Committee: Advisory Street Management
Date: 04th September 2007

Agenda item:
Wards: St Helier

Subject: Proposed Double Yellow lines – Rougemont Avenue, Torrington Way and Holne Chase

Lead officer: Lyn Carpenter, Director of Environment & Regeneration
Lead member: Councillor Tariq Ahmad, Environment & Traffic Management

Key decision reference number: N/A

Recommendations:

1. That the Street Management Advisory Committee consider the issues detailed in this report and recommend that the Cabinet Member:
   a) Notes the outcome of the formal consultation carried out during June/July 2007 on the proposed waiting restrictions in Rougemont Avenue, Torrington Way and Holne Chase as shown on plan Z27-491-01 attached as appendix 1.
   b) Notes the summary of representations received and officers’ comments as detailed in Appendix 2.
   c) Considers the objections against the proposed measures and the arguments for their implementation and the costs and implications of alternative options.

2) Agrees to proceed with the making of the Traffic Management Order for the implementation of the proposed ‘At any time’ waiting restrictions in Holne Chase, Rougemont Avenue and Torrington Way as detailed in Drawing Z27-491-01 attached as appendix 1.

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

1. Purpose of report and Executive Summary

1.1 This report brings to the Cabinet Member’s attention the result of the formal consultation carried out in Holne Chase, Rougemont Avenue and Torrington Way on double yellow line restrictions. It sets out the details of the consultation on the proposed waiting restrictions as shown on plan Z78/491/01.

1.2 This report recommends that the representations received, as summarised in Appendix 2, are considered and approval is sought to make and publish the relevant TMOs for implementation.

2. Details

Policy
2.1 It is Council policy to improve the environment by regulating the number of parked vehicles in an area, thereby improving safety and access for all road users. The key objective of this proposal is to introduce the recommended restriction to improve safety and vehicular access to the named areas.
2.2 Council's duties and powers - The purpose of the proposed double yellow line restrictions is to maintain visibility and access at all times and provide safe conditions for all road users. Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 places a duty on the Council "to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and provide suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway" when exercising any of its functions under the Act. Road safety is therefore a matter that the Council pays regard to when considering whether to make an Order under S.6 of the Act.

2.3 Current parking conditions and proposed restrictions

2.3.1 Red Route

there are currently no yellow line waiting restrictions in any of these roads. However, Red Route restrictions are in place. The first 20m of Holne Chase / Epsom Road junction is protected by 7am – 7pm (red line) restrictions, followed by approximately 13m of short term parking bay - enforced by Transport for London.

In Rougemont Avenue, the west side is protected by 44m (from the junction) of 7am – 7pm (red line) and on the east side there is 10m of red line from the junction, 26m of all day parking bays followed by 7m of double red lines.

Site observations and feedback from some residents indicate that parking does not take place on this section of carriageway, even after the hours of operation.

2.3.2 Following the receipt of LFEPA (London Fire & Emergency planning Authority) letter attached as appendix 4, a number of meetings were convened between officers and Ward Councillors. The area was added to programme of works for investigation. Over the past several months, site surveys have been carried out by officers (see photographs marked as appendix 5); it has been concluded that parking on both sides of the road in all 3 roads causes obstruction to vehicular access and makes access for normal size vehicles extremely difficult and impossible for larger vehicles such as the refuse vehicle, an ambulance and a fire engine. Parking is also taking place at and near junctions/bend on both sides of the road causing sightline difficulties and obstruction for vehicular and pedestrian access.

2.4 The Ward Councillors invited Council officers and the Cabinet Member to a public meeting on 26th August 2006. The Council officer explained the contents of the letter from the Fire brigade and the implications of the obstructive parking by the residents. The concept of double yellow lines received many objections at the meeting. The majority of those present implied that it is Council's responsibility to resolve the parking problems by allowing the construction of footway crossovers and allowing footway parking. It was explained that their request was in fact against several Council policies and also due to lack of funding it would not be able to meet the aspiration for footway parking.

2.5 The decision about whether or not to implement the proposed restrictions will need to take into account the following factors:
2.5.1 On site conditions – as with majority of roads in the borough, there is a high level of demand for on street parking from residents/their visitors and weekend visitors to the allotments adjacent to Holne Chase. All 3 roads are too narrow to accommodate parking on both sides of the road and maintain the minimum required road width of 3m – necessary for the Fire brigade. In fact with vehicles parked on both sides of the road (average car width being 1.8m), the average available road space for vehicular access is reduced to 2.5m. There are certain sections of the carriageway where it is wide enough to accommodate parking on both sides and the proposed restrictions reflect this fact.

The table below shows the average road and footway widths:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Average Road width</th>
<th>Average footway width</th>
<th>Average grass width</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rougemont Avenue</td>
<td>6.1m</td>
<td>1.4m</td>
<td>1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrington Way</td>
<td>6.1m</td>
<td>1.2m</td>
<td>1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holne Chase</td>
<td>6.0m</td>
<td>1.4m</td>
<td>2.8m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6 Displacement

The proposed double yellow line restrictions would mean the loss of approximately 42 spaces from Rougemont Avenue; 16 spaces from Torrington Way and 55 from Holne Chase. This loss of on-street parking can be reduced by the residents using their rear parking facilities. Whilst the loss of spaces is regrettable, the adverse implications of obstructive parking impeding access for a fire engine is so serious that it cannot be ignored.

2.7 Off street Parking/ Rear access

2.7.1 According to the Councils’ records and site observations, virtually all of the properties have off street parking to the rear. This parking facility can be accessed via the rear access, which is private. It has been argued by some residents that this facility is not convenient. Some residents have said that they use this parking facility - the majority, however, claim that it is unsuitable. There have been suggestions that the Council should resurface the rear access so as to make access easier. The Councils’ response is that this area is private and there is no jurisdiction nor funding for such remedial works.

2.7.2 The average width of the side and rear access for each road are shown in the table below. As it can be seen, the widths of both side and rear access is sufficient to provide access to parking to the rear of the properties in all 3 roads. Photographs are attached as appendix 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Average Width of side access</th>
<th>Average width of rear access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rougemont Avenue</td>
<td>2.4m</td>
<td>2.4m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrington Way</td>
<td>2.47m</td>
<td>3m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holne Chase</td>
<td>2.3m</td>
<td>2.33m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.8 Crossovers

2.8.1 With regard to the creation of private off-street parking, the criteria for the provision of footway crossovers has subject to a review involving consultation with Members. The final review report was presented to Cabinet on 25th June 2007.
2.8.2 Cabinet approved a number of recommendations relating to the provision of crossovers including the following which have implications for the properties in these roads:

a) That the Council maintain its mandatory depth and width criteria of 4.5 metres and 2.3 metres but include the opportunity for applicants with a depth of forecourt/garden between 4 metres and 4.49 metres and where their vehicle can be wholly parked within the forecourt/garden without overhanging the public highway to enter into an agreement between the property owner and the Council to allow a crossover to be provided. The Agreement will be registrable as a local land charge and therefore binding on subsequent owners of the property.

b) That the minimum depth of grass verge for refusal is increased to 2m, or if it would result in the loss of amenity verge or planted area that makes a valuable contribution to the street scene.

2.8.3 Although the mandatory depth and width criteria of 4.5 metres and 2.3 metres were retained in the new crossover criteria, there is now an opportunity for residents of these roads to apply for a crossover if the depth of their forecourt/garden is between 4 metres and 4.49 metres and where their vehicle can be wholly parked within the forecourt/garden without overhanging the public highway. Approval would be subject to the property owner entering into an agreement with the Council. The Agreement will be registrable as a local land charge and therefore binding on subsequent owners of the property.

2.8.4 In Rougemont Avenue and Torrington Way the average grass verge depth is 1metre. Any residents in these roads wishing to apply for installation of a driveway may do so as long as it does not result in the loss of amenity verge or planted area of depth greater than the new depth restriction of 2m.

3. Formal Consultation

3.1 Following a report to the Street Management Advisory Committee and the Cabinet Member on 15th January 2007, the Cabinet Member approved the undertaking of the formal consultation on the proposed double yellow line restrictions in the said three roads.

3.2 The formal consultation started on 20th June 2007 and concluded on 20th July 2007. The consultation included the erection of street notices on lamp columns in the area; the publication of the Council’s intentions in the Local Guardian and the London Gazette. Consultation documents were available at Merton Link in the Civic Centre. At the same time a formal consultation newsletter with a plan attached as Appendix 3 was also circulated to all those within the affected area. The documents were also available on the Council’s website.

3.3 Although the closing date was 20th July all representations received after this date, have also been included in this report. The consultation resulted in a total of 144 representations of which 124 oppose the restrictions; 4 in support and 3 comments. Additionally there were 13 representations without an address.

3.4 Representations and officers’ comments have been summerised in Appendix 2.

3.5 In addition to the representations, the Council also received a petition (PT446) containing 31 signatures from 16 households from Rougemont Avenue against the proposed restrictions.

3.6 Majority of the respondents suggested that ‘the London Fire Brigade should consider using narrower vehicles, as this has worked for other counties, and
also works for the refuse vehicles. This would alleviate the problem in many of the other roads in the area particularly when properties in the area do not comprise of more than three stories’.

3.6.1 The Fire Brigade responded with a number of reasons why the above suggestion is not possible:

1) In London there are 111 land-based fire stations each having at least 1 pumping appliance. The fleet needs to be flexible and interchangeable to be able to cover the risks presented throughout London this means a standard fire engine.

2) The fire engines have to be equipped to meet the risks and hazards the brigades are called upon to deal with. The stowage on a fire appliance is again standard and has to be able to carry fire fighting equipment, a 13.5 metre ladder, breathing apparatus, rescue equipment, RTC cutting gear, chemical biological and radiological protection equipment and forced entry gear. As well as this the appliance carries a ‘first aid’ water supply of 3000 litres this is so we can make a rapid attack on a fire whist establishing a supplemental (hydrant) supply. Much of the equipment that has to be carried is bulky and heavy; a smaller appliance would be impractical.

3) Each fire engine needs to carry a standard crew of five personnel and safe riding positions need to be provided; this is of course in addition to the equipment carried. For the full letter please see appendix 4.

3.7 Comments from Metropolitan Police:

‘Police have no objection to the proposal; indeed we fully support them. We can only imagine how the LFB and LAS get their vehicles through these roads when called.’

3.8 Comments from Waste Management:

‘We have extreme difficulty carrying out a service in both Rougemont and Torrington Way due to parked vehicles. We have for some time now had to get the refuse collected on a small cantor RCV. The vehicle and crew are needed to gain access to the roads that are proving virtually impossible to access with our normal fleet of refuse vehicles. We would appreciate any help you can give to alleviate the problem and assist us in providing a cost effective service to the residents of the borough.’

4. Recommendations

4.1 Taking into account the current parking practice; the current crossover and grass verge criteria; available funding and Council’s duties and responsibilities in to consideration, it is recommended that the Cabinet Member agrees to proceed with the making of the Traffic Management Orders (TMOs) and the implementation of the proposed double yellow lines (at any time waiting and loading restrictions) in all three roads in a manner that would prevent parking on both sides of the road except for those areas that are wide enough to allow parking and passage of a fire engine (see plan Z27-491-01). It is also proposed to apply double yellow lines across the access points to the side/rear access/garages. This will make it easier for those residents who may decide to use their parking facilities to the rear of their properties.

4.2 The proposed double yellow line restrictions are risk assessment / danger reduction measures and not an accident remedial measure. That is being proactive and not reactive after the event.
4.3 In considering this proposal the Cabinet Member must also note that this problem is not unique to this area and that the Council must be consistent and therefore, should consider the implications of any decision across the Borough.

5 Alternative options

5.1 Not to do anything. This would be contrary to the concerns expressed by the local residents and LFEPA. And it would not resolve the dangerous obstructive parking that is taking place. More importantly, given that the Council has been made aware of this problem and its implications, the Council is under an obligation to discharge its duty to secure the safe and expeditious movement of traffic in an appropriate and a timely manner. According to legal advice, failure by the Council to act in this case would almost certainly amount to a breach of statutory duty. A duty of care and a possible action against the Council based on negligence would be likely arise if the Council did act, but did so in a negligent manner.

5.2 Allow parking on grass verge. Over the years there have also been complaints regarding parking on the grass verge. Section 15(1) of the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1974 makes it an offence to park on the footway. The Council can exempt areas of the footway from the parking ban by making a Notice under Section 15(4) of this Act. The exemption would include signs and road markings as per The Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002. It is not normal practice to allow parking on the grass verge because it would be difficult if not impossible to mark the parking areas and the grass verge would not be able to accommodate the weight of a vehicle. Continuous parking on the grass verge would lead to mud on the road and on the footway; causing rutting of the verge which would create a dangerous situation for all road users and lead to more resources having to be spent on maintenance.

Sometime ago, a small section of grass verge was replaced with tarmac because the grass verge at that point had a very steep gradient from the paving slabs to the kerb which was being eroded by parked vehicles making the paving slabs on the footway unsafe despite the relaying / remedial works a number of times. This was done on safety grounds and covered a very small section of the grass verge.

5.3 Removal of grass verge to allow footway parking

In accordance with the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1974 parking on any part of a footway is illegal; although there are occasions where provided there is sufficient footway width (minimum 1.5m) parking on footway can be made exempt. This exemption, however, is not made where the footway comprises of a grass verge for the reasons given in section 5.2 of this report. Due to the current policy regarding loss of amenity and the costs involved, grass verges are generally not removed to facilitate footway parking. The Council does not and will not receive external funding for such measures and therefore, costs would have to be met from existing revenue funding or from specific capital allocations. To remove 1m of grass verge from one side of Rougemont Avenue and Torrington Way would cost approximately £192,000.

5.4 As already mentioned, this area is not unique; there are many roads in this borough with large grassed areas and with parking problems some of which do not have rear access / garages etc and some have flats and therefore more residents with higher demand for on street parking.
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6. **Timetable**

6.1 The Traffic Management Orders for the proposed double yellow lines would be made after the statutory 6 weeks period has elapsed.

7 **Financial, resource and property implications**

7.1 The cost of introducing the proposed restrictions is estimated at £7,000, including the making of the Traffic Management Order. This does not include consultation and staff costs.

7.2 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.

8. **Legal and statutory implications**

8.1 These proposals are being dealt with under The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. The overriding obligation when exercising any function under the 1984 Act is to do so in such a way as to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of traffic and the provision of suitable and adequate facilities on and off the highway and so far as practicable having regard to:

(a) the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises;

(b) the effect on the amenities of any locality affected and (without prejudice to the generality of this paragraph) the importance of regulating and restricting the use of roads by heavy commercial vehicles, so as to preserve or improve the amenities of the areas through which the roads run;

(c) the strategy prepared under section 80 of the Environment Act 1995 (national air quality strategy);

(d) the importance of facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and of securing the safety and convenience of persons using or desiring to use such vehicles; and

(e) any other matters appearing to the local authority to be relevant.

8.2 Traffic Management Orders for the proposed double yellow lines 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 in a local newspaper and the London Gazette). These regulations also require the Council to consider any representations received as a result of publishing the draft order.

8.3 In this case the Council believes that 8.1(a) above and 8.1 (d) are satisfied by these proposals. The relevant matters in 8.1(d) is the implementation of the proposed double yellow lines.

8.4 The Council has discretion as to whether or not to hold a public inquiry before deciding whether or not to make a traffic management order or to modify the published draft order. A public inquiry should be held where it would provide further information, which would assist the Council in reaching a decision.
9. Human rights, equalities and community cohesion implications

9.1 The Council carries out careful consultation to ensure that all road users are given a fair opportunity to air their views and express their needs. The parking needs of the residents and visitors are given consideration but it is considered that maintaining safe access must take priority.

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

9.3 The implementation of waiting restrictions affects all sections of the community especially the young and the elderly and assists in improving safety for all road users as well as achieving the transport planning policies of the government, the Mayor for London and the borough.

10. Risk management and health and safety implications

10.1 The risk in not introducing the proposed waiting restrictions would be the potential risk to the residents, in case of an emergency, as a direct result of obstruction and access difficulties will not be addressed.

10.2 There will be loss of parking space but this can be reduced by the residents using their rear parking facilities. It is considered that the risk in not addressing this problem is far greater than the loss of parking space.

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

Appendix 1 – Plans of Proposals – Drawing No. Z27- 491-01
Appendix 2 – Representations
Appendix 3 – Consultation document
Appendix 4 - Letter from the Fire brigade
Appendix 5 – Photographs

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

Contacts

- Report author: Paul Atie
  - Tel: 020 8545 3214
  - email: paul.atie@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
Useful links
Merton Council's Web site: http://www.merton.gov.uk

Readers should note the terms of the legal information (disclaimer) regarding information on Merton Council's and third party linked websites.

http://www.merton.gov.uk/legal.htm

This disclaimer also applies to any links provided here.

[Signature]
I am in favour of the proposed plan for double yellow lines as the lesser of evils. The problem is caused mainly by householders having multiple vehicles and only one house frontage. I am totally opposed to any interference with the grass verges both from the point made about subsidence and also the effect this would I am totally opposed to any interference with the grass verges both from the point made about subsidence and also the effect this would have on the appearance of our road. Who would want to have a car parked under their bedroom window, unable even to open the window because of fumes.

Support the proposed consultation. But feel the need to highlight the following points. Where do people park their cars?

This will lead to a breakdown of the community and possible conflict with other neighbours over the vastly reduced parking. No mention of the allotment use. There is no indication of a policy to encourage/ support people to have dropped kerbs and off street parking laid. Residents house prices will drop. What is the proposed response to the increase of speeding vehicles.

Officer’s comment

The impact of the loss of on street parking can be minimised by the residents using their rear parking facilities. The adverse implications of obstructive parking regarding access for a fire engine is far greater than the loss of on street parking. The proposed double yellow lines will make accessing these roads easier. These roads are used by residents only and therefore, it is considered unlikely that speed would become an issue. The approved crossover review has relaxed the criteria and increased the width of the amenity verge to 2 metres if it will not result in loss of planted verge area that makes a valuable contribution to the street scene.

I think the plans recently submitted are excellent and will force people to use their back gardens to which they all have access — to park their cars — some houses near us have 5 or more car per household and all are parked either in the front garden or on the road with a large garden available and accessible at the rear. The problem needs tackling before a fire or other emergency occurs.

I am in agreement that some form of parking control/assistance is required for these areas and am well aware of the narrowness of the road when cars/large vans are parked on both sides, hence making safety an issue when it comes to fires engines etc having access. I have no doubt that you have already had the suggestion of removing the grass verges making them tarmac to allow official partial kerb parking along these streets and that the costs to do this would be very high, hence the suggestion of double yellow lines. It is difficult and as I am sure you know, will cause problems due to the large displacement of residents’ vehicles. I myself am lucky to have off street parking, which I did some years back. I do however have regular visitors and would be willing to remove part of my front wall to accommodate another vehicle, therefore not encroaching on local resident’s parking. In order for me to this, I would ask the council to consider moving a blossom tree, which has been planted in front of my wall. There is a side access between my neighbour’s address and mine, and the tree could sit in the middle of our two properties without causing any problem to either of us. As nice as it is to have tree line streets, I feel that it is impossible to do so when such parking restrictions are being put in place and I would ask that my request be taken into consideration. I am sure that the local residents will now have no choice but to apply for off street parking as their only option. Obviously in some cases this will not be possible due to the size of the front garden. I believe that it is imperative that the council meet residents half way especially when they are willing to make costly alterations of their own to assist in creating parking outside their own home.

Officer’s comment

The impact of the loss of on street parking can be minimised by the residents using their rear parking facilities. The adverse implications of obstructive parking regarding access for a fire engine is far greater than the loss of on street parking. The proposed double yellow lines will make accessing these roads easier. These roads are used by residents only and therefore, it is considered unlikely that speed would become an issue. The approved crossover review has relaxed the criteria and increased the width of the amenity verge to 2 metres if it will not result in loss of planted verge area that makes a valuable contribution to the street scene.

London TravelWatch supports the rational management of parking. However, it would want to be assured that where there is the possibility that parking could be displaced onto nearby roads carrying bus routes, consideration is given to upgrading waiting and loading restrictions on the bus routes.

‘Blue Badge’ holders may park for up to three hours legally on these lines and may cause the very obstruction that is to be avoided. It was made clear at the public meeting in August 2006, that money is not available to ‘police’ the restrictions especially at night when anyone may choose to park on the double lines and cause the same obstruction. The displaced cars will move to other unrestricted roads eg Rutland drive etc cause similar obstructions there and drivers will not be contactable or known by the actual residents to move cars if necessary. For the same reason it will not be possible to distinguish between an abandoned vehicle or worse still ‘suspect’ terrorist vehicle if the drivers are leaving them a considerable distance from their place of residence. As a Community Nurse in Merton myself, it will make visiting the residents of this area by health professionals and other care agencies including Merton
Services to the vulnerable people of Merton, an impossibility as parking will not be available in these or surrounding roads that would be congested with the displaced cars. I do, however, fully support the need to allow access for fire tenders. Getting rid of or narrowing the grass verge and allowing parking up onto the pavement edge. Allowing crossovers and dropped kerbs in Home Chase and those houses in Torrington Way and Rougemont Ave. Consulting with the Fire and Emergency Planning Committee to consider using narrower vehicles that has been successful elsewhere. We know that narrow roads are not unique to Merton. Options that we would like seen discussed. A plan for dropped kerbs and off street parking for residents. The removal of grass verges to widen roads; tarmac over grass verges to allow partial pavement parking; a road safety initiative being implemented.

22008756  I live opposite the only entrance to the allotment, which is chaotic at the weekend, with all the allotment holders converging outside my house, making it impossible to park anywhere nearby. Parking is also very difficult at night, after all available spaces have been taken, and is a worry when I have to walk from my car to my house at 11pm on my own, often from another road. I would be in favour of resident's permits, so that those living in Holne Chase can park outside there own house. I hope that sensible restrictions are put in place, because if it is just yellow lines, all the parking will be taken by non-residents or residents with more than one vehicle, and I will face an even worse situation than I find myself in today.

Officers’ Comments

Controlled parking zones are often introduced in areas where parking problems are caused by commuters. The parking problem in this area is caused by the residents and therefore, it is not considered that a CPZ would be the appropriate action on this occasion.

It is true that blue badge holders can park on ‘At any time’ restrictions but they may do so without causing obstructions. In the event that blue badge holders park in an obstructive manner, the Council could consider the introduction of loading restrictions that would prevent this. It should be noted that there are many disabled bays existing in these roads introduced by the Council, that are available for any blue badge holders to use. Therefore there should be very little need for blue badge holders to park on double yellow lines.

It is hoped that residents would use their off street parking facility rather than park some considerable distance from their residence. The impact of the loss of on street parking can be minimised by the residents using their rear parking facilities. The adverse implications of obstructive parking regarding access for a fire engine is far greater than the loss of on street parking. The proposed double yellow lines will make accessing these roads easier. The approved crossover review has relaxed the criteria and increased the width of the amenity verge to 2 metres if it does not result in loss of on street parking. The proposed double yellow lines will make accessing these roads easier. The approved crossover review has relaxed the criteria and increased the width of the amenity verge to 2 metres if it does not result in loss of planted verge area that makes a valuable contribution to the street scene.

Other options such as removing the grass verge has also been considered, however, taking the amenity impact into consideration and the current lack of funding, other options are not viable.

**Representations against**

Torrington Way, Holne Chase, Rougemont Avenue and Epsom Road

22008838, 22008810, 22008811, 22008819, 22008816, 22008782, 22008815, 22008965, 22008927, 22008946, 22008947, 22008948, 22008963, 22008966, 22008913, 22008914, 22008908, 22008976, 22009014, 22009016, 22008680, 22008698, 22008792, 22008799, 22008884, 22008792, 22008774, 22008781, 22008835, 22008821, 22008801, 22008804, 22008812, 22008817, 22008818, 22008778, 22008779, 22008836, 22008904, 22008778, 22008931, 22008932, 22008933, 22008942, 22008949, 22008950, 22008952, 22008954, 22008957, 22008955, 22008959, 22008960, 22008962, 22008964, 22008797, 22008843, 22008788, 22008786, 22008775, 22008785, 22008783, 22008841, 22008840, 22008839, 22008837, 22008833, 22008800, 22008802, 22008806, 22008807, 22008808, 22008809, 22008820, 22008805, 22008791, 22008975, 22008926, 22008958, 22008930, 22009264, 22008935, 22008941, 22008951, 22008968, 22008915, 22008937, 22008933, 22008916, 22008910

There will be a reduction in community cohesion due to competition for limited parking spaces. The council is receiving substantial moneys in council tax from the properties affected, and yet seems unwilling to consider any but the cheapest option. The council seems to think that all residents can use their garages, however, many residents of Epsom Road and multiple occupancy dwellings in these roads have no access to a garage. Many garages are not suitable for modern vehicles, and the council cannot assume that residents have the finances to upgrade them. Larger vehicles and vans are not able to use the restricted accesses to the service roads and garages behind the houses. The likelihood is that these restrictions will reduce the values of the houses and flats affected. The council states that its refuse collection trucks cannot travel the length of the loop formed by these roads. The council has now changed to a smaller truck, which now does so with little difficulty. The council’s refusal to allow crossovers in Holne Chase and the Epsom Road, so that residents could park on their front drives, prevents an alternative option for residents with vehicles. It is undemocratic for an elected body to require the responses to the proposal prior to the disclosure of all relevant information; in this case the final report on the provision of footway crossovers was not due to be presented to cabinet until 25th June. No notification of the availability of the outcome of this has been given to the residents of Home Chase, Rougemont Avenue and Torrington Way, yet they are required to respond to the TMO proposal by 20th July 2007. The current situation is discriminatory as mid-terrace residents cannot have driveway access on Holne Chase, whereas most end-of-terrace residents can. At a time when we are being encouraged to be eco-friendly, the proposal also discriminates against many tenants of the George Hill allotment site, some of whom are elderly and of restricted
Alternative suggestions:

The London Fire & Emergency Planning Committee should consider using narrower vehicles, as has worked for other counties, and as has worked for the refuse vehicles. This would alleviate the problem in many of the other roads in the area. After all, no properties in the area comprise more than three storeys.

A narrowing of the grass verge areas as cut-ins in Holne Chase, without removing drainage or tree, in similar fashion as that at 18-21 and 46-49 Holne Chase, thus allowing parking on both sides of the road without restricting access.

Applying Tarmac or cement to the strip along the edge of the allotment fence and on the residential side to enhance the kerbs and allow kerb parking. Few would have an objection to white line marking that would be required for this. The required reduction of grass verge would have little effect on drainage.

A Revision of the current Council policy rescinding the ban on crossovers and dropped kerbs in Holne Chase.

Officer’s comment.

This problem is not unique to these roads. It is considered that this area is better than some other roads in that the majority of the residents have off street parking facility. The residents must take some responsibility for accommodating their vehicle. The impact of the loss of on street parking can be minimised by the residents using their rear parking facilities. The adverse implications of obstructive parking regarding access for a fire engine is far greater than the loss of on street parking.

Due to access problems the Council has been forced to use smaller refuse vehicles with small load capacity in these roads in order to collect refuse. This involves many trips to and from these roads, which is time consuming and cost ratepayers of the borough more money than using the normal 3 meters wide vehicles with high capacity.

To assist residents, the criteria for footway crossovers have recently been changed so as to allow more residents apply for off street parking. However, due to the depth of the grass verge in Holne Chase, it would not be possible to approve crossovers.

Due to the loss of amenity and the costs involved, at the present time, grass verge cannot be removed to allow parking. The Council does not receive funding for such measures. Currently funding is not available to consider any other option except for the proposed restrictions. The double yellow lines are proposed on the grounds of access and therefore safety. The Council can only provide safe parking places. Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 places a duty on the Council "to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) Road safety is therefore a matter that the Council pays regard to when considering whether to make an Order under S.6 of the Act. Following several route tests carried out by the Fire brigade, the Council received 2 letters from LFEPA detailing their concerns over access for a fire engine and the safety of the residents. Following such letters the Council must act. See appendix 4 for Fire Brigade response.

It would be impossible to cater for the needs of all individuals. It is reasonable to expect the majority of residents to use their off street parking facilities (front and rear) and that would minimise the impact of the proposed measures. It would free up on street parking spaces for those who have no off street parking facilities and visitors.

The Council has reviewed the crossover criteria; but every attempt must be made to safeguard the amenity of the road and the area in this case the grass verge. The objective of the proposed measures is to address obstructive parking, which is not reliant on the review of the crossover criteria.

22008699 Having yellow lines on the road will make parking even worse. We previously applied for off street parking but were refused due to the depth of the fore court when measured. In light of your recent proposal, maybe you could reconsider? We feel strongly that other measures should be considered before the route of double yellow lines is taken: No parking of commercial Vehicles at any time on Rougemont Avenue, Torrington Way & Holne Chase. The council should install off street parking on the forecourts free of charge and look at each individual case with the household resident. The grass verge should be cut out leaving the trees, which would widen the road making access easier for Emergency Services & Refuse collections. We also have a large number of commercial vehicles parked in these three roads. I have been told there is a commercial vehicle park available in Morden Park free after a certain time each day until the following morning — it could be pointed out to residents at any meeting if this is in fact correct. It’s only 5 minutes walk back home after parking and would be a solution.

22008787 The parking situation in Holne Chase was not a problem until a few years ago. The council has given planning permission for houses to be extended far beyond what they were originally designed for, which was a small family. When houses are extended and then rented out as rooms the parking situation is obviously exasperated. Perhaps if some block was put on the number of commercial vehicles brought home at night and weekends the situation would be a lot better. These vehicles take up more road width than normal cars. We cannot believe this situation will be thrust upon us without the council changing their policy towards crossovers in Holne Chase. We do have parking at the rear of our property but it is not convenient to use it when you are coming and going and it does not help visitors. We do not flatter ourselves that writing a letter like this makes the slightest difference. We are all too well aware after living here for forty years that decisions are made long before the first consultations with residents are held. That said, we are still hoping to hear that council policy will be changed to allow crossovers in Holne Chase. If not, the value of our property and ability to sell will be badly affected and the to day coming and going made very difficult.

22008795 I would like to register my objection to the proposed double yellow lines on the grounds that it has obviously been put forward by the council as the cheapest option available with regards to meeting their commitment to allow
access for fire engines, but it has failed to consider the problems posed to the residents of the 200 plus properties whose lives and existing conditions will be drastically changed by your proposal. Where does the Council propose that we put all the vehicles that are effectively banning from there existing parking positions. Do you really believe that this will not cause friction between neighbours? I have been reliably informed by local Estate Agents that the proposal will effectively devalue property prices by about £10,000. Will I be compensated, I think not. I’m sorry this obviously doesn’t appear to be the Council’s problem even though Householders are each paying rates of £1350 plus giving the council a minimum Yearly income of £270,000 from these properties. As the council has not been very forth coming in the upkeep of the roads concerned I can obviously understand their reluctance to pay for more than a few cans of paint. Surely we are entitled to a better solution than half a days work for 2 men with cans of yellow paint? With regards to waste vehicles you are already using smaller vehicles to access the roads in question. Maybe the fire brigade will also have to look at the functionality of its vehicles in these back roads and consider not as wide a vehicle. This has been a problem elsewhere as the country has been overcome by the use of narrower vehicles. Your proposal of double yellow lines is creating a precedent for a fair proportion of the roads in the Morden. Is it your intention to submit the same answer for every back road that doesn’t meet the width requirement, if so you will effectively cut the parking in Merton by 50%? Do you really feel that rate payers will sit back and allow you to de-value their properties & there existing life style with this very blinkered solution to an obviously major problem? The proposal will also require wardens to enforce the restrictions with their respective wage bill but I suppose as more & more roads are restricted on safety grounds the fines will pay for a fair portion of the wage bill and as you are deploiting the parking so much you can make even more money by selling of resident parking permits obviously more than there are spaces. Surely a far more effective remedy would be to tarmac the grass verge creating a partial pavement parking area as has already been done in other parts of the Merton area (an example being the St Helier Estate) hence widening the access route to an acceptable level. I do not see why this cannot be achieved as you are not shifting drains and you can work around trees as has already been done in Rougemont and as to the figures of £250,000 quoted at the meeting, to tarmac only one side of the grass verge in Torrington & Rougemont, I find this absolutely absurd and would suggest you start looking for other contractors as you are obviously being overcharged. Finally I would like to voice my concerns as to the lack of consultation that was promised by our “Representatives” at the meeting in August. We were told that there would be another meeting to consider the councils options as it was obvious from the virtually unanimous vote taken at the meeting that the double yellow line proposal was not wanted by the householders present at the meeting. As is the usual council procedure no one is listening to the people concerned and some faceless unelected council official seems to have already made the decision to paint the lines with no regard for the people who supply the funds or the wider ramifications of this precedent. Lastly I would like to know what actions our St St Helier Ward Councillors (our Representatives) have or will be taking in support of the vote taken at that meeting in August.

22008797 As previously stated in a councillors report—“ I declined to implement the recommended course of action as I am concerned that it does not represent the best solution “ we also see this as a ridiculous proposal to solve a minor problem. There are many other roads in Merton that do not have a road width of >3m which will mean putting double yellow lines down every small tree lined avenue in the borough. Any decision made in these 3 roads has huge implications across the Borough. If the Council chooses to adopt the policy of yellow lines in all roads with less than 3.5m accesses in the Borough, the displacement of vehicles would be disastrous. We are quite sure that most residents would oppose any such schemes, resulting in costly assessments and consultations that would far exceed the cost of other sensible options. The refuse collectors have no problems accessing our road. They very sensibly use a slightly smaller vehicle and have no problem getting down our road and a London ambulance regularly has to attend a nearby elderly neighbour again with no problem. The odd badly parked vehicle would not stop the London Fire Brigade attending and rolling out hoses to put out any fire that has occurred. If a vehicle were in the way the London Fire Brigade would move it! The Plan of Proposals is not an accurate map of the current parking situation in the roads. Eleven crossovers have been left off the plans in Rougemont Avenue (no.’s 6, 28, 29, 30, 50, 55, 56, 57, 64, 85 and 87) and therefore your calculations of lost parking spaces are incorrect. How can this be properly consulted if the information in the plan is inaccurate and therefore useless? We feel that you are neglecting your duties under Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 by:

Not providing “suitable and adequate parking facilities”. Planning permission would no doubt be refused on any new development proposing this Draconian approach to resident’s parking.

Not securing “the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians).” Were we unable to park in close proximity to our home, we would have to park in the Harvester car park (the nearest public parking facility) and cross the dual carriageway with two young children in tow.

Your arguments regarding the use of rear access in the minutes of the Advisory and Street Management Committee Meeting on 1 5th January 2007 are contradictory. In paragraph 2.3.1 you state over the past few months that surveyors have concluded that access to all the roads is “extremely difficult” for normal size vehicles and impossible for larger vehicles. This is with a measured average road width of 2.5m. You then advise us in paragraph 2.5.2 that the width of the side access roads (2.4m, 2.47m and 2.3m) is “sufficient to provide access” to rear parking. How you can conclude access to larger vehicles in all 3 roads is impossible, then advise us to park at the rear of our properties, down narrower access roads is plain nonsensical. We do not feel that suggesting that residents use their rear parking facilities is going to solve the problems. The vast majority of rear parking facilities allow for parking one car. Many residents have more than one car (not us, I hasten to add), and also larger vehicles and vans. This suggestion also allows no parking for any visitors to the area and will be hugely disruptive to residents and to nearby roads that must accommodate the extra cars. We feel that widening the road by allowing parking on the grass verge area is a sensible option. In paragraph 2.3.2 (of the meeting above), you talk about parking on the grass verges. At the moment these provide no valuable use apart from a toilet for dogs. When you describe the paving over these as a “loss of amenity”, are you referring to Merton’s canine
residents toileting facilities? The grass verges are currently of no benefit to residents as they are frequently muddy and soiled with dog faeces. The report is also plainly wrong in saying it would be impossible to mark parking bays on grass verges. The markings would be painted on the road, not the grass! Allowing parking on the verges is clearly the only solution to making the road wider and the cost therefore of tarmacing over the grass is negligible when our safety is the key objective. There are many other roads in the Borough with marked parking bays on the verge. Why this cannot be achieved in our 3 roads is a mystery to me! It is the only solution, this also happens in other roads in the borough but you seem to be warning that it will be too expensive. How can you say that the council cannot afford to ignore this problem but it cannot afford the solution? Although it would be the ideal for all houses in the roads to have front drives and crossovers, this is not a viable option for many residents under the current criteria. We feel that in implementing these proposals, you would be abusing your powers by not serving well the majority of the community who have voted you in. We also suggest that more yellow lines in the Borough would be bound to create more revenue for the Council from “illegally” parked vehicles, who have absolutely nowhere to park. There is n “dangerous obstructive parking” in this avenue, as stated in the committee report. Just normal residents, their friends and family, parking outside their houses. In conclusion we repeat we strongly object to the Proposed Waiting Restrictions in Home Chase, Rougemont Avenue and Torrington Way. The report to the Street Management Committee is full of inaccuracies and surely a policy of common sense should be applied here. The majority of residents are against this proposal and we are sure the fire brigade will get access if and when they actually need to. By pulling a double yellow line along these small suburban roads you are taking away the parking we need near our house or even in the surrounding roads. This is not like bringing in residents parking or making main roads red routes, this is making all our houses unusable. The obvious solution is to allow vehicles to park on the verge and the small amount it will cost in my road (£62, 182) is insignificant against the loss of any available parking at my property.

22008705 You are halving the available parking space for the same number of residents. The number of motor vehicles per household has increased over the years, which does not help. After the last meeting another meeting was promised, What has happened to that?

22009013 The circulated plan forming part of the proposal is inaccurate in that no parking restriction is shown outside numbers 89, 87, 85. When in fact all these properties have council installed pavement crossings. Such drastic parking restrictions as proposed will inevitably cause severe congestion problems in nearby roads. Perhaps the council will identify any site where parking is allowed in this area. Why don’t you extend the parking at the end of the road from the alleyway to the main road? Also why have the parking between the alleyway and Torrington Way on one side when the road is wide enough for parking on both sides?

22008701 We are the owners of one car and the parking difficulties that we will experience when the lines are in place will be made worse by the number of our neighbours who have more than one vehicle. Some kind of restriction on the number of cars/ vans per household will need to be issued if plans go ahead. We have no funds to build either a garage or a driveway. Alleyways at the rear of the properties need to be greatly improved. We will have nowhere for visitors to park.

22008700 The reason why we are against it, is because there are such a lot of cars owned by residents it would result in arguments over parking and there would be a lot of bad feeling between residents and I can even foresee problems where the police would have to be involved. And also the result in the price of property going down. Make use of the grass verges to make the road wider all the way down like outside no. 64 and 65.

22008737 The plan in the centre of your newsletter is not correct as several crossovers are not shown and since some of them occur in proposed derestricted areas still more parking spaces will be lost. This being we wonder how accurate the remainder of your plan is and find it hard to believe it wasn’t checked thoroughly before being issued. Before attempting to introduce any parking restrictions there are several issues that need to be addressed, how many residents actually garage their cars when not in use and or overnight; The number of cars per household; the indiscriminate parking of vehicles for days at a time and the ever increasing number of commercial vehicles now being parked overnight. What do you propose doing, if anything, about the surplus cars with nowhere to park? A further problem would be come a night time when visitors come, how do you intend to accommodate these?

22008779 I propose that the grass verges are removed as they have already been done half way down Rougemont Avenue. MD said in the meeting that this was not possible as they are protected under the Conservation Rules. From the map it appears there are 42 spaces for 84 houses. Where are the cars going to park? There is no alternative parking. No-one has taken into consideration that the house at the end of these roads facing out onto Epsom Road also use this Avenue for parking as they do not have anywhere to park either Some houses don’t have frontage or a garage for it to be turned into a parking area. Houses prices will drop. MD asked “Are cars more important than peoples lives?” The response was “Do the council value their tatty unkempt grass verges more important than peoples lives?”

22008793 More homes would be affected by the introduction of double yellow lines on the right hand side of Rougemont Ave. Prices of houses directly affected will fall. Would you buy house from any of the areas affected as opposed to other roads in Merton when you cannot park in front of your own home? The fairest deal would be to do away with the grass verges the council would save on maintenance.

22008929 We are against the proposals, as the yellow lines would merely move the problem to other roads in the area. The residents feel that the council are going for the cheapest option. One alternative would be to tarmac the grass verges and allow cars to park with two wheels on the kerb. The three roads are currently in need of repair and have been for some time and whilst the Council Tax payments increase, we have not seen any benefit. The double yellow lines would just upset the residents. Property prices will reduce due to double yellow lines restrictions. Implementation of the TMO, I am sure some will examine the possibility of claiming back some of the value lost from the Council in the form of...
a demand for Council Tax re-banding. Has the overall cost to the council been taking into account? Disabled persons parking bays will not be affected. So what will the council do if houses opposite each other on Roughmont Avenue each require a disabled parking bay? When dropping off older and younger family members and then searching for a space all this waste fuel and adds to emissions. Is this really one of the impacts that the council wishes to see?

22008952 This will cause friction between neighbours; the proposal will effectively devalue property prices by about £10,000. Will I be compensated, I think not. With regards to waste vehicles you are already using smaller vehicles to access the roads in question. Maybe the fire brigade will also have to look at the functionality of its vehicles in these back roads and consider not as wide a vehicle. This has been a problem else where in the country which has been overcome by the use of narrower vehicles. Surely a far more effective remedy would be to tarmac the grass verge creating a partial pavement parking area as has already been done in other parts of the Merton area (as is the usual council procedure no one is listening to the people concerned and some faceless unselected council official seems to have already made the decision to paint the lines with no regard for the people who supply the funds or the wider ramifications of this precedent). Lastly I would like to know what actions our St Helier Ward Councillors (our Representatives) have or will be taking in support of the vote taken at that meeting in August, example being the St Helier Estate) hence widening the access route to an acceptable level.

22008956 The council is receiving substantial funds from council tax, one of the highest throughout the London boroughs and yet only considers the cheapest option of painting two yellow lines down the road. Parking restrictions would only lower property value. Tension is bound to be created among a friendly community vying for parking spaces. There has been minor consideration made at the implications of painting the lines on disabled car owners who could legally park on the lines and create the same restrictions as previously. Other appropriate options are available to you which don’t seem to have been very seriously deliberated upon such as allowing and providing for kerb parking, allowing for drive ways on houses that could take a small car at least. Being that the area, particularly the St.Helier estate is riddled with restricted parking even further. If the Council gets its’ way we will have even less of a chance of parking once the decision to paint the lines with no regard for the people who supply the funds or the wider ramifications of this precedent). Lastly I would like to know what actions our St Helier Ward Councillors (our Representatives) have or will be taking in support of the vote taken at that meeting in August, example being the St Helier Estate) hence widening the access route to an acceptable level.

22008911 I would like to register my objection. I see yellow lines as a money saving exercise by your department. Parking restrictions will cause neighbours disputes and general bad feeling in the community. The council seems inflexible in their unwillingness to consider other options. Parking restrictions will lower property values in the roads affected. The use of narrower, more appropriate, appliances by the Fire Service. The Council refuse service has solved their access problems by the use of smaller vehicles. This would seem to make sense in view of all the other narrow roads in the area, including the St Helier estate. Adaptation of grass verges to allow partial parking on kerb and road. Road width in Torrington Way would be greatly improved if this were to be allowed. Many roads in the area have this arrangement, including some of the very narrow roads on the St Helier estate, with no apparent diminishment of amenity. This could be done in an environmentally friendly way, for example, using specific concrete parking blocks that allow grass to grow through them while resisting wear by traffic. These products were used successfully by Merton College in its parking area for many years before the recent development. I am sure your own engineers are capable of coming up with something along these lines! The Council would probably save money in grass cutting and verge maintenance over time. There would be no reduction whatsoever in the width of paved footpath available to pedestrians. A revision in current council policy to allow crossovers to properties in Torrington Way with bay windows to their fronts.

22008912 Certain carriageway users, namely blue badge holders, can park on double yellow lines for limited periods of time legally. This fact alone instantly negates the suitability of this proposal: the roadway could potentially be continually inaccessible to fire engines by cars parked on either side of the street displaying blue badges for three hours at a time throughout the day. As unlikely as this may seem, there is every chance that a single blue badge holder’s car could block passage for a fire engine during a fire. Certain carriageway users disregard parking restrictions and park on double yellow lines. If a car happens to be illegally parked in Holne Chase, Torrington Way, or Rougemont Avenue during which time a fire occurs and a fire engine can not fit past, a parking ticket on the windscreen will hardly amend mailers. At a public consultation residents were told that the double yellow lines would not be policed at night in order to reduce costs. If this is the case, which it must be in order to validate this as a half serious proposal on terms of its minimal cost, residents may consider the convenience of parking outside their own house without risk of penalty more attractive than leaving a clear width for emergency vehicles. May I suggest that a widening of the carriageways in the affected areas ie. Removal/ reduction of verge or allowing parking on verge (the verge being obviously necessarily modified) are a more sensible and potentially problem solving answer to this issue.

22008798 Opposed to double yellow lines as there would be no facilities for family, friends, visitors and builders etc. Residents who finish work late or do shift work will be unable to park. This would lead to arguments and would cause general unrest amongst neighbours. The best answer for residents would be to tarmac over the grass verges and allow vehicles to park with two wheels up on the kerb.

22008787 Opposed to the scheme because, the parking situation in Home Chase was not a problem until a few years ago. The council has given planning permission for houses to be extended far beyond what they were originally designed for, which was a small family. When houses are extended and then rented out as rooms the parking situation is obviously exasperated. When Rougemont Avenue and Tonington Way are yellow lined it will push their cars into Home Chase and if anyone comes to visit they will not have a hope in hell of parking. The council should change their policy towards crossovers in Holne Chase.

22008609 There are too many cars per household and not enough space to park them all on the road. Another problem that we encounter, especially at the weekend, is the owners of the allotments who drive and park on the road restricting the parking even further. If the Council gets its’ way we will have even less of a chance of parking once the double yellow lines are painted. The best way forward would be to allow people to have off street parking.
22008698  Opposed to the scheme as visitors would have difficulties, A mail shot to urge people to park round the back could be done with the emphasis that the alternatives would be yellow lines. The wide grass verges in Holne Chase could be reduced to widen the road. Rougemont Av could have the grass verges replaced with tarmac (green perhaps) to allow two wheels on the verge as in other areas. If the yellow lines where put the other side, leaving my side clear from no.84 as far as 74 inclusive, the loss of parking spaces would be minimised allowing me to park on the road

22008819  By putting yellow lines in the road is in my opinion a cheap cop out for the local council which would cause a lot more disruption to the local residents than necessary. Residents would be at logger heads as to who gets a parking space this would damage the community spirit we have in the area. We would have the value of our houses greatly reduced. Most households have more than one car your proposals would not give each house one parking space so where do you advise I park after working all day. Can we take it that we are banned from having friends and family visit if not please advise as to where they might park? At the meeting on the 26th August 2006 95% of the local residents at the meeting objected. Is this another case of the local council listening to the residents with their fingers in their ears? At the meeting in August we were told there would be a further meeting to discuss plans once more has this been conveniently forgotten. Who is going to patrol the road to ensure there wont be any problem, as I fell there will be big ones.

22008702  Opposed to the scheme because if there are double yellow lines on one side, what is going to happen to the cars, residents will not have enough space to park. I am a pensioner will I be able to get a grant to enable me to have a crossover and driveway on my front.

22008984  Opposed to scheme as where will workman park when working for a resident, mothers with children would have difficulty, it would be impossible to have any visitors, family or friends. It will cause a great drop in house prices. The best solution for the problem would be to concrete the grass verges.

22008782  The first point I would like to raise is that the very top of Torrington Way from Nos. 52 to 61 is a no through road which means that the majority of the traffic is usually the residents and doesn’t pose that much of a problem. So is it really necessary to have double yellow lines in this cul-de-sac. The only place I can see lines being of any benefit would be at the top of Torrington Way which would enable cars to have a clean sweep to enter and exit the access road (next to No 51) which leads to the rear of the houses. My second point is if this proposal goes through it will create even more problems than it solves reducing 50% of the parking space for the three roads above mentioned. Residents with double yellow lines on their side of the road will then try to park on the opposite side of the road along with any family and friends who come to visit. I can also foresee that residents without double yellow lines outside their homes would then become extremely unhappy and decide to have crossover drives built and convert their front gardens into a parking space which would obviously lead to virtually no on-street parking in this area at all. Living at the top of Torrington Way at number 61 can see myself, family and friends driving around Torrington Way, Rougemont Avenue and Holne Chase looking for somewhere to park with no success. Which would then mean driving out into the Epsom Road which as you probably are aware is a red route, trying to find somewhere in a nearby road which will not be easy as most of these roads already have their own problems with parking. Which in theory means you could end up parking half a mile to a mile away from your own home if you are lucky. If this proposal does go through it would blight the area and the price of property would plummet making it extremely difficult to sell our house. There would be lots of arguments and disagreements between residents regarding the parking and in general it will make life pretty miserable for everyone. We can see more problems arising if this plan goes ahead and this was obvious to anyone who attended the meeting on the 26th August at St Lawrence’s church hall. Council members were in attendance and a vote was taken to see how many people were against the double yellow lines. The majority of people (around 95%) objected and many suggestions and ideas were put forward but it seems that no one has taken the residents views into account and reported back to us. Surely if the council have any feelings regarding the residents views and the misery that it will create they must come up with other solutions. Do away with the grass verges and allow vehicles to park on the extra space created In parts of Rougemont Avenue the grass verge has been tarmac so why can it be done in Torrington Way? Stop large vans and lorries using residential roads to park overnight that would allow more space. I suppose it is far cheaper and easier for Merton council to paint a couple of yellow lines than listen to anything the residents who live here and have to cope with this problem on a daily basis which I would like to add has already deeply upset quite a lot of people.

22008816  I accept that there are issues that need to be resolved with the parking situation in these 3 roads however, the proposals outlined appear to a major over reaction, without regard to the potentially huge negative impact they will have on residents. I believe that there are other options available to reach a satisfactory outcome and as such object to the parking proposals. Removal of grass verge to make the roads wider or partial removal of the grass verge with yellow lines on the remaining parts to accommodate existing trees. Creation of a one way system. Prohibition of all commercial vans from on street parking (which over time have increasingly appeared in these roads making the roads more hazardous for drivers and pedestrians alike due to restricted views and also significantly reducing the availability of parking spaces for residents cars). Should the current proposals for double yellow lines, to be in force at all times, be adopted I believe that this may make access for the emergency services easier but will be catastrophic for neighbourly relations and almost certainly affect the saleability of property in these roads.

22009015  I strongly oppose this proposal. Where do you expect all the displaced cars to park. I understand the concerns regarding access for emergency vehicles and other services but to impose this proposal is an easily made blinkered decision, which will lead to a massive parking problem and disharmony between residents. As an alternative I would propose:

1. One side of the road the grass verge is removed and replaced with concrete paving with clearly defined parking bays, so that vehicles can partly park on the pavement with out interfering with pedestrian use.
2. That the grass verge be removed on one side or both sides and be replaced with a concrete honeycomb structure, which would not only allow cars to park upon it but also allow drainage and the regrowing of a grass verge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22009016</td>
<td>I am objecting to the scheme, why don’t you extend the parking at the end of the road from the alleyway to the main road. Why have no parking between the Alleyway and Torrington Way on one side when the road is wide enough for parking both sides.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22008961</td>
<td>I am writing to express my concern regarding the proposed double yellow lines being introduced the length of Rougemont Avenue, Torrington Way and Holme Chase. At the public meeting in August 2006 about the parking problems we voiced our concerns then and mentioned alternatives such as changing the grass verges to tarmac and parking there. I feel the grass verges and not maintained and constantly used as a dog’s toilet and also parts of Rougemont do have tarmac instead of grass which apparently was done by the Council. Surely this is a Borough wide issue with many narrow roads. How has this problem been addressed elsewhere. Of course, I understand the safety issue but double yellow lines seem an easy cheap option without seeing the huge community implications. Residents will be competing for parking space on a daily basis and visits from family and friends will become very difficult. I feel that there hasn’t been enough discussion on alternatives and the Council has not involved the Community about the parking problems. I received one letter about the meeting last August 2006 and then this current letter date June 2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22008789</td>
<td>Firstly, as residents of Torrington Way we park both our vehicles at the rear of our property, making fill use of the access way at the side of our house. Many residents, some of whom have two or more vehicles (including commercial vehicles/vans) park on the road despite having rear access and, in many cases, garages. If parking restrictions are imposed on the ‘even’ side of the road, the limited parking that is currently available on the ‘odd’ side of the road will be in very high demand. Vehicles parking directly outside no’s 87 and 85, either side of the access road, can cause severe restriction to that access way. Yellow lines applied at the entrance to the access way must extend far enough to either side to prevent this access being impeded. On this point, it would seem more productive if imposing parking restrictions to apply them to the ‘odd’ side of the road. There are already many lowered kerbs on this side of the road and maximum available parking would be maintained. Secondly if parking restrictions are imposed on Rougemont Avenue, Torrington Way and Holne Chase a significant number of vehicles will be displaced. A fact that has been proven following the imposing of ‘red route’ parking restrictions on London Road. As a result of which vehicles belonging to residents of London Road are frequently parked in Rougemont Avenue and Holne Chase. Further parking restrictions will serve to move the congestion rather than cure it. An alternative to yellow lines would be to tarmac over the grass verge at alternate points along the road to permit parking two wheels on the kerb. Whilst we very much enjoy living in a green residential area we acknowledge that parking is a problem and compromises have to be made. Some grass verges could be saved and of course the trees should remain. Furthermore if parking restrictions are imposed it will severely limit parking for visitors to these roads. Has any thought been given to the feasibility of issuing ‘temporary visitors parking permits’, one per resident to allow visitors to park in the restricted zone for a limited time? Or indeed to issuing residents parking permits at one per household to be used in conjunction with marked bays. This would fairly distribute available parking spaces. Finally as Merton residents and tax payers we need to feel that all available options have been explored including the associated cost implications and due consideration given to residents concerns. It seems to us currently that the cheapest ‘quick fix’ option of yellow lines is the only option being considered. This problem requires careful consideration to provide a sustainable solution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22008944</td>
<td>I wish to express in the strongest possible terms my objection to the proposed parking restrictions to be placed almost the whole length of Rougemont Avenue, Torrington Way and Holme Chase. Whilst I accept that we have an issue with larger vehicles particularly Fire appliances gaining access, raised in 2005 by LFEPAA. I do not believe sufficient consideration has been given to its effect on the community and its residents, or to alternatives raised by the local residents at the ward councillor’s meeting 26th August 2006 when the residents indicated that they strongly opposed the proposed plan. It seems clear that the Council are simply railroading us into the cheapest option without even the courtesy of an explanation as to why the alternatives raised are not viable. My reasons for the objection are as follows: It is well known that parking is an emotive issue in any area and I can see the potential for the current close-knit community to fall apart if the available parking is effectively more than halved. One should also consider the more elderly residents or those with young children who could find themselves having to park at the opposite end of the road to their home or worse still unable to park in the local area at all. A number of residents in the area have had parking areas installed in front of their homes, which is of course extremely expensive, and for many of the homes in Rougemont Avenue impractical due to the lay of the land. I understand that the council refused a proposal, which would have made this possible in Holme Chase. The council is receiving council tax moneys from the homes affected yet seem unwilling to consider anything but the cheapest option. The council seem to think that residents should be able to use garages accessed by the old service tracks to the rear of the dwellings however most were built many years ago and are unsuitable for modern vehicles as in fact are the tracks and the council should not assume that the residents have the finances to upgrade them. The likelihood is that these restrictions will reduce the value of the homes affected. It is undemocratic for an elected body to require responses prior to the disclosure of all relevant information. In this case the final report on the provision of footway crossovers was not due to be presented to cabinet until 25th June. No notification of the outcome has been given to the residents yet we are required to respond by the 20th July 2007. Alternative suggestions: Where not restricted by trees or drains reduce the width of the grass verges on the roads affected. I understand this has been done at 18-21 and 46-49 Holne Chase Tarmac the grass verges on both sides of the roads and allow cars to park half on the verge and half on the road. I for one would be happy to see the last of the grass verge, as it seems to me that these days it has no other use other than that of a dog toilet. This was done with out consultation some time ago in the area in front of No’s 31 to 37 Rougemont Avenue with no ill effects. In fact in terms of parking and access only positive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I know that in some circles motorists are considered the enemy these days but one must also be realistic. These roads which were built in a time when car ownership was unusual now it is the norm and I do not believe that a small adjustment to make an area both safer and user friendly for its residents is too much to ask from ones Local Government.

The most obvious solution would be to remove the grass verges which at the moment serve the purpose of a dog toilet. The council seem to think its ok for us to use garages at the back of our properties but has anyone viewed these? My car would not fit in mine, and there is no way I would walk me and my two young children along the dark rocky path to get back to my house. I feel you have gone for the cheapest option and have not taken modern day living into account. It is a fact of life that most homes own 1 or more vehicles. I feel that the council have already made up their minds and yellow lines are the only option they will agree to. Please prove us all wrong by listening to the residents and think to yourselves would you be happy if double yellow lines where put out side your house!

Objects to proposal as where will disabled relatives and friends who visit park. I have had a quote for off street parking, which I enclose. I cannot afford to spend nearly £8000 on a hard standing, and I understand from other neighbours that they cannot afford it either. The best solution is to get rid of the dog toilet, and pave over the grass verge just like outside no 31, 33, 35 and 37. If all the residents had off street parking the grass verge would have to be removed. It is best for people to keep their front gardens to avoid subsidence and drainage.

Having examined this document and those online, it appears that the decision to propose these measures does not take into account the wishes of the residents, many of whom attended an open meeting at St Lawrence's Church Hall on Saturday 26 August 2006. Both the Cabinet member for Environment & Transport, Councillor Tariq Ahmad, and the author of the 15 January 2007 report, were present, so they cannot have failed to register the level of opposition to the proposal for double yellow lines along the three roads.

Impact Assessment
Was such an exercise carried out which took into account every eventuality pertaining to the residents? Judging from the 15 January 2007 report, it appears not. Yes, some of the impacts of the TMO are mentioned, but many are absent. One such is the impact on property values. Estate agents assessing properties where residents are unable to park in front of their own homes are highly likely to reduce the value of such properties. Moreover, should residents need to move they are likely to be faced with a much longer selling period than at present. If residents' homes lose tens of thousands of pounds in value due to implementation of the TMO, I am sure some will examine the possibility of claiming back some of the value lost from the Council in the form of a demand for Council Tax re-banding. In terms of overall 'cost' to the Council, has that been taken into account? I doubt it — and yet it could amount to a significant percentage, fit not all, of the costed amount to make the grass verges into solid verges. I note from the 20 June 2007 document that "disabled persons parking bays will not be affected by [the TMO] proposal". So what will the Council do if houses opposite each other on Rougemont Avenue each require a disabled parking bay? Will it discriminate between one disabled person over another? Has the impact on the environment really been taken into account? Granted we would lose some grass verges, but consider the wasted fuel and associated carbon emissions when a resident arrives home and goes searching around the loop of the three roads to see if a space is available. Similarly, when dropping off older or younger family members, or unloading shopping, the driver then has to search for a parking space. All this wastes fuel and adds to emissions. Is this really one of the impacts the Council wishes to see?

Options
The houses were built in the 1930s when the level of car usage 70 years later could hardly have been envisaged. Many more recent developments have obviously taken this into account. The most aesthetically pleasing solution would be to remove the grass verges completely and leave the trees, thus creating bays in which to park and a carriageway between the parked cars which could take the current design (more on which later) of emergency vehicle. The simplest solution is to make the verges solid, enabling cars to move onto them and create a wider area of carriageway through which emergency vehicles can pass. From where did the figure of £142,744 originate. Were potential contractors asked to submit tenders? I note the statement: “Due to the current policy regarding loss of amenity and the costs involved, grass verges are not removed to allow parking.” Precisely what loss of amenity occurs if a grass verge is made solid? Surely the opposite is true in this case, as the residents would have the amenity of convenient parking, precisely what their Council Tax and Road Tax should go towards. It is also interesting to note that many roads in the district have raised entrances constructed with individually laid down bricks. If budgets could be found for these cosmetic road works, why can a budget not be set aside to alleviate — hopefully once and for all — a problem inherited from an entirely different era? Once more I note from the 15 January 2007 report: “The parking needs of the residents and visitors are given consideration but it is considered that maintaining safe access must take priority.” This option of hard verges surely fulfils the requirements made in this statement. I have seen many large vehicles make their way through all three roads during the almost 10 years in which I have lived here. Admittedly some have had to move slowly and carefully between the parked cars and that is something we would not want an emergency vehicle to have to do. Nevertheless, removal vans, delivery lorries and many similar vehicles have frequented all three roads. This begs the question, are there not narrower emergency vehicle options, which still carry the required range of appliances? There must have been similar scenarios to this elsewhere, both within the borough and around the country. What research has been done to identify such vehicles? Also, I am sure the emergency services have to update their appliances on a regular basis. Have there been any discussions with the emergency services about the next purchases they make? When, for example, is the next capital expenditure for the fire service due? Could the emergency services influence the design of future vehicles?

I am not in favour of scheme. I think the council should give consideration to relaxing the regulations, which I understand restrict the conversion of front gardens, particularly in Holne Chase, for parking to enable all residents who
want this facility to be able to set it up. Future planning applications for expansion of properties When applications for expansion of properties are presented to the Council where additional accommodation is built and the rooms are let, it is likely that each tenant will have a motor vehicle. This is also likely to be the case where expansion is to accommodate a large family. In these cases I believe the Council should consider imposing conditions with regard to the provision of sufficient parking space(s).

**Officer's comments**

It is acknowledged that the proposed restrictions may cause inconvenience to many of the residents. However, access difficulties particularly for the fire brigade have been identified in these roads. Although other options such as widening of the carriageway and removing the grass verge to allow footway parking has been considered, due to lack of funding and the possible loss of amenity, the only option currently available is the introduction of waiting restrictions. To assist the residents with their off street parking facility, the criteria for the provision of footway crossovers have been reviewed and relaxed. This does not imply that all applications will be approved. Each application will be assessed individually. Due to the width of the grass verge on Holne Chase, however, applications are likely to be refused. It would be impossible to cater for the needs of all individuals. It is reasonable to expect the majority of residents to use their off street parking facilities (front and rear) which would free up on-street parking spaces for those who have no off street parking facilities and visitors.

Parking including disabled parking bays can only be permitted where it is safe to do so.

Creating a one-way system in these roads would not resolve access difficulties.

Heavy goods vehicles of 5T and above are not permitted to park overnight. This matter has been forwarded to the Parking enforcement

Taking the current criteria, available funding and Council's duties and responsibilities in to consideration, it is proposed to introduce double yellow lines (at any time waiting and loading restrictions) in all three roads in a manner that would prevent parking on both sides of the road except for those areas that are wide enough to allow parking and passage of a fire engine. It is also proposed to apply double yellow lines across the access points to the side/rear access/garages. This will make it easier for those residents who may decide to use their parking facilities to the rear of their properties.
Dear Resident

The purpose of this newsletter is to formally consult with you on the current parking proposals for Rougement Avenue, Holne Chase and Torrington Way.

Following several route tests in these roads by the London Fire & Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA), concerns have been raised about the obstructive manner of parking which could affect accessibility by fire engines in the event of an emergency. Additionally the Council’s refuse vehicles also have access difficulties.

The minimum running width required by a fire engine to access residential road is between 3 and 3.5 metres. With cars parked fully on the carriageway, on both sides of each of these roads, the average available road width for access is reduced to 2.5 metres and even less in some sections of the roads.

Parking on the footway is an offence under Section 15(1) of the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1974. However, the Council can exempt areas of the footway from the parking ban by making a Notice under Section 15(4) of this Act. An exemption would include signs and road markings as per the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002. However, it is not normal practice to allow parking on grass verges because the grass verge would not be able to accommodate the weight of vehicles and it would be difficult if not impossible to mark the designated parking areas (which is a legal requirement). The continuous parking on grass verges would also lead to rutting of the surface, mud on the carriageway/footway, and a trip hazard being created between the hard surfaced footway and the verge. This would all lead to additional maintenance cost.

With regard to the creation of private off-street parking, the current criteria for the provision of footway crossovers are under review and the review report has been subject to Member Consultation. The final review report is due to be presented to Cabinet on 25th June 2007.

However, the current Council policy regarding provisions for footway crossovers, the depth of the private forecourt/garden must exceed 4.5m. This is to prevent obstructive parking across the footway that could be hazardous to pedestrians, particularly those using a wheel chair, those with pushchairs and blind or partially sighted people. Also, under the current criteria, crossings that would involve the removal of grass verge over 1 metre wide can be and are often refused.

It is appreciated that there is a high level of demand for on street parking in this area; however, priority must be given to safety of and access for all road users including pedestrians. It is considered that the proposals are essential for improving access for traffic including the emergency services and the Council’s refuse vehicle.

Formal Consultation

To address these concerns the Council is now carrying out a formal consultation to introduce double yellow lines (No waiting restrictions) along one side of the roads as indicated on the plan in the centre of this leaflet to assist the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians). Double yellow lines indicate no parking at any time and require no signs. However in the absence of No loading restrictions vehicles may stop to load and unload goods for a limited period of time. Waiting or parking is not permitted. The disabled persons parking bays will not be affected by this proposal.

www.merton.gov.uk
Let us know your views
A notice of the Council’s intentions, proposing to make the Traffic Management Order (TMO) for the above measures will be published in the local newspaper, London Gazette and posted on lamp columns in the vicinity. We urge anyone who is either in favour or against the proposal to make their representation in writing to the Head of Street Scene and Waste Management, Merton Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, Surrey, SM4 5DX by no later than 20th July 2007, quoting reference ES/EG/RO. Anyone who opposes the scheme must state the grounds on which their objection is made. We also welcome letters in support. Please note that responses to any representation received will not be made until a final decision is made.

A copy of the draft TMO, a plan identifying the area affected by the proposal and the Council’s ‘Statement of Reasons’ can be inspected at the Merton Link, Merton Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, Surrey, during the Council’s working hours, Monday to Friday, between 9am and 5pm. Alternatively, this information can be viewed on Merton Council’s website, www.merton.gov.uk/rougemontave

Contact us
If you require further information please contact Mr. Paul Atie on 020 8545 3214 or via email: paul.atie@merton.gov.uk.
Dear

ROUGEMONT AVENUE, TORRINGTON WAY AND HOLNE CHASE

Further to our meeting on Friday 9th March I am writing to reiterate my very grave concerns with regard to the access for fire appliances to Rougemont Avenue, Torrington Way and Holne Chase.

I have asked fire crews to visit the roads again over recent weeks and on each occasion they have said they could not gain access due to parked vehicles. Quite simply with cars and vans parked as they are, both during the day and at night it would be impossible for a fire appliance to attend to any of these roads within an acceptable time.

I would like to address the points that were raised at the meeting.

You mentioned placing white lines as a voluntary parking restriction.

I do not feel that the residents would take any notice at all of this and as such there would be no resolution to the problem.

I believe one of the residents commented there has not been any need for the fire brigade to attend these roads as long as they could remember.

The fire brigade in fact attended 4 incidents in these roads between July 2005 and now. Fortunately these were minor incidents.

To get a clearer picture I spoke with the incident commander of one of these incidents who informed me that the call he attended was about half way along Rougemont Avenue. The fire appliance could not get further than the first 30m of the road; he had to send his crew on foot whilst the driver of the fire engine had to knock on doors of houses and sound his siren to get people to move cars. He estimates it took between ten to fifteen minutes for the fire engine to reach the house. Once the incident was concluded it took a further twenty minutes to reverse out of Rougemont Avenue, during this time the appliance had to be taken 'off the run' (made unavailable for fire calls). Had this been a serious fire with people needing rescuing I shudder to think what the consequences may have been.

It was suggested that a fire engine could be left at the end of the road and hose laid out to any property on fire. Not accounting for the time this would take, due to the length of the roads an intermediate pump would be required which again would mean a fire appliance would need access, apart from that, a fire engine carries 250m of hose which would not reach the end of the road.

Firefighters are required to wear heavy equipment such as breathing apparatus and having to run up to 400m and then be expected to fight a fire is simply not practical.

It was said that crews could carry any ladder to the fire. The ladders carried on a fire appliance weigh 100kg’s are pretty unwieldy and are designed to be carried by 4 firefighters. It is generally accepted that 60 metres is a realistic distance for a ladder to be carried, that is if you want the firefighters to be fit enough to tackle the fire afterwards.
Rear Access – Rougmont Avenue