Committee: Advisory Street Management
Date: 4th September 2007

Agenda item: Wards: Trinity and Wimbledon Park
Subject: 3E and 3F Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) Review - Outcome of Formal Consultation
Lead officer: Lyn Carpenter, Director of Environment & Regeneration
Lead member: Councillor Tariq Ahmad
Key decision reference number: N/A

Recommendations:

That the Committee considers the issues detailed in this report and recommends that the Cabinet Member:

1) Notes the outcome of the formal consultation carried out between 28th June and 20th July 2007, on the proposed measures to help improve the operation of 3E and 3F controlled parking zones (CPZs) for its residents, businesses and their visitors as part of an overall CPZ review.

2) Notes the summary of representations received and officers’ comments as shown in Appendix 3 and summarised in section 3 of this report.

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

4) Agrees to proceed with the making of the Traffic Management Orders (TMOs) for the implementation of the following proposed measures in zones 3E & 3F, as shown on the original drawing nos. Z78/136/01 (Sheet 1 & 2) Revision B; and Z78/137/01 Revision A, (on display) and in Appendices 1 and 2 respectively:

   a. To amend the zone boundary to include property no. 170 Haydon’s Road in zone 3E instead of 3F.

   b. To change the operation of the existing pay and display part time shared use bays in Ashley Road, Birkbeck Road, Edith Road and Faraday, to allow permit holders to park during the CPZ controlled times.

   c. To convert the existing pay and display part time shared use bays in Effra Road outside property nos. 135 to 143 (odd numbers) to Resident permit holders only.

   d. To introduce two pay and display shared use bays in Edith Road outside property no. 14 Edith Road.

   e. To Introduce double yellow line (no waiting at any time) restrictions, at a minimum of 6 metres, to replace the existing single yellow line restrictions at junctions in Florence Road, York Road, Clarence Road, Ashley Road, Effra Road, Edith Road, Evelyn Road, Faraday Road, Birbeck Road, Queens Road, Craven Gardens, Ashcombe Road, Bridges Road, Latimer Road, Ridley Road, Merton Road, South park Road, Sunlight Close and Wycliffe Road.

   f. To introduce double yellow line (no waiting at any time) restrictions to replace existing single yellow lines at vehicle passing places in certain roads in the
vicinity of property nos; 28 to 30 and 144 to 150 Florence Road; 117 to 121 Clarence Road; 71 to 77 Effra Road; 30 to 32 and 102 to 106 Faraday Road; 22 to 26 Craven Gardens; 25 to 29 Ridley Road; 20 to 22 Latimer Road; Nairn Court, 72 to 78 South Park Road and 146 to 150 South Park Road.

g. To introduce double yellow line (no waiting at any time) restrictions to replace the existing single yellow line restrictions at the end of the Cul-de-sacs in Anchorage Road, Albany Road and Sunlight Close.

h. To introduce double yellow line (no waiting at any time) restrictions to replace the existing single yellow line at the entrance to the Shree Temple in Effra Road.

i. To add, extend or shorten existing parking bays at certain locations in Florence Road, Ashley Road, Clarence Road, York Road, Edith Road, Effra Road, Birbeck Road, Faraday Road, Queens Road, Evelyn Road, Craven Gardens, Haydon Park Road, Latimer Road, Ridley Road, Wycliffe Road and South Park Road.

j. To make the necessary minor amendments in response to specific requests from individual residents during the consultation. (Details are shown on plans).

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

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 This report presents the outcome of the formal consultation carried out with the residents and businesses within in zones 3E and 3F regarding the Council’s proposals to change certain aspects of the CPZs as part of the overall review.

1.2 This report recommends that the representations received, as summarised in Appendix 3, are considered and approval is sought to make and publish the relevant TMOs for implementation of the proposed measures.

2. DETAILS

2.1 The policy of Merton Council is to improve the environment by regulating the number of parked vehicles in the area and to increase safety for both motorists and pedestrians. The key objectives of these proposals is to improve the existing parking controls in the said road to help reduce and control non-essential parking in order to assist its residents, their short-term visitors, local businesses and to improve safety and access 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 effective Controlled Parking restrictions.
2.2 Controlled parking zones, aim to provide safe parking arrangements, whilst giving residents and businesses priority access to available kerbside parking space. It is a way of controlling the parking whilst improving and maintaining access and safety for all road users. A CPZ comprises of yellow line waiting restrictions and various types of parking bays operational during the control times. These types of bays include the following:

2.3 **Permit holder bays**: - For use by resident permit holders, business permit holders and those with visitor permits.

**Residents only**: - for the use by resident permit holders only.

**Pay and display shared use/permit holder bays**: - For use by pay and display customers and permit holders.

**Pay and display only bays**: - For use by pay and display customers only (permits are not valid)

2.4 A CPZ also includes double yellow line (no waiting at any time) restrictions at key locations such as at junctions, bends and along certain lengths of roads where parking impedes the flow of traffic or would create an unacceptable safety risk e.g. obstructive sightlines or safe pedestrian crossing.

2.5 Within any proposed CPZ or review the Council aims to reach a balance between the needs of the residents, businesses, visitors and all other users of the highway. It is normal practice to introduce appropriate measures if and when there is a sufficient majority of support or there is an overriding need to ensure access and safety. In addition the Council would also take into account the impact of introducing the proposed changes in assessing the extent of those controls and whether or not they should be implemented.

2.6 In 1996 zone 3F was introduced in the roads to the east of the existing zones W3 and W4 to include part of South Park Road, Wycliffe Road, Bridges Road and Latimer Road. The zone was introduced to assist residents who were affected by commuters and those displaced from the neighbouring CPZs surrounding Wimbledon Town Centre and the train station.

2.7 Following the implementation of zone 3F in 1996, the residents of the roads north of South Park Road, petitioned the Council for a CPZ. Following a series of consultations these roads were included in a CPZ designated as zone 3E.

2.8 Since the introduction of zones 3E and 3F there have been minor amendments to the zones with the gradual inclusion of additional roads, to assist the local residents and business with their particular parking requirements.

2.9 In order to ensure that the parking zones are effective, meet the demands/expectations of the local community and to address any safety/access issues, the Council periodically undertakes reviews of CPZs introduced throughout the borough.

2.10 In July 2006 the residents’ associations in both zones were invited to a meeting with the project engineer to seek their views / concerns regarding the operation of the zones and the proposed changes. In August 2006, Officers met with the local Ward Councillors for Wimbledon Park and Trinity Wards to discuss the officers’ intentions and to agree a set of proposed measures and optional changes for consultation with residents and businesses in zones 3E and 3F. Below is an overview map of these and the neighbouring zones.
2.11 It was agreed by all stakeholders to proceed with the informal consultation on the following proposed measures and optional changes for each zone as listed below:

**Zone 3E – Proposed Changes**

- To alter the existing zone boundary for zones 3E and 3F to include property no. 170 Haydon’s Road in zone 3E instead of 3F. This is due to the new permit holder parking bays (that are being implemented at the time of writing this report). For No 170 Haydon’s Road to utilise these bays immediately outside its premises it would be necessary for this property to be in Zone 3E.

- To change the operation of the existing pay and display part time shared use/permit holders bays in Ashley Road, Birkbeck Road, Edith Road and Faraday Road (zone 3E) to allow permit holders to park during the whole of the CPZ controlled times.

- To convert the existing pay and display part time shared/permit holder bays in Effra Road outside property nos. 135 to 143 (odd numbers), to Resident permit holders only.

- To introduce two pay and display shared use/permit holder bays in Edith outside property no. 14.

- Where appropriate to provide additional parking bays without compromising safety and access.

- To introduce double yellow line (no waiting at any time) restrictions to replace existing single yellow lines at junctions, cul-de-sacs, bends and passing places.
To review the 3E zone boundary which is made up of Albany Road, Avondale Road, Cromwell Road, Haydon Park Road and part of Ashcombe Road as a separate zone (3H), operational Mondays to Saturdays, between 8.30am and 6.30pm.

**Zone 3E - Optional Changes**
- To change the operational hours to either 10am to 4pm or 8.30am to 8pm
- To change the operational hours to one-hour only, either between 10am to 11am or 3pm to 4pm.
- To introduce additional controls on Sundays, operational between; 10am to 11am; 3pm to 4pm; 10am to 4pm or 10am to 8pm.

**Zone 3F – Proposed Changes**
- To revise the existing boundary for zones 3E and 3F to transfer property no. 170 Haydon’s Road from zone 3F to 3E.
- Where appropriate, to provide additional parking bays.
- To replace existing single yellow lines at junctions, cul-de-sacs, bends and passing places with double yellow line (no waiting at any time) restrictions.

**Zone 3F - Optional Changes**
- To change the operational hours to either 10am to 4pm or 8.30am to 8pm
- To change the operational hours to one-hour only, either between 10am to 11am or 3pm to 4pm.
- To introduce additional controls on Sundays, operational between; 10am to 11am; 3pm to 4pm; 10am to 4pm or 10am to 8pm.

2.12 This consultation was carried out between 20\textsuperscript{th} October and 17\textsuperscript{th} November 2006 with consultation packs, as shown in Appendix 7 & 8, delivered to all the properties and businesses within the two zones. As part of the consultation exercise, the public was also invited to speak to officers at the exhibitions held at the Holy Trinity Church in The Broadway, on 8\textsuperscript{th}, 9\textsuperscript{th} and 11\textsuperscript{th} November 2006. A local Councillor for the area was also present for part of the day on Saturday 11\textsuperscript{th}. In total approximately 20 people visited.

2.13 The consultation included 1822 properties in zone 3E and approximately 530 in zone 3F. A total of 366 questionnaires were received from zone 3E and 121 from zone 3F. That represented an overall response rate of 20.1% and 22.8% respectively. For the full details of the results of the questionnaire, see Appendices 9 & 10. Table 1 below shows a summary of the responses for each zone.

(Table 1 – Breakdown of response by zone)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Properties Consulted</th>
<th>No. of Properties Which Responded</th>
<th>Response Rate %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3E</td>
<td>1822</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3F</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2352</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.14 Table 2 below is a part summary of the results of the main questions asked for each zone.

(Table 2 – Part summary of results)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions 2, 3, 5, 7 &amp; 9</th>
<th>Zone 3E %</th>
<th>Zone 3F %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes %</td>
<td>No %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2. Are you satisfied with operation of the CPZ?</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3. Do you feel the hours need to be changed?</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5. Do you support a one-hour CPZ?</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7. Do you feel that controls on Sundays are required?</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>82.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9. Do you support the proposed separate zone 3H?</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.15 With all the optional proposed changes, the majority of respondents from each zone seemed satisfied with the current operation and preferred the status quo. The results of that informal consultation were presented in a report to the Street Management Advisory Committee meeting and the Cabinet Member on 16th April 2007.

2.16 It was recommended by officers and agreed by the Cabinet Member to undertake a formal consultation, as detailed in section 3 of this report, on the following revised proposals and additional alterations. The proposed measures took into account the majority view expressed by the residents and businesses during the informal consultation:

- To alter the existing zone boundary between zones 3E and 3F to include property no. 170 Haydons Road in zone 3E instead of 3F.
- To change the operation of the existing part time shared use bays in Ashley Road, Birkbeck Road, Edith Road and Faraday in zone 3E to allow permit holders to park at all times during the controlled times.
- Retain the three existing pay and display part time shared use bays in Effra Road outside the Shree Temple, and the three pay and display part time shared use bays on the opposite side nearest to the junction with Haydon's Road.
- Introduce double yellow line (no waiting at any time) restrictions to replace existing single yellow line at the entrance to the Shree Temple in Effra Road.
- To convert the existing part time shared use bays in Effra Road outside property nos. 135 to 143 (odd numbers), to Resident permit holders only.
- To introduce two new shared use bays in Edith Road outside property no. 14.
- To add additional parking bays / extend existing parking places, where appropriate. For details see drawing nos. Z78/136/01 Revision B and Z78/137/01 revision A (on display).
• To introduce double yellow line (no waiting at any time) restrictions to replace existing single yellow line restriction at most junctions, cul-de-sacs, and bends. (For specific locations see drawings in Appendices 1 and 2)

• To introduce double yellow line (no waiting at any time) restrictions to replace existing single yellow lines at passing places in zone in the vicinity of property nos. 28 to 30 and 117 to 121 Florence Road; 144 to 150 Clarence Road; 71 to 77 Effra Road; 30 to 32 and 102 to 106 Faraday Road; 22 to 26 Craven Gardens; 25 to 29 Ridley Road; 20 to 22 Latimer Road; Nairn Court; 72 to 78 and 146 to 150 South Park Road.

• To make the necessary minor amendments in response to requests from residents during the consultation process. These minor amendmentst include the removal of parking bays across crossovers and the introduction of a single yellow line; there have also been requests to extend the existing single yellow line across individual crossovers to improve access/egress and deal appropriately with redundant crossovers in order to provide further parking bays.

• It was also recommended that the Cabinet Member considers the results of that consultation and agree not to proceed with the following proposed and optional changes to zones 3E and 3F, based on the majority view expressed by residents and businesses that responded to the consultation:
  • Changes to the operational times.
  • Introduction of additional parking controls on Sundays.
  • Additional permit holders parking bays in Sunlight Close (zone 3F).
  • Re-zoning of Albany Road, Avendale Road, Cromwell Road, Haydon Park Road and part of Ashcombe Road in zone 3E, as a separate zone, operational Mondays to Saturdays, between 8.30am and 6.30pm.
  • Introduction of double yellow line (no waiting at any time) restrictions to replace existing single yellow lines at passing places at the following locations:
    • Zone 3E - In the vicinity of property nos. 117 to 21 Florence Road; 140 to 144 Clarence Road and 145 to 147 Faraday Road.
    • Zone 3F - In the vicinity of property nos. 50 to 54 Ridley Road and 183 to 185 South Park Road.

3. RESULTS OF FORMAL CONSULTATION

3.1 The formal consultation for the proposed measures commenced 28th June and ended on 20th July 2007. The consultation included the erection of street notices on lamp columns in the area and the publication of the Council’s intentions in the Local Guardian and the London Gazette. Consultation documents were available at the Link, Civic Centre. At the same time a formal consultation newsletter with associated plan/s as shown in Appendices 5 and 6 were circulated to all those who were informally consulted in November 2006. The documents were also available on the Council’s website.
3.2 The consultation resulted in a total of 16 representations. All letters received expressed objections against the proposals. The representations received are summarised in Appendix 3 of this report.

3.3 A letter was also received from the Metropolitan Police, as shown in Appendix 4, who have no objection to the proposals to increase waiting restrictions and would fully support this on both safety and on the grounds of emergency services access. However, they would object to parking bays being placed closer to junctions if less than 10 metres away, which they feel would reduce visibility. They also had an observation of caution regarding the pay and display bays being changed for use by residents all day. It is felt that these bays were introduced to allow access to parking for visitors to the nearby shops and businesses, and by allowing residents to park would result in fewer parking spaces and would be detrimental to the shops and businesses.

**Officer's Comments**

The Council has a duty under Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 “to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians). It also has a duty to provide where suitable, provision of adequate parking facilities on and off the highway”, especially within CPZs, when exercising any of its functions under the Act. It is essential in areas like this where the demand for parking is high, due to the close proximity to Wimbledon Town Centre, to provide a sensible balance between safety and parking provision. In this case the lengths of double yellow lines to replace existing single yellow lines at junctions have been carefully considered. Although the general rule is 10 metres from the junction, various issues such as the type of road; geometry/layout of the road/junction; traffic speeds and volumes are taken into account. Each junction is unique and the requirement for waiting restrictions needs to be specifically designed. For example, 10m or more restriction may be necessary and suitable at a side road junction with a classified road or strategic road having 10 metres of restrictions, but unsuitable/unnecessary at a junction within a quiet residential road.

Regarding the concerns about allowing residents with permits to park in the pay and display bays during the entire operational hours, recent monitoring and observation of parking in these areas has shown that these bays are often under-utilised. It is considered that these changes will make better use of the available parking bays, by giving residents more flexibility, especially when permit holder bays are at full capacity. During the informal consultation some businesses/organisations, i.e. the Shree Temple had some concerns about allowing permit holders to park in some of these bays. In those cases it is not proposed to introduce these changes to those specific bays.

3.4 Majority of the objections received are against the proposed replacement of the existing single yellow line restrictions at junctions and at passing places with double yellow line waiting restrictions. Most of these concerns are from the residents who reside in close proximity. The residents believe that the proposed double yellow lines will severely reduce the available parking for residents in the evenings and on Sundays, which is already in short supply, possibly due to the high level of car ownership amongst residents.
**Officers’ Comments**

At the time when the CPZs were first implemented there was very little parking taking place at junctions. However, over the years, due to the increase in car ownership and in this particular area due to the extended hours of operation of the neighbouring zones, which has resulted in some displacement, demand for on street parking has increased resulting in obstructive parking particularly at junctions causing access and sightline problems to pedestrians and vehicular traffic. The introduction of double yellow lines at key locations is now normal practice and as with the previous CPZ reviews such as all the zones in Wimbledon Village, all single yellow line restrictions were converted to double yellow lines. Every effort is made to ensure that the minimum length of double yellow lines at these locations is introduced to prevent unnecessary loss of valuable parking space.

3.5 It must be noted that no representations or comments have been received regarding the proposed changes to the existing part time pay and display bays to allow residents to park during the CPZ controlled hours, or to the proposed extension/additional bays.

**4. RECOMMENDATIONS**

4.1 It is recommended that the Cabinet Member considers the representations received as a result of the formal consultation, along with officer’s recommendations (as summarised in Appendix 3) and agrees to proceed with the making of the Traffic Management Orders (TMOs) for implementation of the proposed changes as shown on original drawing nos. Z78/136/01 (Sheet 1 & 2) Revision B; and Z78/137/01 Revision A, (on display) and in Appendices 1 and 2 respectively:

a) To amend the zone boundary to include property no. 170 Haydon’s Road in zone 3E instead of 3F.

b) To change the operation of the existing pay and display part time shared use bays in Ashley Road, Birkbeck Road, Edith Road and Faraday, to allow permit holders to park during the CPZ controlled times.

c) To convert the existing pay and display part time shared use bays in Effra Road outside property nos. 135 to 143 (odd numbers) to Resident permit holders only.

d) To introduce two pay and display shared use bays in Edith Road outside property no. 14 Edith Road.

e) To Introduce double yellow line (no waiting at any time) restrictions, at a minimum of 6 metres, to replace the existing single yellow line restrictions at junctions in Florence Road, York Road, Clarence Road, Ashley Road, Effra Road, Edith Road, Evelyn Road, Faraday Road, Birbeck Road, Queens Road, Craven Gardens, Ashcombe Road, Bridges Road, Latimer Road, Ridley Road, Merton Road, South park Road, Sunlight Close and Wycliffe Road.
f) To introduce double yellow line (no waiting at any time) restrictions to replace existing single yellow lines at vehicle passing places in certain roads in the vicinity of property nos; 28 to 30 and 144 to 150 Florence Road; 117 to 121 Clarence Road; 71 to 77 Effra Road; 30 to 32 and 102 to 106 Faraday Road; 22 to 26 Craven Gardens; 25 to 29 Ridley Road; 20 to 22 Latimer Road; Nairn Court, 72 to 78 South Park Road and 146 to 150 South Park Road.

g) To introduce double yellow line (no waiting at any time) restrictions to replace the existing single yellow line restrictions at the end of the Cul-de-sacs in Anchorage Road, Albany Road and Sunlight Close.

h) To introduce double yellow line (no waiting at any time) restrictions to replace the existing single yellow line at the entrance to the Shree Temple in Effra Road.

i) To add, extend or shorten existing parking bays at certain locations in Florence Road, Ashley Road, Clarence Road, York Road, Edith Road, Effra Road, Birbeck Road, Faraday Road, Queens Road, Evelyn Road, Craven Gardens, Haydon Park Road, Latimer Road, Ridley Road, Wycliffe Road and South Park Road.

j) To make the necessary minor amendments in response to specific requests from individual residents during the informal consultation. (Details are shown on plans).

5. TIMETABLE

5.1 If approved the making of the relevant Traffic Management Orders (TMOs) will be advertised with the expected implementation and operation of changes in October/November 2007.

6. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

6.1 Do nothing. This would not address the concerns raised regarding the pay and display part time shared use bays during the informal consultation and the current parking demands for residents as well as the Council's duty to provide a safe environment for all road users.

7. RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

7.1 The risk of not introducing the proposed changes to certain parking arrangements is that the existing parking difficulties would continue and it would do nothing to assist the residents.

7.2 The risk in not introducing the proposed waiting restrictions would be the potential accidents and inconvenience as a direct result of obstruction, obscured sightlines, access difficulties and will affect all road users particularly those who are vulnerable.

7.3 The risk in not addressing the issues from the informal 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 status quo or other changes that cannot be implemented but it is considered that the benefits of introducing the measures outweighs the risk of doing nothing.
8. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

8.1 The cost of implementing the proposed measures is estimated at £10,000. This includes the publication of the made Traffic Management Orders, the road markings and the signs. This does not include consultation and staff costs.

8.2 Implementation of the recommendations in this report will require a 2007-8 capital budget allocation for Controlled Parking Zones and other Parking Management measures and this is still to be agreed.

9. **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

9.1 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.

9.2 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.

10. **HUMAN RIGHTS & EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS**

10.1 The implementation of the subsequent changes to the original design affects all sections of the community especially the young and the elderly and assists in improving safety for all road users and achieves the transport planning policies of the government, the Mayor for London and the Borough.

10.2 By maintaining clear junctions, access and sightlines will improve, thereby improving the safety at junctions by reducing potential accidents.

10.3 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 as well as charitable and religious facilities. The needs of commuters are also given consideration but generally carry less weight than those of residents and local businesses.

10.4 Bodies representing motorists, including commuters are included in the statutory consultation required for draft traffic management and similar orders published in the local paper and London Gazette.

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

   - Appendix 1  3E - Proposed CPZ layout drawing no. Z78/136/01 Sheet 1 & 2, Revision B.
   - Appendix 2  3F - Proposed CPZ layout drawing no. Z78/137/01, Rev A.
   - Appendix 3  Summary of representations received
Appendix 4  Letter from the Met Police
Appendix 5  3E - Formal consultation leaflet (June/July 07) and table of results for informal consultation
Appendix 6  3F - Formal consultation leaflet (June/July 07) and table of results for informal consultation
Appendix 7  3E - Informal consultation leaflet (Nov 07), plan and questionnaire.
Appendix 8  3F - Informal consultation leaflet (Nov 07), plan and questionnaire.
Appendix 9  3E - Informal consultation (Nov 07), results table
Appendix 10  3F - Informal consultation (Nov 07), results table
Appendix 11  Photos of current parking situation

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

13. Contacts
- Report author:
  - Name: James Geeson
  - Tel: 020 8545 3054
  - email: james.geeson@merton.gov.uk
- Meeting arrangements - Democratic Services:
  - email: democratic.services@merton.gov.uk
  - Tel: 020 8545 3356/3357/3359/3361/3616
- All press contacts - Merton’s Press office:
  - email: press@merton.gov.uk
  - Tel: 020 8545 3181
- London Borough of Merton:
  - Address: Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, SM4 5DX
  - Tel: 020 8274 4901

14. Useful links
14.2 Readers should note the terms of the legal information (disclaimer) regarding information on Merton Council’s and third party linked websites.
14.3 http://www.merton.gov.uk/legal.htm
14.4 This disclaimer also applies to any links provided here.
### Objections to Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Observations of Director of Environment and Regeneration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22009166</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the changes to the single yellow lines at corner of Faraday Road and Birbeck Road, but also where Evelyn Road, Edith Road, Effra Road, Florence Road, Ashley Road, and Clarence Road intersect. These are quiet roads with no congestion problems caused by parking at these junctions. They are exactly the same as many roads throughout the borough, which do not have any lines at all. There is a serious lack of parking spaces. There many families with small children and elderly residents and the single yellow lines are essential for us when returning late at night as it is virtually impossible to park in residents’ bays. Without this we will have to park a considerable distances, many roads away.</td>
<td>At the time when the CPZs were first implemented there was very little parking taking place at junctions. Thus the need for double yellow line waiting restrictions was not considered as a high priority. Also, single yellow lines do not require signage within a CPZ opposed to double yellow lines, which did at that time in accordance with the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions. Therefore the single lines kept the street clutter to a minimum. According to the current regulations double yellow lines no longer require signs for this very reason. There are many other junctions within the borough, which have not yet been considered for waiting restrictions. The reason for this that they have not been identified as potential risks, nor have our residents and emergency services reported any concerns with them. However, the Council currently has an ongoing list of junctions and other key locations to treat, which are dealt with, as and when resources are available. The introduction of waiting restrictions require a formal consultation with publications of the Council’s intent in the London Gazette and Local paper. This in its self can be very time consuming and costly. Double yellow lines remove obstructive parking and improve both visibility, safety and access for all road users including pedestrians especially those with disabilities. This is normal practice as recommended in the Highway Code and is supported by the Met Police. The Council is aware that this puts a strain on the demand for parking and is committed to keeping these restrictions to a minimum where practicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22009024</td>
<td>Faraday Road SW19 8PA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22008905</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22008987</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22008988</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22009257</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am writing to complain at the proposals to change the single yellow lines to double lines. The current difficulties with residential parking in the area are the lack of permit bays. Single yellow lines allow the residents to park outside the normal weekday commuting hours, when permit bays area often full. It must be remembered that the residents parking scheme is a service we pay for and is to serve the residents. What the Council should be doing is maximising residential parking bays by converting all available space. Perhaps single yellow lines areas. Also discouraging the use of more than one car by a single residency with increasing the cost of more than one permit. The purpose of double yellow line restrictions is to maintain access and improved sightlines at all times not just during the peak or normal working hours. Double yellow lines are proposed for new CPZs and for all reviews undertaken. These restrictions are proposed at key locations such as junctions, bends and along lengths of a road where parking may impede the flow of traffic, pedestrian movement and visibility at any time of the day. The Council is aware that this may place extra pressure on the demand for parking and is committed to keeping these restrictions to a minimum where practicable. There is currently a charging structure for second and subsequent permits to help discourage unnecessary multiple car ownership. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wycliffe Road SW19 1ER</td>
<td>I register my opposition to the plan to further regulate the parking around this area. It appears that the Council utterly confused on whether it is encouraging the use of side streets as cut-through or piling in the double yellow lines to increase revenue from parking fines. The current status quo is poor, but nothing I have read actually looks like an improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Lane SM4 5DX</td>
<td>The proposed measures are to improve road safety and to address the needs of the local community. CPZs are self financing through charging for permits/fines and there are a series of associated costs such as maintenance and enforcement etc. The service is self sufficient, and any excess revenue generated is put back into supporting the Council’s transport infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effra Road SW19 8PA</td>
<td>I write regarding the proposal to introduce double yellow lines from nos. 71-77 Effra Road. My mother lives at No. 73 Effra Road. She is 90 years old and has a blue badge. I visit my mother on a regular basis to assist her with shopping, getting to hospital appointments, gardening and other tasks. Currently I am able to park on the single yellow line displaying her blue badge and not taking a valuable parking space from another resident. I always park at least 12 feet from the access point of Effra Close on the single line and, provided vehicles on the opposite the access corner are parked accordingly, have never seen vehicles, including large lorries, experiencing difficulties accessing Effra Close. However, a problem may occur if someone parked in Effra Close too near the entrance. If the residents of Effra Close, who are fortunate to have free parking, feel that entering Effra Road from the Close is difficult due to parking in Effra Road, then surely a mirror could be erected to allow drivers to see oncoming traffic. I would request that the Cabinet member reconsiders the proposal to put double yellow lines at the above said location. I would hope that at least one bay between 71-73 Effra Road might be seen as a positive way forward. Incidentally, if my mother be entitled to a disabled persons bay, where would this be sited on the new proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faraday Road SW19 8PA</td>
<td>Blue badge holders are entitled to park on both single yellow lines and double yellow lines for up to 3 hours as long as they do not obstruct the flow of traffic. The extent of the proposed double lines is the same as the current single yellow line and is at the minimum requirement. As Effra Close is a main access road to Effra Road for a number of dwellings, its junction needs to be kept clear of parked cars. This improves both visibility for motorist and safe access for pedestrians especially those with disabilities. Also, the proposed double yellow lines at this junction will provide a convenient and suitable location for vehicles to pass. Reducing the length of the double lines at this location, to provide additional parking, would exacerbate visibility for motorists aggressing Effra Close, making it unsafe and would not be supported by the Police. Upon receiving an application form each site is investigated and disabled bays are only introduced in areas where it would be safe to do so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cromwell Road SW19 8NA</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the proposal to replace single yellow lines with double lines outside 102-106 Faraday Road. on the grounds that it is not needed and unnecessary. Having lived here since before the CPZ was introduced, I am not aware of any fundamental problems with the present arrangements. In this respect the status quo should be maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See above comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The extent of the existing double yellow line from the junction is less than the 6 metres. According to the Highway Code and best practice, the desirable clearance of parked cars from junctions is 10 metres or more. However, the Council is aware of the demand for parking and is committed to keeping these restrictions to a minimum where practicable. Unfortunately due to the nature of Ascombe Road, compared to the typical residential side roads for the majority of zone 3E, the requirements for longer double yellow lines at its junctions is necessary due to the greater traffic volume. In this case it is therefore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cromwell Road is still heavily used for parking. We often not get home from work until about 8pm, by which time all the permit bays are frequently occupied. At present this causes little difficulty as we can park on the single line until the next morning. If the double yellow line is extended, we would be denied this safety valve. I do not see what benefit this would bring.

Recommended that the double yellow lines are extended to the proposed 10 metres. See comments from the Met Police in paragraph 3.3 of this report, relating to this issue.

22008990
Albany Road
SW19 8JD
This is not a through road and there is no need to be heavy handed with the traffic regulations. People in the road have always parked considerately and this would only add to parking problems if this was to be carried out.

See above comments.

22008989
Albany Road
SW19 8JD
As the owner of and resident of # Albany Road, I will be most affected by these proposed changes. I understand from my neighbour that single yellow lines were introduced outside 71 Haydon Park Road to keep a caravan in their garden. Access was not used more than twice a year it is no longer used for that purpose. It seems strange that you are now proposing to make restrictions more stringent. Albany Road is unique amongst the cul-de-sacs in that it has a large space in front of Moffat Court in which vehicles can turn. Indeed most large vehicles turn into Albany Road when Gap Road is busy and turning out would be a great risk. I do not understand the rationale in restricting access at the end. I am not aware of any request from residents for double yellow lines at the end. I can only assume that this is a decision with little or no knowledge of the local area. I wrote requesting that an additional space be provided outside my house but the letter was ignored.

The proposed double yellow lines at the end of the cul de sac will provide a clear turning area for motorist at all times. This will prevent dangerous and illegal reversing into Gap Road. Unfortunately the requested parking bay outside this particular property would remove the turning facility for motorist.

22008991
Faraday Road
SW19
Our objection is to the plan to introduce double yellow lines areas, which currently have single yellow lines. We were told when residents’ parking was introduced that it would be for the benefit of the residents and that it would prevent commuter parking. During the day there is no parking problem in Faraday Road and there is no need for a parking scheme at all. During the evening when everyone returns home from work, there is sufficient room to park. This is partly because for no good reason, when the scheme was introduced, some areas were given yellow lines and not parking bays. We notice this especially around the junctions with Evelyn Road and suspect it applies throughout. We have fallen foul to this and received parking fines. The proposals will make it impossible to park legally during the evening and weekdays. This is of particular concern with regards to old people and women who need to park close to their homes. We are unable to come up with any reasons why this should benefit residents. All the other residents I have spoken to expressed the same objections. How many Faraday residents have written in support? I would also point out that a street notice regarding the proposals was posted beneath an overgrown tree, making it difficult to see. We
believe that the scheme is being changed so that more parking fines can be issued, generating more revenue. Further evidence is the continuing rise in permit prices and daily parking fees, which has risen greater than inflation.

Partly in Support / Against Certain Aspects of the Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Observations of Director of Environment and Regeneration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22008986</td>
<td>I am pleased to know that you have taken into account the local opinion to some extent and do not intend to proceed with the changes listed in the summary of the results table. We are a noncar owning household who encourages visitors to use public transport. Nevertheless I have comments on two of the proposals. To introduce double yellow lines to replace existing single yellow lines at vehicle passing places in the vicinity of the said junctions. I do not understand the need to introduce more draconian parking restrictions at these points. As a general rule the single yellow lines are not abused. The street does not appear to suffer much from impassibility problems. To introduce double yellows lines will cause hold ups in the street when deliveries are made. I wish to support double yellow lines at junctions to replace the existing single yellow ones. I think these measures will improve visibility and hence safety for pedestrians and drivers alike.</td>
<td>The majority of respondents from each zone seemed satisfied with the current operation and preferred the status quo. Therefore in view of the response, it was decided not to proceed with any operational changes to the CPZs. The need for changing the existing single yellow lines at passing places with double yellow lines, is to ensure that these areas are kept clear of parked cars at all times. This provides a suitable area for drivers to pull into allowing oncoming traffic to pass and reducing congestion. Vehicles will still be entitled to load/unload on these double yellow lines for up to 20 minutes at a time. After consideration of the concerns raised during the informal consultation regarding the proposed double yellow lines at passing places, officers were satisfied that some of the proposed double yellow line restrictions could be abandoned in certain areas where there is additional, alternative or natural passing places. This would maintain a level of parking supply when the demand is high. It is considered that at least one designated passing place halfway along each road would be sufficient. Support for double lines at junctions is noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear [Name],

Re: Controlled Parking Zone Review, 3e and 3f, London Borough of Merton (Waiting and Loading Restrictions) (Amendment No. *) Order 200x; London Borough of Merton (Free Parking Place) (Disabled Persons) (No. *) Order 200*

Thank you for your letter of 2nd July and the accompanying plans in relation to the above-mentioned proposals. Police would make the following observations.

As regards the proposals for the double yellow lines in Rougemont Avenue and Holne Close, police would have no objection to the proposals; indeed we would fully support them. We can only imagine how the LFB and LAS get their vehicles through there when called.

As regards the proposals to alter the waiting and loading regulations in the CPZ Zones 3e and 3f, we would have no objection to the proposals and again would fully support the increase in the waiting restrictions on both safety and emergency service access grounds. We would add one observation of caution regarding the Pay and Display part time shared use bays. If these bays were introduced to allow parking so that people could access nearby shops and services, then allowing the residents full time shared use of them could be detrimental to the local businesses that they serve; it has been our experience that residents quickly get into the habit of using these first, to ensure plenty of residents only parking, which then precludes visitors from using these bays. It may be something you wish to reconsider if the Pay & Display bays are intended to service shops and businesses.

As regards the permit holder bay extensions in Wycliffe Road, Latimer Road and Ridley Road, police would object to proposals to provide additional parking spaces where they extend existing bays nearer to junctions and in so doing bring parked vehicles closer than 10 metres to the junctions as we feel that this could bring an reduction in visibility. Whilst we are aware that other authorities have followed a similar route, it is not something that we feel that we can support, and as the reduced sightlines could lead to accidents, we feel that we have to object.

As regards the disabled bays, police would have no objection to the bays at Sherwood Park Road, Lynmouth Avenue, The Green (Cherrywood Lane) and Manor Way. However we would make observation that we believe that the road opposite should be...
For details of the committee report and officers’ recommendations, please visit our website using the following link www.merton.gov.uk/pdf-3e_report

What Happens Next?

The Council has carefully considered all the feedback received during the informal consultation and is now undertaking a formal consultation. At the conclusion of this consultation the Cabinet Member will make a decision on whether or not to implement the proposed changes. Please be advised that the earliest committee meeting is on 4 September 2007.

An advert for the Traffic Management Orders (TMOs) will be placed in the local newspaper, the London Gazette and posted on lamp columns in the area. We urge anyone who is either in favour or against the scheme to make representation in writing to: Head of Street Scene & Waste, Merton Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, Surrey, SM4 5DX by no later than 20 July 2007, quoting reference ES/SGE/3E_Review.

Please note that no responses will be made to representations received until a decision is made. Anyone who opposes the scheme must state the grounds on which their objection is made. We also welcome letters in support. A copy of the proposed TMOs, a plan identifying the areas affected by the proposals and the Council’s Statement of Reasons can be inspected at the Merton Link, Merton Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, Surrey, during our normal office hours, Mondays to Fridays, 9am-5pm. Alternatively, this information can be viewed on our website using the following link www.merton.gov.uk/cpz-3e_review, or at Wimbledon Library.

We would like to thank you for the feedback provided on the Initial proposals. If you require further information, you may contact James Greason on Tel. 020 8543 1004.

---

Formal Consultation
Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ’s)
Zone 3E Review

Dear Residents/Business,

The purpose of this newsletter is to let you know the results of the informal consultation carried out in October/November 2006, on the proposed review of ‘3E’ CPZ, and to inform you of the Council’s intention.

The consultation resulted in a response rate of 20.1%. The overall majority are satisfied with the operation of the CPZ and do not support the various proposed optional changes listed in the table below.

Table: Summary of Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
<th>No %</th>
<th>Unsure %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are you satisfied with the operation of the CPZ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel that the hours need to be changed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You support a one-hour CPZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel that controls on Sundays are required?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You support the proposed separate zone 3F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After analysing the returned questionnaires and taking note of your views, the results and officers’ recommendations were reported to the Cabinet Member and the Street Management Advisory Committee on 16 April 2007, where approval was given to proceed with a formal consultation on the following proposed measures and as shown on the plan enclosed, 178/136/01 Rev B.

The Cabinet Member’s decision is as follows:

- To amend the zone boundary to include property no. 170 Haydon’s Road in zone 3E instead of 3F.
- To change the operation of the existing pay and display part-time shared use bays in Ashley Road, Birkbeck Road, Edith Road and Faraday to allow permit holders to park during the CPZ controlled times.
- To convert the existing pay and display part-time shared use bays in Effra Road outside property nos. 135 to 143 (odd numbers) to resident permit holders only.
- To introduce two pay and display shared use bays in Effra Road outside property no. 14 Effra Road.
- To introduce double yellow line (no waiting at any time) restrictions, at a minimum of 6 metres, to replace the existing single yellow line restrictions at junctions in Florence Road, York Road, Clarence Road, Ashley Road, Effra Road, Edith Road, Evelyn Road, Faraday Road, Birkbeck Road, Queens Road, Great Gardens, and Oak Road and Wyvill Road.
- To introduce double yellow line (no waiting at any time) restrictions to replace existing single yellow lines at vehicle passing places in certain roads in the vicinity of property nos. 128 to 130 and 144 to 150 Florence Road; 117 to 119 Clarence Road; 71 to 77 Effra Road; 30 to 32 and 102 to 106 Faraday Road; 22 to 26 Craven Gardens.
- To introduce double yellow line (no waiting at any time) restrictions to replace the existing single yellow line restrictions at the end of the Cule de-Sacs in Archers Road and Albany Road.
- To introduce double yellow line (no waiting at any time) restrictions to replace the existing single yellow line at the entrance to the Sheen Temple in Effra Road.
- To add, extend or shorten existing parking bays at certain locations in Florence Road, Ashley Road, Clarence Road, York Road, Edith Road, Effra Road, Birkbeck Road, Faraday Road, Queens Road, Evelyn Road, Craven Gardens and Haydon Park Road.
- It has also been decided that the pay and display shared use bays in Effra Road outside the Sheen Temple and near to the junction with Haydon’s Road, are to remain unchanged.

www.merton.gov.uk

---

Wimbledon Park Ward Members
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Trinity Ward Members
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Councillor Simon Witty
Tel: 020 8543 3671

28 June 2007

If you would like more information in your own language, please call us at the address shown in the bottom line, have confirmed that you have as many as you need to translate it in a language you can read.
An advert for the Traffic Management Order (TMO) will be placed in the local newspaper, the London Gazette and on lamp columns in the area. We urge anyone who is either in favour of or against the scheme to make representation in writing to: Head of Street Scene & Waste, Merton Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, Surrey, SM4 5DX by no later than 30 July 2007, quoting reference ES/SGE/3F..

Please note that no responses will be made to representations received until a decision is made. Anyone who opposes the scheme must state the grounds on which their objection is made. We also welcome letters in support. A copy of the proposed TMOs, a plan identifying the areas affected by the proposals and the Council’s Statement of Reasons can be inspected at the Merton Link, Merton Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, Surrey during our normal office hours, Mondays to Fridays, 9am–5pm. Alternatively, this information can be viewed on our website using the following link www.merton.gov.uk/cpz/3f_review, or at Wimbledon Library.

We would like to thank you for the feedback provided on the initial proposals. If you require further information, you may contact James Gresiter on Tel: 020 8591 3034.

Dear Residents/Business,

The purpose of this newsletter is to let you know the results of the informal consultation carried out in October/November 2006, on the proposed review of 3F CPZ, and to inform you of the Council’s intentions.

The consultation resulted in a response rate of 22.8%. The overall majority are satisfied with the operation of the CPZ and do not support the various proposed optional changes listed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Zone 3F</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
<th>No %</th>
<th>Unsure %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2. Are you satisfied with the operation of the CPZ?</td>
<td>Zone 3F</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3. Do you feel that the hours need to be changed?</td>
<td>Zone 3F</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5. Do you support a new CPZ?</td>
<td>Zone 3F</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6. Do you feel that controls on Senders are required?</td>
<td>Zone 3F</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After analysing the returned questionnaires and taking note of your views, the results and officers’ recommendations were reported to the Cabinet Member and the Street Management Advisory Committee on 16th April 2007, where approval was given to proceed with a formal consultation on the following proposed measures also shown on the plan overleaf. 178/137/01 Rev A

The Cabinet Member’s decision is as follows:

- To amend the zone boundary to exclude property no. 170 Hoyton Road from zone 3F.
- To introduce double yellow line (no waiting at any time) restrictions, at a minimum of 6 metres, to replace the existing single yellow line restrictions at certain junctions in Staines Road, Latimer Road, Ridley Road, Merton Road, South Park Road, Sunlight Close and Wycliffe Road.
- To introduce double yellow line (no waiting at any time) restrictions to replace existing single yellow lines at vehicle passing places in the vicinity of property nos. 25 to 29 Ridley Road, 20 to 22 Latimer Road, Nairn Court, 72 to 78 South Park Road and 146 to 150 South Park Road.
- To introduce double yellow line (no waiting at any time) restrictions to replace the existing single yellow line restrictions in Sunlight Close at the end of the Cul de sac.
- To add, extend or shorten existing parking places at certain locations in Latimer Road, Ridley Road, Wycliffe Road and South Park Road.

For details of the committee report and officers’ recommendations, please visit our website www.merton.gov.uk/pdh_dje_report (the report contains both 3D and 3F CPZ reviews).

What Happens Next?

The Council has carefully considered all the feedback received during the informal consultation and is now undertaking a formal consultation. At the conclusion of this consultation the Cabinet Member will make a decision on whether or not to implement the proposed changes. Please be advised that the earliest committee meeting is on 5 September 2007.

www.merton.gov.uk
Dear Resident / Business,

The purpose of this consultation document is to inform you that the Council is carrying out a review of the existing Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) 3E and to seek your views on the proposed changes. The neighbouring zone 3F is also being reviewed separately.

Your Zone was implemented in 1998 and although over the years the Council has carried out minor changes to address requests and concerns of the local community a full review has not been carried out since its introduction.

The objective of the review is to improve the zone’s operation and to address access difficulties. This may involve changes to the zone boundary, hours of operation, changes to the different types of bays, additional bays, bay extensions, reduction of existing restrictions and the introduction of double yellow lines.

In addition, to enable effective enforcement of the controls, it is necessary to ensure that all the restrictions comply with the Department for Transport’s regulations. This means that all designated on-street parking bays must be clearly marked and correctly signed.

PROPOSED CHANGES
The following changes are proposed and shown on the enclosed drawings (Z78/136/01_3E_Informal Consultation - Sheets 1 & 2).

- To revise the existing zone boundary to include property No. 170 Haydon’s Road.

- To change the operation of the existing pay and display part time shared use/permit holders bays in Ashley Road, Birkbeck Road, Edith Road, Effra Road and Faraday Road to allow permit holders to park Mondays to Saturdays, between 8.30am and 6.30pm.

  This will improve the current usage of these bays between 9.30am and 4.30pm by providing more available parking spaces for permit holders.

- To convert the existing pay and display part time shared use/permit holder bays in Effra Road outside property Nos. 135 to 143 (odd numbers only), to resident permit holders only bay.

  This will provide more available parking for residents, who find it difficult to park.

- To provide two new pay and display shared use/permit holder bays in Edith Road outside property No. 14.

  This will increase parking provision in the area for use by permit holders and pay and display customers.
• To add additional spaces or extend parking bays, where appropriate without compromising safety and access.

• To improve safety and access by reducing obstructive parking that is currently taking place in the evening and on Sundays by replacing the existing single yellow lines with double yellow lines at the junctions, cut-de-sacs, bends and passing gaps in the zone.

• Review the zone boundary to include Haydon Park Road, Cromwell Road, Avondale Road, Albany Road and part of Aschcombe Road as a separate zone designated as zone 3H, operational as Mondays to Saturdays, between 8.30am and 6.30pm.

This will prevent inter-zonal movement, which may cause parking stress to those who live within close proximity to Wimbledon Town Centre.

(N.B. Proposed changes along Haydon’s Road between its junctions with Gap Road/Plough Lane and Merton High Street are currently being considered as a separate scheme and will be subject to a formal consultation.)

OPTIONAL CHANGES
The following optional changes could be considered where there is general support:

• To change the operational hours:

One-hour operation
This will provide less restriction for residents, visitors and reduce the number of visitors’ permits they would normally obtain. However, it may encourage others to park in the area outside the controlled times to access the local shops and nearby train station, which would increase the demand for parking. Trying to enforce the entire zone within a limited period of time will also put extra pressure on the Parking Attendants, making the enforcement of the zone less effective.

Reduced hours of operation
Reducing the hours of operation will provide less restriction for residents whilst still preventing commuters from parking in the area. However, residents returning from work later in the afternoon, outside the controlled times, may have difficulties finding available parking due to short-term shoppers. Motorists unable to park in the adjacent roads, where there are longer controlled hours, may take advantage of the lesser restrictions and park in this zone outside the controlled times.

Extended hours of operation
Lever restrictions in the evening would provide residents with added parking priority, safeguarding them from others using the nearby facilities in the evening. However, this would increase restrictions for residents and visitors and increase the number of visitors’ permits they would normally obtain.

• To change the operational days:

Additional controls on Sundays
Providing additional controls on Sundays would provide residents with added parking priority, and would have similar affect as the extended hours mentioned above.

LET US KNOW YOUR VIEWS
The decision on the implementation of each aspect of the scheme will be subject to the responses received during this consultation. Please complete and return the enclosed prepaid questionnaire to stamp required) with any further comments/suggestions you may have by 17th November 2006. You are also invited to our public exhibitions to speak to officers (see dates and venue on the last page of this document.)

We regret that due to the large number of responses received during a public consultation it will not be possible to individually reply to each respondent. We welcome your comments on this proposal, which will be noted and included within the proposed measures where appropriate.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT
The result of the consultation along with officers’ recommendations will be reported to Street Management Advisory Committee and the Cabinet Member for Environment and Traffic Management on 15th February 2007. Once a decision is made you will be informed accordingly.

CONTACT US
If you require further information please contact Mr James Gessan on 020 8545 3034 or email him at james.gessan@merton.gov.uk. Alternatively you can visit our website using the following link www.merton.gov.uk/3e_review
Public Consultation
Controlled Parking Zone 3E Review

We would like to know your views.

The information you provide will be used by the London Borough of Merton for the purposes of this consultation only.

Name: ............................................................................................................
Property No./Name: ..................................................................................
Post Code: .................................................................................................

Signature: .................................................................................................
Road: ...........................................................................................................
Email: .........................................................................................................

Please tick the appropriate boxes and return this card by 17th November 2006

1. Are you a resident or business?  
   □ Resident  □ Business  □ Other - Specify

2. Are you generally satisfied with the operation of 3E CPZ?  
   □ Yes  □ No  □ Undecided

3. Do you feel that the operational hours need to be changed?  
   □ Yes  □ No  □ Undecided

4. If yes, which one of these times would you prefer?  
   □ 10am-4pm  □ 6.00 am-8pm  □ Other - Specify

5. Do you support a one hour CPZ?  
   □ Yes  □ No  □ Undecided

6. If yes, which one of these times would you prefer?  
   □ 10am-11am  □ 3pm-4pm

7. Do you feel that additional parking controls on Sundays are required?  
   □ Yes  □ No  □ Undecided

8. If yes, which one of these times would you prefer?  
   □ 10am-11am  □ 3pm-4pm  □ Other - Specify
   □ 10am-4pm  □ 10am-8pm

9. Do you support the re-zoning of Haydon Park Road, Cromwell Road, Avondale Road and part of Ashcombe Road as a separate zone designated as zone 3H?  
   □ Yes  □ No  □ Undecided

Do you have any other issues or additional comments regarding the proposals? (Please write in BLOCK capitals)

...................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................

Please Note: In view of the large number of responses received during a public consultation it will not be possible to reply individually to each respondent.

It will be appreciated if you would complete the monitoring information requested overleaf.

ISSUED: 20 Oct 2006
Dear Resident / Business,

The purpose of this consultation document is to inform you that the Council is carrying out a review of the existing Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) 3F and to seek your views on the proposed changes. The neighbouring zone 3E is also being reviewed separately.

Your Zone was implemented in 1996 and although over the years the Council has carried out minor changes to address requests and concerns of the local community a full review has not been carried out since its introduction.

The objective of the review is to improve the zone’s operation and to address access difficulties. This may involve changes to the zone boundary, hours of operation, changes to the different types of bays, additional bays, bay extensions, reduction of existing restrictions and the introduction of double yellow lines.

In addition, to enable effective enforcement of the controls, it is necessary to ensure that all the restrictions comply with the Department for Transport’s regulations. This means that all designated on-street parking bays must be clearly marked and correctly signed.

PROPOSED CHANGES
The following changes are proposed and shown on the enclosed drawings (278/137/01_3F_Informal Consultation).

• To revise the existing zone boundary to exclude property No. 170 Haydon’s Road.

• To add or extend parking bays, where appropriate without compromising safety and access.

• To improve safety and access by reducing obstructive parking that is currently taking place in the evening and on Sundays by replacing the existing single yellow lines with double yellow lines at the junctions, cul-de-sacs, bends and passing gaps in the zone.

(N.B. Proposed changes along Haydon’s Road between its junctions with Gap Road/Plough Lane and Merton High Street are currently being considered as a separate scheme and will be subject to a formal consultation.)

OPTIONAL CHANGES
The following optional changes could be considered where there is general support:

• To change the operational hours:
One-hour operation
This will provide less restriction for residents' visitors and reduce the number of visitors' permits they would normally obtain. However it may encourage others to park in the area outside the controlled times to access the local shops and nearby train station, which would increase the demand for parking. Trying to enforce the entire zone within a limited period of time will also put extra pressure on the Parking Attendants, making the enforcement of the zone less effective.

Reduced hours of operation
Reducing the hours of operation will provide less restriction for residents and their visitors whilst still preventing commuters from parking in the area. However residents returning from work later in the afternoon; outside the controlled times, may have difficulties finding available parking due to short-term shoppers. Motorists unable to park in the adjacent roads, where there are longer controlled hours, may take advantage of the lesser restrictions and park in this zone outside the controlled times.

Extended hours of operation
Later restrictions in the evening would provide residents with added parking priority, safeguarding them from others using the nearby facilities in the evening. However, this would increase restrictions for residents' visitors and increase the number of visitors' permits they would normally obtain.

To change the operational days:
Additional controls on Sundays
Providing additional controls on Sundays would provide residents with added parking priority, and would have similar effects as the extended hours mentioned above.

Tell us your views
The decision on the implementation of each aspect of the scheme will be subject to the responses received during this consultation. Please complete and return the enclosed prepaid questionnaire (no stamp required) with any further comments/suggestions you may have by 17th November 2006. You are also invited to our public exhibitions to speak to officers (see dates and venue on the last page of this document).

Details of the public exhibitions and your local Ward Councillors are provided overleaf.
Public Consultation
Controlled Parking Zone 3F Review

We would like to know your views.
The information you provide will be used by the London Borough of Merton for the purposes of this consultation only.

Name: ..........................................................    Signature: ..........................................................
Property No./Name: ..............................................    Road: ..........................................................
Post Code: ..........................................................    Email: ..........................................................

Please tick the appropriate boxes and return this card by 17th November 2006

1. Are you a resident or business?    ☐ Resident ☐ Business ☐ Other - Specify

2. Are you generally satisfied with the operation of 3F CPZ?    ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Undecided

3. Do you feel that the operational hours need to be changed?    ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Undecided

4. If yes, which one of these times would you prefer?    ☐ 10am-4pm ☐ 8.30am-8pm ☐ Other - Specify

5. Do you support a one hour CPZ?    ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Undecided

6. If yes, which one of these times would you prefer?    ☐ 10am-11am ☐ 3pm-4pm

7. Do you feel that additional parking controls on Sundays are required?    ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Undecided

8. If yes, which one of these times would you prefer?    ☐ 10am-4pm ☐ 10am-6pm

Do you have any other issues or additional comments regarding the proposals? (Please write in BLOCK capitals)

...........................................................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................................................

Please Note: In view of the large number of responses received during a public consultation it will not be possible to reply individually to each respondent.

It will be appreciated if you would complete the monitoring information requested overleaf.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROAD</th>
<th>NUMBER CONSULTED</th>
<th>NUMBER OF RETURNS</th>
<th>% RESPONSE</th>
<th>RESIDENT</th>
<th>BUSINESS</th>
<th>BOTH</th>
<th>UNSURE</th>
<th>Q2: ARE YOU GENERALLY SATISFIED WITH THE CZR</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>% YES</th>
<th>% NO</th>
<th>% YES</th>
<th>% NO</th>
<th>% UNSATISFIED</th>
<th>% UNSATISFIED</th>
<th>% UNSATISFIED</th>
<th>% UNSATISFIED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALBANY ROAD</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANCILHAGE CLOSE</td>
<td>1    2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASHCOMBE ROAD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASHLEY ROAD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATKINSON ROAD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIRKBECK ROAD</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLARENCE ROAD</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COWPERY ROAD</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRAWFORD GARDENS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROMWELL ROAD</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDITH ROAD</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPPA ROAD</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVELYN ROAD</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARRADAY ROAD</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORENCE ROAD</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAP ROAD</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAYDON PARK ROAD</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAYDON PARK ROAD</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK ROAD</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3E - Informal Consultation (Nov 2006) – Results Table (Sheet 1 of 2)
| ROAD              | Q2: DO YOU SUPPORT A 1 HOUR GPZ | Q3: IF YES, WHICH HOUR WOULD YOU PREFER | Q4: DO YOU SUPPORT THE PROPOSED BOUNDARY CHANGE | YES | NO | Unsure | % YES | % NO | % Unsure | % YES | % NO | % Unsure | % YES | % NO | % Unsure | % YES | % NO | % Unsure | % YES | % NO | % Unsure |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----|----|--------|------|-----|--------|------|-----|--------|------|-----|--------|------|-----|--------|------|-----|--------|------|-----|--------|------|-----|--------|------|-----|--------|
| ALEXANDER ROAD    |                                 |                                           |                                               | 0  | 0 | 0      | 0%  | 0%  | 0%     |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |
| ANCHORAGE CLOSE   |                                 |                                           |                                               | 0  | 0 | 0      | 0%  | 0%  | 0%     |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |
| ASHCLIFFE ROAD    |                                 |                                           |                                               | 0  | 0 | 0      | 0%  | 0%  | 0%     |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |
| ASHCLIFFE ROAD    |                                 |                                           |                                               | 0  | 0 | 0      | 0%  | 0%  | 0%     |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |
| AVONDALE ROAD     |                                 |                                           |                                               | 0  | 0 | 0      | 0%  | 0%  | 0%     |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |
| BEAK ROAD         |                                 |                                           |                                               | 0  | 0 | 0      | 0%  | 0%  | 0%     |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |
| CLARENCE ROAD     |                                 |                                           |                                               | 0  | 0 | 0      | 0%  | 0%  | 0%     |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |
| COOLEY ROAD       |                                 |                                           |                                               | 0  | 0 | 0      | 0%  | 0%  | 0%     |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |
| COOLEY ROAD       |                                 |                                           |                                               | 0  | 0 | 0      | 0%  | 0%  | 0%     |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |
| CHAVERNA ROAD     |                                 |                                           |                                               | 0  | 0 | 0      | 0%  | 0%  | 0%     |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |
| CROOKS ROAD       |                                 |                                           |                                               | 0  | 0 | 0      | 0%  | 0%  | 0%     |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |
| CROOKS ROAD       |                                 |                                           |                                               | 0  | 0 | 0      | 0%  | 0%  | 0%     |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |
| EDITH ROAD        |                                 |                                           |                                               | 0  | 0 | 0      | 0%  | 0%  | 0%     |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |
| EDDA ROAD         |                                 |                                           |                                               | 0  | 0 | 0      | 0%  | 0%  | 0%     |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |
| EDDA ROAD         |                                 |                                           |                                               | 0  | 0 | 0      | 0%  | 0%  | 0%     |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |
| EDDA ROAD         |                                 |                                           |                                               | 0  | 0 | 0      | 0%  | 0%  | 0%     |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |
| EDDA ROAD         |                                 |                                           |                                               | 0  | 0 | 0      | 0%  | 0%  | 0%     |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |
| EDDA ROAD         |                                 |                                           |                                               | 0  | 0 | 0      | 0%  | 0%  | 0%     |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |
| EDDA ROAD         |                                 |                                           |                                               | 0  | 0 | 0      | 0%  | 0%  | 0%     |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |
| EDDA ROAD         |                                 |                                           |                                               | 0  | 0 | 0      | 0%  | 0%  | 0%     |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |
| EDDA ROAD         |                                 |                                           |                                               | 0  | 0 | 0      | 0%  | 0%  | 0%     |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |
| EDDA ROAD         |                                 |                                           |                                               | 0  | 0 | 0      | 0%  | 0%  | 0%     |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |
| EDDA ROAD         |                                 |                                           |                                               | 0  | 0 | 0      | 0%  | 0%  | 0%     |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |
| EDDA ROAD         |                                 |                                           |                                               | 0  | 0 | 0      | 0%  | 0%  | 0%     |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |
| EDDA ROAD         |                                 |                                           |                                               | 0  | 0 | 0      | 0%  | 0%  | 0%     |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |
| EDDA ROAD         |                                 |                                           |                                               | 0  | 0 | 0      | 0%  | 0%  | 0%     |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |
| EDDA ROAD         |                                 |                                           |                                               | 0  | 0 | 0      | 0%  | 0%  | 0%     |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |     |     |        |
# 3F Informal Consultation Nov 06

## Summary of Consultation Results by Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Number of Houses Consulted</th>
<th>Number of Residents Responded</th>
<th>% Residential</th>
<th>% Economic</th>
<th>% Business</th>
<th>% Unsure</th>
<th>% Yes</th>
<th>% No</th>
<th>% Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridges Road</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton Road</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haywards Road</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather Road</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merton Road</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridley Road</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Park Road</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunlight Close</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Broadway</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wycliffe Road</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Questions 1-4

- **Q1**: Do you support a limit on hours?
- **Q2**: Do you support 10pm - 5am?
- **Q3**: Do you support 3am - 6am?
- **Q4**: Do you support 7am - 9am?

## Questions 5-6

- **Q5**: Do you support 5am - 7am?
- **Q6**: Do you support 9am - 11am?