**Cabinet Member:** Planning and Traffic Management  
**Date:** 8 June 2009  
**Agenda item:**  
**Wards:** Raynes Park  

**Subject:** 20mph Speed Limit – Cambridge Road  
**Lead officer:** Sarah Tanburn, Interim Director of Environment & Regeneration  
**Lead member:** Councillor William Brierly  
**Forward Plan reference number:**  
**Contact officer:** Edward Quartey, Tel: 020 8545 2171, email: edward.quartey@merton.gov.uk

---

**Recommendations:**

It is recommended that the Cabinet Member for Planning and Traffic Management consider the issues detailed in this report and proceeds with the introduction of a 20mph speed limit for only Cambridge Road, Panmuir Road and Cambridge Close.

A. Notes the outcome of the formal consultation carried out during November 2008 and January 2009 on the proposed 20mph speed limit for Cambridge Road area as shown in Appendix 4.

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

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

D. Agrees to proceed with the making of the Traffic Management Order (TMO) and the implementation of the proposed 20mph speed limit, according to drawing number Z73-191-01A.

---

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to inform the Cabinet Member for Planning and Traffic Management of the outcome of a formal consultation conducted between November 2008 and January 2009 in the Cambridge Road area for a 20mph speed limit, as shown on plan Z73-191-01 in Appendix 4.

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

1.3. It is recommends that the Cabinet Member, subject to consideration of objections, gives approval to proceed with the implementation of the 20mph speed limit for Cambridge Road, Panmuir Road and Cambridge Close, as shown on plan Z73-191-01A in Appendix 1.
2 DETAILS

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

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

2.3 During the compilation of the various areas for the 20mph, roads with existing traffic calming measures were identified and reviewed in order to determine the need to turn the area into a 20mph zone or 20mph speed limit. These traffic calmed roads were grouped into 18 different areas, including four existing 20mph zones. The plan, which shows the various areas, is included in Appendix 2.

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

2.5 It should be noted that traffic speed and volume surveys were carried out after the consultation and provided the proposals are approved, comprehensive surveys would be conducted in order to determine the effectiveness of the proposed measures.

2.6 The current speed limit on all the roads within the two proposed areas is 30mph.

2.7 Cambridge Road area 20mph speed limit is bounded by Cottenham Road (inclusive), Coombe Lane, Arteberry Road and Oakwood Road (inclusive). Durham Road, Amity Grove, Lambton Road, Pepys Road and Cambridge Road (east of Durham Road) are the roads in the area with existing traffic calming measures. All the other roads within the proposed area are narrow except Richmond Road and Cottenham Park Road.

2.8 Hollymount Primary School and recreational parks are located in the proposed Cambridge Road area 20mph speed limit.

2.9 Following discussions with the Cabinet Member and Ward Councillors, statutory and informal consultations for a 20mph speed limit were carried out.
3 BACKGROUND & STRATEGIC CONTEXT

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

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

3.3 There is evidence that 20mph zones are effective measures in reducing road collision casualties over an area. A Transport for London study has shown that 20mph zones in London reduced fatalities and seriously injured casualties by 57% and the frequency of injury collision by 42%.

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

Advantages
- Improve the local environment and road safety for all road users – particularly vulnerable groups such as children
- Promote safe journeys to schools
- Reduce the number and severity of injuries to road users
- Reduce accident levels, especially for vulnerable road users
- Reduce ‘rat running’ (use of side streets to avoid main roads)
- Ensure fewer drivers break the speed limit

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

4 CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN OR PROPOSED

FORMAL CONSULTATION

4.1 Local area statutory and informal consultations commenced on 21 November 2008 for a period of 7 weeks and closed on 9 January 2009. The initial consultation period was for 4 weeks, but was extended, as there was an error in the newsletter circulated to all interested parties within the boundary. The consultation leaflet together with the letter informing residents of the extended date for any comments, are included in Appendix 4.

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

4.3 The Council received 82 representations out of 2422 newsletters distributed. A breakdown of this is shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Against</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Num.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Num.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>73.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 The results show 73.2% of residents against the 20mph speed limit proposals, 18.3% in support, 7.3% unsure and 1.2% only made comments on the proposals.

4.5 Most of the responses received were against the whole of the area being consulted for a 20mph speed limit, as most of the roads had no speeding issues except Cambridge Road and Cottenham Park Road.

4.6 OBJECTIONS FROM STATUTORY GROUPS AND RESIDENTS GROUPS

4.6.1 Metropolitan Police

The proposals as provided intend to introduce a 20mph speed limit, by means of limit rather than zone, in the Cambridge Road area. DfT guidance on this subject advises that 20mph limits are encouraged “in situations where there is a particular risk to vulnerable road users.” Whilst there are areas within this proposal where the presence of a school would justify such a limit within the vicinity of the school, police do not believe that this applies to the whole area.

The advice also states that a 20mph zone should be used over a large area, a 20mph limit in an individual street or a small number of roads. Police consider that the proposed area does not constitute a small number of roads, and therefore to comply with guidance the scheme should be introduced zonally. The continued introduction of 20mph speed limits, in different manners, across the borough can, in our opinion, only serve to provide greater confusion as to what the speed limit is and therefore can only have an adverse effect on compliance, which is at odds with the DfT guidance.

The guidance further states that 20mph speed limits are suitable for streets where “vehicle speeds are already low (the Department would suggest where mean vehicle speeds are 24mph or below), or where additional traffic calming measures are planned as part of the strategy.” On behalf of the local Safer Neighbourhoods Team, this office undertook a speed survey in the western end of Cambridge Road in August of this year. The speeds of 16,822 vehicles were recorded. Of these 6,995 were in excess of the existing 30mph limit. The average recorded speeds were 29mph in each direction. This is clearly at odds with the DfT’s guidance on streets suitable for the introduction of a limit, and there are no proposals contained
In this consultation for additional traffic calming as is also advised. It appears clear from this that the limit, or at least certain areas of it, is unlikely to meet the DfT guidance that a successful “20mph speed limit should be generally self-enforcing”.

Additionally the proposed signing of the limit, as shown on supplied plan drawing no. Z73-191-01 does not appear to comply with the standards suggested by current signing guidance. The Traffic Signs Manual Chapter 3 provides guidance on the positioning of repeater signs in table 14-4. For a 20mph speed limit with repeater signs on alternate sides of the carriageway, as shown in this plan, the maximum recommended distance between repeater signs is 200 metres. There are a number of points where this distance is exceeded. Whilst police are aware that the law only requires repeater signs to be placed “at regular intervals”, we consider it ill advised at best to fail to comply with the current advice. Indeed, given that motorists are used to a situation where street lamps are indicative of a 30mph limit, police believe there is a case for exceeding the current guidance and placing extra signs in an effort to make the new limit clear.

Chapter 3 also provides advice on the siting in general terms of signs, in that drivers should have an unobstructed view of traffic signs. One of the proposed repeater sign locations was found to be on the far side of the carriageway alongside a bus stop bay. When a bus is present, it is clear that the speed limit sign will be obscured, which we believe will not aid compliance with the proposed limit.

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

Council response

As most of the area is mainly residential with a school and recreational parks, this is regarded a vulnerable road area.

DfT Local Transport Note 1/07 recommends 20mph speed limit area to be considered over a wider area than individual roads to make them more effective.

Traffic speeds survey conducted on Cambridge Road within the vicinity of Hollymount Primary School recorded very low speed; hence no further measures will be introduced. The other section of Cambridge Road where the recorded mean speed is higher than 24mph, electronic speed indicators are proposed to encourage drivers to reduce their speeds. The 20mph speed limits are not meant to be self-enforcing, as enforcement is the responsibility of the Metropolitan Police.
The drawing sent out during the consultation stage were not detailed design drawing, hence did not include the spacing between all the repeater signs. This will be done during the detailed design stage when approval is granted for the scheme.

4.6.2 **South Ridgeway Residents Association**

We were surprised to discover that the proposals for 20 mph speed limits include several residential roads that lie in our (SRRA) area e.g. Dunmore Road, Montana Road, Hunter Road, Devas Road and Conway Road.

We have canvassed the views of our residents who live in these roads, and the overwhelming majority of those canvassed think that the proposals, as they affect their roads, are a complete waste of money. Virtually no one drives down these roads at more than 20mph as things stand. Roads such as Arterberry Road and Cottenham Park Road, where there may be a case for introducing a 20mph limit, are not included.

There is also the issue of enforcement - no one believes that the proposed limits will actually be enforced.

I would have thought that at a time when our public finances have so clearly run out of control that this is a good place to start saving money. I understand that the money may be coming from some other pocket e.g. TfL, but it is still part of the huge deficit in public finances.

**Council response**

The proposals for the area have been reviewed to consider Cambridge Road, Cambridge Close and Panmuir Road, as the extent of the 20mph speed limit.

Enforcement of speed limits is the responsibility of the Police as they are the only organisation given the powers to do that.

4.7 **JUSTIFICATION**

4.7.1 Following the responses received during the formal consultation process, it is recommended that Cambridge Road, Cambridge Close and Panmuir Road be the only roads to be considered for a 20mph speed limit. Hence modifications have been done to the original proposals to reflect the change.

4.7.2 Cambridge Road has a section, which is traffic calmed (between Durham Road and Pepys Road) and the section between Combe Lane and Durham Road is not traffic calmed. Both Cambridge Close and Panmuir Road are cul-de-sacs located within the section of Cambridge Road, which is not traffic calmed.

4.7.3 Two traffic speed surveys were carried out in Cambridge Road, within the vicinity of Cottenham Park and outside Hollymount Primary School. Cottenham Park is
located along the section without any traffic calming and Hollymount School is located within the traffic calmed section.

4.7.4 The speed survey outside Hollymount Primary School recorded a mean speed of approximately 21mph, whilst the survey outside Cottenham Park recorded a mean speed of 29mph.

4.7.5 As the mean speed along Hollymount Primary School is low, this section can be converted into a 20mph speed limit area without any additional traffic calming features. However, the section outside Cottenham Park would require traffic calming features to comply with the guidelines, as the mean speed is high.

4.7.6 As vertical traffic calming features are not the most favoured option with residents and drivers, two Electronic Speed indicators (ESI), one in each direction was proposed within the vicinity of Cottenham Park. In addition to this, central hatching (road markings) was proposed in the middle of the carriageway to narrow the width of the carriageway, which is approximately 9.1 metres.

5 TIMETABLE

5.1 If approved, the Traffic Management Orders for the proposed measures would be made and the measures implemented by 30 August 2009.

6 FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS

6.1 A substantial 20 plenty investment programme has been put together for this fiscal year to potentially deliver 20mph/limits throughout the borough subject to consultation. The original settlement was made up of a total of £180k Merton capital budget.

6.2 This proposal will be funded from the Merton capital (2009/10 allocation) and the approximate scheme value of £25k exclusive of design cost is contained within this capital stream. If approved, to successfully deliver within this fiscal year will require good forward planning and project management.

7 LEGAL AND STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

7.1 The Traffic Management Orders for a limit would be made under Section 84 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended); and for a zone Section 84 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended) and the Highways Act (as amended). The Council is required by the Local Authorities Traffic Order (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 to give notice of its intention to make a Traffic Order (by publishing a draft traffic order). These regulations also require the Council to consider any representations received as a result of publishing the draft order.
7.2 The Cabinet Member must consider the factors set out in the results of the formal consultation set out in Appendix 3. While the views expressed by local residents must be considered, Cabinet Member is not bound to decide in accordance with the majority view and must take the other legal relevant factors into account.

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

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

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

9 CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS
9.1. N/A

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

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

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

10.4 The Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 1994 apply to this scheme. Therefore when undertaking its duties as Client and Designer under these regulations, the Council follows the Approved Code of Practice, 'Managing Health and Safety in Construction', published by the Health and Safety Commission. The Planning Supervisor appointed for this scheme is F.M.Conway Ltd.
10.5 Potential risks have been identified during the preliminary and detailed design stages. Therefore, the measures have been designed accordingly to manage them; these are detailed in the table below.

Management of Health and Safety Risks

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

11 APPENDICES

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

- Appendix 1 – Plans of proposals drawing no. Z73-191-01a
- Appendix 2 – Borough wide plan of proposed/identified areas.
- Appendix 3 – Representations and officers’ comments.
- Appendix 4 – Consultation documents.

12 BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

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

Useful links:

Merton council’s web site: [http://www.merton.gov.uk](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](http://www.merton.gov.uk/legal.htm)

This disclaimer also applies to any links provided here.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPRESENTATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Road area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**22013451**
A great idea. I have had too many experiences of cars racing down Cambridge and Pepys Road and almost causing an accident. Hopefully it will be policed as well to reinforce the idea

Officer comments
Comments noted.

**22013753**
I thoroughly support this proposal, particularly in Cambridge Road where vehicles travel at ridiculous speeds past the entrance used by children going to and from their playground in Cottenham Park.

I have raised this with LBM several times during the past years and am delighted that LBM is at last taking this very sensible and responsible action.

Officer comments
Comments noted.

**22013746**
Really good idea. It has my strongest support.

Officer comments
Comments noted.

**22013716**
Following my telephone conversation, I would like to confirm my family full support for the above proposal.

The excessive speeds at which cars and buses travel past our house on Cottenham Park has for many years been a source of worry and irritation for us. The roads included in your proposals that clearly suffer the most from speeding and would greatly benefit from the 20mph proposals are, in my opinion, Cottenham Park Road, Durham Road, Cambridge Road and, to a lesser extent, Pepys Road.

Of the roads mentioned above, Cottenham Park Road is the only road not to have any traffic calming measures introduced. I personally consider speed humps to be the best solution to slowing traffic down. However if this is not a viable solution, then reducing the speed limit to 20mph would also be perfectly acceptable.

I look forward to hearing from you with regards to any important developments regarding the above proposals.

Officer comments
Comments noted. The proposals do not include any physical traffic calming features (humps).

**22013705**
I am writing in strong support of the proposal for a 20 mph speed limit in the Cambridge Road area as outlined in the circular of 21 November 2008.

In a few narrow roads (e.g. Tolverne and Trewince) the traffic speed is probably 20 mph or under. However
in wider roads, such as Durham Road, Cambridge Road and Pepys Road, the traffic speed is often far in excess of 30mph despite the traffic humps. This makes it quite difficult for children and older people to cross the road and sometimes to get out of a parked car safely. In addition, fast speeding lorries occasionally cause the houses in our terrace to shake. I therefore regard the 20 mph speed limit proposal as having important benefits for the general quality of life and environment of this densely populated residential area.

I agree that 20 mph signage is cheaper and likely to be a more effective compared with further road humps, especially as in Pepys Road it is possible to go over the humps without reducing speed, while more severe speed restricting humps could present potential problems for emergency services etc. However it will be important to do some monitoring of compliance with the 20 mph speed limit, especially during the initial stages and in the wider roads with heaviest traffic.

I therefore very much hope that the proposed 20 mph strategy goes ahead. I look forward to hearing of developments in its implementation and also of plans for some enforcement of adherence with this speed limit.

**Officer comments**

Comments noted.

22013703

I support the introduction of a 20 mph speed limit in the Cambridge Road area. It is desirable that the existing speed humps be removed upon its implementation to reduce the "done to vehicle suspension and reduce the need for additional braking and acceleration when encountering speed humps with the subsequent reduction in pollution from vehicle exhaust and engine noise this should produce.

**Officer comments**

Comments noted. The introduction of the proposals will not imply the removal of the existing traffic calming features, as they are required to reduce traffic speed.

22013664

Just a quick note to respond to the above proposed scheme. My family and I are totally in favour of the scheme. We live in Panmuir Road and the speed of cars along Cambridge road has been a cause of concern for some time. Due to parked cars on both sides of the road pulling out from Panmuir Road is treacherous.

Also there are two parks along Cambridge Road and a school. The wish to not have a 20 mph limit seems a no brainer. One road that does need a 20 mph speed restriction is Durham road again cars are parked on both sides of the road making visibility difficult when pulling out or crossing the road by foot. Cars and buses shake the trees with their speed in both directions. We hope very much that the scheme will progress.

**Officer comments**

Comments noted.

22013660

I live at ?? Cottenham Park Road and have received both your communications about the proposed speed limit in this area. I did find the original almost unintelligible and am grateful for the clarification in your letter of 17 December.

I have no objections to the speed limit - indeed would welcome it. But I do have a concern about unnecessary signage. A good example is the ludicrous proliferation of warning signs about the roundabout at the junction of Cottenham Park Road and Pepys Road - it makes that part of the street look ugly. I note from your plan that no less than 15 signs are proposed in this very small area. Surely a great deal of expense can be saved by having one sign at each entry point into the zone?

**Officer comments**

Comments noted.
The additional traffic signs are required as part of the legal regulations for a 20mph speed limit. The proposed signs will be kept to a minimum and installed on existing sign posts where possible to reduce clutter. If the proposed area was a zone, then the signs will be erected only at the entrances into the zone and no additional signs will be required within the area. The downside is that, additional traffic calming measures will be required to make the zone self-enforcing.

**22013659**

Really good idea. It has my strongest support.

**Officer comments**

Comments noted.

---

Thank you for the letter of apology. Although the letter you sent out was OK and fairly easy to get the idea of what it meant. I fully support this scheme. 3 years ago I was driving slowly down Amity Grove when a child on a bicycle came out from between parked cars in front of me. She fell of her bike in shock and was totally unscathed. My bumper stopped inches from her head.

If I had been going any faster I doubt she would have been so lucky. This happened even though her parents were walking alongside her on the pavement. Anything that helps prevent the tragedy that those parents, the child and myself would have gone through is fantastic.

**Officer comments**

Comments noted.

---

I would just say that I believe it would be an excellent idea to have a 20 mph zone as proposed.

I hope it will be part of a process of educating drivers to keep their speed down without the crude process of installing road humps. In USA (New England, anyway) 20 mph in residential areas is considered normal and it is courteous to observe the limit. It is much more civilised that way.

**Officer comments**

Comments noted. The proposal for the area is a 20mph speed limit (enforced by the police) and not a 20mph zone (self-enforcing).

---

Thank you for your newsletter of 21st November. This note is to register my support for the proposed 20mph zone in the Cambridge Road. However I do not support the installation of so called 'speed cushions'; having observed them in use both in Durham Road and also in the street from my office in Southwark I have come to the conclusion that they are waste of money as most drivers take no notice of them whatsoever and make no effort to slow down. Furthermore in many of the locations proposed for them on your plan the road width is reduced to the width of a narrow single carriageway by cars parked on each side of the road, which has the effect of reducing traffic speed.

If it is necessary to take measures in the road to reduce traffic speed, the effective solution is to install raised tables such as that which takes the pedestrian crossing in Coombe Lane to Raynes Park station but such a measure is not necessary for the reasons I have given in Richmond Road - or any of the other streets mentioned in your note. I am positive that the money that is proposed to be spent on installing ineffective speed cushions could be spent far more effectively elsewhere.

If it is decided to proceed with this proposal I would also suggest that the necessary signage be mounted on lampposts where possible instead of single posts to reduce street clutter as well as saving money.

**Officer comments**
Comments noted. No additional speed cushions are being proposed as part of the proposals. The additional traffic signs will be erected on existing lamp post where possible to minimise clutter in the area.

**22013605**

We were delighted to read in the newsletter about the proposed traffic calming initiatives for the Cambridge Road area. As residents of Cambridge Road we are only too aware of the excessive speed of the traffic on this road - which is used as a cut through by commuters- making it a dangerous road to cross in what is a residential area with many young/elderly people. It would be fantastic if measures were taken. To help ensure that drivers stayed within 20MPH.

**Officer comments**

Comments noted.

**22013564**

Thank you for sending the newsletter about the proposed 20 mph zone in and around Cambridge Road. I read it with great interest, and while I am happy with the proposal for the area to be converted to a 20 mph zone, I do not agree with the introduction of speed bumps throughout the area.

From my experience yes there may be an issue with traffic speeding along Cambridge Road and to a lesser extent Cottenham Park Road, however the other roads being narrower and not used for cut through's do not suffer. I am not aware of any serious accidents and presume this measure is being proposed on increased safety grounds, which with schools, parks and scout hut in the area is understandable.

In addition I dislike the idea of speed bumps for reasons of pollution, both engine fumes and noise as well, and the increased wear and tear on cars. As a resident I feel my neighbours and myself will suffer from all of these and it will actually be detrimental to the neighbourhood in general should additional speed bumps be introduced. I am sure there are other traffic management methods you could consider and should investigate their merits.

Please take into account my views when discussing this matter and I am happy to participate in any further consultation.

**Officer comments**

Comments noted. The area is being proposed a 20mph speed limit area and not a 20mph zone. No additional speed humps are being proposed for the area except the traffic signs. The proposal is not an accidents remedial scheme where the location and type of accidents will be investigated and measures put in place to stop them from re-occurring.

**22013526**

Thank you for the information regarding the proposed traffic calming measures for the Cambridge Road area.

While traffic calming is welcome, particularly in Richmond Road, I am concerned about the sitting of speed cushions, illustrated on the drawing, to be in line with our driveway. I have walked around the area where speed humps are already installed and, in general, their situation opposite driveways seems to have been avoided, and I hope this is within the Council's guidelines, or perhaps the markings on the drawing should be ignored? The first sentence of the paragraph 'PROPOSALS' does not make it clear whether or not there would be any speed cushions in the road.

Apart from the above, I think to enforce the lower speed limit would be difficult. Obviously, there cannot be enforcement officers in the roads and some drivers would not take notice of the proposed signs.

**Office comments**

Comments noted. Enforcement of these speed limits are the responsibility of the police as they are the only
who can do that. They have informed us they will not be doing that, as they do not have the resources.

Officer comments

Comments noted. No additional traffic calming measures (speed hump) are being proposed in the area. As most of the roads are narrow with parking on both sides, traffic speeds are already low, which will not require any enforcement.

22013524

I am writing in response to your newsletter dated 21 November to say that I strongly support this proposal.

As a resident of Cambridge Road I have been very concerned about the speed with which traffic travels along the part of the road, which has no traffic calming.

Vehicles, which have only just left the A3, come along the road, past the allotments and Cottenham Park where there are often children and dog walkers crossing the road, at speeds of well over 30 mph. I personally have narrowly avoided a collision while pulling out of my driveway when a car came speeding from the Coombe Lane end of the Road.

Officer comments

Comments noted.

22013519

I am writing in response to your newsletter dated 21 November to say that I strongly support this proposal. As a resident of the area and someone who cycles regularly along Cambridge Road I am very concerned about the speed with which traffic travels along the part of the road, which currently has no traffic calming. In an area where there is a Park and allotments, it is only a matter of time before there is a serious accident.

Officer comments

Comments noted.

22013496

We support your excellent proposals.

Many roads are used as a short cut; many are straight with resultant high speeds. The area contain" many highly used spaces, Cottenham Park, Wimbledon Society Hall, St Matthews Church, the Bowling Club, Hollymount School and so on all of which generate a large amount of pedestrian traffic.

Officer comments

Comments noted.

22013481

I am quite happy with the proposed 20 mph Speed Limit for the Cambridge Road area but there is one matter, which needs rectifying. The street sign in Melbury Gardens where it meets Oakwood Road shows incorrectly that there is no exit from Melbury Gardens into Durham Road. Could this be rectified please? Many thanks.

Officer comments

Comments noted.

AGAINST

22013765

There is no need for blanket 20mph speed limit in the area, and no apparent reason for the proposed measures (for example a high accident rate in the area). It would be impossible to police such measures, and therefore be pointless anyway. The money would be better spent on other things (our neglected parks for
Comments noted. It is easier to have a wide area 20mph speed limit than a short section where it will be easily disobeyed. The scheme is not an accident remedial scheme where the locations and causes of accidents will be investigated and measures introduced to stop them from re-occurring. Most of the roads within the proposed area are narrow with parking on both sides, which make it very difficult for drivers to exceed the speed limit; hence enforcement will not be required on most of the roads. On roads where the speed limit will be exceeded, the Metropolitan Police has the responsibility to enforce these limits, as they are the only organisation granted to powers to do that.

The cost of a life saved in the event of an accident will be more than the cost to introduce the proposals.

I am a resident on Kenwyn Road. I wish to object to the proposal. I think the money would be better spent on other things. The proposal would destroy the area with excessive street signs and road markings. I also think it would be impossible to police. It would be better to install reminders of the existing 30 mph limit.

Officer comments:

The proposal is to improve safety for all road users. If the speed limit is 30 mph drivers would travel at 34-35mph. But if the speed limit is 20mph, they would travel at 24-25mph and that 10mph reduction can make a big difference when impacting on a young child. The street signs will be installed on existing lamp columns, where possible to reduce clutter. The traffic signs will be kept to a minimum and installed on existing lamp post where possible to minimise clutter within the area.

Most of the roads within the proposed area are narrow with parking on both sides, which make it very difficult for drivers to exceed the speed limit; hence enforcement will not be required on most of the roads. On roads where the speed limit will be exceeded, the Metropolitan Police has the responsibility to enforce these limits, as they are the only organisation granted to powers to do that.

As a resident and property owner in Raynes Park I wish to respond to the proposed speed limit signs and road markings and road bumps which have been provisionally planned for installation.

I totally object to this and feel it is totally unnecessary. Traffic flows at a respectable and considerate speed in this area and it has never been a problem so far. There are simply too many signs all over the roads and pavements and they simply clutter up the streets and spoil the beauty of the area itself. Of course I understand that safety is of paramount importance to us all but clearly there is no need for unnecessary expense where it is not required.

May I suggest that money is better spent on vehicles that open the street drains and clear them of all the litter, leaves, soil and rubbish that clog them up and cause flooding as soon as we have a heavy rainfall. These vehicles used to exist when I was a child and they would clean out the drains regularly. I did surprisingly see one on Parkside about a year ago doing exactly this job but never see them in the smaller streets around where I live. Some drains are so clogged up with soil that plants are growing out of them! Flooding is dangerous and has developed into being a big problem in recent years and it needs to be addressed. If this is not your department then perhaps you could bring this to the attention of whichever department it is.

Back to the proposals, I feel this is a waste of council tax money and could be better spent elsewhere and it is for this reason and above that I object.

Officer comments:

No additional traffic calming features (humps) have been proposed as part of the Cambridge Road area 20mph speed limit. The proposed traffic signs and road markings are legal requirements for a 20mph speed limit and will be kept to a minimum. They will be installed on existing lamp post where possible to minimise
clutter within the area.

The proposals are not unnecessary, as they will determine the severity of any accidents when they occur. I appreciate your concern that speeds are low within this area, however if the speed limit is 30 mph drivers would travel at 34-35mph. But if the speed limit is 20mph, they would travel at 24-25mph and that 10mph reduction can make a big difference when impacting on a young child.

Gully cleansing is being carried out on a regular basis, however I will forward the additional comments to the appropriate section within the Council.

22013760

Further to a telephone conversation with Ms G??? yesterday, and as Chairman of Copse Hill Estate Ltd Residents Association, I am directed by the Board to write and oppose your proposed 20speed limit in our area. We would like to know how many accidents there have been in the area involving pedestrians being hit by a vehicle to warrant this blanket speed limit. Cambridge Road already has road humps.

The consensus of residents is that we do not need a 20mph speed limit particularly not in Cottenham Drive where the amount of traffic is negligible at the best of times and we have not had any accidents for at least 6 years. I myself live on the so called S-bend in Cottenham Drive and I am confident of this statistic and know full well just how little traffic we have.

We believe that in these serious economic times the council should be endeavouring to save our money not spend it - indeed a reduction in Council Tax would be more appropriate at this time. We are also aware of the Council spending money at this time of year to ensure they get their budget funding in April.

The Residents of Cottenham Drive are particularly opposed to 20mph signs where they would be futile given that it is rare for anyone to travel above this speed anyway. We do not need any more signage attached to lampposts or any other post for that matter. If the council eventually insist on any 20mph signs they should be at the entrance to Cottenham Drive from Copse Hill and Cottenham park Road ONLY.

We would further add that it was only two and half years ago that we succeeded in having the road humps in Cottenham Drive removed, so to replace them would be an appalling waste of our money.

Officer comments:

The proposals are not an accident remedial scheme where the location and causes of the accidents will be investigated and measures implemented to stop them from re-occurring. This is a speed reduction measure within residential roads to improve safety for all road users and reduce the severity of accidents. If the speed limit is 30 mph drivers would travel at 34-35mph. But if the speed limit is 20mph, they would travel at 24-25mph and that 10mph reduction can make a big difference when impacting on a young child.

The blanket speed limit is appropriate, as a smaller area will be ignored by drivers. Cambridge Road between Durham Road and Pepys Road is the section, which has existing traffic calming measures. The section between Durham Road and Coombe Lane has no traffic calming measures.

Following responses from residents, the proposed area has been reviewed to only consider Cambridge Road, Cambridge Close and Pannuir Road as the 20mph speed limit area.

The cost of a life saved in the event of an accident is more than the cost of the proposals. The road humps in Cottenham Drive will not be replaced within the proposals.

22013759

I am writing on a personal level to oppose your proposed blanket speed limit in the Cambridge Road Area.

I would like to see the accident statistics on which this decision has been made as on the face of it this appears to be a budget spending strategy.
I am aware of a letter you have received from a Mr. ????? who lives just about as far away as is possible from the main road of Cottenham Drive. He claims there have been several accidents in Cottenham Drive which information is totally fabricated and considering he is approaching 90 years of age demonstrates the mischievousness of the elderly.

We certainly do not want extra road signage in Cottenham Drive where it is completely unnecessary.

I trust the Councillors will re-consider their decision and give thought to a more beneficial way of spending our money such as on the NHS.

Officer comments:

The proposal is to improve safety for all road users. If the speed limit is 30 mph drivers would travel at 34-35mph. But if the speed limit is 20mph, they would travel at 24-25mph and that 10mph reduction can make a big difference when impacting on a young child. The proposals are not an accident investigation scheme where the locations and causes of accidents will be investigated and measures put in place to stop them from re-occurring.

The proposals are not driven by letters received from residents but the Council’s objective to convert most residential roads with existing traffic calming measures into a 20mph speed limit (enforced by Metropolitan Police) or 20mph zone (self-enforcing).

The road signs are legal requirements associated with speed limit. This will be kept to a minimum and installed on existing lamp post to minimise clutter within the area.

The proposed area has been reviewed to only consider Cambridge Road, Cambridge Close and Panmuir Road as the extent of the proposed 20mph speed limit.

22013758

I see little point in erecting signs without an assurance that there is a good method of recognising and dealing with those who disobey such instructions: actions such as these simply affect those who are considerate and law-abiding. It is unlikely that anyone driving on Amity Grove (where I live) would not be aware from the speed humps and narrow space between parked cars that caution is required (and that 20 mph will be TOO FAST in parts.)

As Chair of the Local Safer Neighbourhood Panel I also have concerns that our S N Team will be constantly bothered by people wanting action taken because they believe some drivers are ignoring the restriction, although this is outside their general remit.

I am against the proposal in its present form but there may be particular roads that residents believe warrant even more "street furniture" and road markings.

Officer comments:

Comments noted.
The Metropolitan Police is the only organisation granted the powers to enforce speed limit, hence any enforcement/fines to drivers who disobey the limit will be down to them.

Most of these roads are narrow with parking on both sides, which makes it impossible to drive above the speed limit; hence your S N Team will not be constantly bothered.

The proposals have been reviewed to only consider Cambridge Road, Cambridge Close and Panmuir Road as the extent of the 20mph speed limit area.

22013751
I am a resident from Pendarves Road, Raynes Park and I am writing to raise my objections to the proposed 20mph speed limit zone in the Cambridge Road area. I have read the information on the notification from Merton Council regarding the proposal and am opposed to the scheme primarily because I do not wish to see any further road signs or markings in this area. Furthermore, I would prefer the installation costs of such a scheme to be redirected to other areas, which I believe, are more needed locally, especially to the regeneration of the local parks. I hope that you will consider my objections seriously.

Officer comments:

The proposal is to improve safety for all road users by reducing the severity of any accidents when they occur. The traffic signs and the road markings are part of the legal requirements for a 20mph speed limit. This will be kept to a minimum and installed on existing lamp post where possible to minimise clutter.

The cost of a life saved in the event of an accident is more than the cost to introduce the proposals.

I write as a property owner within the affected area to object to the proposal on the following grounds;

1. There are on occasion's good reasons to seek to impose such a speed limit:

2. Wimbledon Town Centre is a good example. There are equally good reasons NOT to do so in an area that does not warrant it, and the Cambridge Road / Spencer Road area is such an area. Cambridge Road to the east of Durham Road already has a proliferation of speed humps; a speed limit is quite superfluous. To the west of Durham Road, the necessity for such draconian limit is completely absent; it is one of those roads where, if imposed, it would bring about whole sale disregard, and have an adverse impact on the good that such schemes might have brought elsewhere. In Spencer Road, there is already a narrow band of traffic island between parked cars, and the imposition of such a limit can only have a detrimental effect, not least I mention below.

3. Has any member of the Council tried to drive any significant distance, at 20mph? The reality is that it is extremely dangerous to be forced to drive at a confined speed, requiring constant attention to the speedometer, thereby increasing reaction time in the event of say, a jay walker or child wandering into the carriageway. It has been stated that studies in the UK and Denmark, show that crashes are less likely to be fatal at 2 mph, but it seems clear by your omission that no studies have been cried out to highlight the corresponding danger of forcing drivers to drive unnecessarily on their speedometer in roads which are not suited for sue a restriction.

4. Since the proposed limit was first mooted there has been an unprecedented change in the economic and national climate. To spend a considerable sum of money on such a scheme at a time where we are advised that councils will have to cut a number of budgets, and most likely the budget for the Freedom Pass on which the elderly rely so heavily, and withdraw it would simply force" traffic onto the roads, which would exacerbate exactly the problem which the Council purports to be reducing by this scheme.

I strongly urge that for all the above mentioned reasons to reject the proposed scheme for the whole Cambridge Road! Spencer Road Area as proposed.

Officer comments:

Comments noted.

1. The Council is in the process of converting most residential roads with existing traffic calming measures into 20mph speed limit (enforced by Metropolitan Police) or 20mph zones (self-enforcing). The proposed area has been reviewed to only consider Cambridge Road, Cambridge Close and Panmuir Road as the extent of the 20mph speed limit area.

2. As 20mph zones are self-enforcing, you are compelled to drive at 20mph due to the constant spacing of the traffic calming measures. In a 20mph speed limit area, drivers will travel at 24-25mph and the reduction in speed limit can make a big difference when impacting on a young child.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>22013728</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am writing to inform you of our objection to the proposed Cambridge Road area. Our objection is based on the following points:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The proposals are unnecessary as there is a low accident rate in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It will create unnecessary road signs and road markings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It will be impossible to police such measures, thus rendering them pointless anyway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Our Council tax money would be better spent on other more urgent requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Officer comments:**

1. The proposal is not an accident investigation scheme where the location and causes of accidents will be investigated and measures implemented to stop them from re-occurring. This is a speed reduction measure to improve safety on residential roads by reducing the severity of any accidents should they occur.

2. The signs and road markings are legal requirements associated with speed limits. This will be kept to a minimum and installed on existing lamp post where possible to minimise clutter.

3. As most of the roads are narrow and with parking on both sides of the carriageway, traffic speeds are already low and not expected to be in excess of the proposed speed limit. In roads where the limit will be exceeded, responsibility lies with the Metropolitan Police, as they are the only organisation granted the powers to enforce speed limits.

4. The cost of a life saved in the event of an accident is more than the cost to implement the scheme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>22013727</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There seems to be no apparent reason for this proposal, which will entail a large increase in street furniture and expenditure of our council money. Improvements of parks and facilities for young people in general, would be a far better use of these funds. In any case, how is it going to be policed, more speed cameras?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Officer comments:**

The proposal is to improve safety for all road users by converting residential roads with existing traffic calming features into 20mph speed limit (enforced by Metropolitan Police) or 20mph zones (self-enforcing). If the speed limit is 30 mph drivers would travel at 34-35mph. But if the speed limit is 20mph, they would travel at 24-25mph and that 10mph reduction can make a big difference when impacting on a young child. The signs and road markings are legal requirements associated with speed limits. These signs will be kept to a minimum and installed on existing lamp post to minimise clutter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>22013725</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We write to you to object to the 20mph speed limit in the Cambridge Road area, particularly with regard to Dunmore Road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We live at ?? Dunmore Road, which is part of the Dunmore Road Conservation area. Our road is a very quiet, residential road. It is not a cut through, or part of any rat run and therefore has no need for any such speed calming measures. In fact, the only vehicle we notice that regularly speeds along this road is the Council waste disposal lorry on Monday mornings. We would rather the driver of that vehicle was given a warning than the street be covered with speed limit signs. There is already a proliferation of street sign pollution as it is.

We question who is going to enforce this speed limit? We don't see any police in the area for real crimes as it is. Additionally, to our knowledge there has not been an accident or injury on our road.
To go through with this proposal is an unnecessary use and abuse of the ratepayers' money. It would appear that this is for the sole purpose of keeping Street Scene & Waste employees on the payroll.

Officer comments:
The proposals for Cambridge Road area has been reviewed to only consider Cambridge Road, Cambridge Close and Panmuir Road the extent of the proposed 20mph speed limit area.

22013724

It is with great concern that I read of suggestions for the above plan.

This council has limited means for providing all the requirements imposed by government, let alone for projects to meet more specific local needs.

This above area is a location with relatively low through traffic. I know about this having lived in Durham Road at this address since 1981. I live in a first floor flat with my living room overlooking the Durham Road with a view up toward the junction with Cambridge Road.

The only section of the proposed area that might benefit from a 20 mph speed limit is from the T-junction where Durham Road meets Cottenham Park Road down to where it meets Coombe Lane.

The reason for this is solely that some drivers of the local buses on route 200 like to travel down Durham Road at high speed when they can see they are not being requested to stop at any of the Request Stops.

A few strategically placed reminder "smiley faces" may be all that is required to deal with this problem, in the way that the 2 "smiley faces" sited on Wimbledon Park Side do so effectively.

We do not require a multiplication of street signs and road markings, or the expense of these.
Who is going to police such a suggested 20 mph zone?
Who pays for policing overnight drinkers once they leave late-opened pubs?
We need money for other things such as the:
1. Disgracefully neglected, and consequently dangerous, local parks.
2. The concentration camp appearance of the rusty overhead footway above the railway line at Raynes Park station.

Whenever I have visitors from locations throughout Britain and even more so from abroad, such as Japan and France, I feel ashamed that they should see the centre of Raynes Park looking down-at-heel.

Officer comments:
Comments noted.
The proposal has been reviewed to consider Cambridge Road, Panmuir Close and Cambridge Close as a 20mph speed limit. If the scheme is approved, the traffic signs will be kept to a minimum and installed on existing lamp columns where possible to minimise clutter.

Most of the roads within the proposed area are narrow with parking on both sides, which make it very difficult for drivers to exceed the speed limit, hence enforcement will not be an issue. On roads where the speed limit is exceed, responsibility is down to the Metropolitan Police, as they are the only organisation granted the powers to enforce speed limit.

22013723

I am writing to register my strong objection to the proposal to introduce a 20mph zone in the above area. My reasons for objecting to this are as follows:

1. The proposals are unnecessary. 20mph zones are only necessary in areas where there is a high density of pedestrians, such as Wimbledon or Raynes Park town centres. In a normal suburban area such as the Cambridge Road area, the existing 30mph limit is quite sufficient. It is an unreasonable
imposition to oblige everyone to drive at 20mph in the area, when 30mph is a perfectly safe speed on a clear road. I am not aware that there is a high accident rate in the area, which would necessitate the introduction of a lower speed limit.

2. In many of the roads proposed as having 20mph signs, for example Pendarves, Kenwyn, Rosevine, Tolverne and Trewine Roads, Oakwood and Laurel Roads, and Hunter, Devas, Montana and Dunmore Roads, the parked cars on both sides of the road make it impossible to exceed this speed anyway. A reduced speed limit is not needed and would serve no useful purpose.

3. It would be impossible to police this speed limit, which renders it pointless anyway. Unfortunately those drivers who want to drive fast will drive fast regardless, while safe drivers will simply be inconvenienced even more than they already are by the many humps, bumps and obstacles in the area.

4. The signs and road markings would be a most unwelcome addition to the relatively quiet and attractive roads of West Wimbledon, and are visually unacceptable. This is Wimbledon, not Los Angeles, and the reason people choose to live here is largely because of the pleasant environment - please do not ruin our streets with all this visual clutter.

5. The proposals would cost a considerable sum of money to implement, and this money could be better spent on other improvements within the borough, such as providing additional manpower to maintain our woefully neglected parks. Even if the available money has to be spent on road related projects, it would be better spent on mending potholes, improving road surfaces and relaying pavements (many of which are extremely uneven and dangerous rather than introducing this unnecessary scheme.

6. A much better use of money would be to simply remind people to observe the existing 30mph speed limit by installing a few "smiley faces" or speed reminders at strategic points where people might otherwise be tempted to exceed this speed.

In these times of supposed economic stringency, where the Council maintains it does not have the money for many projects, it would be unacceptable for substantial sums of money to be spent on this pointless scheme, which would only be to the detriment of the general environment and all those who live in the area.

Officer comments:
Comments noted.

1. The area is being considered for a 20mph speed limit (enforced by Metropolitan Police) and not a zone (self-enforce). 20mph speed limit / zones are considered in areas where vulnerable people are at risk, especially around schools and residential areas. As the proposed area is mainly residential and with a school, introducing a 20mph speed limit would improve safety for these vulnerable road users.

2. As the parked cars makes it impossible for drivers to exceed the speed limit within the narrow roads within the area, the proposals have been reviewed to only consider Cambridge Road, Cambridge Close and Panmuir Road as the extent of the 20mph speed limit.

3. The narrow nature of theses roads makes it impossible to exceed the speed limit, however on roads where this limit is exceed, responsibility lies with the Metropolitan Police as they are the only organisation granted the powers to enforce speed limit. No additional traffic calming features (speed humps) are proposed for this area, however the primary objective of the existing traffic calming measures in the road, is to reduce traffic speed and improve safety for all road users.

4. The traffic signs and road markings are part of the legal requirements associated with 20mph speed limits. These traffic signs will be kept to a minimum and installed on existing lamp post where possible to minimise clutter.

5. Comments noted. The cost of the proposals is neglegible compared to the cost of a life saved in the
event of an accident.

6. Transport for London on behalf on all the London boroughs is educating drivers by television, radio and bill board advertisement on the effect of accidents and measures to help reduce drivers speed.

22013722

Further to the consultation process, we live on Hunter Road, which, as you probably know, is both short and narrow and provides little or no possibility for speeding. We have lived here since 1986 and do not believe there has been a single accident in our road.

We would hope that the Council could find a better use for the funds needed to implement the proposal in Hunter Road: such as further funding for local hospitals, schools etc.

Officer comments:

Comments noted.

Following responses from residents, the proposals have been reviewed to only consider Cambridge Road, Cambridge Close and Panmuir Road as the extent of the proposed 20mph speed limit area.

22013721

As a resident for 34 years at this address, I have not been aware of speeding vehicles in the roads where you propose to have a 20mph speed limit.

I am fortunate in having a garage, the lack of parking facilities in the Raynes Park and west Wimbledon really does need to be addressed. Cars and vans are parked on every corner, and parked so badly on bends of Spencer and Richmond Roads that they are a danger to pedestrians and drivers alike.

In my opinion, there is no need for the introduction of a 20mph speed limit, but to provide a car park, especially when the station parking area will no longer suit commuters.

Officer comments:

Comments noted. Parking facilities in the Raynes Park and west Wimbledon area is not within the scope of this scheme, however consideration will be given to improving sightlines at the bends and junctions within the area. The proposals have been reviewed to only consider Cambridge Road, Cambridge Close and Panmuir Road as the extent of the proposed 20mph speed limit.

22013720

Further to a letter of 17 December from Council officers, and in the light of their comments, I would like to make the following representations, further to those in my letter of 8 December.

1. I am not sure what is meant by 'additional features' not being required. These are not defined. The letter says that 'appropriate signage' and 'road marking' would be required. These are not defined. Signage can only mean additional street clutter, adding to already badly placed signs re Residents parking, signs re speed cushions etc, Marking such as the enclosed shown on the Conservatives recent newsletter, is quite clearly, from this photo, detrimental to the look of roads in conservation areas, like my road, Pendarves Road. I strongly object to any further street signs and markings.

2. Reading the recent Conservatives newsletter, items that this is a political agenda. It says that speed in streets is an area of 'major concern' and 'emotive'. --We are a close community in Pendarves Road, and issues of major concern and emotive issues are, I can assure you, discussed at length. Yet until I received your letter of consultation in December, I had never heard this issue mentioned. It is therefore not at all an issue in this road and the surrounding ones, so please don't waste money and further spoil our conservation area with these unnecessary measures.

Other than this, I adhere to the other points made in my letter of 8 December:

1. 20mph limits are not necessary. It would be far better to enforce 30mph limits with the use of cameras, The only 20mph zone I have seen is at Hampton Village and this has now been withdrawn in favour of enforcement of a 30mph limit with cameras. I think that it is telling that the 20mph limit
was dropped.

2. There is not a problem with fast traffic in my immediate adjoining roads- Pendarves Rd (my road), Kenwyn and Rosevine. In Lambton Road the traffic calming measures work. Maybe on Cambridge Road, particularly where the school is, is a problem?

3. I read this newsletter-that you would –not put speed cushions in my road (Pendarves Road) nor indeed any other roads where there are not already such measures. This is unnecessary -we do not have a traffic speed problem in my road or adjoining roads.

4. You refer to maintaining safety and quality of life, but I have never in 12 years, felt these to be compromised in any way.

5. I question the spending of budget on these unnecessary measures my road has not been swept at all adequately this year, especially when the leaves fall and you do not put enough resource into Planning enforcement there are a significant number of loft conversions in this area which are in breach of planning permission. Please put the money to better use.

Officer comments:
Comments noted.
1. The ‘additional features not being required’ refers to new traffic calming features in the form of road humps. The appropriate signing and road markings are the legal requirements associated with 20mph speed limit, which are the entry / exit signs, repeater signs and 20mph road marking on the carriageway. The additional traffic signs would be kept to a minimum and installed on existing lamp post where possible to minimise clutter in the area.

2. Following requests from residents, the proposed area has been reviewed to only consider Cambridge Road, Cambridge Close and Panmuir Road as the extent of the 20mph speed limit area.

3. No additional traffic calming features (speed humps) are being proposed for this area.

4. The reduction of speed limit will enable vulnerable road users especially children to use the road safely.

5. The cost of a life saved in the event of an accident is more than the cost to introduce the scheme.

22013715

In receipt of your notice regarding ‘Proposed 20mph speed limit - Cambridge Road area’ it has been very badly put forward and the bulk of your exercise is a complete waste of taxpayers money.

There are already far too many speed humps in the Raynes Park area, and we certainly do not need any more. The roads you propose targeting, as 20mph zones are all roads I know well, and do not warrant such legislation.

Where a 20mph limit is needed is in Pepys Road, because in spite of speed humps, the lorries – vans in particular, and wide cars can miss these and speeds down the road pretty fast. I would put a 20mph limit on Pepys Road and possibly Artenbury Road. The rest is a waste of our council tax money, and object to it most strongly. Instead, why not reduce pensioners council tax amount. Do you have so much money to waste?

Officer comments:
Comments noted.
Please accept our apologies fro the error in the consultation leaflet, which was sent to all residents within the proposed area. The proposed speed limit area would not require any additional traffic calming features, moreover following correspondence from residents, the proposed area has been reduced to consider Cambridge Road, Cambridge Close and Panmuir Road as the extent of the 20mph speed limit area.
I am writing to you in my capacity as representative of the Lambton Road CA at the Conservation Area Design and Advisory Panel and a consulted neighbour, to object to the proposed installation of over 40 new 20mph road signs within the zone.

The proposed measures, in my view, would be contrary to the conservation of the area, providing additional visual clutter to the existing Controlled Parking Zones signage. I have no objection to the principal of attempting to make drivers observe a cautious approach in a residential area and therefore I find the proposed 13 signs at the entrance and exits to the zone replacing existing signage acceptable.

Thank you for giving me an opportunity to be consulted on this matter. Due to the threat that this proposal presents, I would appreciate a receipt of this objection be acknowledged by return or email to

**Officer comments:**
Comments noted.
The road signs are part of the legal requirements associated with 20mph speed limit. These signs will be kept to a minimum and installed on existing lamp post where possible to minimise clutter within the area.

I am writing to oppose this scheme for the following reasons:

Pepys Road and Cambridge Road are the only roads where speeding can be a problem. We do not need additional restrictions elsewhere.

There is no attempt to enforce the current 30mph speed limits so I don’t see how this proposal would help. Many roads within this proposed 20mph zone are within a conservation area where we have too many unwanted street signs. NO MORE PLEASE

**Officer comments:**
Comments noted.
Following correspondences from residents, the proposed area has been reviewed to only consider Cambridge Road, Cambridge Close and Panmuir Road as the extent of the 20mph speed limit area.

As most of the roads within the area are narrow with parking on both sides of the carriageway traffic speeds are low, hence enforcement will not be an issue. On roads where the speed limit will be exceeded, responsibility lies with the Metropolitan Police, as they are the only organisation granted the powers to enforce speed limits.

The traffic signs are part of legal requirement associated with speed limits. These signs will be kept to a minimum and installed on existing lamp post where possible to minimise clutter within the area.

I agree to convert the Cambridge Road area into a 20mph speed and only with speed cushions or some other calming or slowing down device. I understand the proposal does not include speed cushions from Durham Road to Coombe Lane.

I think something should be installed as drivers travel much too fast at the stretch of Cambridge Road. It is a cut through especially at rush hour and coming onto my road in the morning in a car or even on foot can be quite daunting. However a speed limit without measures would be a waste of resources, as I don’t think a change from 30mph to 20mph would make any difference in driver speeds.

**Officer comments:**
Comments noted.
The proposals does not include any speed cushions, however, two electronic display signs would be installed.
on Cambridge Road where there are no traffic calming features to encourage drivers to reduce their speeds. Following correspondence from residents, the proposed area has been reviewed to only consider Cambridge Road, Cambridge Close and Panmuir Road as the extent of the 20mph speed limit area.

The proposals will be monitored and if they do not achieve their objective, additional measures will be considered. If the speed limit is 30mph, some drivers would at times travel at 34-35mph. But if the speed limit is 20mph, they would travel at 24-25mph and that 10mph reduction can make a big difference when a collision occurs with a vulnerable road user, especially a young child.

22013709

Whilst I support the application of a 20 mph speed limit in the Cambridge Road area, I wish to object to the proposed scheme on the following grounds.

Firstly, the proposed speed limit signs will add greatly to the signage already in place, further cluttering the street scene, and adding to confusion for drivers. The council have been lax in this respect, for instance just at the junction of Pepys Road and Durrington Avenue is a pole from a sign, which has been removed, yet the pole remains, unnecessarily.

My second objection is on the grounds that the traffic calming humps on Pepys Road are quite inadequate, and in fact dangerous. Any driver can proceed along the middle of the road at speed, causing considerable danger to oncoming vehicles or those turning out of side roads. Existing speed limits are frequently not observed, and the proposed 20mph limit will only be fully observed when Pepys Road has full, side to-side humps, not the broken ones at present. Your proposal to put up signs but not enhance the speed humps seems quite misguided, and will fail to ensure the 20mph limit is fully observed.

Officer comments:

Comments noted.
The additional traffic signs are part of the legal requirement associated with a speed limit. These signs will be installed on existing lamp post where possible to minimise clutter within the area.

Following correspondences from residents, the proposed area has been reviewed to only consider Cambridge Road, Cambridge Close and Panmuir Road as the extent of the proposed 20mph speed limit area.

22013708

I wish to object to the proposed 20 mph zone on the grounds that it is completely unnecessary and a waste of ratepayers money.

I notice that no case for justification for a reduction in speed limits or for the creation of a 20 mph area is made in the information provided. Please will you let me know how many accidents involving killed or seriously injured have occurred in the proposed zone in the last three years. Please will you also tell me the total cost budgeted for this superfluous exercise?

Officer comments:

Comments noted.
The main objective of the proposals is to reduce traffic speeds on residential roads to minimise the severity of any accident when it occurs.

The scheme is not an accident remedial scheme where the locations and causes of accidents will be investigated and measures implemented to prevent it from re-occurring, but a speed reduction measure across the area.

The cost of a life saved in the event of an accident is more than the cost of the scheme.

22013706

I have received and read your newsletter. I wish to object to these proposals.
My objection does not relate to the main roads coloured pink on your map ("existing calmed roads"). I agree these should be "calmed", particularly in the area around schools as at present. However I think the measures in Pepys Road are not very effective - motorbikes and larger vehicles speeds are not cut by the lozenges at all.

However my objection does relate to the side roads. I can only speak as to the area in which I live. My reasons for objecting are:

1. Speeding in Devas Road is not as far as I am concerned an issue at all;
2. Putting in humps will simply cause unnecessary added pollution (both noise and emissions) for no benefit at all;
3. The added street furniture that accompanies such schemes is environmentally unfriendly and detrimental to an otherwise attractive street scene;
4. This scheme has been suggested, it seems to me, on a "one size fits all" basis: as I say at the beginning of this letter there are streets where such a scheme is necessary, but it there are many more, including my own, where it is not;
5. The scheme for these roads is in my view unnecessary and therefore a waste of council taxpayers money at a time of recession the council should particularly be seeking to contain cost and not sanctioning unnecessary schemes such as this.

Officer comments:

Comments noted

1. Following correspondences from residents, the proposed area has been reviewed to only consider Cambridge Road, Cambridge Close and Panmurr Road as the extent of the proposed 20mph speed limit.
2. No additional traffic calming features (speed humps or speed cushions) are being considered as part of this proposal.
3. The street furniture is part of the legal requirement associated with speed limits. This will be kept to a minimum and installed on existing lamp post where possible to minimise clutter within the area.
4. This is a Council’s objective to convert all residential roads into 20mph speed limit to reduce the severity of any accidents when they occur.
5. This is not a waste of Council’s money as the cost to save a life in the event of an accident is more than the cost of the proposals.

22013705

We object categorically to the proposed 20 mph speed limit in the Cambridge Road area (SW20), as we believe it is an unnecessary expenditure. We suggest instead that the 30 mph speed limit currently in existence should be enforced.

Officer comments:

Comments noted.
It is not an unnecessary expenditure as the cost of a life save in the event of an accident if more than the cost to introduce the proposals. If the speed limit is 30mph, some drivers would at times travel at 34-35mph. But if the speed limit is 20mph, they would travel at 24-25mph and that 10mph reduction can make a big difference when a collision occurs with a vulnerable road user, especially a young child.

22013702

As a resident of Richmond Road, I would like to register my extreme concern over the nature of the above proposals. I obviously recognise the need to promote road safety in all areas, but these proposals appear to represent a totally disproportionate approach to an issue that has frankly never been much of a problem in
our area. With the exception of the occasional idiot, the local community are extremely respectful of the need to drive slowly along narrow roads with parked cars on either side and I fail to see how the proposed measures will

1. make any significant difference and
2. be capable of policing.

We have lived here for 22 years and I do not recall a single accident in Richmond Road during that time that was due to the speed limit being exceeded. The proposed installation of over 40 new 20mph signs within the zone, including one that is sited right outside our house and in direct view of the front window despite the presence of a natural road break a few yards away, will be very expensive and will transform a quiet, attractive residential area into an "urban" environment with excessive unwanted street signs and road markings.

What I find most annoying is this disproportionate response to a relatively minor issue, while Merton Council continue to ignore the residents' appeals to do something about the daily influx of commuter parking in our streets - all over London there are simple schemes in place which restrict parking by non residents during a two hour period in the morning, and yet Merton have consistently rejected this proposal. I can only assume that the reason for this is the fact that the scheme would not generate as much revenue as Merton's alternative proposal of all day parking restrictions - and yet you seem only too happy to waste thousands of pounds on the 20mph scheme as proposed.

If you want to do something for the community and are concerned about speed limits, you could easily install reminders of the existing 30mph speed limit at strategic locations - which would have as much impact. It would really be nice if for once Merton Council did something that was in the interests of the local community and which reflects the view of the ratepayers - that is after all what you were elected to do. I doubt this email will make any difference, in view of the past record of "listening", and there are probably other issues that I am too naive to contemplate, but why not start this difficult year by surprising us.

Officer comments:

Comments noted.

As most of the roads are very narrow with parking on both side of the carriageway, hence reduced traffic speeds, the proposed area has been reviewed to only consider Cambridge Road, Cambridge Close and Panmuir Road as the extent on the proposed 20mph speed limit area.

The parking restrictions within the area are not within the scope of these proposals and have been referred to the appropriate section.

Merton Council is in the process of introducing a 20mph speed limit on most of the residential roads with existing traffic calming features within the borough. The major objective is to reduce the severity of accident, should they occur. If the speed limit is 30mph, some drivers would at times travel at 34-35mph. But if the speed limit is 20mph, they would travel at 24-25mph and that 10mph reduction can make a big difference when a collision occurs with a vulnerable road user, especially a young child.

All the correspondences are given consideration before a decision is made on the scheme, hence the proposed area being reduced to only consider Cambridge Road, Cambridge Close and Panmuir Road.

I would just like to register my serious concern at the proposed 20mph speed limit around the Cambridge Road area.

I live with my family (including 3 young children) on Melbury Gardens, overlooking Cottenham Park. The traffic on our road is always quiet, except perhaps a Saturday morning when visitors come to the park. Even at this, the busiest time of the week, drivers take great care and drive slowly. So much so that the road is used by many Driving Schools.
There is no need to enforce this 20mph limit. The expense at this time of financial difficulty across London, the whole country and the world is frankly totally unnecessary. The many additional signs would be most unsightly and who is really going to monitor whether drivers stick to this new speed limit?

This area is a quiet area, not a rat race zone. If anything, perhaps one or two more reminders of the 30 mph speed limit (as per the electronic reminder of your speed on The Ridgeway close by to here) or a smiley face or two as near Coombe Infant School would be quite sufficient. I urge you and your colleagues to rethink this unnecessary proposal.

Officer comments:
Comments noted.
Following correspondences from residents, the proposed area has been reviewed to only consider Cambridge Road, Cambridge Close and Panmuir Road as the extent of the proposed 20mph speed limit area.

The cost to save a life in the event of an accident is more than the cost to introduce the scheme. The traffic signs are part of the legal requirement associated with speed limit. These signs will be kept to a minimum and installed on existing lamp post where possible to minimise clutter.

I wish to register my objection to the above proposal. This is because I believe it is unnecessary for a blanket 20mph speed restriction in the area; no justifiable reason has been provided for the proposal in my view; the area is likely to become busier and with excessive unwanted street signs and road markings and it would be difficult to police. In place of the proposal, I would endorse road signs, which remind drivers of the current 30mph limit. I hope these points will be taken into consideration.

Officer comments:
Comments noted.
A blanket cover for the area will make it possible for drivers to stay within the proposed speed limit unlike a smaller area, which will be ignored. The major objective of the proposals is to reduce the severity of any accidents within residential roads when they occur.

The street signs will be kept to a minimum and installed on existing lamp post to minimise clutter within the area.

I am writing to register with you my opposition to the proposal for the 20mph zone in the area of Richmond Road, West Wimbledon, where I live. We should, I feel, be reducing 'street clutter', not adding to it with street signs and road surface paintings like this. There is also no practical need for such a zone, the streets mostly being single-lane anyway, due to parking on both sides (e.g. Richmond Road) - that reality in itself limits speed effectively in most cases.

Officer comments:
Comments noted.
The traffic signs and road markings are part of the legal requirement for a speed limit area. These will be kept to a minimum and installed on existing lamp post where possible to minimise clutter. The major objective of the proposals is to reduce the severity of any accidents when they occur.

I write to register my objection to the above scheme.

There is already plenty of superfluous signage in this area and I am not convinced of the usefulness of adding more, especially in conjunction with a scheme, which would appear unnecessary and unjustified. I also cannot see how the proposed speed limit zone would be enforced, unless the intention is to install cameras, of which no mention has been made, so far at least.
Finally, I would have thought that, especially in these uncertain financial times, Merton Council would be easily able to find more pressing uses for council tax payers money rather than spending it on schemes the local population has neither asked for nor approved.

Officer comments:

Comments noted.
The objective of the proposals is to introduce a 20mph speed limit on all residential roads to reduce the severity of accident when they occur. The traffic signs are part of the legal requirement and will be kept to a minimum. They will be installed on existing lamp post where possible to minimise clutter within the area. As most of the roads within the area are narrow with parking on both sides of the carriageway traffic speeds are not expected to be higher, hence enforcement would not be required on these roads. On roads where speeds are high, responsibility lies with the Metropolitan Police, as they are the only organisation granted the powers to enforce speed limits.

22013662

We write to object most strongly to this proposal for the following reasons:
1. There is absolutely no need for a 20mph speed limit zone in this area and the reason is not apparent in that it is not a serious accident area.
2. The proposed measures would transform a quiet residential area into one with excessive and unnecessary ugly "street furniture" and for what purpose?
3. The reason we say for what purpose is that nobody is going to police the area so the proposal is utterly pointless.
4. It would cost a huge amount of money and be a total waste of Council Tax money.
5. If you have such spare cash available it would be far more logical to spend it on both Cottenham Park and Holland Gardens.

Officer comments:

Comments noted.
1. The objective of the proposals is to introduce a 20mph speed limit on all residential road to reduce the severity of any accident when they occur. This is not an accident remedial scheme where the location and cause of these accidents will be investigated and remedial measures put in place to stop them from re-occuring.
2. The number of street signs will be kept to a minimum and installed on existing lamp post where possible to minimise clutter within the area.
3. Most of these road are narrow with parking on both sides of the carriageway, hence speeds are low which do not require enforcement.
4. It will not be a total waste of money as a life saved in the event of an accident is more than the cost to introduce the proposals.
5. The money cannot be used for any other reason than what it is meant for.

22013661

I feel the proposals for a 20mph speed limit in the above area is totally unnecessary and for the following reasons,
1. We do not have an excessive accident rate in this area
2. It would be impossible to police such new measures
3. It would also be unsightly in a residential area
4. The costs involved do not warrant such extreme measures
I would suggest that SMILEY FACES or SPEED REMINDERS (such as the one on Ridgeway, SW19) would be far more appropriate.

Officer comments:

Comments noted.
1. The objective of the proposals is to introduce a 20mph speed limit on all residential road to reduce the severity of any accident when they occur. It is not an accident remedial scheme where the cause,
location and severity of these accidents will be investigated and remedial measures put in place to stop them from re-occuring.

2. The number of street signs will be kept to a minimum and where possible, existing lamp columns will be used to accommodate these signs.

3. It will not be unsightly in a residential road, as the value of a live saved in an accident is more than the appearance of a road.

The proposals have been reviewed to consider Cambridge Road, Cambridge Close and Panmuir Road. Electronic speed indicators are being proposed in Cambridge Road to encourage drivers to reduce they speeds.

22013658

I do not support the proposed scheme.
The additional restriction is unnecessary, because speeding is not a problem in this residential area. Speed humps in Lambton and Pepys Roads provide all the control that is required. The proposed scheme would lead to much additional and unsightly signage.

Officer comments:

Comments noted.
The additional restriction is necessary as it will reduce the severity of any accidents when they occur. The number of additional street signs will be kept to a minimum and where possible existing lamp columns will be used to accommodate these signs.

22013656

We do NOT support the proposals for the 20mph Scheme in their current form.
Why not? Because speed limits are not generally observed by motorists unless they are policed and enforced (whether by cameras, police patrols, squeezes or road humps) - everyone knows that. And we understand that there are no resources to be made available for policing/enforcing. So erecting 20mph signs and painting the tarmac will be an empty - and no doubt costly - gesture.

We live at the bottom end of Cambridge Road and routinely observe vehicles travelling at 40mph plus; so we would actually welcome some speed bumps. But their exclusion from the current scheme renders it useless, as far as we're concerned.

Officer comments:

Comments noted.
Speed limits are not generally observed by motorists by in the event of an accidents, the severity will be reduced if speeds are low. If the speed limit is 30mph, some drivers would at times travel at 34-35mph. But if the speed limit is 20mph, they would travel at 24-25mph and that 10mph reduction can make a big difference when a collision occurs with a vulnerable road user, especially a young child.

Most of the speeds on these road are low, hence will not require any enforcement. The proposals will not be a costly gesture as the cost of a life saved in the event of an accident, is more than the cost to introduce the scheme.

22013655

I was rather alarmed to learn that you propose 20 mph speed limits on Coombe Lane to beyond Pepys Road and to Cottenham Park Road, involving 50 additional signs plus road markings.

This would seem to be a totally impractical idea, which would, no doubt, involve months of road works to install to very little effect. These are suburban roads, not major thoroughfares, and whilst you may get the odd car going at speed, most people realise that these are residential roads and require sensible speeds. It does not seem worthwhile to start putting up signs, extra road markings and other eyesores. This would be at considerable cost and there must be more useful ways of spending ratepayers' money. I hope you will reconsider this proposal.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of road works involved will be minimum as most of the works will be in the footway. The proposed signs will also be installed on existing lamp columns to minimise street clutter. The proposals have been reviewed to only consider Cambridge Road, Cambridge Close and Panmuir Road in the proposed 20mph speed limit area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22013654</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The traffic calming proposals for the Cambridge Road / Cottenham Park / Pepys Road area, and specifically the introduction of a 20 mph limit, are completely unnecessary and therefore a complete misuse of the rates. There is no problem with speeding in the designated area and I strongly object to the Council's proposals and ask that they are withdrawn.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The objective of the proposals is to reduce the severity of any accident when they occur. If the speed limit is 30mph, some drivers would at times travel at 34-35mph. But if the speed limit is 20mph, they would travel at 24-25mph and that 10mph reduction can make a big difference when a collision occurs with a vulnerable road user, especially a young child. The proposals have been reviewed to only consider Cambridge Road, Cambridge Close and Panmuir Road in the proposed 20mph speed limit area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22013653</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I strongly object to this scheme. It is totally unnecessary and the amount of money it would cost could well be better spent in other needy Council departments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The objective of the proposals is to reduce the severity of any accident when they occur. If the speed limit is 30mph, some drivers would at times travel at 34-35mph. But if the speed limit is 20mph, they would travel at 24-25mph and that 10mph reduction can make a big difference when a collision occurs with a vulnerable road user, especially a young child. The cost to save a life is more than the cost of the proposals, hence will not classify the proposals as a waste of money.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22013651</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am not sure what the stats say about traffic accidents/incidents in the area but having lived in Kenwyn Rd SW20 and Dunmore Rd SW20 since 1994 the scheme seems unnecessary. In my opinion the very great majority of drivers act and drive responsibly and the proposed scheme would, at some expense, add to street clutter and would be very hard and costly to enforce - nor would it be a deterrent to the minority of irresponsible drivers who currently flout the existing limit. I am therefore opposed to the scheme as it stands but would be in favour of a selective 20mph limit in Cambridge Road, which is the one road where I believe it would be justified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals are not an accident remedial scheme where the locations and causes of accidents will be investigated and measures put in place to stop it from re-occurring. The number of additional signs will be kept to a minimum and where possible located on existing lamp columns. Following correspondances from residents, the proposals has been reviewed to only consider Cambridge Road, Cambridge Close and Panmuir Road as the extent of the proposed 20mph speed limit area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I wish to object to this proposal, which is quite unnecessary and yet another restriction on the poor old motorist. Please forward to whoever is responsible.

Officer comments:
Comments noted.

My wife and I looked into this proposal and carefully assessed all pros and cons to it as a parent to a toddler. We have lived in this area for the past four years and did not see any benefit in imposing this limit. This area naturally is very quiet and unless someone who is a non-resident in this place makes any noise there is no issue here. The council may invest into another priority for this area.

Officer comments:
Comments noted.

The objective of the proposals is to introduce a 20mph speed limit on all residential roads to reduce the severity of any accident when they occur. If the speed limit is 30mph, some drivers would at times travel at 34-35mph. But if the speed limit is 20mph, they would travel at 24-25mph and that 10mph reduction can make a big difference when a collision occurs with a vulnerable road user, especially a young child. Following correspondances from residents, the proposals have been reviewed to only consider Cambridge Road, Cambridge close and panmuir Road as the extent of the proposed 20mph speed limit.

I am astounded the council allowed this letter to escape without two things being checked.

A) The dreadful English in the letter
B) The lack of clarity in the letter

As a long term resident of the borough of Merton I take exception to a letter asking me to make decisions about an important issue when the calibre of the English language used in the letter is abysmal. I understand that the writer of the letter may not have English as his first language but surely he can ask for help to get the English correct before such a letter is mailed to residents. What a terrible error to make. Is nobody responsible for checking these things are correct before they are printed out, let alone the cost of wasted postage?

My second point is that there is a severe lack of clarity in the letter as Jane Barnes points out in her email in response to your letter. I will not repeat what she said except to say that I agree you need to be clearer with what exactly is proposed. Why is there this urgency to 'rush' this 20 MPH limit through without a longer time for discussion and decision making, surely this could have all been raised some six month ago to give us proper time for consideration to the proposals?

Finally when a supermarket is built on the car parking and Water Board site in Raynes Park where will all the cars who regularly park there move to? I guess to local streets with CPZs in them causing local residents to fork out for annual parking permits, more money for the council? Call me cynical if you like but I am sure many local residents didn't really want this scheme especially as the parking for the supermarket will be limited and there will not be enough parking for the residents of the 90 odd flats, causing them to park in local streets too.

Officer comments:
Comments noted.
Apologies for the printing error in the newsletter which was distributed to residents within the proposed boundary.

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed 20mph Limit in the Cambridge Road area. While I can
see there might be a need for the limit in the major "through" roads, eg: Cambridge, Durham, Lambton, Pepys and, to a lesser extent, Langham Road, there is no need in the minor residential roads in my immediate area, eg: Dunmore, Montana, Conway, Hunter and Devas Roads and, probably, in others I'm less familiar with, eg: Pendarves, Kenwyn, Rosevine, Tolverne and Trewince Roads. All these roads are narrow and short and it is actually difficult to drive at more than 20mph along them as things stand, even if one wanted to. I think the scheme is a waste of public funds, which would be better spent elsewhere.

**Officer comments:**

Comments noted.
The other smaller roads have a legal 30mph speed limit and this will determine the severity of any accident when it occurs. Legally reducing the speed limit to 20mph will make a huge difference in the event of an accident when it involves a vulnerable road user, especially a child. The scheme is not a waste of money as the cost of a life saved in an accident is more than the cost of the scheme.

Following correspondances from residents, the proposals has been reviewed to only consider Cambridge Road, Cambridge Close and Panmuir Road as the extent of the proposed 20mph speed limit.

22013604

I wish to object to this proposal on the following grounds:

1. The existing traffic calming measures in the area are perfectly adequate; I have been resident in Montana Road for 36 years and have not experienced problems with speeding traffic.

2. The allocated funds would be better spent on alleviating current danger points in the area, for instance the installation of double yellow lines at the junction of Arterberry Road with the Ridgeway. Currently vehicles are parking in Arterberry Road right up to junction and I have personally witnessed a number of near accidents resulting from this.

3. The proposal is at variance with the Mayor of London's declared policy of enhancing traffic flow.

Overall the proposals appear to be a waste of public resources.

**Officer comments:**

Comments noted.

1. No physical additional traffic calming measures are being proposed within the area as part of the speed reduction measures, except the traffic signs informing drivers they are entering and within a 20mph speed limit area. Following correspondences from residents, the proposals have been reviewed to only consider Cambridge Road, Cambridge Close and Panmuir Road as the extent of the proposed 20mph speed limit.

2. The proposals would inform drivers to reduce their speeds and in the event of an accident occurring, reduce the severity. We will also look at improving sightlines at road junctions within the proposed area.

3. The proposals will not alter traffic flows within the area as there are no road closures or one way included. The proposals will reduce traffic speeds but still keep traffic moving.

The proposals are not a waste of public resources as the cost of a life saved in the event of an accident is more than the cost of the proposals.

22013600

It was with disbelief that we read the council’s proposal to introduce a 20mph limit in the Raynes Park area.

We have lived here for over 30 years and can only recall one accident, which occurred years ago at the nearby junction. Most people drive with due care and attention and like myself drive well below the limit when the situation demands it, but at the limit when conditions are safe. This is yet another example of the nanny state interfering unnecessarily. Also at this time of financial stringency money should surely not be spent in this way. My comments are as follows:-

1. I should like information on exactly how many accidents have happened in this area in say the last
five years. Were they caused by excessive speed or-by driver error?

2. Where children are collected from St. Matthew's school at the end of Oakwood Road. There is a right-angle bend, which prevents excessive speed. At most speed cushions could be placed at both sides of the corner.

3. If anyone can build up excessive speed on Cottenham Drive then they must be Lewis Hamilton because the right-angle bend halfway down itself prevents it.

4. As to the many short residential streets such as mine, Richmond Road, or e.g. Pendarves Road, Montana Road, due to the shortness of the roads and the number of parked cars it is impossible to build up a dangerous speed. Also the additional road signs will simply be an unnecessary eyesore.

5. Where the more major roads, re. Cottenham Park Road (higher section), Durham Road and Cambridge Road are concerned, cushions are surely sufficient.

6. In fact the council is not even suggesting the one alteration, which would improve safety at the junction of Richmond Road and Cambridge Road. Turning out of Richmond Road into Cambridge Road going north is hazardous simply because of the restricted view. Cambridge Road bends to the right anyway and the cars parked right up to the crossroads on Cambridge Road completely obstruct the view to the right. If the council were really interested in safety, they would put cushions on Cambridge Rd immediately before the junction with Richmond Road as well as double yellow lines on the bend. See below

In short there is surely no need for a general 20 mph speed limit in this area. It would be quite wrong for people driving safely on a clear road at say 28 mph to be accused of excessive speed. A 20 mph limit is only required on high streets with a high density of pedestrians.

Returning to the subject of finance I should like to know exactly how much money this exercise is to cost. We in the private sector are already subsidising preferential pensions for council employees and must not be treated as cash cows for any scheme the council dreams up. It may come as a shock to the council but most people particularly for the foreseeable future simply CANNOT AFFORD TO PAY MORE COUNCIL TAX. In fact a council with a Conservative majority should be seeking ways of saving money rather than spending it. I am sending copies of this letter to councillors, our MP and to RAWW in the hope that sense may prevail.

Officer comments:

Comments noted.

1. The proposals are not an accident remedial scheme where the location and causes of the accidents will be investigated and appropriate measures introduced to stop them from re-occurring. This is a speed reduction measures aimed at reducing traffic speeds within residential roads to reduce the severity of any accidents when they occur.

2. The right angle bend is a speed reducing measures in itself as drivers have to slow down to negotiate this bend. We will investigate and if additional measures are required, we will do that. However, following correspondences from residents, the proposals have been reviewed to only consider Cambridge Road, Cambridge Close and Panmuir Road as the extent of the proposed 20mph speed limit.

3. Comments noted.

4. The proposals have been reviewed to only consider Cambridge Road, Cambridge Close and Panmuir Road as the extent of the proposed 20mph speed limit. However, the roads mentioned in your letter are legally 30mph speed limit and this will affect the severity of any accidents when they occur. The traffic signs area part of the legal requirement and will be kept to a minimum. They will be installed on existing lamp columns where possible to minimize clutter.

5. No additional traffic calming measures are proposed for this area.

6. Comments noted and this location will be investigated and where possible introduce measure to
improve sightlines.

Driving at 28mph is not regarded as excessive speed as they are driving within the speed limit. However this speed will determine the severity of any accidents when they occur. 20mph speed limits are not only required on high street but also within a residential area where there are vulnerable road users, especially children. The cost of a life saved in the event of an accident is more than the cost of the scheme, hence should not attribute the cost of the scheme as excessive.

22013580

Thank you for your recent newsletter regarding the proposed 20 mph residential speed limit. Whilst supporting the principle of the 20mph limit I do object to the scheme in its current form. Your letter appears to contradict itself and contains at least one sentence that makes no sense at all (To convert this area into a 20mph speed limit no additional traffic Calming feature would not be required - what does this mean?) The letter firstly states speed cushions will be needed and this appears to be supported by the map which has some unexplained markings which seem to be new speed cushions and then the letter goes on to say 'No additional calming features would be introduced.'

What is the truth?

As a considerate & careful driver who lives in Coombe Lane and one often has to use Cambridge Road to avoid the chaos caused by the sequencing of lights in Raynes Park that causes daily tailbacks along Coombe Lane, I am in favour of a 20 mph limit. That is still faster than using the main road but I do object to speed cushions. The name itself is something of a misnomer. Their impact is anything but cushioning to the cars that use the road and I have had to replace at least one set of tyres because best known to me the tracking on my car has been put out of line by similar 'cushions' elsewhere. There are other ways of reminding drivers of the limits and I hope these can be considered in place of 'cushions'

Officer comments:

Comments noted.

Please accept our apologies for the printing error in the newsletter. No additional speed cushions are being proposed as part of the measures. The measures proposed to enfored this speed limit are the traffic signs within the proposed boundary.

22013579

I am writing to object to the proposed speed limit of 20 MPH in the Cambridge Road area and the associated speed cushions, for the following reasons:

- I believe that the current speed limit of 30 MPH is not unreasonably fast and that a limit of 20 MPH is too slow.

- Even if it is decided to impose a limit of 20 MPH, I strongly object to the use of speed cushions to enforce this, as most speed cushions are far too severe. For instance, some of the speed cushions in and around the area of Dukes Avenue in New Malden are so large that one has to crawl over them at walking pace. I am not a fast or impatient driver but I find it extremely frustrating having to drive in second gear at an average speed of about 10 or 15 MPH when there is a completely clear road ahead and no pedestrians in sight. In this respect speed cameras would be far better than speed cushions because there would be nothing to stop one reaching the speed limit.

- Speed cushions would cause delays for ambulances.

Officer comments:

Comments noted. No speed cushions are being proposed as part of the measures for the area.

- The speed limit of 30mph will determine the severity of any accident within the proposed area when they happen. If the speed limit is 30mph, some drivers would at times travel at 34-35mph. But if the speed limit is 20mph, they would travel at 24-25mph and that 10mph reduction can make a big difference when a collision occurs with a vulnerable road user, especially a young child.

- No additional speed cushions are being proposed as part of the measures for the area. If you drive at
10-15mph to go over the speed cushions in Dukes Avenue, then they are serving the purpose for which they were introduced. You do not only need to reduce your speed when there are pedestrians around, but will also improve your safety and those in your vehicle.

22013577

I commend the Council's concern to address the problem of speeding on the borough's roads. If I have understood correctly the notification we have received, the Council is, fortunately, not proposing to convert our area into a 20mph zone. Such an approach, particularly the use of speed cushions, would have been highly objectionable:

(a) it would have created real inconvenience to residents in terms of the extra noise and exhaust arising from the changing of speed/gears - ask only: "Would you like to have a "speed cushion" in front of your house?";

(b) it would have meant that vehicles, which need to travel at speed, such as ambulances, would need either to slow down or cause great discomfort to their distressed patients by riding over the humps; and

(c) evidence shows that it would have had little effect on the very people whose behaviour needs to be changed - irresponsible and reckless drivers would not be deterred but would continue to swerve round or sail over "speed cushions" as they already do on so many roads.

Assuming, therefore, that what is being proposed is a 20mph limit for the area, may I ask you to consider the impact of having a succession of "20mph limit" signs scattered along this very pleasant and tree-lined road. Such signs and posts would amount to a visual intrusion; introduce ugliness into what is a very peaceful and uncluttered area. Some might consider this a price worth paying provided it deterred irresponsible drivers. But surely the sort of person who ignores the current 30mph limit would be even more impatient with a 20mph limit and would hardly be likely to observe it.

The Council might feel it is rendering a service and doing its duty by putting up such signs and markings, but the question is: would it really address the problem? I submit that it would not and that the 20mph proposal should not be approved. So as not to sound too negative, may I point out that many children and elderly people use Cottenham Park Gardens. I have often thought that what might be useful would be two simple signs, each located some 50 yards or so before the two entrances to the Gardens. These signs, rather than spelling out a particular speed limit, should simply warn that there are children and elderly people ahead. This might at least appeal to the consciences of reckless drivers who have children or elderly parents of their own.

Officer comments:

Comments noted.

The Council is not proposing a zone but a speed limit. No additional speed cushions are being included as part of the measures for the area. The street signs are part of the legal requirements associated with speed limits. This will be kept to a minimum and where possible installed on existing lamp columns to minimise clutter.

The proposed 20mph speed limit is to improve safety on residential roads to reduce the severity of any accidents when they occur. The proposals have been reviewed to only consider Cambridge Road, Cambridge Close and Panmuir Road as the extent of the 20mph speed limit. An electronic speed indicator will also be installed on Cambridge Road, within the vicinity of Cottenham Park to display the speeds at which drivers are travelling.

22013575

In response to your consultation newsletter dated 21 November, I would make the following representations:

1. I do not think that 20mph limits are necessary. It would be far better to enforce 30mph limits with the use of cameras. The only 20mph zone I have seen is at Hampton Village and this has now been withdrawn in favour of enforcement of a 30mph limit with cameras. I think that it is telling that the 20mph limit was dropped.

2. There is not a problem with fast traffic in my immediately adjoining roads - Pendarves Rd (my road), Kenwyn and Rosevine. In Lambton Road the traffic calming measures work. Maybe only Cambridge
Road, particularly where the school is, is a problem?

3. I read this newsletter that you would not put speed cushions in my road (Pendarves Road) nor indeed any other roads where there are not already such measures. This is unnecessary, as we do not have a traffic speed problem in my road or adjoining roads.

4. You refer to maintaining safety and quality of life, but have never, in 12 years, felt these to be compromised in any way.

5. This would result in too much street furniture. We already have street furniture placed in our road and surrounding ones concerning the Residents Parking. These have-not been placed with any sensitivity to the fact that we are a Conservation Area. We do not need more clutter badly placed like this.

6. I question the spending of budget on these unnecessary measures my road has not been swept at all adequately this year, especially when the leaves fall and you do not put enough resource into Planning enforcement -there are a significant number of loft conversions in this area which are in breach of planning permission. Please put the money to better use.

Officer comments:

Comments noted.

1. The objective of the 20mph speed limit is to reduce the severity of any accident on residential road when they occur.

2. Following correspondences from residents, the proposals have been reviewed to only consider Cambridge Road, Cambridge Close and Panmuir Road as the extent of the 20mph speed limit.

3. Comments noted.

4. The reduction in speed limit will allow vulnerable road users especially children to use the road safely.

5. The street furniture are part of the legal requirements and will be minimise to reduce clutter and where possible installed on existing lamp columns.

6. The cost of a life saved in the event of an accident is more than the cost to introduce the proposals.

I write as one of the folk who has resided in Cambridge Road the longest and who cherishes this calm and peaceful road. Your "Newsletter" is, as I'm sure you'll appreciate, somewhat difficult to fathom (particularly line 1, para. 5). However, you state clearly that "A 20mph speed limit is a dedicated area where improving safety and maintaining the quality of life" is your main objective. I find it impossible to see how you would improve the quality of life by your proposals as outlined. My objections are these:

1. It is unrealistic to believe that the irresponsible, speeding motorcyclists and motorists who use Cambridge Road would be slowed down by "20mph signs"!

2. Who would enforce the speed limit?

3. There are one or two residents in Cambridge Road with serious illnesses who have on occasions had to be rushed to hospital by emergency ambulance. An ambulance, being delayed by bumps in the road could literally mean a matter of life or death to those to whom every second counts. I have good reason to know this from my own experience.

4. Unnecessary bumps in this road would cause needless distress to sick and infirm patients being transported by car or ambulance.

5. This wide, quiet road does not need tall, unsightly, and inharmonious, metal traffic signs.
6. Besides being a waste of money, traffic signs would be ineffective and would have the very opposite effect of "maintaining the quality of life" in this area.

Officer comments:

Comments noted. Reducing the speed on these road will improve safety for all road users, especially vulnerable road users.

1. It is very difficult to slow down the speeds of motorcyclists, as a balance will have to be met when introducing any physical measures considering they are classified as one of the vulnerable road users.

2. As most of the roads are narrow with parking on both sides of the carriageway, traffic speeds are low, hence enforcement will not be required. However on roads where the speeds are higher, responsibility lies with the Metropolitan Police as they are the only organisation granted the powers to enforce speed limit.

3. No additional speed humps are being proposed as part of the measures for the area.

4. This proposal is for a speed limit, which will not lower response time for emergency services, but will save a life in the event of an accident occurring.

5. The traffic signs are part of the legal requirement associated with speed limits and will be installed on existing lamp columns where possible to minimise clutter.

6. The proposed measures will improve safety by reducing the severity of any accidents when they occur.

22013573

Thank you for sending me the information about the imposition of the 20 mph limit in the area around Cambridge Road.

- This is a mistaken policy.
- It will cost a great deal of money (better spent elsewhere)
- It will generally be ignored (see New Malden) unless closely policed.
- The focus should be much more on enforcing the current speed limit.
- Dangerous drivers in this area do not obey the current 30 mph limit, and they will no doubt continue regardless.
- Drivers who do obey the new limit will inevitably be overtaken by others - in my view this is MORE dangerous.
- Better to concentrate your efforts in calming vulnerable locations e.g. schools
- Cambridge Road particularly copes perfectly well with the current limit.
- Local smaller roads are so congested with parked vehicles that it is virtually impossible to do more than 20 mph anyway.
- This will involve yet more 'road clutter' and signage.
- There is a mistaken perception in government that if you pass a law, you will automatically change behaviour. This is patently untrue. Better to continue to educate.
Officer comments:

Comments noted.

- The proposed measures will help the Council to improve safety on residential roads by the introduction of 20mph speed limits to minimise the severity of any accidents when they occur.
- The proposed measures will be less costly than the cost of a life saved in an accident.
- As most of the roads are narrow with parking on both sides of the carriageway, traffic speeds are low, hence enforcement would not be required. However on roads where speeds are high, responsibility lies with the Metropolitan Police as they are the only organisation granted the powers to enforce speed limits.
- If the speed limit is 30mph, some drivers would at times travel at 34-35mph. But if the speed limit is 20mph, they would travel at 24-25mph and that 10mph reduction can make a big difference when a collision occurs with a vulnerable road user, especially a young child.
- The proposed 20mph signs are part of the legal requirements and will encourage drivers to drive within the proposed speed limit.
- Overtaking will be impossible as most of the roads are narrow and heavily parked at most times of the day.
- Following correspondances from residents the proposals have been reviewed to consider Cambridge Road, Cambridge Close and Panmuir Road as the extent of the proposed 20mph speed limit.
- Cambridge Road copes with the current speed limit of 30mph but the objective of the proposals is to reduce traffic speeds across all residential areas to reduce the severity of any accidents when they happen.
- Most of the local roads are congested and impossible to travel more than 20mph, but legally all of these roads are 30mph speed limits.
- The traffic signs will be installed on existing lamp columns where possible to minimise clutter within the area.
- Transport for London, on behalf of all the London Boroughs is educating drivers on the consequences of accident by advertisements on the television, radio and billboards.

22013572

I want to object to the proposed introduction of a 20mph speed limit and related street works as set out in your newsletter dated 21 November 2008. My family and I live on Conway Road, which is within the proposed limit area. I object for the following reasons:

1. Cottenham Park Road and Durham Road are wide through-roads used by buses and have been designated with "B" status (the B281). Excessive speed is already prevented by existing speed cushions and there is no evidence that these roads would be made any safer by lowering the existing 30mph limit.

2. There is very little traffic on the roads immediately surrounding my own (Conway Road, Hunter Road, Devas Road, Montana Road) and to my knowledge there has never been a motor vehicle-related accident on them causing personal injury. So there will be no benefit from changing the existing speed limit, which has existed since these roads were developed in the 1920s.

3. One of the key attractions of Conway Road and the surrounding roads mentioned above are the absence of road markings or signage. Introduction of new signage and possible future road calming measures would significantly detract from street scene.

4. The council tax on my property is nearly £2,300 per year. I consider the proposed scheme an
outrageous waste of taxpayers' money, which would be better rebated to local residents.

In summary I see no identifiable benefits to the proposed scheme and a negative impact on the visual amenity of the area in which I live. It is a waste of money. Merton Council should carry out proper cost-benefit analyses before proposing, yet alone implementing, schemes of this nature. I hope this scheme is abandoned.

Officer comments:

Comments noted.

1. Legally these road are 30mph and the reduction in speed limit will reduce the severity of any accidents when they occur.

2. This is a speed reduction measures on residential roads and not an accident remedial scheme where the location and causes of the accidents will be investigated and measures put in place to stop them from re-occurring.

3. The signs are part of the legal requirement associated with speed limits. This will be kept to a minimum and where possible installed on existing lamp columns.

4. Comments noted.

22013568

Your newsletter/circular regarding the Cambridge Road speed limit was unfortunately hilarious in its use of language and seemed to convey the opposite meaning of the message it was trying to transmit. I am sure it will shortly appear on the Radio Four News Quiz.

In response to your circular, if I have understood it, I would like to object to the proposal to introduce a 20mph limit for the reasons set out below.

1. Your third paragraph sets out what would need to be done to convert this area into a 20mph zone in accordance with the legal requirements. The fourth paragraph then states that you are not going to fulfill these requirements, but you do not state a valid reason. By definition the 20mph limit cannot therefore be legally enforced.

2. I understand that the police do not support the scheme, also because it cannot be legally enforced.

3. My third reason for objecting is that I live in Lambton Road and speed bumps were introduced a number of years ago without any effect whatsoever. There is also a lorry restriction at the junction with Worple Road but skip lorry drivers seem to delight in assessing the maximum speed the bumps can be approached at, usually at around 7.30am.

4. If you think that erecting 20 mph speed limit signs will somehow slow the traffic I do not think that you have carried out sufficient research. I have enclosed a copy of an article, written by Simon Hacker, which refers to the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea's experiment at removing road signs in Kensington High Street. Traffic engineers should be adopting schemes which reduce the number of road signs, not introducing further measures to increase them.

Officer comments:

Comments noted.

1. The leaflet explained the differences between a 20mph zone and a 20mph speed limit as in other areas where this has been done residents asked for the differences. The leaflet then proceeded with the proposals for the area. The 20mph speed limit would not require enforcement as most of the roads are narrow with parking on both sides of the carriageway during most times of the day and this contributes to the low speeds.

2. The police do not support the scheme as they would be responsible for its enforcement.
3. Comments noted.

22013566

Firstly, I would like to offer my wholehearted support for the proposed reduction in the local speed limit to 20mph.

I am concerned however, and strongly object to, the proposed positioning of the 20mph sign directly outside my property. I base my objection on the grounds of safety and request that the Council reconsider the position, especially as there are only two proposed new signs for the entire length of Lambton Road.

The lack of parking restrictions on Lambton Road, and the proximity to Raynes Park Station, means that from every weekday morning, often until late into the evening, the road becomes a commuter car park. Access to and from our driveway is often severely restricted, and sometimes blocked, as a result. We have little alternative but to reverse park into the driveway as parked cars make it impossible to see oncoming traffic when subsequently exiting back onto the road. Even when driving out forwards it is often a lottery as we look for oncoming traffic along the pavement and through the windows of parked cars.

If you also consider the volume of footpath traffic, and my lack of confidence in my driving, you can perhaps appreciate how stressful it can become just entering and leaving the property. I feel that the proposed position of your sign will exacerbate our problem. Lambton Road slopes upward to Cambridge Road and the signage will be directly within our line of sight when looking up the road for oncoming traffic when exiting the driveway. I do not think it is unreasonable for the Council to reposition the sign given the length of the road and amount of alternative available space.

Officer comments:

Comments noted.

Following correspondences for residents the proposed area has been reviewed to only consider Cambridge Road, Cambridge Close and Panmuir Road as the extent of the 20mph speed limit area.

There are proposals for a CPZ within this area and when introduce will improve sightlines into and out of driveways including.

22013565

We have received your newsletter regarding the proposed 20 mph speed limit in the Cambridge Road area. We have to register our concern at this proposal. This seems to be a complete waste of council resources and indeed public money at a time when there is so much to be done within limited budgets.

We would like to know on what basis this need has been identified, whether any residents were consulted (we were not in Dunmore Road) and how the decision was reached. For Dunmore Road in particular this seems completely unnecessary. As we are sure you are aware this is a short road, which already significantly restricts the speed, which can be reached in going from one end to the other. Also it has almost no off street parking. Parking outside houses is therefore dense and again severely limits the speed, which can possibly be achieved over a distance of no more than about 200 metres. Finally given the number of roads involved in this proposed scheme how can it possibly be enforced in any effective way?

We would strongly urge you to reconsider your proposal in general and certainly ask that Dunmore Road be excluded.

Officer comments:

Comments noted.

The proposals are part of the Council’s policy to reduce traffic speeds within residential areas, hence reduce the severity of any accidents when they occur. Following correspondences from residents, the proposals have been reviewed to only consider Cambridge Road, Cambridge Close and Panmuir Road as the extent of the 20mph speed limit.

22013562
As a resident of Laurel Road, I am totally surprised that you should want to put speed humps in this road, as there are cars parked both sides of the road which only allows single line traffic and I doubt if anybody does more than 10 mph, therefore, not posing any danger to pedestrians.

Regarding Cambridge Road, I feel that cameras would be more of a deterrent than speed humps and more environmentally friendly.

In a time when the Government is asking Councils to cut down on expenditure, the idea of speed humps in Laurel Road seems a total waste of money and I would like to know what sort of cost is incurred by doing this.

**Officer comments:**

Comments noted.

No additional speed humps are being proposed as part of the measures for this area. Following correspondences from residents, the proposals have been reviewed to only consider Cambridge Road, Cambridge Close and Panmuir Road as the extent of the speed limit. The review also includes two electronic speed indicators in Cambridge Road within the vicinity of Cottenham Park to inform drivers of the speed at which they are travelling.

---

22013561

As a long-term resident who regularly uses the Cambridge Road area both as a pedestrian and 'motorist I wish to register my objection to the proposed twenty-zone. Any speeding problems will only be exacerbated by this limit. Consider other local twenty-zones, such as Clarence Avenue in New Malden. Those who habitually drive faster than thirty ignore the speeding restrictions there. What is more it has made the road far more dangerous because when these reckless, motorists find themselves behind someone who adheres to the limit they attempt to overtake; accelerating to above thirty, thus putting at risk not only the driver they are overtaking, but also the one who may be approaching from the opposite direction on the two-lane road and even the pedestrian crossing the street who is suddenly faced by an accelerating vehicle in a lane which he previously believed to be empty.

Twenty-zones do not promote safer driving; they encourage motorists to speed out of peer-pressure from other drivers who want only ignore the limit. This in turn endangers pedestrians who, confidently assuming that every vehicle on the road is travelling at a safe twenty will make more risky crossings when before they would have taken greater care. Such a situation shall not develop if speed limits remain at thirty - motorists shall not become aggravated by an unexpected drop in speed (a speed which I might add, unlike thirty, is difficult to maintain being too fast for second gear and too slow for third) and feel moved to overtake others riskily in our tight two-lane roads.

I appreciate that the twenty-zone in Clarence Avenue is intended to protect the pupils of Coombe Girls School and similarly here, those of Hollymount School (though curiously not St. Matthew's School as I see that the zone does not extend down the whole length of Cottenham Park Road to the school's entrance).

However, do these pupils really need to be protected when they are not on the roads, i.e. at weekends and during the middle of weekdays? A variable limit enforcing twenty mph during School run hours on weekdays would be a sensible solution and would doubtlessly reduce the immense cost of installing new sign and sleeping policemen throughout the area. Especially during a time of imminent economic difficulty when such funds are needed elsewhere.

**Officer comments:**

Comments noted.

---

22013531

I am intrigued as to the reasoning behind this proposal. Is it because there have been a number of fatal accidents in this area, if so I am not aware of them.
I assume that the twelve road cushions in Oakwood Road would include the lower half of Cottenham Park Road. I also note that you are intending to re-instate speed cushions in Cottenham Drive. I am surprised at this as you only recently paid a contractor a huge amount of money to remove the 4 granite speed restrictors from this Drive (in the last three years).

With regard to the speed cushions Boris Johnson the Mayor for London stated only last week that councils should consider other alternatives to speed cushions. My personal reason for not wanting them is that they are noisy and therefore antisocial, besides which the council can't maintain the ones it already has, an example of this is Durham Road.

A much better idea would be to put in width restrictors as you have in Garth Road particularly in long roads such as Cambridge Road and Cottenham Park Road. With regard to the 20MPH speed limit, due to non-resident commuters parking along both sides of the roads to catch the train from Raynes Park Station in this area, it is very difficult to do any more than 20 MPH any way, so I have no objections to this.

Perhaps you could put in signage first and see how it goes for a six month period before unnecessary spending of council taxpayer's money. The money saved could be spent on resurfacing some of the roads in this area. I know for a fact Cottenham Park Road has not been resurfaced in the thirty years that I have lived here. I trust that my views will be taken into consideration.

Officer comments:

Comments noted.

No additional speed cushions are being proposed as part of the 20mph speed limit measures. There are certain locations where width restrictions are feasible but not Cambridge Road. The proposals only involve signings, which will be monitored and reviewed when they do not achieve their objective.

22013530

While the rationale for converting existing "traffic calmed roads in the Borough into 20mph zones is stated in the recent council newsletter (21.11.08) the proposal to convert ALL the roads within the designated area to this speed limit appears excessive. The need for a new proposal suggests that these "calming" measures have not been effective, which is not surprising. The premise appears to be that speed kills, but it is the irresponsibility of road users; be they pedestrians or motorists/bikers that contributes to accidents, not necessarily speed per se.

We have had the imposition of speed humps and bumps, dangerous chicanes (on Copse Hill and Martin Way) increased road markings and roadside flashing lights in the Borough. All these are a distraction to the motorist and do not necessarily reduce traffic speed as I have noticed.

Trewince Road is one of the roads to be targeted by this proposal. This is a quiet residential road and not a through way. Traffic speeds are already low in the road. In fact it is difficult to get up to speeds over 20mph along it as it is. The expense of erecting entry and exiting mph signs and adding road markings in each road throughout the proposed area is a complete waste of money. If, as the proposal initially stated that only existing "traffic calmed" roads should be considered for conversion to 20mph this might be considered more reasonable, but the inclusion of such a large number of roads is excessive.

Should this scheme go ahead it is essential that as your proposal suggests, NO "calming features" are to be installed IN THIS ROAD. Parking space for residents has already been reduced by the length of double yellow lines painted at the corner with Rosevine Road and the installation of metered spaces at the Worple Road end. It is therefore essential that no further space is taken up by the installation of speed humps. In any case, it is difficult to understand how a hump, positioned at the side of a road over which cars have to be parked has any bearing on reducing speed in that road. It just makes it more awkward for the beleaguered motorist.

Officer comments:

Comments noted.

The existing measures have been effective at reducing traffic speeds as they are within the limit of 30mph. The introduction of the 20mph speed limit will improve safety on residential roads; hence reduce the severity of any accidents when they occur. It is better to have a wider 20mph speed limit area than a small one, which
will be abused by drivers most of the time.

22013520

We have received details of a proposal to place most of Raynes Park in a 20mph zone, involving traffic calming measures and numerous signs.

We object to this proposal on the grounds of it being unnecessary, not requested and a waste of money.

It is unnecessary because as many smaller roads in the area are of a short length and/or have many parked cars it is already difficult to reach even 20mph. Wider roads are usually not very busy and so to crawl at 20mph would be too restrictive.

From the residents with whom we have spoken there is no desire for this measure. Many other projects in the borough require attention, i.e. upkeep of parks and tennis courts, cleaning graffiti etc at the very least, and in these times of financial restraint it would be a great waste of money to carry out this unwarranted scheme.

There may be a case for a 20mph stretch on the road outside Hollymount Primary School in Cambridge Road between Pepys Road and Lambton Road but any further restriction is entirely without merit.

Officer comments:

Comments noted.

The area is being considered a 20mph speed limit (enforced by Metropolitan Police) area and not a 20mph zone (self-enforcing). No additional physical traffic calming measures are being proposed as part of the measures except the traffic signs, which will be installed at regular intervals and on existing lamp columns to minimise clutter.

The section of Cambridge Road outside Hollymount Primary School, Pepys Road and Lambton Road have all got existing traffic calming measures.

22013515

I would like to strongly oppose your proposed 20 MPH speed restriction and speed hump install, I have been a resident in Raynes Park for over 33 years and never experienced any problems with speeding traffic in or around the area.

I believe this is just some people in the Civic Centre trying to justify their job by wasting the residents hard earned taxes on ridiculous hair brained ideas that will not only cost a fortune but will make traffic even slower than it already is by drivers trying to avoid these roads forcing them on to main roads causing even more pollution.

This is a case of a sledgehammer cracking a nut, as resident of Tolverne Road I know that is virtually impossible to speed down as it's a short road and most of the time both sides of the road are full of parked cars and difficult for two cars to pass one another, so putting two humps here would be madness.

Officer comments:

Comments noted.

22013513

I am writing to object to the proposals to erect numerous speed bumps in the area around Laurel Road where I live.

Traffic in this area is very light and generally for access only. Traffic does not travel at excess speeds and it does not need to be calmed. Speed bumps are a nuisance not a help to the local environment and residents; they create noise, dangerous driving, as people drive their cars around them to avoid them, unnecessary wear and tear on vehicles, pain and discomfort to sick or injured passengers. They are generally a discredited solution to a perceived problem.
As well as objecting to this particular scheme I would like to object to the Council spending residents' money on budget areas such 'traffic calming'. I would prefer it were spent where it will have some value, increasing resources for the elderly, schools, libraries etc.

Officer comments:

Comments noted.

No additional speed humps are being proposed as part of the 20mph speed limit. The objective of the speed reduction measure is to improve safety on residential roads, hence reduce the severity of any accidents when they occur. The cost of a life saved in an accident is more than the cost to introduce the proposals.

I am most dismayed to hear that you are considering a series of traffic calming measures in the Cambridge Road area.

I live on Laurel Road very close to the junction with Cambridge Road and I object most strongly to the proposed addition of speed humps and cushions. I have lived here for two years and do not consider there to be a speed or traffic problem on either Laurel or Cambridge Road. Laurel Road is a small road with cars parked on either side and a kink at the end. Barely any traffic uses this road other than residents and it is extremely rare for any vehicle to speed along here. The same can be said of Cambridge Road, despite it being a slightly busier thoroughfare.

I feel the addition of speed humps or cushions is entirely unnecessary and will cause a disturbance. A number of years ago I lived on a road with speed humps, one directly outside my house. I was constantly aware of cars breaking before the hump and accelerating after it. There were other occasions when cars did not slow down for the hump and there would be a crashing and scraping sound as the front of the car hit the tarmac. Not to mention the terrible racket when a flat bed truck or skip lorry goes over them.

Traffic humps are a nuisance to car owners due to damage and wear and tear to the vehicle and a nuisance to residents due to the increased traffic noise. They create more pollution due to constant breaking and accelerating of vehicles and they are a hindrance to ambulances. Laurel Road is a quiet and pleasant road to live in. This would not be the case if speed humps or cushions were to be put here. Being so close to Cambridge Road, I would experience the disturbance from both roads, whereas at present there is no problem whatsoever.

Officer comments:

Comments noted.

No additional speed cushions are being introduced as part of the 20mph speed limit proposals. Following correspondences from residents, the proposals have been reviewed to only consider Cambridge Road, Cambridge Close and Panmuir Road as the extent of the proposed 20mph speed limit.

I object to your proposals to impose the above 20 mph speed limit on the following grounds:

1. You present no evidence that the current speed limit of 30 mph is causing danger or nuisance- you are simply asserting your ambition for 20mph speed limits.

2. It is a waste of money; I would prefer to have a reduction on the annual rates than have you to carry on with this and other similar wasteful schemes. What is the cost benefit analysis behind this proposal

3. The additional proposed street signage adds yet more un-welcome and un-wanted clutter to the area, worsening the ambience of the area (you can deliver on both of your presumed mandates in your job title of "Improving the Street Scene and Reducing Waste" by NOT implementing this plan).

The urgent safety areas that need to be addressed are the very dangerous double mini roundabouts at the junctions of Copse Hill, Cottenham Park Road, Woodhayes Road and The Ridgeway and the single mini-roundabout at the junction of Pepys Road and Cottenham Park Road (see enclosed map). There are lots of
minor collisions on these poorly designed roundabouts where cars going straight from The Ridgeway to Copse Hill and vice versa and straight on along Cottenham Park Road respectively, fail properly to take into account the right of way of others. In my opinion, traffic calming should be put in place at the entrance to all of these mini roundabouts (this measure seems to have been effective at the nearby junction of Copse Hill with Coombe Lane). Most importantly, you should not be using your poor street layout at these junctions as the reason to impose the 20 mph limit in the whole area, as is currently being proposed.

Officer comments:
Comments noted.

1. The proposal is a speed reduction measure and not an accident remedial scheme where the location and causes of the accidents will be targeted and measure put in place to stop them from re-occurring.

2. The cost of a life saved in the event of an accident is more than the cost to introduce the measures.

3. The additional street signs are legal requirements associated with speed limits. These will be kept to a minimum and where possible installed on existing lamp columns to minimise clutter.

COMMENT

Thank you for your letter asking for the views of neighbours living in the Cambridge Road area about the proposals to introduce speed zones of 20 mph. I must say I was surprised by this proposal by Merton Council, I don't feel a complete 20mph limit in the whole of the area proposed is necessary or desirable. I feel it would be far better to target specific areas e.g. outside schools /danger spots, although I have children who regularly use the roads I haven't felt worried or concerned by the speed of the traffic in most of the roads mentioned and don't feel a 'blanket' 20 mph zone would be necessary nor effective. However, I feel a small number of 'smiley faces' and reduced speed of 20mph in the top half of Cambridge Road outside Hollymount School for example, would be a good proposal.

The number of roads mentioned in the proposal, if implemented would transform quiet residential roads nearby with unwanted street signs and road markings, which would also be impossible to police or monitor. I live in Durham Road, where speed bumps have been installed to slow traffic down, many drivers still manage to speed, I think the smiley faces /reminders are far more effective in residential areas, I know this has been effective in areas of Richmond and Teddington in traffic calming without the need to have too many signs.

One road where I feel a 20 mph limit is needed and necessary is along the Ridgeway in Wimbledon, and I am surprised that Merton Council haven't already implemented one there, as there are seven schools in the immediate area, traffic, including buses regularly speed along this narrow stretch of road from the roundabout at the top of Wimbledon Hill Rd along the Ridgeway to the roundabout at the top of Copse Hill. There is one 'smiley face' to remind drivers but as the road is so narrow and young children are regularly using the pavements, I feel a 20 mph here is necessary, but I don't feel a 'blanket' 20mph zone would be necessary nor effective.

Officer comments:
Comments noted.

I live in Lambton Road. I would just say that I believe it would be an excellent idea to have a 20 mph zone as proposed.

I hope it will be part of a process of educating drivers to keep their speed down without the crude process of installing road humps. In USA (New England, anyway) 20 mph in residential areas is considered normal and it is courteous to observe the limit. It is much more civilised that way.
**22013743**

Our response to this proposal is that, whilst there are a small number of roads where traffic speed can be a problem (Cambridge Road being one of them) there is no need for an area-wide approach with the consequent proliferation and cost of ugly signage and markings.

This household believes that a measured, street by street approach will best serve the interests of the majority of residents.

**22013518**

The plans you sent to me have been studied carefully and I write to register my strong objection to the proposals for the following reasons:

1. My experience as a driver has demonstrated that whilst it is possible to drive at 30 mph in fourth gear, at 20 mph it is necessary to drive in third gear. The implication of this is that your proposal would result in a greater fuel use and, consequently, a greater carbon footprint.
2. As more and more obstacles are added due to ‘traffic calming’ then more and more attention is demanded to cope with these obstacles, which diminishes the amount of attention available for driving safely.
3. It is unjust that most law abiding members of the public have to suffer the inconvenience of these measures due to the irresponsibility of the anti-social few. In addition to which my observations confirm that, even on roads where traffic calming measures have been introduced, those same few drive above the limit of 30 mph, combining such drivers with the common practice of swerving in order to pass centrally over traffic calming features is a most dangerous event.
4. I resent the waste of money your proposed measures incur. You will see that I live in Cottenham Drive. We have had, first, traffic humps, which turned out to be too dangerous in icy weather and were taken away. We then had lines of cobble installed, which caused complaints due to the noise they made, and they were removed. You now propose to start the whole process again, which will be a further complete waste of council tax. This is irresponsible profligacy.
5. Arising from my professional occupation I am sensitive to the environmental qualities of our area. There is no doubt in my mind that, as more and more restrictions are added to our roads, the quality of the environment deteriorates. You are directly responsible for maintaining a high aesthetic quality of this neighbourhood and your proposals will, undoubtedly, detract from that quality.
6. It is my belief that more serious study is needed into those issues, which affect road safety and yet do not seem to command any attention from the authorities. An instance of this is permitting car headlights to be used in streets, which have street lighting and the use of unshielded street lighting, both of which produce glare and impair visual perception of the drivers of cars. This fact, combined with the extra attention needed at nighttime to avoid traffic calming measures, detracts considerably from road safety.
7. I note that you do not offer any evidence as to why these road proposals are considered necessary. I believe that such evidence should have accompanied your letter. If there is concern about road safety it is my view that any expenditure would be more profitably directed at keeping road surfaces in proper order and the other measures mentioned in this letter. It has to be admitted that the state of the roads in this area is far from an acceptable standard.

In conclusion I reiterate my objection to the proposals and recommend they be abandoned.
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Dear Resident/Business

In line with Merton’s commitment to reduce vehicular speeds through 20 mph zones or 20 mph speed limits, funding has been allocated for 2008/09 financial year to convert existing traffic calmed roads within the borough into 20mph zones/limits. Cambridge Road area bounded by Cottenham Park Road (inclusive) in the north; Coombe Lane in the south; Arteberry Road in the east; Oakwood Road (inclusive) in the west has been identified as one that is suitable for a 20mph speed limit. A drawing is enclosed showing the boundary.

A 20mph speed limit is a dedicated area where improving safety and maintaining the quality of life for local residents takes precedence over the general objective to ease traffic movement. Traffic speeds within the area are not to exceed 20 mph.

To convert this area into a 20mph zone in accordance with the legal requirements, additional traffic calming measures would be required on Richmond Road (4 sets of speed cushions), Oakwood Road (12 sets of speed cushions), Melbury Gardens (4 sets of speed cushions), Spencer Road (1 set of speed cushion), Avenue Road (2 sets of speed cushions), Cottenham Drive (3 sets of speed cushions), Laurel Road (1 set of speed cushion), Hunter Road (1 set of speed cushion), Conway Road (2 sets of speed cushion), Lamham Road (3 sets of speed cushion), Pendarves Road (1 set of speed cushion), Kenwin Road (1 set of speed cushion), Rosevine Road (1 set of speed cushion), Tolerne Road (2 sets of speed cushion), Trewince Road (2 sets of speed cushion), Devas Road (2 sets of speed cushion), Montana Road (1 set of speed cushion), Dunmore Road (2 sets of speed cushions) and part of Cambridge Road (6 speed humps in line with the existing speed humps).

Due to the large number of additional features required for a zone, it has been agreed to consider a limit for this area.

PROPOSALS
20mph Limit
To convert this area into a 20 mph speed limit additional traffic calming features would not be required. The introduction of a 20mph limit would require the appropriate signage and road markings within the area. The approximate locations of the signs are shown on the enclosed drawing. No additional traffic calming features would be introduced as part of the proposal.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT
A Notice of the Council’s intentions to make the Traffic Management Order (TMO) for the above measures will be published in the local newspaper and the London Gazette. Notices will also be posted on lamp columns in the vicinity. Representations for and against must be done in writing to the Head of Street Scene and Waste Management Division, Merton Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, Surrey, SM4 5DX by no later than 12 December 2008, quoting reference ES/SGE/CAMBRIDGERD20MPH.
Anyone who opposes the scheme must state the grounds upon which their objections is made. Those who support the scheme are also encouraged to make representations.

Please note that responses to any representation received will not be made until a final decision is made by the Cabinet Member. The Council is required to give weight to the nature and content of your representations and not necessarily the quantity. Your reasons are, therefore, important to us.
The outcome of the consultation, along with officer’s recommendations will be reported to the Cabinet Member for a decision. Once a decision is made, you would be informed accordingly via a newsletter.

A plan identifying the area affected by the proposal can be inspected at Raynes Park Library, Approach Road, Raynes Park, London, SW20 8BA and at Merton Link, Merton Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, Surrey during the Council’s working hours, Monday to Friday, between 9am and 5pm.

CONTACT DETAILS
Simao De Borja - Traffic Engineer
Tel: 020 8545 3208
Email: simao.deborja@merton.gov.uk
Website: www.merton.gov.uk/cambridge2Umph

If you would like more information in your own language, please contact us at the address shown in the bottom box.

Raynes Park Ward Councillors
Clrl Margaret Brierly
Tel: 020 8545 3396
Email: margaret.brierly@merton.gov.uk

Clrl Linda Scott
Tel: 020 8545 3396
Email: linda.scott@merton.gov.uk

Clrl Rod Scott
Tel: 020 8545 3396
Email: rod.scott@merton.gov.uk

Village Ward Councillors
Clrl John Bowcott
Tel: 020 8946 1011
Email: john.bowcott@merton.gov.uk

Clrl Richard Che Illew
Tel: 020 8545 3396
Email: richard.che Illew@merton.gov.uk

Clrl Samantha George
Tel: 020 8404 1303
Email: samantha.george@merton.gov.uk

You can also get this information in large print, in Braille and on tape.
Dear Resident

Proposed 20mph Speed Limit - Cambridge Road area

You were recently sent a consultation newsletter regarding the Council’s proposal to convert the Cambridge Road area bounded by Cottenham Park Road, Cronthe Lane in the south, Arterberry Road in the east, and Oakwood Road in the west into a 20mph speed limit area.

This letter is to apologise for the errors in some of the road names, the confusing nature of the newsletter particularly with regards to the fourth paragraph and to provide clarification of the proposal. The paragraph should have read as follows.

PROPOSAL
20mph Limit
To convert this area into a 20mph speed limit additional features would not be required. The introduction of a 20mph limit would only require appropriate signage and road marking within the area. The approximate locations of the signs are shown on the enclosed drawing. No additional traffic calming features, such as speed humps or platforms, would be introduced as part of the proposal.

Due to the confusion caused by the error the closing date for all representations has been extended to 9 January 2009, which must be made in writing to the Head of Street Scene and Waste Management Division, Merton Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, Surrey, SM4 5DX.

Again please accept our sincere apologies and do not hesitate to contact me should you require any further information.

Yours faithfully,

Anna Gallard
Traffic Engineer
Traffic Highway Services
London Borough of Merton
anna.gallard@merton.gov.uk

Edward Quartey
Traffic Engineer
Traffic Highway Services
London Borough of Merton
edward.quartey@merton.gov.uk