responsibility to review any implemented measure to ensure its effectiveness and to address the ongoing changes and demands.

6.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 The cost of implementing the proposed changes in all the zones including the publication of the Draft Traffic Management Orders, is estimated at £62,000. This does not include staff costs.

6.2 The set up costs for the proposals will be funded from the Capital budget identified for controlled parking zones.

6.3 The financial effects of the review of the Wimbledon Village proposals will be reviewed as part of the revenue budget process, and have been taken into account in the business planning process.

7. RISK MANAGEMENT AND HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

7.1 The risk in not introducing the proposed measures would be an inefficient use of the existing zones and the parking difficulties currently experienced by VC permit holders and visitors will not be addressed.

7.2 The risk in not addressing the issues raised from both of the formal consultation exercise would be the loss of confidence in the Council by those who need help the most. The proposed measures may cause some dissatisfaction from those who have requested the status quo, but it is considered that the risk of doing nothing is greater than the risk of introducing the measures.

7.3 All works will be carried out in accordance with the Health and Safety at Work Act and the Construction Design and Management Regulations.

8. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

8.1 The Traffic Management Orders would be made under Section 6 and Section 45 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. Any objections made to the proposed order should be made in writing.

8.2 The Council has discretion as to whether or not to hold a public inquiry before deciding whether or not to make a traffic management order or to modify the published draft order. A public inquiry should be held where it would provide further information, which would assist the Council in reaching a decision.
9. HUMAN RIGHTS & EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

9.1 Controlled parking zones affect all sections of the community especially the young and the elderly and assist 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.

9.2 Residents, for whom parking near their homes has become a daily source of anxiety, may benefit from an enhanced quality of life and improvement by reduction of non-essential vehicle movements.

9.3 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 design of the scheme includes special consideration for the needs of people with blue/orange badges, local residents, businesses, charitable and religious facilities. The needs of commuters are also given consideration but generally carry less weight than those of residents and local businesses.

9.4 Bodies representing motorists, including commuters are included in the statutory consultation required for draft traffic management and similar orders.

APPENDICES:

Appendix 1 - Representations in support
Appendix 2 - Representations against
Appendix 3 - Representations supporting the approved changes
Appendix 4 - Representations opposing the approved changes
Appendix 5 - Letter from Metropolitan Police
Appendix 6 - Wimbledon Village CPZs Overview Plan
Appendix 7 - Newsletter (Zone VC) – Formal Consultation - February 2006
Appendix 8 - Newsletter (Zone VOn) – Formal Consultation February 2006
Appendix 9 - Newsletter (Zone VOs) – Formal Consultation February 2006
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DRAWINGS – The following drawings form part of this report:
Drawing No. Z78/112/01E, 02D, 03D, 04F and 05E - Detailed plans of the zones showing the proposals of the Wimbledon Village controlled parking zone review.

These plans are also available for inspection at the Council’s offices. Please ring 020 8545 4679 to arrange viewing.
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### Representations in support of Formal Proposals - February 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22005423 Murray Road North Residents Association</td>
<td>Thank you for the revised consultation document, which in respect of Murray Road accurately reflects the changes we discussed. We are pleased that our collaboration is positive for our residents and wider community. May I emphasise that residents are concerned at any increase in the number of VC business permits, particularly as holders can now use shared-use pay and display bays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22005359 Belvedere Grove SW19 7RL</td>
<td>I refer to the newsletter and support the proposals that there be resident permit bays outside 16/18 and 23/25 Belvedere Grove. I am a permit holder and find it extremely difficult to park 2 roads away, which is not convenient with 3 children and shopping to unload.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220054374 Lingfield Road SW19 4QD</td>
<td>I am writing to express my support for the proposals contained in your consultation document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22005429 Lauriston Road SW19 4TQ</td>
<td>We are in full agreement with the proposal to convert permit holder bays into residents permit holders only, and note that the permit bays outside nos. 4 and 6 Lauriston Road are to be converted to shared-use. I would like to confirm that no further pay and display bays are to be introduced. If so we will oppose any further additions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22005362 Lauriston Road SW19 4TJ</td>
<td>I support the proposals to convert the permit holder bays to resident permit holder bays, and also accept that it is reasonable to convert the bays outside 4 and 6 Lauriston Road into pay and display. However, I am strongly opposed to the suggestion that further pay and display shared use bays may be introduced in Lauriston Road. I think that after the changes above are introduced there will be sufficient shared-use pay and display bays. Moreover to introduce such a general suggestion when all other details are close to agreement would call into question the whole proposal, which may have been inadvertently made. I do support the proposed double yellow lines along the Ridgway where it intersects with the side roads.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Officer’s comments:**

It is believed that the combination of all the approved and proposed changes will assist the local community. With VC business permit holders distributed throughout the various zones and restricted to shared use bays it is unlikely that any particular zone would become saturated. As with any implemented measure, the situation will be monitored and will form part of the future review. Where possible any difficulties will be addressed accordingly.

It is considered that there is provision for additional parking bays in Lauriston Road, which will not be pursued at this moment in time. Following the future review, however, there may be cause to reconsider this at that time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22005360 Marryat Road SW19 5BD</td>
<td>I appreciate you writing to me in response to my representations concerning the review. I didn’t mention in my letter that the unrestricted parking in the evening outside Boleyn Lodge in the evening and on Sundays causes obstruction whilst exiting the car park. Might you be prepared to put in double yellow lines as part of the 9 month review process, when longer experience of the impact will be available? This request will be investigated however it should be noted that the crossover is very close to another crossover and the other resident must also support this request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22005373 Lauriston Road SW19 4TQ</td>
<td>As a resident of Lauriston Road, I will not object to the proposals provided that if the bays outside No. 4 and 6 are converted to shared-use, then all the bays are converted to resident permit holder only. When the scheme is reviewed after 9 months, and if it is proved that the bays are difficult for me, the bays will be converted back to pay and display. Apart from the bays outside nos. 4 and 6, no other new pay and display bays are introduced in the road. Businesses, in the context of Vos, mean only businesses in the Village and the North side of the Ridgway. Our visitors may use resident permit holder bays. It has already been approved for the bays in Lauriston Road to be converted to resident only bays. Once implemented the measures will be monitored and the appropriate action will be taken 9 months after implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22005445 Lingfield Rd SW19 4PZ</td>
<td>It seems that the initial requests for parking in this road have now been met. All efforts by the Council on residents’ behalf are very much appreciated as is the cooperation shown by residents in adjoining roads. The proposed parking plans in this area will now be more acceptable to the residents. The 2 hours in pay and display bays is particularly crucial to the versatility and availability of parking Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for residents but wonder if the 60 pence per hour is sufficient?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wimbledon Village Review
Representations against the Formal Proposals - February 2006

APPENDIX 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Observations of Director of Environment and Regeneration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22005358 The Grange SW19</td>
<td>I continue to be suspicious that the business community is being favoured over residents. They are not affected by the traffic, noise and pollution. They are also opening at later hours. I have also noticed quantities of litter disposed by non-residents who park here.</td>
<td>The objective of the proposed measures is to ensure the most effective use of available space. This will in turn assist the residents and businesses. Every effort has been made to accommodate the residents by giving residents with parking difficulties priority over the available parking bays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22005427 Grange Residents' Association</td>
<td>With regards to the additional shared-use bays being introduced in The Grange, I wish to object to the proposal of putting one outside no. 26 by the big tree. My reason for objecting is that it would make existing from no. 2 very difficult and dangerous. It would also make it more difficult to exit no. 26. <em>(It must be noted that the actual location of the proposed bay is outside No. 25 The Grange and not outside No. 26 as stated in their letter)</em></td>
<td>It is not considered that the proposed bay would cause obstruction/difficulties. The situation, however, will be monitored and the appropriate action, if any, will be taken at that time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wimbledon Village Review
Representations supporting the approved measures

APPENDIX 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22005329 Courthope Road SW19 7RD</td>
<td>We strongly support the plan that parking in Courthope Road is for residents only. As one of the nearest roads to the Village, our road is often taken up by business permit holders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22005332 Grosvenor Hill SW19 4RS</td>
<td>I support the proposals outlined for zone VC resident permit holders subject to the following. Resident parking bays are relabelled ‘residents permit holders only, at all times. Currently non-permit holders park in these bays after 6.30pm and on Sundays. In Grosvenor Hill the pay and display only bays are reading meters as ‘pay and display/residents permit holders shared-use. In this road, 30% of residents parking has been suspended for use by construction companies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Officer’s comments:
It is considered that the previously agreed measures and the new proposed measures will primarily assist VC resident permit holders as well as visitors. However, it should be noted that the hours of operation is not subject to change and therefore non-permit holders can park after 6.30pm and on Sundays.

Wimbledon Village Review
Representations against the approved measures

APPENDIX 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 22005322 Business Church Road SW19 5DQ | It is ironic that Merton’s slogan is ‘a great place to live, work and learn’ but as it appears the Council is determined to sabotage any chance of working in Wimbledon Village. It is no secret that shops are closing on a daily basis due to the downturn of the High Street. Here in the Village we have the added problem of increased rates, limited transport and no car parks. Since the introduction of Permit holder bays we have seen a decline in business with customers complaining that they simply cannot park. It would appear that although the majority of respondents to the consultation in September 2005 opted for no change, the committee were mostly going to go ahead anyway, which was a pointless and expensive consultation and a mockery of democracy. The rapid demise of the Village will soon become as bland as Wimbledon Town Centre. You also spoke to resident in Church Road who informed me that delivery vehicles to our shops could park on double yellow lines. I always thought that this was a parking offence, and would be grateful if we can have this in writing, as the parking wardens are extremely
| 22005371 | Business  
| Church Road  
| SW19 5DW | I am an employee at this business and also a resident in the Village and have a zone Vot permit. I wish to pass my disapproval of the report that went to committee on 11 January 06 concerning the following issues: 

The conversion of all the zone VC permit bays to residents’ bays, which will cease business user parking, seems entirely inappropriate. The use of our cars is entirely paramount to the nature of our business. We also encourage and introduce people to live in the Village and help towards to the economy. Yes there a more cars than spaces, but we all require an equal opportunity to park and we all know the situation regarding parking. Replacing single yellow lines with double yellow lines are an eyesore and are physically unsightly, giving the impression of further restrictions. They are totally restrictive as is their purpose and should not be installed without a valid reason. It is all well trying to create a smoother flow of traffic, but if people can’t park, how can the Village thrive. The introduction of double yellow lines along Church Road, which I imagine is due to parking affecting the controversial bus lane, should never have been approved. Visitors will need places to park, and businesses will be dreadfully affected. 

I am against the introduction of double yellow lines at the junction on Ridgway, unless it is proven that parking cars are causing accidents. I use Ridgeway day and night, week and weekend and although parked cars can slow the traffic flow, I believe we must accept this as a result of a thriving Village. Allowing Business permit holders to park in zones VN, Von and Vos, will surely cause future problems with residents in these zones. The traffic restrictions implemented at the bottom of Wimbledon Hill over the last couple of years have merely shifted the congestion problem elsewhere. Also bear in mind that the majority of businesses do not park in the Village at night, and that the many residents will not park in the Village during the day. To allow VC residents’ permits to only park in their respective parts of the High Street, we must recognise the importance of addressing these matters by sensible means and not making parking more difficult than it already is. We also need to ensure that visitors are encouraged to the Village and are not frightened away by yet further restrictions. I would also like to point out this business sponsors events in the Village each year, because we believe that it is beneficial to the local community, rather than generating more business. I don’t actually believe that our business benefits financially from this. We all choose to live in London and the car forms a huge part of the modern life and we must realize the negative consequences that this may cause. The Council should not be looking trying to address an almost worldwide war against cars and resulting anti parking issues that the car creates. Motor cars are here to stay and constitute the main form of parking. In my opinion nothing in the formal consultation has been thoroughly thought through but instead people who feel they need to be seen doing something are scratching about for ideas, which they hope will temporarily pacify local residents and antagonise local businesses and justify the taxes we pay. There will always be those who are dissatisfied should these proposals not be actioned, and these tend to be the selfish variety. They need to broaden their minds and realise the repercussions would be disadvantages. |

| 22005361 | Business  
| Church Road  
| SW19 5DX | I run a lettings office in the Village, and I am a holder of a VC business parking permit. I am writing to register my objection with respect to the changes to the VC permit spaces. The ability to park easily around the Village is a huge importance to the running of our business, which involves showing properties, which necessitate us using vehicles on a constant basis. It is of no small importance to note that people choose to live in the Village partly as a result of our work. We act as ambassadors to the residents who have benefited from increased house prices. We have been a proud supporter of various events and it is clear from the support of such events that we feel that the success and prosperity of the Village is linked to our own, and it leaves a bitter taste to find that we are penalised by the local authority for our efforts. I would urge you to reconsider these changes. |

| 22005327 | Belvedere Avenue  
| SW19 7PP | Am I correct in saying that the Resident permit holder bays in Belvedere Avenue will only be at the ends of this 400 yard road as originally planned. If so I think it is unreasonable for the elderly and infirm residents. I am 88 years old and do you expect me to walk 200m to a residents’ bay for which I must pay £45 for a permit? |

| 22005349 | Belvedere Drive  
| SW19 7DG | I note the clear statement in the newsletter that the Council has acknowledged the fact that the majority of those who responded to the consultation opted for no change. One is therefore bound to ask what was the point of undertaking the consultation, if the Council was going to ignore the result. My own principal reason for opting for no change was one of cost. The Council is constantly tinkering with the traffic management in and around Wimbledon Village on a piecemeal approach, at an unwelcome expense. It is also unacceptable that there are further proposed changes to the Wimbledon zones on the
Council’s website, without reference to paper based communication, which is a disadvantage to those without access to the internet. There is nothing in the newsletter that supports the Council’s claim that ‘your views are important’.

22005352
Highbury Road
SW19 7PR

I am writing to express my concern at aspects of the proposed changes in the parking arrangements. Changes to the existing bays near the Village will have the effect of forcing business permit holders or commuters to park further away from the Village, and I estimate that over 90 spaces will be affected. The displaced vehicles will probably park in Highbury Road and Alan Road, which do not have the capacity to absorb the increased parking. I would suggest that the proposals are reconsidered and reduce the changes, so that there is more equitable distribution of business parking throughout all roads. A further possibility would be to reduce the maximum stay from 9 hours to 5 hours in Highbury Road and Alan Road. The proposals unless modified will only have the effects of moving the problem elsewhere.

22005323
The Grange

I can’t believe that the parking bays outside my house and now outside 11 The Grange are going to be pay and display only. The principle of shared use bays has been satisfactory, so why are we moving away from this? If the pay and display bays are removed, we and our visitors will be less likely to be able to find a parking space. If it is necessary to provide further pay and display spaces, they can be introduced along the Grange and other neighbouring roads. In summary we recognise parking is an issue and remain patient with people who block our drive and Sunday congestions due to the Emmanuel Church park.

22005324
The Grange

At present I park outside my house or more often than not opposite. Making the parking bays opposite to pay and display only will make life difficult for residents. My property is split into four flats with at least four cars parked outside, which fully utilise the existing bays. If the parking opposite is not permitted for residents then we have to park further away from where we live. In our house alone we have a neighbour with a severe heart condition, and I have three small boys, which I have to bring in and out of the house. We have elderly parents who come and visit and need to be able to park outside. We pay for our residents’ permits to park outside our house. Allowing business permit holders to park in our bays makes it even worse as these are the first choice for them. Please keep it shared use opposite my house giving us more flexibility, and why not give the shoppers more pay and display further down the road. Our road gets busy with a lot of children and elderly persons and we need to put safety into this to park nearer to our homes.

22005334
The Grange

What is the point of holding consultations, which resulted in the majority opting for no change, and then ignoring this on certain points? With regards to the proposals to provide pay and display only bays outside No. 11 The Grange, this will restrict the residents from parking, and should be made ‘pay and display, shared-use’. How many business permits have been issued for zone Vos. Whilst writing there is lack of disabled persons parking bays in the High Street near to the Village surgery at No. 35a, which could replace the existing taxi bays that seem to be under utilised.

22005351
Ridgeway
SW19 4QW

Firstly I did not receive any information regarding a formal consultation carried out in September 2005. I would like to know how and in what form this consultation was carried out, and why I did not receive anything. Although there was a majority response for no change, changes are being made, the main one to which I object strongly, being the conversion of the pay and display, shared-use in The Grange to pay and display only. These appear to be the only such bays to be proposed in the zone and means that I will not be able to park outside my house, which seems unfair. I however would not object to shared-use bays and the do support the replacement of the single yellow lines to double yellow lines, although it will put extra strain on parking, with obstruction to my gated entrance.

22005333
Parkside
SW19 5NB

I am confused after reading the newsletter and had no idea where I could or couldn’t park in Wimbledon, because the map doesn’t really say. I have noticed that in spite of the majority view expressed by residents, the Council decided to do what they want anyway. Can I suggest that fulfilling your obligations to central government by asking residents their views, is not enough, acting on them is a democratic process. The parking policies in Wimbledon are strangling the Village atmosphere making it too difficult and uneconomic for the average wage earner and families to go shopping. Every week we go through the process of being unable to park and do not contribute to the local economy. An incredibly simple way to resolve the parking situation is to provide space and save the Council money at the same time. If possible can you tell me how much the Council makes in revenue over the year, and what is the proposed parking income? In summary I remain patient with people who block our drive.

22005350

I fail to understand how the Council wishes to change the parking facilities within the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Durham Road</th>
<th>Village, when the majority of those who responded to the consultation opted for no change. May I ask, what was the point of the consultation? Is it to spend more Council tax? I only hope that enough residents formally complain to stop yet another unnecessary change to the parking facilities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officer’s comments:</td>
<td>These representations are against the measures that have already been subject to a previous consultation and their implementation was approved by Committee in January 2006. Controlled parking zone reviews are carried out to make sure the implemented measures meet the objectives of a CPZ and that the current parking demands and needs are balanced appropriately. It is also a means to ensure that the available parking spaces are used more efficiently and effectively. It is also a way of updating the restrictions to address any changes in traffic and parking patterns. The questions that were asked during the informal consultation were about merging the zones (zone boundaries) and the residents opted for status quo. Therefore zone VC will not be split into two zones along the High Street nor any zones be merged. But there was support in the comment section that VC residents be allowed to park in the other zones. Over the years there have been two concessions in place. VC permit holders have been able to park in zones VO and VOs. In January 2006 it was agreed to formalise these concessions and to include another zone, VN, within the concessions. This will distribute the number of VC permit holders through out other zones and prevent the saturation of any particular zone. Throughout the consultation process the resident and business associations were involved and where possible their input has been incorporated. A number of residents volunteered to form a core group to have an input on the consultation leaflet to reflect issues affecting residents. Representatives from the Business Association have stated that businesses would like economic and residential sustainability in Wimbledon Village. A mixture of short-term (1-4 hours) parking should be provided to meet the needs of different types of visitor to the Village. Business staff should be encouraged to park further away to allow customers and residents to park closer to the Village centre. It was/is considered important that employees and business permit holders do not saturate pay &amp; display bays, as this will discourage visitors and, subsequently, compromise the commercial viability of Wimbledon Village. The Grade - discussions with the Residents’ Association were held in order to reach a balance in terms of parking provisions to cater for the needs of the residents and businesses. It was agreed that the pay and display shared bays in The Grade near its junction with Ridgway and a permit bay outside no. 11 The Grade could be converted to pay and display only with a 2 hours maximum stay. This would be long enough for customers to visit the businesses in the area whilst maintaining a turnover of vehicles. Those who may wish to stay longer than 2 hours can use the pay and display bays along Southside Common and in The Grade, Lauriston Road, Murray Road north, at their junctions with Southside Common, which operate for 5 and 10 hours. It should also be noted that those who have objected have off street parking facilities. Over the years there has been an increase in demand for parking and consequently after the operational hours of the waiting restrictions parking has been taking place at junctions and along narrow sections of roads causing obstruction to other road users; compromising access and general safety and in case of Church Road overriding on the footway particularly by buses and other larger vehicles. The approved double yellow line restrictions will ensure clear sightlines and access at all times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer’s comments:</td>
<td>The Grade - discussions with the Residents’ Association were held in order to reach a balance in terms of parking provisions to cater for the needs of the residents and businesses. It was agreed that the pay and display shared bays in The Grade near its junction with Ridgway and a permit bay outside no. 11 The Grade could be converted to pay and display only with a 2 hours maximum stay. This would be long enough for customers to visit the businesses in the area whilst maintaining a turnover of vehicles. Those who may wish to stay longer than 2 hours can use the pay and display bays along Southside Common and in The Grade, Lauriston Road, Murray Road north, at their junctions with Southside Common, which operate for 5 and 10 hours. It should also be noted that those who have objected have off street parking facilities. Over the years there has been an increase in demand for parking and consequently after the operational hours of the waiting restrictions parking has been taking place at junctions and along narrow sections of roads causing obstruction to other road users; compromising access and general safety and in case of Church Road overriding on the footway particularly by buses and other larger vehicles. The approved double yellow line restrictions will ensure clear sightlines and access at all times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22005428, High Street, SW19 5AY</td>
<td>Representation against the part of the proposals, that 6 new parking bays on High Street be Pay and display only, rather than shared-use or resident only. I write on behalf of Parkside House Residents Association. The newsletter within the body of its text does not refer to the designation of the 6 bays in question. However the map evidences that there is designated pay and display bays. It is a reasonable assumption that the Cabinet Street Management Committee meeting were never made aware of the Parkside House Residents Association’s objection to the proposed designation or that these were any objection whatsoever. I further bring to your attention that a Council officer replied to me on 28 November responding to the to my letter dated 4 Nov 05. However this reply purposely either avoided either addressing the required issues, or provided inadequate or unsatisfactory explanation. Although the response stated ‘ All those who make representations will be advised the time and date of the Cabinet meeting. Either myself, or any member of the Parkside Residents Association were informed of the date of the Committee, and thus denied the opportunity of attending. Kindly provide an explanation for this failure, and lack of proper response to my 4 November 05 letter. Also inform me wether one has a right to attend the Cabinet Management Committee Meeting on 29 March 2006. The further grounds of objection, over and above those already mentioned are: No explanation has been given why commercial interests were only considered. No explanation why the designation of the bays on 5 Sept 05 were shelved in favour of those designated on 1 Sept 05. Parkside Residents Association was denied the opportunity to attend the Cabinet meeting on 11 Jan 06. It is clear that the Traffic and Parking section has employed a deliberate tactic of deciding at the onset that the 6 bays in question will should be pay and display only, and ignoring the residents. The designation directly contradicts what is both reasonably and fairly required. Lastly it was proposed by your office some time ago that the 3 resident only bays would be established on Marryat Road, opposite the present pay and display bays, near the junction with High Street. There is no reference of these bays within the 26 Jan 06 newsletter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer’s comments:</td>
<td>The 6 parking bays proposed for the High Street are part of a different scheme and did not from part of this formal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
consultation. These bays are subject to a different formal consultation, which has not concluded yet. These comments will be addressed in a different report. With regards to the additional bays in Marryat Road, these bays were approved in January 2006 and will be implemented in conjunction with measures proposed in February 2006, subject to Committee approval.

Letter from Metropolitan Police

Your reference: ES/SM/SGE
Our reference: V8
Date: 15 February 2006

Street Management
London Borough of Merton
Merton Civic Centre
London Road
Morden
Surrey
SM4 5DX

LONDON BOROUGH OF MERTON

20 FEB 2006

Metropolitan Police Service

Merton Traffic Garage
Traffic Management Unit
15 Deer Park Road,
Merton,
SW19 3YX

Tel: 020 8247
Fax: 020 8247
Email: www.met.police.uk

Dear Sir,

THE LONDON BOROUGH OF MERTON (CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE)(VILLAGE)TRAFFIC ORDER 200X

I am writing in reply to your letter, with enclosures, dated 2 February 2006

Police have no observations to make provided that the scheme will be correctly signed and the orders properly made using appropriate legislation.

May we please be supplied with 1 copy of the made order in due course.

Yours faithfully,

Traffic Management Unit
to the Cabinet Committee.

Please note that there are also other changes that have been agreed and that further consultation is to be undertaken in the other zones. To view all the agreed and proposed changes for all Wimbledon Village zones please refer to the Council’s web site www.merton.gov.uk/villagereview

What happens next?
The Council is now undertaking formal consultation to implement the aforementioned proposed changes. It is proposed to report the outcome of this formal consultation to the Cabinet Street Management Committee on 29th March 2006 for a decision whether or not to implement the proposals.

An advert for the Traffic Management Order will be placed in the local newspapers and posted on lamp columns in the area. We urge anyone who is either in favour or against the proposals to make representations in support of the

The Head of Traffic & Parking Section, Merton Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, Surrey, SM4 SDX by no later than 24th February 2006, quoting reference ES/SGE/Village Review.

A copy of the notice, a plan identifying the area affected, and the Council’s Statement of Reasons can be inspected at Merton Link in Merton Civic Centre and Wimbledon Reference Library.

Please note that no response will be made to representations until a decision is made by the Committee. Anyone who opposes the scheme must state the grounds on which their objection is made. We also welcome representations in support of the proposals.

We would like to thank you for your participation in the consultation process and for your feedback thus far. Please let us know your views, they are important and will have a bearing upon the decision made.

If you require any further information, you may contact Mr Paul Atie on telephone number 020 8545 4869 or e-mail to paul.atie@merton.gov.uk. Alternatively you can obtain further information and view the proposals on our web site www.merton.gov.uk/villagereview

---

**Newsletter ~ Wimbledon Village Review Zone VC**

**Merton - a great place to live, work and learn**

Dear Resident/Business

The purpose of this newsletter is to inform you of the outcome of the formal consultation carried out in September 2005 on the review of Wimbledon Village controlled parking zones and the decision made by the Cabinet Street Management Committee.

A report was presented to the Council’s Cabinet Street Management Committee meeting on the 11 January 2006 where the following were approved:

- to convert all permit holder bays in zone VC to resident permit holder bays only (business permit holders will not be allowed to park in these bays);
- to adjust zones VO1 and VC so that the ‘The Green’ is included in zone VC;
- to replace the existing single yellow lines with double yellow lines for a minimum of 10 metres at all the junctions in all the Wimbledon Village zones;
- to introduce double yellow lines along Church Road within the existing controlled parking zones;
- to introduce 10m of double yellow line junction protection on Ridgway at its junctions with Lingfield Road, the Grange and Murray Road (single yellow lines within these junctions will be retained) and to replace existing single yellow lines with double yellow line restrictions along Ridgway from its junction with Murray Road to outside No. 54a Ridgway;
- to allow business permit holders to park in pay and display shared use bays and permit holder bays in zones VN, VO1 and VO2;
- to allow Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) VC resident permit holders who live south of the High Street to park in zones VO1 and those who live north of the High Street to park in zones VO2 and VN.

The Council has acknowledged the fact that the majority of those who responded to the consultation opted for no change. However, taking into consideration the need to provide residents with greater security, it was agreed for zone VC permit holders to be allowed to continue the current practice and park in zones VO1, VO2 and additionally be able to park in zone VN. Those factors that were considered include:

- within the comments section of the prepaid reply card many residents commented that zone VC permit holders should be allowed to park within their zone.
- zone VC can not function properly without the help of the other zones.
- since 1999 zone VC permit holders have been allowed to park in zone VO1.
- since 2004 there has been an Experimental Traffic Management Order to allow zone VC permit holders to park in zone VO1.
- there are no records to indicate that this arrangement has caused any inconvenience to the residents VO1 and VO2.

Before the above measures can be implemented it would be necessary for the following proposals to be put in place in your zone. It was, therefore, also agreed that a formal consultation be undertaken to convert existing pay and display permit holder shared use bays in Lingfield Road and The Green to pay and display/resident permit holder shared use bays.

It was also agreed that the scheme is reviewed in 9 months time and a further report presented
Newsletter ~ Wimbledon Village Review Zone VOn

Merton - a great place to live, work and learn

Dear Resident/Business,

The purpose of this newsletter is to inform you of the outcome of the formal consultation carried out in September 2005 on the review of Wimbledon Village controlled parking zones and the decision made by the Cabinet Street Management Committee.

A report was presented to the Council's Cabinet Street Management Committee meeting on the 11th January 2006 where the following were approved:

- to convert all permit holder bays in zone VC to resident permit holder bays only (business permit holders will not be allowed to park in these bays);
- to replace the existing single yellow lines with double yellow lines for a minimum of 10 metres at all the junctions in all the Wimbledon Village zones;
- to introduce double yellow lines along Church Road within the existing controlled parking zones;
- to allow business permit holders to park in pay and display shared use bays and permit holder bays in zones VN, VOn and VOs;
- to convert permit holder bays in Clement Road, Old House Close, Lancaster Road and Belvedere Avenue to resident permit holders only;
- to reduce the maximum stay from 9 hours to 5 hours in pay and display shared use bays in Belvedere Avenue between its junction with Church Road and Belvedere Grove;
- to allow business permit holders to park on pay and display shared use bays and permit holder bays in the zones VN, VOn and VOs;
- to allow Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) VC resident permit holders who live south of High Street to park in zones VOs and those who live north of High Street to park in zones VOn and VN.

The Council has acknowledged the fact that the majority of those who responded to the consultation opted for no change. However, taking a number of factors into consideration, it was agreed for zone VC permit holders to be allowed to continue the current practice and park in zone VOn, VOs and additionally be able to park in zone VN. Those factors that were considered include:

- within the comments section of the prepaid reply card many residents commented that zone VC permit holders should be allowed to park within their zone;
- zone VN can not function properly without the help of the other zones;
- since 1999 zone VC permit holders have been allowed to park in zone VOn;
- since 2004 there has been an Experimental Traffic Management Order to allow zone VC permit holders to park in zone VO;
- there is no record of any arrangement that has been made any inconvenience to the zones VOn and VOs.

It was also agreed that the scheme is reviewed in 9 months time and a further report presented to Cabinet.

Before the above measures can be implemented it would be necessary for the following proposed changes to also be put in place in your zone. It was, therefore, also agreed that a formal consultation be undertaken to:

- convert pay and display shared bays in Belvedere Grove outside Nos. 16/18 and Nos. 23/25 to resident permit holder bays only and reduce the maximum stay from 9 hours to 5 hours in pay and display shared use bays in Belvedere Grove at its junction with Belvedere Avenue.

Please note that there are also other changes that have been agreed and further consultation to be undertaken in other zones. To view all the agreed and proposed changes for all Wimbledon Village zones please refer to the council's web site www.merton.gov.uk/villagereview.
It was also agreed that the scheme is reviewed in 9 months time and a further report presented to the Cabinet Committee.

Please note that there are also other changes that have been agreed and that further consultation is to be undertaken in the other zones. To view all the agreed and proposed changes for all Wimbledon Village zones please refer to the Council’s web site www.merton.gov.uk/villagereview

What happens next?

The Council is now undertaking formal consultation to implement the aforementioned proposed changes. It is proposed to report the outcome of this formal consultation to the Cabinet Street Management Committee on 29th March 2006 for a decision whether or not to implement the proposals.

An advert for the Traffic Management Order will be placed in the local newspapers and posted on lamp columns in the area. We urge anyone who is either in favour or against the proposals to make representations in writing to:

The Head of Traffic & Parking Section, Merton Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, Surrey, SM4 SDX by no later than 24th February 2006 quoting reference ES/SGE/Village Review.

A copy of the notice, a plan identifying the area affected, and the Council’s Statement of Reasons can be inspected at Merton Link in Merton Civic Centre and Wimbledon Reference Library.

Please note that no response will be made to representations until a decision is made by the Committee. Anyone who opposes the scheme must state the grounds on which their objection is made. We also welcome representations in support of the proposals.

We would like to thank you for your participation in the consultation process and for your feedback thus far. Please let us have your views, they are important and will have a bearing upon the decision made.

If you require any further information, you may contact Mr Paul Atie on telephone number 020 8545 4869 or e-mail to paul.atie@merton.gov.uk. Alternatively you can obtain further information and view the proposals on our web site www.merton.gov.uk/villagereview

Dear Resident/Business

The purpose of this newsletter is to inform you of the outcome of the formal consultation carried out in September 2005 on the review of Wimbledon Village controlled parking zones and the decision made by the Cabinet Street Management Committee.

A report was presented to the Council’s Cabinet Street Management Committee meeting on the 11th January 2006 where the following were approved:

- to convert pay and display shared use bays in The Grange at its junction with Ridgeway to pay and display only bays;
- to replace the existing single yellow lines with double yellow lines for a minimum of 10 metres at all the junctions in all the Wimbledon Village zones;
- to introduce 10m of double yellow line junction protection on Ridgeway at its junctions with Lingfield Road, The Grange and Murray Road (single yellow lines within these junctions will be retained) and to replace existing single yellow lines with double yellow line restrictions along Ridgeway from its junction with Murray Road to outside No. 54a Ridgeway;
- to allow business permit holders to park in pay and display shared use bays and pay permit holder bays in zones VN, VON and VOS;
- to allow Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) VC resident permit holders who live south of the High Street to park in zones VOS and those who live north of the High Street to park in zones VON and VN.

The Council has acknowledged the fact that the majority of those who responded to the consultation opted for no change. However, taking a number of factors into consideration, it was agreed for zone VC permit holders to be allowed to continue the current practice and park in zones VON, VOS and additionally be able to park in zone VN. Those factors that were considered include:

- within the comments section of the prepaid reply card many residents commented that zone VC permit holders should be allowed to park within their zone.
- zone VC can not function properly without the help of the other zones.
- since 1999 zone VC permit holders have been allowed to park in zone VON.
- since 2004 there has been an Experimental Traffic Management Order to allow zone VC permit holders to park in zone VOS.
- there are no records to indicate that this arrangement has caused any inconvenience to the zones VON and VOS.

For the above measures to be implemented it would be necessary for the following proposed measures to be put in place. It was therefore agreed that a formal consultation be undertaken to:

- convert permit holder bays in The Grange, Lauriston Road, Wilberforce Way and Murray Road (except for those permit holder bays 0/5 No’s 68/70 Murray Road) to resident permit holder bays only;
- convert permit holder bays outside No. 2 The Grange and Nos 4/6 Lauriston Road to pay and display shared use bays;
- introduce additional pay and display shared use bays in Lauriston Road and The Grange.
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