<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representations</th>
<th>Appendix 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUPPORT</strong></td>
<td><strong>PELHAM ROAD AREA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>22012654</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As residents of Palmerston Road, we would like to strongly support the proposal for creating a 20 mph zone in the Pelham Road area. With cars parked on both sides of all of these roads there are dangers, especially for children and the elderly, when trying to cross a road in the area. In addition, particularly at night, the effect of cars crossing road humps at speed causes noise and vibration to residents. This can be irritating and frequently is at a level that exceeds the sound from television. We are also concerned about the age of most of the houses in this area. Many were built in the mid 1800s; the foundations were probably adequate for the time but the extent to which they can survive the constant battering by traffic remains to be seen. Any effort made to reduce this is to be welcomed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Officer comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As Merton Road is currently closed due to the ongoing gas works, Pelham Road and the other roads within the area, is being used as a diversion route, hence the high volume of traffic within the area. There is a lorry ban restriction on most of the roads within the area, hence when Merton Road is open to through traffic; heavy goods vehicles would not be able to use these roads within the area and the noise levels will be reduced.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>22012659</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think a traffic calming/speed reducing scheme for the Pelham Road area is just what it needs, but the problem is traffic humps don't work now! People tear up and down these roads in their cars, driving as if they're on a racetrack, so how will you enforce it? Perhaps sealing off one end of these roads stopping people cutting through is the answer?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Officer comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pelham Road area is being considered a 20mph zone, and with the existing traffic calming features on majority of the roads within this area it will be self-enforcing. Additionally, traffic calming features will be installed on the roads currently without any. As a rule majority of drivers do slow down upon approach to speed reducing features; we are aware of few who do not but it is envisaged that with the appropriate signs and road markings along with additional traffic calming features, more drivers are encouraged to adhere to the speed limit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>22012634</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am writing in response to your information sheet regarding the 20mph limit proposal for the Pelham Road area. I have no objection to the proposed 20mph zone; it seems too sensible given the numerous road intersections and car parking areas within the zone. However, I do object to the proposed installation of traffic calming features on Griffiths Road. You provide no justification for your statement &quot;for this area to satisfy the criteria for a 20mph zone, traffic calming features have to be implemented on Griffiths Road&quot;. Surely you can impose a 20mph limit without the requirement for traffic calming features? I utterly oppose the installation of traffic calming features as they cause unnecessary deceleration and acceleration of vehicles, which in turn causes increased pollution and noise. It would be far, far better to encourage the movement of vehicles at a constant (but slow) speed through the area, and there is already in effect traffic calming in place on Griffiths Road because with parked cars it's largely too narrow for two vehicles to pass. The additional pollution generated by the constant deceleration and acceleration caused by the navigation of artificial traffic calming features should be avoided at all cost, especially in this age of climate change and soaring fuel prices. I would be much more supportive of &quot;20&quot; and &quot;SLOW&quot; signs painted alternately on the road surface at every 20 yard interval, as a constant reminder to drivers that they're in a speed restricted zone. I have seen this work very effectively in Ireland. Further, if you do proceed with building traffic calming features in Griffiths Road, please do not allow these works to commence until after the completion of the gas mains replacement works on Merton Road and the surrounding roads. The whole area is already in traffic chaos due to these works, which I believe are due to last until early next year. Further road works during these works should be avoided unless absolutely necessary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Officers comment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To satisfy the legal requirements for a 20mph zone, traffic calming features are required on Griffiths Road. This area can be converted into a limit, which would not be enforced since it is only the Police who can</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
enforce speed limits. It is therefore advisable to convert this area into a zone, which will be self-enforcing. If approved, the works would not commence until the works on Merton Road is finished.

22012769
I refer to the newsletter I received about the above proposal - which affects the road I live in, Palmerston Road - and I write to support the proposal to install a 20mph zone in the Pelham Road area. I do hope though that this will equally apply to any buses on diversion in the area. Currently buses are on diversion down Palmerston Road due to the closure of Merton Road for road works, and it is they that are causing most traffic disturbance and are rattling down the road at high speed. I hope that the introduction of this 20mph limit will mean that the use of Palmerston Road for the diversion is re-considered in future.

Officers comment
The proposed 20mph zone will apply to all vehicles, which use the area. Guarantee cannot be given that this area will not be used as a diversion route.

22012785
I write with my invited comments to the 20 mph scheme and calming scheme proposed for Pelham Road and surrounding area. I have been a resident in Pelham Road for 18 years and have seen a constant build up of traffic cutting through this road, as many people use it as a short cut to the town or Kingston Rd, racing to beat the other traffic. In principle, putting a restricted 20 mph limit is good, however, who will police this? I note that there is a 20mph restriction outside the shopping centre, but I don’t think anyone complies, it does not make any difference, particular when the traffic is congested as this doesn’t allow for anything faster, but in quieter times its not effective, the flashing 20 mph sign is ignored. Recently since the end of Pelham Road has been closed due to the gas works, the road has become a very pleasant place to live, and not a constant battle of trucks and cars getting stuck because they can’t pass each other. We have asked the council before to consider putting a width restriction or barrier at the end of Pelham/Merton end so that we don’t get these heavy lorries, which have struck parked cars in the past. Some of this traffic is caused because of a no right turn out of Quicks Rd, so people turn left and then right into Pelham, could it be that Pelham and Griffiths share this flow and allow people the choice to turn left or right (putting down a yellow box) out of Quicks, its allowed at the moment because of the gas works diversion, it certainly helps with the distribution of flow. The Victorian villas houses in this part of Pelham Rd are suffering from the heavy traffic causing increased subsidence; this area is a conservation area and should be treated with some sensitivity. I would strongly urge that you consider these other methods to cut down traffic flow in Pelham, not only speed but also the quantity. I hope that you consider my requests; I know that I voice the opinion of my neighbours.

Officers comment
Pelham Road cannot be closed as part of the Pelham Road area 20mph zone, since further investigations would have to be carried out to determine the effect on the surrounding road network within the area. But before any work can be carried out, funding would have to be secured and any change would be subject to the consultation process. All reasonable requests have been added to the programme for future investigation. As Pelham Road is used by other residents within the area, should the closure be considered, an area wide consultation exercise would have to be carried out. Pelham Road has 248 residents whilst 933 other residents, who live within the area but not on Pelham Road and require access to their various roads through Pelham Road would have to be consulted.

22012937
We are writing to express our strong support for the proposed 20mph zone in the Pelham Road Area. Drivers passing through these residential streets often exceed the current 30mph limit and we believe that reducing the limit to 20mph will have a positive impact Driving at 30mph or above through these residential streets significantly increases the chances of an accident occurring, but results in a negligible saving in journey time. We sincerely hope that if this proposed 20mph limit is implemented it will be rigorously enforced.

Officers comment
Comments noted.

22012961
We thoroughly support these proposals as broadly outlined in your newsletter of 29 August 2008. We would like to make the following points regarding detail:
1. Pelham Road Conservation Area is a key element within this proposed 20mph facility. Whilst being the narrowest bit of road in the area, it is also a much over-used cut-through for non-residential traffic (traffic that should be using Kingston Road or the Broadway). This is a problem even with the existing traffic calming road humps and is unlikely to be reduced by 20mph entry signs. We consider that the closure of Pelham Road at its junction with Merton Road (using a South Park Road/Queens Road type closure i.e. one that admits emergency vehicles) should be included in the 20mph proposals. This will make a huge contribution to the aims of the 20mph proposals, while bringing much needed traffic enhancement to the Pelham Road Conservation Area at little, if any, extra cost.

2. Traffic Advisory Leaflets 7/91 8 9199 make quite clear the requirement for two signs, one on each side of the road, for the 'gateway effect' at the entry to a 20mph facility. The Wimbledon Broadway 20mph facility, with its road painted and electronic reminders coupled with speed tables, loses much of its effectiveness by not having a 'gateway' effect and is recognized as requiring improvement by Merton's Principal Traffic Engineer, Mitra Dubet. It would seem an ineffective use of public funds if the ‘gateway’ conditions for establishing proper entry to a 20mph facility are not incorporated in the Pelham Road Area Proposals. We would expect to see, on your descriptive drawing, 2 entry signs at each entry point. (Please note Griffiths Road has no entry signs at all on your present drawing)

3. Wimbledon Town Centre 20 mph facility requires improvement, as referred to above, but it is not shown at all on your consultation plan. Its current ineffective beginning (for vehicles travelling west along the Broadway) is an unreadable sign outside No77 in the Broadway. It would seem only logical that, with the Pelham Road Area becoming 20mph, the Town Centre 20mph facility should be extended east to cover the Polka Children's Theatre and YMCA, suggesting a ‘Gateway’, appropriately, at the Eastern extent of the Broadway. This scheme would probably require less signage than would be required for introducing the Pelham Road Area on its own. (Please note that your 20mph proposal for Gladstone Road has conflicting signs at the Northern end where it joins the Town Centre 20mph scheme while at the Southern end it is presently ‘no entry’ and we suggest should remain so).

Officers comment
Comments noted.

22012963
I refer to your letter dated 29th August 2008. I wrote to you 6th June 2005 highlighting our traffic problems and I am happy for the proposals to go ahead. Heavy traffic: The amount of vehicles using our street is unacceptable and so is their speed. There are lorries transporting cars (two-story) as well as other heavy lorries, busses and far too many cars. Many times a day our whole house is vibrating badly and windows are shaking as if the glass will shatter when cars and other vehicles drive down our road. As Russell Road is a residential road there should be no lorries or busses being allowed to use the road at any time. Gladstone Road has no entry at all from the Kingston Road end. You can't do a right turn into Palmerston Road when coming from South Wimbledon. This obviously means that even more vehicles will be using Russell Road. I am aware that Hamilton Road, Hardy Road, etc SW19, been closed off completely and can't help but wish something similar would happen in our area too. Road safety: The high volume of traffic and the high speed of vehicles using this road are unacceptable. For pedestrians it is extremely dangerous to cross the road especially on Russell Road the Kingston Road end. Cars are parked too near the street corners (both Russell Road and Kingston Road), which reduce the visibility for the pedestrians, which doesn't help. I am in favour of the proposals and I am relieved that something is going to be done about our residential area and the road safety. I would of course have preferred a complete closure, similar to the Hamilton Road area or even one way road systems.

Officers comment
The recent increase in traffic in Russell Rd and the surrounding area is because Merton Road is currently closed to through traffic due to the ongoing gas works, hence the roads within the area, is being used as a diversion route. There is a lorry ban restriction on most of the roads within the area. To close off some of the roads to through traffic, further investigation would have to be carried out to assess the effect on the surrounding road network. This would be subject to an area wide investigation, consultation and funding.

22012975
I am writing to advise you of my support for the proposed 20mph zone in the Pelham road area. I look forward to the traffic being slowed down by your proposals. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you need any further support in this matter.

Officers comment
Comments noted.
22013013
I must applaud your administration’s commitment to 20mph and am delighted that our ward and fortuitously my road is proposed for inclusion. I have replied to the public consultation in wholehearted support. To summarize my detailed points.
1. Please can this opportunity be taken to close the east end of Pelham Road, which, in fact, was recommended to committee in the last days of the last Tory Administration, but the ill-fated Merton Relief Road brought in Labour who shelved it.
2. Please can we have a ‘proper’ 20mph facility that is compliant with the official Traffic Advisory Leaflets. To economise on entry signage is a major mistake. To be effective we need emphatic paired ‘gateway’ signs at every entry point, as the Advisory leaflets demand.
3. This opportunity should be used to extend the existing and hopefully improved Broadway/Wimbledon Town Centre 20mph facility to include Wimbledon Theatre, the YMCA and Polka Children’s theatre. (it would actually save the cost of some of the signs in the Pelham Road Area proposals) A proper ’Gateway to Wimbledon’ at the East end of the Broadway would be a great legacy to common-sense urban planning, recognising and giving ‘pride of place’ to some of the wonderful family facilities on offer over the length of the Broadway.

Officers comment
Further investigations would have to be carried out for the closure of Pelham Road, hence cannot be included as part of this scheme. The design of the 20mph zone will be as per the Traffic Advisory Leaflets. The Broadway and Wimbledon Town Centre 20mph zone is not within the boundary of this scheme.

22013026
Whilst I approve of the introduction of a 20mph zone, I strongly disagree with the suggested amendment (as advised in letter dated 1/9/08) to include an additional set of speed cushions within the vicinity of no 58 Griffiths Road. Representations against the proposed amendment are:
1. This section of Griffiths Road is a cul de sac.
2. Traffic volume is virtually limited to residents only (who drive carefully!) Speed cushions would not stop the odd delivery van from speeding (whereas a speed bump would). It is a short section and in particular the distance between the junction and the first car park (where most cars stop and turn) is not greater than the lengths of any of Derby Road, Granville Road or Harcourt Road.
3. None of the latter are being shown as requiring speed bumps or cushions. Resident’s Parking within this section is already tight and I believe that this would be adversely impacted by a speed bump (some residents I’m sure will park either side of the bump thus reducing the number of cars that can park in the street).

Having spoken to the officer in charge, it has become obvious that all the above representations are futile anyway because I now understand that there are legal rules which have to be complied with when introducing a 20mph zone. So………As a compromise, should the scheme go ahead then I would reluctantly accept a speed bump. A speed cushion would be a complete waste of money as it would not prevent the only known observed risk (the odd speeding delivery van) from continuing to flaunt the law; at least a speed bump would be effective. To achieve maximum impact, I would then recommend that a speed bump be sited halfway along the cul de sac.

Officers comment
The amendments are required to satisfy the legal requirements.

22013032
Reference the Newsletter to residents regarding the proposed Pelham Road 20 mph zone dated 29 August 2008, as a resident in Palmerston Road within the Zone, I am strongly in favour of this project, but have the following observations:

Map
It seems inaccurate as it does not show several of the existing traffic calming measures eg speed cushions in Palmerston Road and Pelham Road installed many years ago (but often ignored by motorists if they can get away with driving over them at speed).

Traffic Survey in the Zone Streets as per the Newsletter details
The speed survey carried out for just one day (Tuesday 8 July 2008) I feel is quite inadequate to ascertain the true speeds in the streets, especially the "rat running" streets eg Palmerston Road, Southee Road etc. It seems very odd that speeds were shown higher in Russell Road with its awkward humps right across the road (some quite high) and traffic movement restricted by closely parked vehicles, and it being a
narrower street than the others. Whereas Palmerston Road has speed cushions (with gaps) allowing somewhat easier movement of vehicles and certainly for large wheel base ones. Also turning into the junctions is easier than at Russell Road. Has there been some error in compiling or transferring these figures onto the Newsletter?

**Proposed New 20 mph Traffic Signs**

As per the map why are none proposed at the Griffiths Road/Merton Road junction? All the other junctions shown on the map seem to have them proposed (and see points below about signage).

**Future Speed Control / Monitoring**

How will the new project be monitored for it to be truly effective? Recent bus diversion Palmerston Road have proved notices are ignored, speeding is frequent (and the streets have been used for many years as general traffic "rat runs" anywhere between the Broadway and Kingston Roads).

Presumably speeds over 20 mph will be a traffic offence enforceable by the Police - but they (and the Council) do not have resources to monitor adequately the Zone. It will be necessary to have speed monitoring done at all hours and several times a week/month after the project is introduced plus and/or frequent "spot checks" at all hours of the day and night, and in the most vulnerable streets -ongoing. No doubt it will be impossible to have actual speed cameras in the Zone (funding!), but I suggest "mock" camera warning notices are also installed at Zone junctions at least, and at various parts of the Zone - as has been done elsewhere in London, the borough and in the country. /...

**Inappropriate Road usage**

The four bus diversion routes recently imposed upon residents in Palmerston Road for 5/6 weeks caused extra heavy traffic to use the road because word passed round the transport community that it could be used as a short cut between the Broadway and Kingston Road. This will inevitably now be remembered by drivers in the future to avoid the long way round via Merton Road to South Wimbledon. Several excursion/tourist coaches, huge supermarket delivery lorries and site demolition / grab trucks all used the road inappropriately. Indeed, since the diversion ended last week. Occasional buses have continued to use the road when travelling "light" back to the depot- the 93 and 164 routes were doing this, and at excess speeds. Apparently, when not carrying passengers, they can deviate from the scheduled bus route any way they want.

Therefore as part of the new project it will be essential to have additional notices at especially the Broadway and Kingston Road junctions, barring HGV's and coaches etc from entering the Zone.

"Restrictive Notices"

To help reduce through "rat runs" which contribute to the speeding problems in the straight grid-like streets in the Zone, and to curtail unnecessary traffic flows, it would be advisable, as part of the project, to introduce further turning restrictions particularly into and out of junctions at the Broadway and Kingston Roads. There are some already, but not enough, I suggest.

**Further Plans for the Zone**

I hope the Council and Police have contingency plans for the future should it be indicated that the new 20mph zone is not as efficient as envisaged after a while. This will become serious if there is inadequate real monitoring and enforcement. Drivers inevitably become complacent and start ignoring the notices, and word gets round about infrequent checks.

I hope these comments are useful and that the Council, along with other Authorities, can successfully maintain and monitor this new Zone in the Pelham area - which is badly needed and will be appreciated by the residents.

**Officers comment**

Comments noted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22012768</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| I have been a resident living on the corner of Pelham and Southey Road for 18 years and of all the ludicrous schemes over the years the above mentioned proposal has to be one of the most unnecessary waste of time and tax payers' money I have seen so far. In short I totally oppose the proposal and my reasons are as follows:
| 1. There is no evil to address. By your own admission the maximum average speed in the area is 27 mph and frankly even reaching that speed is all but impossible due to the centre cross road speed bumps and the forest of the existing bumps and impediments in the roads in this area.
| 2. In all the time I have lived in the area there have be no serious road accidents and certainly none associated with purely speed. No evidence has been shown to warrant the change.
| 3. As admitted the majority of the area already has the irritating bumps and no more are needed or desired. They cause damage to cars and they are a menace for cyclists and the fire brigade located at the end of Southey Road. They also cause considerable noise. I hear cars changing gear, clanking and... |
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banging over the bumps during the night even with my windows shut.

4. Given there is little or no evil to catch the proposal can only be intended as yet another revenue earning schemes to fine anyone doing say 22 miles per hour. This is has nothing to do with preventing accidents or benefitting local residents.

5. Critically there is nothing in the consultation paper sent to local people about how much it will all cost? For sure it will be substantial. The erection of 20 mph speed signs, more bumps, yet more road markings, (as if we do not have enough), is an appalling waste of tax payers money, as well as unsightly and unnecessary. I refer you to the English Heritages campaign to clear street signs, not to make more for little or no reason, as is the case here. The proposal states that signs will have to be erected at "all entry points and exists"! Its madness. I truly think Britain and political correctness and the nanny state has gone too far. It's enough to make me wish to emigrate.

6. More signs are confusing to drivers. The 20 mph area is so small and already full of bumps it's simply not necessary to have more speed restrictions. I do not think it is satisfactory to be asked to respond to this consultation without:
- details of the cost
- a proper impact assessment on how it will reduce any alleged evil
- Statistics of speed related accidents within the proposed zone for past 5 years.

If these investigations have not been carried out there ought not to even be a consultation and in any event this information must be provided to local residents before any decision is made. I am frankly disgusted that it is even contemplated to waste my money on such an unwanted and unwarranted scheme. I shall be forwarding this letter to the local press and to my Councillors. I am most alarmed by the proposal and I will most certainly be seeking an account of the cost, the proposed contractors appointed and evidence as to the need for this scheme in the event common sense does not prevail.

Officers comment
Comments noted. Merton is being proactive in creating a safer and improved environment by reducing speed, accidents and severity.

22012931

Having lived with speed cushions within a few yards of our home for approximately 10 years I would not support further use of these methods of traffic calming for several reasons:
The effect on the residents and their property:
1. Vibration
The presence of speed cushions remains a constant anxiety to us as our 100 year old house vibrates to a more or lesser degree almost every time any vehicle passes over the speed cushions. Heavy vehicles, many of which use this road as a cut-through from 6.45am onwards, cause particularly violent effects.
2. Noise
The noise produced is very disturbing, both night and day, as vehicles accelerate after every cushion as they come up the road, the sound of heavy vehicles being particularly pronounced. In addition, many car drivers misjudge their vehicles' clearance, hitting the underside of their vehicles and causing sudden, extremely loud scraping sounds.
3. Pollution
The state of our curtains and windowsills (inside and outside) is testament to a noticeable increase in pollution since the cushions were installed. The effectiveness on the reduction of traffic speed:
Your statistics show that these measures have failed to bring the speed of vehicles down to 20mph. Many heavy vehicles, particularly those which are not owned by the driver - often rubbish collection vehicles - are observed to drive much faster than 30mph

Officer comments
The design of the proposed measures would minimise noise, vibration and pollution.

COMMENT

22012653
Thank you for the information re. the proposed 20mph zone about which I have no view. However I do have a strong view which is supported by the comparison of current speed levels in Southey Road which has bumps and Griffiths Road which has none: there is virtually no difference. Road humps in Griffiths Road are a waste of the ratepayers money and furthermore are an increased source of discomfort to patients conveyed in ambulances in an emergency

Officer comments
The difference between the speed survey on Griffith Road and Southey Road is minimal; however, the proposed speed cushions on Griffiths Road are required as part of the legal requirements for a 20mph zone. If this area has been considered a 20mph speed limit, no additional features would have been needed.

22012779
Please can you supply further information regarding Merton Council's proposal to convert the Pelham Road area to a 20 mph zone. Can you please confirm that the only changes to the existing road layout will be the addition of traffic calming to Griffiths Road and the traffic signs at the entry of each road in the proposed zone; that there will be no changes to the existing speed cushions in the area? I would like to get more information regarding the traffic survey. - Why is the survey only for a single day (Tuesday 8th July) - is this because there would be too much information for the newsletter? Was the survey conducted over a longer period and over a weekend? - Why is the 85th percentile used as a statistic? Can you please provide details of the mean, median and average and the size of the population for the roads surveyed? - Why were Pelham Road statistics not provided? Do you have a record of the number of accidents in the area? Is the Pelham Road scheme supposed to be self-enforcing? How will the council gauge the success of the scheme in terms of reducing speed and traffic? If the scheme is not successful in reducing vehicle speeds, will speed cameras be introduced? Also can you please provide details of the financial cost of this proposal and are there any financial criteria to be met by such schemes before they can be proposed? I appreciate I have asked a lot of questions. Many thanks for your patience. I look forward to receiving your response in a timely manner.

Officers comment
All the proposed measures are detailed within the consultation document, which include additional traffic calming features on Griffith Road and the entry/exit signs for a 20mph zone. The traffic survey was for 2 days and was meant to be an indicative; the average was then included in the newsletter. The survey was not conducted over a weekend. In engineering terms, it is normal practice to use 85%ile, which highlights the speed beneath which 85 out of 100 cars surveyed travelled at. Other data requested is not available. If approved, it is proposed to undertake the appropriate before and after traffic survey at key locations. This will allow the monitoring and the effectiveness of the proposed measures. There were 6-recorded personal injury accidents within the proposed zone. The Pelham Road area scheme will be self-enforcing through the traffic calming features. The use of cameras cannot be confirmed at this moment in time. Introduction of cameras are subject to Transport for London (TfL) and police approval and can only be introduced in areas with 4 killed and seriously injured (KSIs). The estimated cost of the scheme is approximately £30K.

TRINITY ROAD AREA

22012390
Many thanks for providing information relating to the proposed scheme. I live in Clarence Road and have three young children and we are all enthusiastic users of South Park Gardens. I am in full support of the scheme and recognize the reasons for not recommending a 20 MPH zone throughout, however I do think that it is important to consider closely the issues relating to traffic at the Trinity Road entrance to South Park Gardens. Perhaps additional traffic calming features are going to be introduced at this point (such as a crossing, raised pedestrian area), however if this is not the case then it should be seriously considered. Currently traffic approaches the entrance to the park from Queens Road in the middle of the road due to residents parked cars – if cars follow road regulations, as they should, they then face a small chicane, which in affect directs them directly at the path and towards pedestrians waiting to cross the road. Currently this can be approached at great speed and a slight loss of concentration could be exceedingly dangerous. The alternative is to avoid this and go the wrong side of the bollard, on the wrong side of the road. My son was nearly knocked down as he left the park; he looked right before crossing, only for a car to come at great speed on the wrong side of the road. I have seen this occur regularly and it is frightening. They do it to avoid the chicane or to overtake a car slowing to negotiate the chicane. Perhaps you could acknowledge receipt of this email and indicate whether the new scheme has already considered this danger – it would be nice to coordinate any improvement with the planned investment in South Park Gardens.

Officers comment.
This location would be investigated further, however, this investigation cannot be conducted as part of the Trinity Road area 20mph speed limit. Additional investigations would require funding and further consultations. All requests for additional features will be added to the future programme for further investigations for 2009/10 financial year subject to available funding.

22012392
As a Queens Road resident may I thank Merton Council for proposing 20 mph traffic calming measures in the Queens Road/Trinity Road area. This is excellent news, particularly for Queens Road. The speed cushions proposed for the middle section of Queens Road are also an excellent idea. Queens Road and Trinity Road have long suffered from heavy traffic volumes, often at quite high speeds, and as residential roads with schools and parks close by they need to be given some additional protection. I would be grateful if you could regard this email as a formal "letter of support" for the scheme. One small point - the traffic light system at the start of Queens Road near the Centre Court shopping complex and police station is not working properly - too many vehicles ignore the traffic directions, jump the lights and proceed down Queens Road in contravention of the signs which prohibit vehicles, other than buses, from entering Queens Road. It would be helpful if the Council and the traffic authorities could improve the monitoring of traffic at this junction; a traffic camera would do the trick.

Officers comment
Support noted. The traffic lights system on Queen's Road near Centre Court is not within the boundaries of this scheme, however, this information will be forwarded to the Police who are responsible for enforcement.

22012663
This is to confirm our acceptance in principal the 20mph proposal, however, we would propose the following two items;
ITEM 1
That there be placed an "electronic speed display unit" rather similar to those that are in action in Hartfield Rd, along Wimbledon Common near Parkside, and in other areas in the borough. We would suggest that they be located in Trinity & Queens Road. These would be an addition to the normal speed warning signs.
ITEM 2
That there be placed a raised platform in Trinity Rd at the entrance to South Park Gardens. This could replace the chicane that exists there or have both. A Chicane & a raised platform. It is worth pointing out that the gardens are soon to undergo a major overall of the interior, and when finished no doubt will attract even more visitors. Therefore as this is a major entrance/exit gate, we would suggest that this particular section merits an extra & adequate calming measures to compensate for this increased pedestrian traffic, especially during summer period. Also we understand there will also be an increase in the number of park activities all the year round.

Officer comments
Electronic speed display unit is to be erected on Queen’s Road, within the vicinity of Priory Primary School. An investigation would be carried out on Trinity Road, within the vicinity of South Park Gardens (if funding is secured), hence will not be installing any electronic devices at this stage. As per instructions, minimal number of features is being proposed for any given area. Any additional features would be subject to further investigation, consultation and funding.

22012639
I am writing generally in support of the above proposed plans. As a mother of two small children and a cyclist as well as a driver I welcome any plans to limit road traffic accidents appropriately. However, I also have concerns about speed along the stretch of Queens Road heading west, from the Trinity/Ashcombe rd junction towards The Broadway. I walk this stretch of road daily and often observe vehicles, including the number 200 bus, traveling at high speed along this relatively long, clear stretch of road. As a pedestrian it is quite unnerving especially as there are lots of children and elderly people using and crossing this road, with two nurseries, sheltered housing and a nursing home situated on it. I am quite surprised that there are no speed limit or traffic calming plans for this fast stretch of Queens rd. Also I am concerned that when cars leave a 20mph zone on the earlier part of Queens rd and enter this open stretch they will accelerate more readily. I feel equally concerned about the crossroads of Trinity/Ashcombe and Queens roads, which is, I feel, also a dangerous junction, for cars, cyclists and pedestrians alike. It becomes very busy with all of the above especially at peak times and I personally have had close shaves as a pedestrian and cyclist there. It is a tricky junction to cross with traffic coming from 4 different directions. I ask you to take into consideration the people of all age groups using this...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22012666</td>
<td>A large number of residents would like a raised table on Trinity Road opposite the entrance to South Park Gardens. Please add to the excellent plans that you have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer comments</td>
<td>Queen’s Road (west of Trinity Road) is not within the boundaries of this scheme. Trinity Road has been added to the future programme for investigation subject to available funding. An investigation for a pedestrian crossing facility and appropriate location will be carried out on Trinity Road, within the vicinity of South Park Gardens, if funding is secured during the 2009/10 financial year. Consideration will also be given to the junction of Queen’s Road and Trinity Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22012722</td>
<td>I am writing with respect to the Trinity Road area 20mph scheme, I am in support of schemes to reduce speeds and traffic. I would most welcome a scheme, which closed off certain roads out of the area onto Haydon’s Road (e.g at the junction with York Road and Effra Road) to prevent traffic using Florence Road as a cut-through. But failing that I am supportive of any scheme to control speeds and especially traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers comment</td>
<td>Road closures would have to be investigated further to determine its impact on the surrounding road network and would be subject to the consultation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22012739</td>
<td>Thank you for the circular delivered to us recently about the proposed 20mph speed limit in the Trinity Road area of Wimbledon. My wife and I are generally supportive of the scheme as we live in Queens Road and have been concerned about the speed of traffic on both Trinity and Queens Road for some time. Like many residents in the area we have very young children (in our case 15 months and 2% years old) who walk along the pavements in the area and we are worried that there will be a serious accident caused by motorists driving at excessive speed on these two roads. There is one aspect of the proposal, however, which we are not in favour of. This is the proposal to place a speed cushion (the exact detail is not specified) outside number 94 Queens Road as this is also in effect outside of our house (on the south side of the road it would lie between numbers 137 and 139). We are concerned that the speeding up and slowing down of traffic at this point will have a direct impact on the noise levels and our peaceable enjoyment of our property. In addition, there are three parking spaces running outside of numbers 137, 139 and 141 Queens Road. Many residents have converted their front gardens to parking spaces on Queens Road with a consequent reduction in the remaining front gardens and parking bays. Parking is extremely limited on Queens Road and the bays are constantly in use. We would be extremely concerned if our ability to park were compromised by the introduction of the speed cushion. Any reduction of parking spaces would displace parking into Craven Gardens and would force us to walk our children across Queens Road to the car which is in itself relatively hazardous given the volume of traffic and will potentially be much harder if traffic is also slowing down at this point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers comment</td>
<td>The proposed speed cushions will not affect parking since vehicles can be parked over them. The dimensions of the proposed speed cushion are unlikely to increase noise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22012741</td>
<td>We have recently received a newsletter from Merton Council informing us of a proposed 20mph limit for the Trinity Road Area. The newsletter indicated that any comments on the proposed scheme should be</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
provided to you in writing. This letter contains our comments. We would be grateful if you could consider these and bring them to the attention of the relevant people within the Council. We are very much in favour of any proposals, which will have the effect of reducing the speed, and, if possible, the volume of traffic using Trinity Road. We have long considered that the number of vehicles using Trinity Road as a cut-through and the speed of vehicles are both far too high for a residential road, part of which borders South Park Gardens. In the light of this, we would like to indicate our support for the proposed 20mph limit. However, we would also like to raise one specific matter for consideration, which is not currently included in the scheme. On Trinity Road, there are traffic calming measures opposite Florence Road and opposite Faraday Road. There are, however, no such measures in the stretch of road in between. The effect of this is that cars travelling in both directions routinely accelerate sharply in the stretch of road between Florence Road and Faraday Road. This creates considerable additional noise (and no doubt other) pollution and means that vehicles on that stretch regularly exceed even the current 30mph limit. This is a particularly undesirable and potentially dangerous state of affairs given that the stretch of road in question includes one side of South Park Gardens, with exits from the Gardens, which are, inevitably, used by many families and small children. We would therefore invite the Council to give very serious consideration to the introduction of additional traffic calming measures on the stretch of Trinity Road between Florence Road and Faraday Road. Such measures would be likely to be extremely effective in reducing the overall speed of vehicles travelling along Trinity Road and, in particular, in reducing average speeds in a section of the road used by a disproportionately high number of pedestrians, including children. That would be entirely consistent with the aims of the proposed scheme. However, we consider that the introduction of a 20mph speed limit without taking these further measures is highly unlikely to be effective to anything like the same degree. Thank you for your attention to the content of this letter which we ask to be given due consideration by all those at the Council concerned with the proposed Trinity Road scheme. Should you wish to contact us about the proposed scheme or this letter, we should be happy for you to do so.

Officers comment
This location has been included in the programme for future investigation to also include the provision of pedestrian crossing facility. This would be subject to available funding and the consultation process.

22012929
I am writing to express my full support for the proposed introduction of a 20mph speed limit in the Trinity Road area, as advised in your newsletter of 29 August. I strongly believe that a limit of 20mph, if properly enforced, will significantly improve the safety of the roads in the area. The current limit of 30mph is inappropriate given the width of the streets and the number of parked cars that makes crossing roads as a pedestrian a challenge for myself as an adult, let alone for the children and young people who use South Park gardens and the two primary schools Holy Trinity and the Priory. This is especially true of Trinity Road, which is used as a cut-through throughout the day by a large number of vehicles, often driven too fast for the road conditions. I have personally witnessed a number of near-misses involving pedestrians on the road and believe that a 20mph limit would both reduce the likelihood of further incidents and reduce the severity of any incidents that do occur.

Officers comment
Comments noted.

22012948
With reference to your newsletter regarding the proposal of a 20 mph zone in the Links Road, Wimbledon area. Can I as a non-driver of more than 12 years make a couple of observations? Firstly I whole heartedly agree with the proposal of a 20 mph zone. Secondly I wish it be considered that Latimer Road is changed into a one way road, driving from east to West as we get untold cars, lorries and vans charging straight down from the Broadway which are not only a hazard but our homes vibrate!! Also very large lorries often have to reverse back down the road, as they are unable to turn into Wycliffe Road. Please note Latimer Road is quite narrow and has a camber due to a conformed underground stream. I have been a resident of Latimer Road for nearly sixty years and have observed many misses, near-misses and accidents along its length due mainly to vehicles travelling too fast from West to East!! Please no road humps etc, as already mentioned we suffer enough vibration. We also worry about safety of children who use the swimming baths each day.

Officers comment
Any additional proposals will be added to a programme for further investigations subject to funding and consultation.
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## 22012962
The volume and speed of traffic in the road has increased radically in the 14 years we have lived here and are now entirely inappropriate and unsafe for the character of the road. Trinity Road is residential; part of it is in a Conservation Area; there is a Doctors’ surgery; a listed park - South Park Gardens and it is on the way to two schools: Holy Trinity and The Priory so that everyday there are numbers of elderly, unwell and parents with children walking up and down and crossing the road. Residents have asked for traffic reduction/speed restrictions in Trinity Road in the past. The newsletter dated this August 29 from Merton Council to residents, notes that a recent volume and traffic speed survey in July 2008 (this is holiday time for many people) recorded an average 85th percentile speed of 28.8 north and 25.7 south in Trinity Road. I know that a resident (not me) organised a traffic census for a week in 2002, and 40,886 cars passed the checkpoint, some of them doing 50mph outside the park. The resident also put together a bound pack with photos of what the traffic was like on a daily basis, which went to the council and the then local MP. A council officer suggested closing the road and a petition asking for this was organised in 2003: 91% of residents were contacted and of those 93% signed. I believe the 2002 figures are more likely than the July 2008 ones: traffic volume and speeds have not decreased. Two gentlemen at a Wimbledon Area Forum in 2003 said a 20mph zone would be appropriate, yet although a council officer said suggestions would be welcome, nothing was done. It is about time that something was done and I therefore welcome the proposed 20 mph limit. Even better if it could be enforced!

**Officers comment**
Comments noted

## 22012977
I would like to back your considerations for a 20mph speed limit along Trinity Road. I live along the road, I frequently walk in this area with children, I see children crossing the roads there to go to the local schools and I also travel by car through this area and Queens Road which is another of your proposed traffic calming areas. My concerns are that on leaving South Park Gardens by the Trinity Road exit I observed a driver on the wrong side of the bollards, travelling at speed. I frequently see people weaving around the traffic bollards at speed. I also see many people using their mobile phones along this road. Since the rise in the popularity of satellite navigation devices, we have seen a big rise in the volume of traffic using Trinity Road to get around the Haydons Road area. We frequently see large lorries and vans, which would seem to be totally out of place on this residential road. I would like to see restrictions on lorries allowed to use the road. At best, if the 20mph limit were to be put in place, I feel it would improve the safety of the area and the safety of pedestrians and local users. I fully support your plans and hope that they are going to be put into effect.

Please do not hesitate to contact me for further views about this matter.

**Officers comment**
Comments noted

## 22012978
I think that the above proposal is good as the cars race through this area, however I would like to raise the following issues:

* Speed table like the one at the Queens Road school is preferable to road humps, because they are easier to see from the distance and provide a visible crossing for pedestrians, they also look much better than road humps and above all are very effective to slow down the traffic.

* I would like Craven Gardens to be included in this proposal as it is a narrow "U" shaped road with cars parked on both sides of the road.

* I would like the whole length of Queens Road to be 20 mph area.

**Officers comment**
Officers were instructed not to consider road humps and speed tables, hence the option to use speed cushions. Craven Gardens would have to be considered in the next batch since the traffic order is in the process of being completed. The other section of Queens Road would have to be considered in the next batch.

## 22013190
We were very pleased to receive the 20mph speed limit for the Trinity Road area in Wimbledon. We live on South Park Road just next to one of the speed bumps, which really do not do their job. I cannot count the number of times vehicles come hurtling down the road on a daily basis, I can only assume far faster than the 30mph limit, and scrape their under carriage on the speed bump. We worry for our children's
safety as the road is not particularly wide and the speed limit is due a reduction for people’s safety. I only hope the proposal is passed and people actually adhere to it.

One question I did have was why police vehicles feel the need to race up and down our road, day and night, sirens blaring, when there is the far safer route of the main road just metres away. Naturally this will be on an emergency occasion, but I feel very afraid when they speed down the road at ridiculous speeds with the area so heavily populated with young children now. I only hope it doesn't take a death to make them change their route. Is there anything you are able to do about this please? And can the police please refrain from putting on their sirens on late into the night/early in the morning when there are obviously no other cars about and people are trying to sleep! The flashing lights are enough surely? Or can you tell me the contact details of the person I should contact with regards to this?

Officers comment
Your comments would forwarded to the Police.

22013054
I would like to support the proposal for Trinity Road to become a 20 MPH zone.

I have lived on Trinity Road for over 20 years and have seen an increasing problem with traffic and drivers driving down the wrong side of the road to avoid slowing down for the bollards. Children and families are particularly at risk when crossing the road to use South Park Gardens. We have personally had our cars run in to over half a dozen times by speeding drivers. We have lost count of the times; wing mirrors have been broken by speeding drivers. The noise level on the road is also pretty unbearable.

So both my husband and I would appeal for the speed limit to be lowered to 20mph and if possible a speed camera to be installed.

Officers comment
Comments noted

22013031
I am writing to support the proposal to introduce a 20 mph speed limit in the Trinity Road area, as it will encourage drivers to slow down in this residential area. Currently most drivers observe the present 30mph limit or only slightly exceed it. All these drivers are likely to travel more slowly. However my main concern at present is that a significant minority drive well in excess of 30 mph despite the presence of speed humps. These drivers pose a serious danger in a residential area and are unlikely to take any notice of a 20 mph limit. Could the proposed limit be policed from time to time, perhaps during the rush-hour?

In addition I suggest that the council should consider extending the proposed 20 mph speed limit area to include Bridges, Latimer, Ridley and Wyc1iffeRoads. Drivers sometimes travel too fast in these roads, particularly in Latimer Road, and the area outside the leisure centre can be very busy.

Officers comment
It is only the Police who can enforce speed limits and they have informed us it is unlikely they will be doing that, since they do not have resources.

22012405
I have just received the details regarding the above proposal and have some questions. I am a resident of Queens Road and live at number 96 so would have one of the proposed speed humps almost directly outside my property:

1. Where were the Queens road speed measurements taken? There are existing calming measures at the Haydons road end of Queens road and I am interested to see if there is a difference in the speed between the calmed and non calmed areas of the road.

2. I am concerned by the additional noise associated with cars accelerating after passing a speed hump or driving too fast over it and grounding out. If you are a driver yourself you are no doubt aware that It is common for drivers to behave this way, which will inevitably increase the amount of noise.

3. What type of speed humps will be introduced? The humps at the Haydons road end are largely ineffective, as they need to be bus friendly. Will the new ones be similar?

4. As part of the same exercise will you be also enforcing the use of the bus only traffic lights by the centre court centre in Queens road? I am a firm believer that most of the faster traffic in queens road is caused by drivers illegally using the bus lane. This behaviour has never, as far as I am aware, been discouraged.
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or enforced. Your speed recordings also support this theory.
I am, in principle supportive of the reduced speed zone but would like the above answered first.

**Officers comment**

2. The speed survey on Queen's Road was conducted midway between Evelyn Road and Trinity Road. No speed measurements were undertaken along the traffic calmed section of Queen's Road. The survey data recorded for Faraday Road, Effra Road, Clarence Road, Florence Road and South Park Road are all existing traffic calmed road along the entire length. The speed data for these road are lower than the section of Queen’s Road, which is not traffic calmed.

3. The type of speed reducing measure to be introduced on Queen's Road are speed cushions with a height of 75mm, width of 1.6m and length of 3.0m. This height will reduce the grounding effect associated with very low cars, which go over them.

4. The new speed cushions will be bus friendly and its width will allow buses to straddle them without any discomfort to its occupants.

5. The bus traffic lights by the centre court centre is not within the boundary of these works. I will forward your comments to the appropriate person within the Council to investigate.

**AGAINST**

22013075

With regards to our telephone conversation of this morning (1st October 2008) regarding the above proposal. I would like to put forward a few points, which were mentioned during our conversation, in writing. I feel that this exercise is a complete waste of effort, money and is going to create a huge amount of disruption whilst the work is carried out.

1. I have lived at the above address for almost 40 years and for some years have had a 'speed table' outside our house. This does NOT slow down the traffic, regardless of the fact that there is a so called roundabout 50 yards further up the road. During the past few months we have had a large number of cement mixers travelling up and down this street, to and from the construction site on the Broadway. These lorries do not attempt to slow down when going over the speed tables any more than the busses slow down. If you are in bed when these vehicles go past, the bed actually shakes and I have now noticed that there are hairline cracks appearing in the house. I can only assume that they are caused from the constant shaking which the house is subjected to.

2. Since the introduction of the 'freedom pass' I have been using the busses more frequently than in the past and have noticed that in spite of being very agile on my feet, I have great difficulty staying on my feet whilst on the bus, due to the way and the speed at which they travel, (quit often in excess of 40 mph down Queens Road. The drivers seem to have no concern over the safety and comfort of their passengers. (I have held a bus licence for almost 40 years and our prime concern when taking our PSV test was the safety and comfort of our passengers). This doesn't seem to be the case anymore.

3. The speed tables which are here outside the school seem to be regarded by the children AND PARENTS as a place for them to cross the street and that the cars should stop for them. This sometimes frightens you to death when you observe some of the cars slowing down to go over the humps, the kids think that they are stopping for them and blatantly walk out right in front of the cars. Your heart finishes up in your throat!

4. Finally one other observation, which I have made over the years, is the fact that 'speed cushions' tend to damage cars very badly. I used to operate a fleet of chauffeur driven cars (mostly Volvo's) and it came to my notice that the cars although being no more than 6 months old, were wearing the front tyres on the inside edge 1” to the extent that the steels were showing. The cars were sent back to Volvo under warranty for repair and we were informed that this was caused by the geometry of the front suspension being damaged by 'speed cushions'. I then began to look at every Volvo I saw and noticed that most of them were in the same position with the tyres badly worn on the inside 1” which was not very easy to see unless you went under the car. It was quite frightening to think how many people were driving at speed on motorways with defective tyres and were not even aware of the fact.

I am sorry to appear to be so negative with regards to this proposal, but I don't think that the introduction of a 20 mph speed limit is going to achieve anything, until we can discover a way to educate drivers to behave responsibly and then perhaps it would be just purely wasteful as they would drive sensibly. The only suggestion that I can make is 'speed limit' signs which light up reminding drivers that they are exceeding the limit and what the limit is. I have noticed that more drivers seem to take more notice of them than humps or chicanes. The chicanes seem to set a challenge to see how fast they can be
Officers comment
This is not a waste of time, as the measure will improve road safety especially for vulnerable road users. Some of the roads within the area has restrictions on HGV’s and would ensure these signs are installed at all the entry points, where they are required. The design of the proposed speed cushions would minimise the effect on vehicles.

COMMENT

22012999
I have two questions as part of my initial response.
1. Is a two day speed survey sufficient to gain reliable data and I believe it was taken during school holidays.
2. I consider the introduction of a 20mph limit will have no effect whatsoever unless it is randomly policed on a regular basis. For example parts of the Wimbledon one way system are 20mph are you able to advise how many speeding tickets have been issued. Please don't tell me none because everyone obeys it, because this is not the case. By randomly policed, I mean police officers with hand held speed guns, setting up speed traps at various times of the day and various days of the week. Richmond park has had a 20mph limit for several years now and as a regular visitor have seen many speeders caught by the Parks police, as a result the majority obey the limit.

Officers comment
A two day survey is not sufficient to gain a reliable data, however it provides an idea of traffic flows and speed. The survey was not done during school holidays. For a 20mph zone or 20mph speed limit, free flow traffic conditions are required for the speed survey. Once the proposals are approved, speed surveys will be carried out at key locations before and after implementation.

The police are responsible for enforcement of speed related offences. Police have been clear that due to their limits resources and priorities they are unable to effectively and routinely enforce such offences and as a result they do not support proposals such as limits. Police often support a zone as these are self-enforcing. On this occasion due to lack of support for a zone (due to required additional traffic calming features, consideration has been given to a limit.

QUICK’S ROAD AREA

SUPPORT

2202458
Whilst I support the objective of improving safety in the Quicks Road area I am sceptical on the ability to meet this without the formation of a 20mph zone. If the only measures are to put in place 20mph limit signs without additional traffic calming measures it seems very unlikely that much impact will be made on the speed of through traffic. I would suggest that the overall cost benefit case of the initiative (including all consultation, planning, implementation and maintenance costs) would be significantly improved by the placing of a small number of physical traffic calming measures throughout the zone. Being a resident of Latimer Road, I am acutely aware of the high number of vehicles that do not currently comply with the 30 mile an hour limit. I believe that this is a particular problem due to the nature of the entrance to Latimer Road being a direct run-off from Wimbledon Broadway, coupled with the Leisure Centre being positioned at that end of the road. The positioning of the Leisure Centre means that a high number of people, including a high proportion of children, cross the road near the junction and are put at an increased risk due to the high number of vehicles using Latimer Road as a cut through from Wimbledon Broadway and Town Centre to the Haydons Road area without breaking their speed significantly at the junction. Further more I believe that this will be exaggerated by the high number of new residents moving into the area due to the residential apartments being developed on the Broadway and at the substantial Plough Lane site. I am not aware of any traffic measurements/ assessment processes having taken place in your consideration of the situation, maybe this would be appropriate to determine what really is required?

Officer comments
Comments noted. However, to convert this area into a 20mph zone, additional traffic calming measures www.merton.gov.uk
would be required on the roads without any traffic calming features, including the roads which exit onto Merton High Street. Most of these roads, which exit onto Merton High Street, are closed off to through traffic. Introducing traffic calming measures on these roads is unlikely to be supported by the majority of the residents. Since this area is in a controlled parking zone (CPZ) and parking is allowed on both sides of the carriageway vehicular speed on these roads, which are not through roads, is unlikely to reach more than 20mph. It was, therefore, feasible to convert this area into a 20mph speed limit rather than a 20mph zone.

22012985
We would like to welcome and support the proposals to introduce a 20MPH limit in the Quicks Road area. This will improve road safety in the area considerably, hopefully reducing "rat running" traffic seeking to avoid Merton High Street and generally calming through traffic in these roads. We would also like to see the introduction of a safe pedestrian crossing across Quicks Road to the Recreation Ground, preferably aligned to one of the existing entrance gates (opposite the end of Victory Road and/or between Nelson and Hardy Roads). This would improve safe access for children and young people to the recreation ground and playground facilities, and also allow safe crossings for those walking to local childcare and school facilities.

Officer comments
Comments noted.

22013008
We would like to welcome and support the proposals to introduce a 20MPH limit in the Quicks Road area. This will improve road safety in the area considerably, hopefully reducing "rat running" traffic seeking to avoid Merton High Street and generally calming through traffic in these roads. We would also like to see the introduction of a safe pedestrian crossing across Quicks Road to the Recreation Ground, preferably aligned to one of the existing entrance gates (opposite the end of Victory Road and/or between Nelson and Hardy Roads). This would improve safe access for children and young people to the recreation ground and playground facilities, and also allow safe crossings for those walking to local childcare and school facilities.

Officer comments
Comments noted.

22012967
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Merton Council's proposal for a 20mph limit in the Quicks Road area. I very much support the proposal to implement a 20mph limit in this area: the streets in question are primarily residential streets, not routes designed for through traffic. The existence of barriers (eg at the southern end of Hamilton, Hardy, Nelson and Victory Roads), and the width restriction at the eastern end of Quicks Road, strongly supports this view. The extent of car parking on many of these streets means that higher speeds are inappropriate and potentially dangerous. Reduced traffic speeds should therefore yield benefits in terms of road safety, as well as traffic noise and environmental impact. We so agree that a 20mph limit is more appropriate than a 20mph zone: it is not obvious that the traffic calming measures needed for a 20mph zone could sensibly be installed throughout the area. I would, however, question the Council's intentions as respects enforcement of the new 20mph limit. I note that there is no intention to place a "20" sign at the entrance to Hamilton Road Mews from Merton Road (which provides a potential entry point to the area of the 20mph limit for vehicular traffic) or a corresponding "30" sign at the exit from Hamilton Road Mews onto Merton Road. It seems to me that this would render the zone unenforceable: the absence of signage would appear to provide a legitimate defence to anybody facing prosecution for exceeding 20mph anywhere within the proposed area of the new limit. I am also disappointed to see that the proposed area is not to be larger: for example the plans on your website suggest that South Park Road, Florence Road and Clarence Road (and neighbouring streets) will remain subject to the existing 30mph limit. These are also residential streets with a great deal of on-street car parking, where a 20mph limit would seem to be appropriate.

Officer comments
Comments noted. The proposed area is wider, but they were grouped into area to prevent the result of one influencing the other.

AGAINST

22012400
I am writing to object to the proposed 20mph zone outlined in the newsletter of 29 August 2008 on the
grounds that this is unnecessary spending for spending sake. I have lived in Nelson Road since 2002 and in Wimbledon for the past thirty years or so. In my considerable experience of driving in the proposed area, the only road I have found to be in need to traffic calming is Haydon’s Road, between the railway bridge and Quick’s Road. Almost all the other roads have a ‘natural’ speed of about 20 mph anyway. As a careful and perhaps slightly critical driver, I would be the first to applaud this scheme if there were any justification for it. If the council has money that it needs to get rid of, I’d like to propose that either our extortionate council tax is reduced, or that an email address be set up so that residents can more easily object to their money being spent on spurious ‘schemes’.

Officers comment
The proposed measures are funded from funds allocated to 20’s plenty aimed at improving safety and maintaining the quality of life for local residents. Reduced traffic speeds will reduce accidents and severity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CECIL ROAD AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUPPORT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22012637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am writing to express our support for the proposals outlined in the newsletter dated 29 Aug 2008. I sincerely hope these plans proceed and the council members ensure that the new restrictions are enforced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Officer comments
Comments noted

| 22012775        |
| While very much in favour of this proposal in general terms, I would not be in favour of changing the existing one-way systems operating in this area to two-way. Your map indicates that this might be the case as you show: 
*30 mph speed limit signs for traffic exiting Cecil Road onto Kingston Road. This direction of travel is currently forbidden as this lower part of Cecil Road is one-way in the other direction;  
* 20 mph speed limit signs for traffic entering Balfour Road from Merton Road. Similarly, this direction of travel is currently forbidden, as Balfour Road is entirely one way in the opposite direction; Please could you advise and make clear what your proposals actually involve? |

Officer comments
There will be no changes to the existing traffic movement on Cecil Road or Balfour Road. The signs on the plan were shown in error.

| AGAINST         |
| 22012635        |
| I wish to raise an objection to the proposed installation of a twenty miles per hour traffic zone in Cecil and Balfour Roads on the following grounds:  
1. Balfour Road is a one-way street in an easterly direction. The proposed sign "Entering The 20 MPH Limit Area" would not be required as it is not possible to enter at its junction with Merton Road.  
2. The distances between right-angled bends are so short, and so full of parked cars, that it would be virtually impossible to significantly exceed a speed of twenty miles per hour.  
3. There is already a road calming narrowing outside houses numbered 80 and 82 as indicated on your plan.  
4. Large numbers of road signs have been REMOVED from parts of Central London, resulting in a reduction in road accidents.  
5. The proliferation of signs is environmentally unfriendly and will no doubt impose an additional burden on the Council’s finances. Would you please inform me if there have been any accidents in this area as a result of speeding cars and, more importantly, the nature of any survey that you have carried out. I do expect an answer to these two questions. |

Officer comments
Comments noted. There will be no changes to the existing traffic movement on Cecil Road or Balfour Road. Cecil Road is being considered for a 20mph speed limit and signs/road markings are essential and a legal requirement. Where possible all signs will be mounted on existing signpost to reduce street clutter. The accidents that occurred were on Merton Road.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MERTON PARK AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22012939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are writing to support this proposal for ALL streets in the schedule and particularly for Dorset Road, which is the road in which we live. At present, as you are no doubt aware, we suffer greatly from the noise pollution and danger that arises from traffic travelling at speeds that are far too high. It is clear to us that every environmental and safety benefit will be achieved from the proposal and we can see no disadvantages whatsoever. We welcome the earliest possible implementation of the Order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Officers comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments noted.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22012955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not against the 20 mph limit stated in your document of 19 September 2008, but against the proposed use of speed cushions in certain roads in the indiscriminate manner you propose. Daybrook in particular because no vehicle can travel more than 20mph along it, with its corners and parking. There are other roads where cushions are pointless namely Erridge, Chaenwood and Charminster, but the residents there must speak for themselves. I trust you will not put them in Daybrook Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Officers comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This area is being considered for a limit necessitating only road markings and signage.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22012958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am generally in favour of the change to a 20mph limit, especially in Dorset Road. However, enforcing it is another matter. One hopes that it is not intended to erect speed cameras in all these roads and it is doubtful whether merely changing signs to read 20 mph will be effective. Existing speed restricting road humps seem to have little effect on car drivers and none on larger commercial vehicles that use Dorset Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Officers comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Police are responsible for enforcing speed related offences and due to their priority and lack of resources, it is acknowledged that it is unlikely to be enforced. Speed cameras are subject to a number of criteria and are the responsibility of the Police and Transport for London (TfL) and this area does not meet the criteria for cameras.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22012959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I write in support of the plans to impose a 20 mile an hour speed limit onto a major part of Merton Park. Living on Dorset Road as I do, I believe the imposition of a 20 mile an hour limit cannot happen too soon. The speed of many drivers - especially during the rush hour - is often extremely dangerous. They fail to realise that children live in Dorset Road, and that many need to cross the road to get across to the Tramlink stop. I believe that imposing a speed limit is essential for enhancing the safety of these children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Officers comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments noted.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22012974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am in two minds about the 20mph limit. If the humps were removed I would be more in favour because even going at 20mph they damage the cars suspension. I tried travelling at that speed today and it is very difficult not to creep over it. People will become frustrated and speed up and if there is no enforcement of the limit it will be point less. Many roads in the area are used for parking during the day and a low speed is essential for reasons of safety. We own 1 car.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Officers comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments noted. It existing traffic calming measures are effective in reducing speed, accidents and severity. Additionally, they often deter rat running.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22012960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am responding to your notification of the above Order - very much in favour of the proposed imposition of the 20MPH speed limit. My reasons are as follows.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(1) The imposition of the speed limit will not constitute anything of significance by way of inconvenience to those living in the neighbourhood while at the same time it will improve. Considerably, the quality of life in the area.

(2) The imposition will tend towards the desirable objective of keeping through-traffic to the main roads and out of the residential area of Merton Park.

(3) The imposition will in an unobjectionable way constitute an encouragement to people to forsake their cars and travel by public transport Merton Park is singularly well provided in the matter of public transport and every encouragement needs to be given to the public to take up the facility afforded such that the facility will be able to be sustained to the benefit of the environment.

I appreciate that there are many people who need to use a vehicle within the Merton Park area, such as builders and other trades-people; and I would not wish to see their lives made more difficult by reason of the imposition - if that were the case. I am assured, however, that, in so far as the imposition does not prevent access. But is solely in regard to speed, there will be no inconvenience of any magnitude resulting to such people by reason of the imposition. Such that, as I say, I am very much in favour of the proposed Order

Officers comment
Comments noted.

22012964
We are writing in fully support of the proposed 20 mph zone being introduced in Merton Park. We, and many of our neighbours, have children and anything that can be done to encourage slower and more careful driving would be greatly appreciated.

Officers comment
Comments noted.

22013005
I support the 20 mph speed limit in the Merton Park area.

Reasons.
1. Merton Park is a 'rat run'.
2. Drivers who cut through have no respect for local residents.
3. Sadly, some Merton Park drivers have no respect either!
4. 4 points of entry of entry into John Innes, Merton Park is as it is! Make some these entry points; 'No entry', and the 'rat runners' will be curtailed!
5. Good to no more 'calming measures'. They cause damage to 'normal' cars. Those who do not care or pay no heed to them any way! I have actually been overtaken on 'humps' on both Kenley and Mostyn Roads!
6. 20 mph limits can work. I have a lot of experience of such measures in Southsea and Portsmouth, and they 'do' work.
7. It is not necessarily the accidents that matter, it is the 'near misses' and the 'clips' on wing mirrors etc that are the most irritating, always caused by people 'in a hurry'.

Officers comment
Comments noted.

22013007
I am responding to your newsletter on the above subject.

At the outset I would like to lend my support to the scheme with one major proviso. The whole exercise will be a complete waste of time and money if the speed limit is not enforced. My experience of other similar schemes is that most drivers take no notice whatsoever. So I would like to know exactly how you intend to enforce the rule.

Assuming that enforcement is in place could I point out that the speed humps in the area then become superfluous? At present the humps succeed in slowing most drivers but not below 20mph and the minority who ignore then will continue to do so. The major exceptions to this are Dorset Road and Mostyn Road where the humps only slow the smallest of cars that cannot straddle the separated humps. Indeed those particular ones are a positive danger as drivers weave to straddle them.

I hope this is a positive contribution but its only common sense anyway.
Officers comment
Since only the Police are responsible for enforcement, due to their priority and limited resources, it is unlikely that the proposed limit would be enforced. If they were enforced, the existing humps would not be superfluous since they will help reduce speeds to the accepted level of 20mph.

22013010
Thank you very much for your letter of 19 September, outlining the proposed 20mph limit for the Merton Park area (ref ES/SGE/MERTON PARK 20MPH).

I am fully supportive of the proposal; my purpose in writing is to encourage you to review the format of the information sent out in any similar exercise in future.

In the letter, the section headed "proposals" starts with an explanation of exactly what you are not proposing - i.e. a 20mph zone with many additional speed humps. However, I had to re-read the letter several times before this was clear to me, and I fear the niceties of the distinction between a 20mph zone and a 20mph limit may lead to unnecessary concern about what is being proposed.

Officers comment
Comments noted

22013011
I would like to support the proposal for a 20mph speed limit in Merton Park based on the following reasons:

In my experience the introduction of traffic calming measures such as speed humps like those in Kenley Road, will make little or no difference to vehicle speed and only serve to annoy motorists and reduce the lifespan of a vehicles’ suspension. Measures such as those on Martin Way also appear to be totally ineffective as "skilled" drivers are able to navigate these at speed. However, in this case I think the lack of effectiveness is actually due to poor design as I am sure that higher, concave curbs would dissuade motorists from taking the risk in the first place, especially bus and lorry drivers who appear to happily cut the corners that are now getting more and more damaged by the day. The only traffic calming measure that I have ever seen to be effective is one which only allows traffic to pass in one direction at any one time, i.e. vehicles have to stop to let the vehicle approaching in the other direction pass. I appreciate that these are only effective when a sufficient volume of traffic actually makes vehicles stop and in streets such as mine, which has limited on-road parking, this solution is not a desirable option. The lack of suitability of this option is further compounded by the councils’ desire to reduce the number of parking spaces available through the unnecessary introduction of residents parking. The problem that we face in Kenley Road is that it is used as a shortcut to Morden avoiding the queues that build up on Martin Way and Kingston Road. I believe this could be lessened by doing more to restrict the flow of traffic through Kenley Road for non-residents by making it easier for traffic to use Mostyn Road and Dorset Road as the main thoroughfare. I am not advocating over-policing but a simple sign of "Access for Residents Only" may also act to reduce/calm traffic and is one that I would in principle support. I would encourage the council to think more laterally when considering solutions. For example, partnering with Transport for London to lower the cost of all day parking around Morden Station for commuters would prevent the need to implement extensive residents parking which may then mean traffic calming options that reduce on-road parking spaces are less of a concern. Should the introduction of the 20mph speed limit go ahead I would encourage the council to consider the use of more "suburb-friendly" 20 mph signs rather than the standard ones, which along with double yellow lines and residents parking, only serve to further erode the unique rural-like qualities of Merton Park. I have seen eye catching signs in areas outside the borough that are designed by children of local schools which emphasise the 20 mph speed limit but also carry a catchy and sometimes poignant message and picture. I think these would be more fitting to the Merton park area. Furthermore, I am against the use of electronic 20mph signs that detect speed and light up when it is breached, as these would further serve to urbanise the neighbourhood.

Officers comment
Priority give way system was consider, however, as this area is in a CPZ, there would be loss of approximately 6 parking spaces per location. As residents parking are in high demand, further loss would not be welcome by residents. Comments regarding parking fares have been noted and sent to the relevant officer. All signage and road markings will be introduced in accordance with the Traffic Signs and Regulations Direction 2002’. There are currently no plans to introduce Vehicle Activated Signs (VAS) would be used within the Merton Park area.
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I write to support the proposal of introducing the 20mph speed limit within the Merton Park ward. I live in Poplar Road South and am appalled with the speed that some people drive down my road, especially in the morning 'rush'. I really don't like the traffic calming humps and I am pleased that my road does not have them, though this may well be why the frustrated car/motorcycle drivers speed down this road. I have already had one cat killed by a motorist and have seen a child cyclist involved in an accident on Poplar Road South.

Officers comment
Comments noted.

Concerning the above, I was interested to note that MELROSE ROAD, SW19 3HG was not included in the proposals. Is there a reason for this? Traffic that uses Melrose Road as a 'rat run' already speeds unnecessarily along this road and I would have thought this was a prime location to introduce a 20 mph limit. I fully support the speed limit as opposed to the "zone" for all the reasons you mentioned in the newsletter. There is enough street furniture to last a lifetime in Merton Park. Unfortunately, "conservation"-area street names for Melrose Road isn't one of them! When can we expect an upgrade on that?

Officers comment
Melrose Road was accidentally referred to as Melrose Avenue in the consultation leaflet. The conservation"-area street name for Melrose Road would be referred to the relevant officer.

Firstly, I would like to congratulate the Council on recognising the need to slow vehicles in this area. I agree with the decision not to choose a 20mph zone with all the extra calming measures. However, as is obvious from the way in which many drivers ignore the current speed limit in Dorset Road where speeds regularly exceed 40mph, Mostyn Road and the north part of Poplar Road, just signposting a 20mph limit will have little impact on these thoughtless and dangerous drivers. To ensure that the limit is maintained will either require heavy policing, or more effectively average speed cameras placed:
• in Mostyn Road at the junctions of Sheridan and Leafield Roads
• in Dorset Road at the junctions of Langley Road and close to Morden Road.
These cameras will then be able force the speed down over the long stretches of 'fast road' and eliminate the need for cushions in Dorset Road. Hopefully it will then encourage drivers to recognise the new speed limit and drive more thoughtfully in the rest of the area. In the event that the MP1 zone is extended to include the rest of Poplar Road, then it will probably be necessary to put cameras here too. Many drivers, particular van drivers and those driving short wheelbase cars, do not find the current bumps of sufficient height to cause them to slow at all.

Officers comment
Cameras cannot be used to enforce the speed limit and also the Police have informed the Council that they would not be able to enforce this due to their limited resources.

My husband and I were pleased to receive your newsletter dated 19th September with the information that you proposed to make the Merton Park area a 20mph area. During the week in our area and surrounds from early in the morning and about early evening, it would be impossible to go more than 20mph as the parking of cars in this area is getting impossible. I was surprised to see on your map that you did not include the top of Mostyn Road (adjacent to Martin Way) in the existing calmed roads as the cushions go to the top. We would like the yellow lines at the top of our road (nearest to Mostyn Road) extended as when a car is parked close to the corner the cars come speeding around into Cranleigh Road on the other side of the road and time and again if we are driving from our house we have to avoid a collision, but ourselves and neighbours are prepared for a crash one day. We are certainly in favour of the speed limit, but knowing the way some drivers tear down our road are they going to observe this, or what is to stop them. It is impossible to drive to the top of Mostyn Road into Martin Way at certain times of day as drivers tear down Mostyn Road into Cranleigh Road to avoid the traffic jams and use it as a cut through into Morden, so yes anything to stop our road being used as a cut through.

Officers comment
Comments noted. The yellow lines on Mostyn Road at its junction with Cranleigh Road would be investigated any extension would be subject to Cabinet member approval and a formal consultation.
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22013039
My view on the above proposal is that I completely agree 20mph should be introduced. There are daily events that prove cars/vans have no regard for safety around the area. There are several schools, cycle routes and 20mph is much safer and would hopefully calm down speed and therefore children and adults will be safer. I would like to comment further by saying 20mph signage would be better painted onto the road surfaces rather than street furniture – it is safer, in my view, not to have to look away from where you’re driving. I just wish all mph’s were impressed into the floor of the road.

Officers comment
Comments noted.

22013050
As residents of the area of Merton Park affected by the above proposal we welcome and fully support the proposals. While understanding that many motorists wish to use Aylward Road as a convenient alternative to Mostyn and Dorset Roads and as a quicker access route to the western end of Kingston Road, the speed at which traffic often comes along the road is clearly excessive for its size and nature as a residential street. Accordingly anything that causes the traffic to use more sensible speeds is to be welcomed.

Officers comment
Comments noted.

22013055
I am writing to say that in principle I support the 20mph limit but would be interested to know what evidence the council has for making the decision, and if enforced how it would be policed- even with the current traffic calming methods certain roads are still used as ‘rat runs’ such as Dorset and Mostyn Road.

Officers comment
As the Council has a duty under the Road Traffic Act to improve safety on its roads, it is proposing to introduce a 20mph speed limit within the area. The Police has informed the Council that they will not enforce a limit and would have preferred a 20mph zone, which are self-enforcing. ‘Rat run’ would have to be investigated further to access its impact on the surrounding road network. This would be subject to available resources and funding.

22013069
I am writing to indicate my support for the proposed 20 mph zone in Merton Park. This will provide a safe and sensible option and hopefully will reduce the use of side roads during rush hour.

Officers comment
Comments noted. As additional measures are not being implemented as part of the 20mph speed limit, it is unlikely that drivers would seek an alternative route thereby creating rat runs in other roads.

22013105
I am writing to support the proposal to make the Merton Park area a 20 mph speed limit area instead of a 20 mph zone. Road humps in particular, apart from being expensive, are potentially damaging to a vehicle’s structure and the sooner they are removed the better! Whilst writing to you I would also like to raise two other points. The first concerns the chicanes recently introduced in Martin Way. The exit design of these constructions is highly dangerous and needs to be radiused. Better still would be to remove them as part of the 20 mph speed limit proposal. The second point concerns the pavement extensions built in Cannon Hill Lane to define the car parking areas. These extensions, too, are highly dangerous, particularly to strangers to the area. Without these extensions, the passing of vehicles would be facilitated and the fact that cars are parked is quite obvious. I hope these observations are of some help.

Officers comment
The Martin Way scheme is not part of this scheme.

22013145
I SUPPORT the 20 mph limit in the Merton Park area. My reasons for SUPPORTING are it will ensure the safety of everyone on the road e.g. pedestrians, cyclists & motorists.

Officers comment
Comments noted
As per the Resident's survey for the 20mph speed limit in the area, I would like to register my Support for the limit. The reason for support is:

Far too many cars and lorries use the roads as shortcuts and my road in particular as a rat run. I have noticed heavy lorries/trucks driving faster than the current speed limit already. As they go over the existing humps at such speed, the trucks weight slams down hard on the roads as it comes off the hump and I have noticed that my house has shaken due to the heavy vibrations as a result. It is also very dangerous for pedestrians and children, especially at rush hour.

Officers comment
Comments noted. The introduction of the 20mph speed limit should improve safety for all road users.

I support a 20mph limit in the Merton Park area. My reasons are
1. I believe it will be more effective in cutting vehicle speed than road humps
2. there are many young children living and going to school in Merton Park and a 20mph limit will produce a safer environment for them
3. it is likely to reduce rat-running
4. Merton Park is a pleasant residential area and slower driving will enhance this environment
5. car emissions will be reduced
6. it will be safer for cyclists

Officers comment
Comments noted.

I live in Dorset Rd and think it a good idea to have a 20mph speed limit in Merton Park, and especially in Dorset Rd, because despite a 30mph speed limit cars and motorbikes can sometimes appear to be exceeding that speed on Dorset Rd. I have 5 year old and 2 sons in secondary education and their safety on the roads worries me. The point I would particularly like to make is that some kind of traffic calming device is needed on the bend in Dorset Rd by Erridge Rd and Sandbourne Avenue. Sometimes cars go so fast round that bend that they have to cross to the opposite side of the road. Obviously if a car is coming in the other direction there is an problem. Sometimes motorists simply "iron out" the bend anyway, by crossing to the other side of the road.

Officers comment
The road markings within the bend will be reviewed, by extending the hatched area in the middle of the road from the speed cushion nearest to the bend to the other end after the bend. This would narrow the available carriageway width, hence reduce speed.

I support a 20 mph limit in the Merton Park Area because
- a traffic speed of less than 30 mph would be safer for residents and motorists
- a 20 mph sign just might raise the safety awareness of motorists entering the area
- it also just might deter impatient motorists from otherwise tail-gating cars going slowly through the area
- existing traffic-calming measures in Merton Park already make it sensible for vehicles to travel at speeds below 30 mph

However, regarding the consultation process, it is unfortunate that no information to support the introduction of the speed restrictions has been provided by the Council. It appears that greater cohesion is required between the Council and the local police on the way the speed restrictions will be implemented.

Officers comment
Comments noted. The relevant information was not available. The collection of the data would have caused delay to the proposals. As part of the process, Police and other emergency services are consulted on all schemes within the borough.

I am in favour of the 20mph limit for the following reasons:
Currently traffic turning into Melrose Road from Dorset Road cuts the corner at speed which is obviously dangerous. Lorries and coaches use Dorset Road a lot - when they go over the speed bumps on Dorset Road it is incredibly noisy - the sides of the lorries clatter and the impact cause vibrations which can be
felt all over our house. We would welcome a scheme that reduces this. Generally traffic drives too fast down Dorset Road and it is still a well-used cut through despite the introduction of the no right turn at the south end. The crash on Tuesday 7th October on this corner between two vehicles at this junction suggests there is a necessity.

Officers comment
We would investigate this location.

22013160
I would like to state that I support a 20 mph limit but I would like to see more measures taken to enforce the limit. I don't think that painted signs on the roads will be a strong deterrent. I would like to see this measure supplemented by more appropriate traffic calming measures (I don't mean humps on the road, which are already in place and seem to have very little effect on speed).

Officers comment
Since only the Police are responsible for enforcement, due to their priority and limited resources, it is unlikely that the proposed limit would be enforced.

22013162
We write in response to your proposal to convert Merton Park area into a 20mph speed limit. Several years ago when the Council first proposed the introduction of traffic calming measures in Merton Park, a consultation was made which resulted in a majority vote favouring such introduction. However, at that time, the Council decided to implement a partial introduction of traffic calming measures and not to do anything in those streets that voted against the measures. As a resident of Cranleigh Road, one of the roads that voted against the measures and did not get any, I was taken aback at discovering that the other roads got them but we did not. Actually that was not the way the vote was meant to be read. It was yes or no to traffic claming measures for Merton Park, a partial implementation was actually not the subject of the consultation. The consequences have been daunting. Cranleigh Road has now become the standard by-way of any speed-loving motorist who wants to avoid the infernal traffic of Martin Way leading into Morden town centre. We have experienced several accidents in the corner of Mostyn Road and Cranleigh Road when the motorists drive down from Mostyn way and turn right to enter, at high speed, the bump-free Cranleigh Road motorway. A 20mph zone is a way of correcting that historical wrong, resolving the problem we are facing in Cranleigh Road (and some other roads) which is been used to avoid roads with dense traffic or with traffic calming measures; and, in general terms, to improve safety and quality of life of the local residents. Therefore, we wholeheartedly support the implementation of a 20mph zone and encourage you to do it without delay. On the other side, a 20mph speed limit without the necessary traffic calming measures is a total waste of time and money. I failed to find a single reason in your newsletter to support this initiative.

Officers comment
Comments noted. Due to the number of additional traffic calming features, it was considered that such a proposal would have been rejected by the majority of the residents. For the introduction of a zone additional features are essential and a further consultation would need to be carried out.

22013170
I support the 20mph limit in the Merton Park area. I live on Dorset Road and the speed that cars use along this (and many other roads in the area) is excessive. I have found that the speed bumps haven't made a huge amount of difference to the speed people use along this route. It is a busy road and I feel that if we could reduce the speed then it might become a little safer. I am also concerned about the double bend as most cars not only travel in excess of the speed limit but most also come around it on the wrong side of the road and it is only time before we have a particularly nasty accident. In fact this morning as I was taking my daughter to school a council vehicle took the bend fast and over the white line!

Officers comment
Comments noted. The road markings within the bend would be reviewed, by extending the hatched area in the middle of the road from the speed cushion nearest to the bend to the other end after the bend. This would narrow the available carriageway width, hence reduce speed.

22013172
I support the plan to convert the area into a 20MPH speed limit rather than a 20MPH zone. The zone would cause an increase in environmental pollution and would inconvenience local residents rather than the commuters and business vehicles that transit the area at high speeds, ignoring the humps and cushions etc. A 20MPH limit is preferred (over a 30MPH limit) for reasons of safety.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22013174</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I'm writing in support of the proposed 20mph speed limit - and to avoid, at any cost a 'speed zone'. Current traffic 'calming' measures on Mostyn Road - apart from their considerable expense of installation - have, in my view, proved far more irritating than calming. They also encourage - in conjunction with our necessary roadside parking - the 'slalom' school of driving, dangerous, especially at night, and enjoyed solely by pizza delivery boys. Road bumps make travel on our nice K5 bus route far more adventurous than it should be and I'd hate to be an ambulance driver (or patient on board). Not least, a speed limit is a decision we can review and if need be raise or reduce at next to no cost. At very least I hope we will monitor the effects. You say that we currently have no speed-related' accident information and I hope that you'll berate the Met accordingly. Here's our last chance to get some before and then after information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Officers comment |
| Comments noted |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22013175</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thank you for your letter. I would like to write in support of the proposal for the Merton Park speed limit of 20 mph. The main problem of this proposal is that of enforcement. However, it should be noted that this proposal does not deal directly with the real issues of traffic in Merton Park as I see it. I live on the corner of Kenley Road and Circle Gardens and find the traffic at certain times of day very oppressive. It is not the speed of traffic per se but the congestion problems that especially during term time cause public order problems e.g. abusive shouting, threats of violence and danger to young children as passengers and pedestrians. The speed hump that is in place quite frankly causes more problems for us in noise and vibration from large vehicles, which simply sit on the hump unable to pass. I understand Circle Gardens has been problematic for sometime and some residents would consider a controlled parking zone proposal again. Also there are problems with the 'no left turn' into Kenley Road from the Sainsburys /Merton Council car park, as drivers simply do not adhere to it, causing further congestion. The drivers tend to drive erratically here despite the signage causing danger to elderly pedestrians and shoppers walking to Sainsbury's. Whilst I am grateful for your proposals and your attention to expense I was wondering if your proposals do not go far enough. Is it possible for Merton Council to consider applications for funding for creating a 'home zone' or something like it for this area?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Officers comment |
| Comments noted. The proposal is not to deal with traffic management in the area as a whole but to try and reduce the speed of vehicles on these roads. The 'no left' signs in Kenley from the Sainsbury / Merton car park will be investigated and if the need arises additional signs will be installed. As too many features are required for a home zone in this area, it was agreed to consult on a speed limit. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22013176</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I SUPPORT a 20mph speed limit. The area is populated by a large number of families with young children. Vehicles are commonly seen travelling significantly in excess of the current 30mph limit through tree and parked car lined roads. Assuming that the deterrent it provides is heeded by the majority of drivers, this should increase the safety of the residential roads in the Merton Park area by helping to reduce the speeds that some drivers consider acceptable, as it increases their margin above the imposed limit. Though it was surprising to learn that the police do not enforce 20mph limits, from a personal point of view - as a driver in a one (though occasionally two) car family - I find that the illuminated speed signs which react to measured speed are an effective deterrent. This view is shared by a number of my friends and colleagues as they point a noticeable accusing finger at you! I would urge you to consider the use of such equipment to aid the deterrent, without resorting to the upheaval and expense of a full 20mph zone, as this introduces unpopular speed bumps which seem to result in increased acceleration attempts causing noise and pollution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Officers comment |
| Comments noted. The VAS only effective for a short period of time, after which time, drivers simply ignore these signs. There have been reports that there are some drivers who speed on approach to these signs so as to make the sign indicate a high speed. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22013186</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I strongly support the 20mph limit as a matter of principle. I am a member of Merton Cycling Campaign, a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
branch of the London Cycling Campaign and we always support 20 mph limits in residential areas. However, I would hate to see 20mph introduced as a token gesture. If not enforced it is meaningless. I understand that Wimbledon Town Centre is 20mph. I hadn't realised. Judging from traffic speeds I can only assume that it is not enforced. Also, the humps in the road do limit the speed anyway, and especially at peak times the road is so congested that traffic is often at a standstill. However, personally, as a cyclist and a motorist who has to endure the humps on a daily basis I would like to see them removed and other measures put in to slow the traffic, such as strategically placed flower tubs and parking on the diagonal which make the traffic weave. I have seen this done in Kingston as a way of making the road pedestrian friendly rather than car friendly. This may deter cars using the area as a rat run. Also we have had to pay for the suspension on our car to be renewed due to damage caused by road humps. Would councillors be able to lobby for this kind of measure? I understand that removing humps is costly but if nobody asks then no action will ever be taken?

Officers comment
Comments noted. There are currently no proposals to remove existing traffic calming features which help reduce speeds.

22013188
In response to the consultation re the 20 mph limit in Merton Park, I would like to register my support. As a resident of Dorset Road living opposite the alley way to the tramlink station. My family and I are only too aware of the effects of speeding traffic. Whereas in many roads in Merton Park the width of the roads and the parked cars slows the traffic anyway. In Dorset Road, the width of the road and the long straight stretches mean that many motorists speed down the roads in excess of 40mph. Cars sweep round off the Morden Road where there seems to be little discouragement to slow the traffic to 30mph and continue at high speed down Dorset Road. It is increasingly difficult for pedestrians crossing the road from the tramlink alley especially in the rush hour. This is worrying as many children use this route to and from the local schools. I would have preferred a 20mph home zone area but as this has apparently been rejected the proposed 20mph is the second best option.

Officers comment
Comments noted. The introduction of the 20mph speed limit will help reduce the speed of vehicles, hence improve safety for all road users.

22013191
I would not be in favour of the introduction of a 20 mph speed limit unless evidence was adduced that it would bring material benefit to the area. The Merton Council newsletter referred to in the Merton Park Ward Councillors' letter of 26 September did not reach me, but the inference from the final point for consideration listed in that letter is that no such evidence was adduced. Before agreeing I would want to know how many serious accidents and deaths had occurred due to traffic moving between 20 and 30 mph in, say, the past twenty years, and what evidence there is from elsewhere that a reduction to 20 mph would materially improve the record. I have a subsidiary objection, which is to the proliferation of street furniture and road markings the proposed change would involve. In this respect the largely superfluous residents' parking scheme introduced in my immediate area a few years back had a disastrous effect on the environmental impact of this otherwise amazingly attractive suburban area, and I would be antipathetic to any new measures which would add to this environmental damage.

Officers comment
This is not an accident remedial measure but speed reduction measures to improve safety for all road users. The proposal is in line with Merton's commitment to reducing speed through 20mph zones and limits.

22013192
I support a 20mph limit. I think a one way system at Circle Gardens would help safety. At present I have to be aware of traffic coming from five different directions. As there are no humps on the Circle, cars drive as fast as possible and it is not possible to see them when they approach. I think speed limit signs which show you're speed limit would be more useful than more humps. Also it is getting increasingly harder to drive through these roads due to parked cars on both sides of the roads. Very often roads are blocked due to large vehicles being unable to pass narrow areas of the roads.

Officers comment
The one way system on Circle gardens will have to be investigated further. As there are no humps on this road, making this road a one way may encourage drivers to drive faster. Cars parked on either sides of
In reply to your letter sent to all Merton park residents regarding converting our area into a 20mph zone I am in complete agreement with this action. However I am concerned with the following-

1. Increased through traffic avoiding Modren town centre or Kingston Road on the north side through to Martin Way and reverse.
2. Heavy goods vehicles using it as a cut through and causing damage to trees on roadside.
3. Litter management
4. How would this be enforced?

Officers comment
1. The proposals would not increase traffic in the area as there will be no road closures or one way roads.
2. Most of the heavy goods vehicles in the area use Dorset Road to access Kingston Road or Morden Road. Heavy goods restriction cannot be introduced on Dorset Road as this road is the only link between Morden Road and Kingston Road. This route is also the primary emergency route.
3. Litter management within the area is not within the scope of this scheme, however this will be forwarded to the appropriate team.
4. Since only the Police are responsible for enforcement, due to their priority and limited resources, it is unlikely that the proposed limit would be enforced.

We support the 20 mph in the Merton Park Area, and would welcome anything that would restrict the speed of passing traffic because:-

1) With parked cars on either side of our front driveway, it can be very dangerous driving out into the road, especially when some drivers pass by at well over the permitted speed limit.
2) There is also the school opposite, and the elderly residents which are very vulnerable to speeding traffic, especially having to cross the road with parked vehicles either side.

Officers comment
Comments noted. The proposals would help reduce traffic speeds which may assist in individual drives being accessed a little easier. It would also improve safety for all pedestrians.
unlikely that the proposed limit would be enforced. However they will convict any driver who disobeys the limit.

AGAINST

22013052
There is too much of a health and safety culture permeating our lives, logically if we carry on like this we will ban cars because they will always cause accidents. I have experience of a 20 mph zone in Tower Bridge (now withdrawn) and all it caused was confusion and uncertainty really dangerous drivers are not effected by measures like this, all it does is inconvenience the average person unnecessarily.

Officers comment
Comments noted.

22012966
I am all for safety measures in the Borough and am fully supportive of making life easier and safer for pedestrians and cyclists etc BUT as a Merton Park resident, I am TOTALLY and UTTERLY AGAINST any further traffic calming or speed measures. The Merton Park area is already so busy that the traffic already crawls at a snail's pace. There is no opportunity to speed in the borough even if someone wanted to. There must be at least 25/30 driving schools using the very streets that you refer to in your proposal document and these learner drivers are there from 6 am to late at night. It is virtually impossible to avoid them night or day hence the traffic is already moving at a ridiculously slow pace. If, like myself, you need to get the kids to school in the mornings and drive in to Wimbledon, it is already a completely chaotic system and takes forever. You've already put pro cycling measures at the junction of Church Lane /Kingston road so that you now can't filter left. This has already caused further chaos in Church Lane with long lines of cars backing up. A great many people have no alternative but to use the car for various reasons, we can't all cycle or walk. I assume the main reason for the 20 mph zone is as a money making exercise, to fine motorists who speed, but as I say this is already totally unnecessary. The Council are already penalising motorists enough given the ludicrous parking charges in the borough even when eating out quite late at night in Wimbledon and also we are already having to pay for various parking permits of course to park outside our own houses. ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!

Officers comment
No additional traffic calming measures are needed within the area as part of the 20mph speed limit. The main reason for the 20mph speed limit is not a money making process, since the Council cannot issue penalty notices to offenders. It is only the Police who have the power to enforce speed limits and issue fixed penalty notices to offenders.

22013000
Can I register my objection to the introduction of this limit in this ward. As the limit will not be enforced in any way I do not believe that the money spent will be cost effective. The current speed restrictions are observed by the few and these new regulations would be similarly be ignored. However on a more positive note can I suggest that the rat runs through the Merton Park estate be closed by instituting a one way system and appropriate road closures. I also think that introduction of 'Residents Only Parking' in Windermere Avenue, Grasmere Avenue, Kenley Road, Circle Gardens etc would reduce traffic flow and increase usage of the existing public car parks tat are presently underused. I am a car owner but I inevitably use my garage for parking.

Officers comment
The limit would not be enforced; however imposing a 20mph speed limit on the roads is likely to improve safety for all road users compared to the current 30mph. Further investigations would have to be undertaken for the ‘rat run’ within the area. This would be subject to available funding and resources.

22013002
I feel that a 20mph limit on the bigger roads such as Dorset Road, Mostyn Road, Cannon Hill Lane etc is too slow and would cause problems and frustration for drivers. Some drivers would stick to the limit, which may irritate other, not so careful drivers, into overtaking or intimidation. Therefore I am not in favour of this limit. The 20mph limit would probably work on the smaller roads so I don't mind whether the limit is put in place on these roads or not. Most of them are congested with parked cars, which slows down the traffic anyway.

Officers comment
The 20mph speed limit on Dorset Road, Cannon Hill, is considered to be appropriate as the existing traffic
calming measures were installed to reduce traffic speeds to approximately 20mph.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22013003</th>
<th>I am writing in response to your letter of 19 September about a proposal to introduce a 20mph speed limit in Merton Park. I wish to object to this proposal as there is no evidence that this measure is needed and no data has been given about the rate of accidents in Merton Park nor of average speeds. This is just another anti car measure by Merton Council, whose policy, in reality, is to make the life of drivers as difficult as possible. Please note I do not possess a car.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officers comment</td>
<td>The proposed scheme is not an accident remedial scheme but a speed reduction measure. Other than encouraging drivers to reduce speed the proposals are not considered to a hinder drivers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 22013006 | Thank you for giving me the opportunity to give feedback to your proposals. I object almost entirely to the proposals, which indicate to me that the borough lacks any real direction and is awash with money to waste. The use of the euphemism “speed cushions” is irritating when everyone knows that they are hard objects and do cause damage to cars suspension systems even when driven over at slow speed. I applaud any true action to improve the safety of our streets including the use of speed limits, speed humps and improved junctions/sightlines etc; unfortunately in the five years living in Merton all I have witnessed is wasteful, badly planned and expensive schemes [particularly Martin Way] The proposal as presented is just one of these schemes. The roads are narrow and there are already speed bumps that effectively prevent any excessive speed above 20 mph. We do not need more controls involving more street signage. In any case who will enforce the speed limit and who will bear the additional cost of this? I am rather disappointed by this use of taxpayer's money and will be contacting my local councillors by copying this mail to them. The need for a 20 mph limit does exist and should be placed;-  
1. To the stretch of narrow road [Cannon Hill Lane] between Kingston Road and Aylward Road  
2. Close to all schools.  
There is also a need to improve the junction of Aylward Road and Cannon Hill Lane where sightlines for traffic travelling north and making a right turn are very poor. The junction between Cannon Hill Lane and Kingston Road could benefit from traffic lights. To summarise I object on the grounds of cost and need. The money should be spent dealing with areas where the real problems exist! |
| Officers comment | The proposed cushions will be introduced in accordance with DfT guidelines and whilst travelling within the speed limit, damage will not be caused to vehicles. The roads are narrow and the existing traffic calming features prevent any excessive speeds, however these roads are legally 30mph. The Police would have to enforce and bear the cost of the speed limit. Since only the Police are responsible for enforcement, due to their priority and limited resources, it is unlikely that the proposed limit would be enforced. The local councillors were made aware of the proposals. |

| 22013019 | I am totally opposed to this proposal. It is not necessary in this area. The amount of traffic does not warrant these measures. I THOUGHT WE ARE ALL SUPPOSED TO BE GOING GREEN!!! It is a fact that engines are at their most efficient when in higher gears. Therefore to be permanently in a low gear will increase wear and tear on the engines and gear boxes and increase emissions. Another fact is that there would be increased fuel consumption. For an example if vehicles were required to do say 20mph on a motorway or main road on a given distance. The fuel consumption would rocket. The same applies on minor roads |
| Officers comment | Comments noted, however, the advantages outweigh the disadvantages. |

| 22013035 | I am writing to object to the proposed 20 mph limit in Merton Park. The grounds for my objection are:  
1. You have provided no evidence whatsoever that speed (between 20 and 30 mph) is a contributory factor to accidents in the area.  
2. You have provided no evidence that the 20 mph limit will reduce accidents.  
3. You do not propose to enforce the limit in any practical way.  
4. The limit is therefore not an effective use of the scarce resources available to you.  The only thing to be said in its favour is that at least it is better than yet more road humps  
- Merton must surely be the most road-humped Borough in Britain. |

www.merton.gov.uk
I am writing to oppose the measures proposed for the following reasons:

The current 30MPH restrictions don't work in that traffic speed often exceeds this limit. The current Speed humps in Dorset Road fail to achieve their speed reduction objectives. The reasons for this are as follows:

- The rows of three humps across the road act as pinch points. Traffic approaching them in a single stream will attempt to straddle them without reducing speed. Where there is two-way traffic, the streams tend to accelerate to the pinch points in an effort to get there first and to use the central hump because it's easier to steer straight for the next one than it is to re-align the vehicle on one of the in-lane humps. The central humps are also chosen because there are parking bays close to the hump sets which automatically push the traffic out into the middle of the road. It follows therefore that simply reducing the speed limit to 20MPH will not alter this cluster of behaviours. The root of the problem is that the roads of Merton Park are used as Rat-runs for traffic coming down the A217 and moving towards Wandsworth trying to avoid traffic snarl ups at the bottom of Merantun Way, South Wimbledon and Wimbledon Town Centre. Some turn left at Dorset Road but others cut through from Kenley and Daybrook Road. This translates into traffic queues in the early morning trying to turn right at the Dorset Road, Church Lane and Mostyn Road junctions with Kingston Road. I don't think it's possible to prevent these phenomena by closing roads or creating one-way systems without severely reducing the utility of the area's road system for the residents of Merton Park. Changing the isolated humps for full width ramps may have more effect and would certainly slow down some of the vehicles without diverting them onto the crown of the road. However, Dorset Road has a tendency to flood in heavy rain and some drainage issues may arise. There is effectively a ramp across the road at the junction with Morden Road so any additional effect on the passage of emergency vehicles will be minimal. I do think that changing humps for ramps would prevent a cluster of behaviours that centre around passing humps without reducing speed. Introducing Speed Cameras will only be effective in the immediate vicinity of the cameras. The only other alternative that might have a beneficial effect would be the introduction of a priority passing system. This would have the additional benefit of protecting residents vehicles parked in bays. In conclusion then, I think the council should be considering full width ramps and priority traffic sections instead of speed limits.

Officers comment

The rows of speed cushions, are effective means of reducing traffic speeds. The objective of the proposal is to reduce speed and any other issues such as 'rat runs' would require additional investigations.

Changing speed cushions into humps would be more effective, but officers were instructed not to consider road humps. Cameras cannot be considered since the roads concerned do not satisfy the requirements. Priority give way would result in a loss of 6 parking spaces per location. As this is in a CPZ and parking is in high demand, residents would oppose it.
unlikely event that there was some psychological effect, the resultant slowing would be entirely negligible. The proposed scheme might enable the Council to claim, on paper, that it had taken measures to meet its manifesto commitment to slow traffic, but since there would in our opinion be no effect whatsoever on the ground, it would be a complete waste of money. We very much hope that it will be rejected.

Officers comment
Comments noted. Traffic calming feature would have been required in Langley Road as part of the legal requirements for a 20mph zone. It was considered that the number of features for a zone would have been rejected by the residents.

22013069
I am opposed to a 20 mph speed limit in Merton Park, since it is not enforceable. The white no parking lines in Circle Gardens and Cranleigh Rd are an example of this. They are just a waste of money and they are completely ignored. It will just make the area more unsightly with signs on the pavement and on the roads.

Officers comment
Comments noted. The white markings are to improve sightlines from private drives and also prevent drivers from parking in front of these drives.

22013078
I appreciate being given the opportunity to comment on these proposals. It seems to me that there is no problem: I have been here a year and the level of traffic is relatively small compared to my previous address in Walton on Thames where we were next to a school and it had become a short cut to avoid a roundabout. There were no calming measures at all and that was not satisfactory. However here you have light traffic, calming measures, parked vehicles all of which limits the speed. It seems to be a complete waste of money to put in all the necessary notices for a 20 mph limited knowing that those who drive carefully will do so anyway and the others will not take too much notice of an un-enforced limit. However, if it means that because there is no official 20 mph limit further calming measures will be put in, which would probably reduce available parking on the street and add more stress and wear to the vehicles, then a designated zone, how be it not surveyed, would be preferable. Personally I believe the flashing signs "kill your speed" or similar are a very effective measure and too much regulation are counter-productive. If you had been suggesting the limit for DORSET Road I would think it is necessary. Despite calming measures it's quite dangerous to cross especially with small children. The bumps are perhaps too far apart as they give inconsiderate drivers the chance to build up speed. Overall then I feel the status quo is satisfactory and avoids further expense. I am glad the bus lane situation has been resolved. We felt very aggrieved being fined on that when it was hard to avoid when turning left and other traffic were eager to proceed. If the fine had not arrived on the day we were going away for a month I would have appealed but the thought of having to pay twice the amount if losing was not an option for retired people.

Officers comment
No further measures are required as part of the 20mph speed limit. Parking can take place over cushions. The flashing signs only reduce speeds when drivers use the road for the first time, once they know it is not enforceable, they often become ineffective. The cushions on Dorset Road are not too far apart and are within the requirements set by the DfT.

22013107
I am very surprised by this initiative. I see no need for a 20 mph zone involving 5 sets of cushions in Erridge Road. These would be wasteful, unnecessary and a control too far. There is nowadays no problem with speeding cars in Erridge Road, and I doubt if there is any significant demand for such superfluous, disfiguring measures. Indeed for Erridge Road, such cushions would produce a deterioration in our environment with cars slowing and speeding up causing extra noise and pollution. This consequence makes these measures a retrograde one for us, producing a net disadvantage for no provable gain. No reason is given in the Council's announcement apart from reducing vehicular speeds. There is no information on traffic speeds in Merton Park nor any information on relevant traffic accidents. Within Merton Park it is virtually impossible to do more than 20mph in any case. With some high quality information I might support a 20 mph speed limit (as opposed to a zone with the concomitant measures). I have supported Council initiatives in the past to control traffic and parking. These measures have brought benefit. However, I see the present proposal as a step too far. I could only support it if supplied with some sound evidence. If the Council wishes to retain the trust of those for whom it seeks to work it might do well to consider the following:

1. this proposal has come as a surprise and has been greeted in my area with a degree of incredulity
2. those of us who supported parking control and traffic calming measures in the past were confronted with sceptics who argued that the Council could not be trusted to keep such measures and related charges within limits
3. there have been recent hikes in parking charges of 50% and in one case 150%.

Officers comment
To satisfy the requirements for a zone, a number of features would have been required for Erridge Road, however since the proposals are for a 20mph speed limit, no traffic calming features are required in Erridge Road.

22013148
I am not aware of a speeding problem in Merton Park. The roads are already littered with squads of sleeping policemen- huge investment. It is already quite difficult to drive at more than 25 mph. Use the money on something more worthwhile.

Officers comment
Comments noted.

22013149
I strongly object to the council’s proposal to impose a 20mph limit in Merton Park. You state that: “….improving safety and maintaining the quality of life for local residents takes precedence….”. The proposals to impose this 20mph limit will not full fill either of these sated aims. The Government’s own advice recommends that. “Extreme caution should be exercised when considering making 20mph speed limits using speed limit signs with no supporting speed reducing features. The weight of evidence points strongly to signed only 20mph limits having little or no effect on traffic speeds”... If the 20mph limit does not have any effect on speed within its limits it cannot improve safety. The quality of life of residents will not be maintained, as cars will remain in the area for longer with a greater potential for pollution if they drive at the proposed speed. You have offered us no to supporting evidence for the decision to implement these measures. As residents we do not have a problem with speeding cars, or a high accident rate caused by speeding vehicles on the roads in Merton Park. DfT guidelines recommend that:

"20mph speed limits should be used for individual roads or a small number of roads"
This scheme covers a huge number of roads therefore ignores Government guidelines. For this scheme to be successful it needs to be self regulating because no enforcement measures proposed. I have yet to speak to a single Merton Park resident who wants this limit imposed on their road therefore without the support of the majority of regular road users the limit will not be self regulating. I urge the council to drop this unpopular, unenforceable and potentially in effective scheme.

Officers comment
The proposals is likely to reduce traffic speeds, hence improve safety for pedestrians. Most of the roads within this area have existing traffic calming features, required to reduce traffic speeds. These existing traffic calming features are not programmed to be removed as part of the 20mph speed limit. No supporting evidence was included, however volume and speed surveys would be conducted before and after the scheme is implemented. DfT guidelines recommends that 20mph zones / limits should be considered for a wider area for it to be effective.

22013154
I am in receipt of the Residents' Survey for Merton Park and would like to state that I am opposed to the 20mph speed limit in Merton Park. Can you advise me of the reason why this has been suggested to the area? Traffic speed to the area is already reduced due to the endless humps in the roads and in the ten years I have lived in Merton Park, I have rarely witnessed excessive speeds. I am sure the numerous driving schools that use our roads for lessons would be looking elsewhere if this was not a suitable location.

Officers comment
As majority of the roads within the area have existing traffic calming features, it is considered that the proposed limit is likely to benefit the area and encourage drivers to reduce their speed.

22013155
Please register our opposition to this proposal for the reasons described in the attached letter. You should note that we have hand delivered this letter to the council offices today.

22013158
I am opposed to a 20 mph limit in the Merton Park Area.
We are asked to give our opinion without the benefit of vital background information such as details of average vehicle speeds in Merton Park and details of traffic accidents in Merton Park in which speed has been a contributory factor. I have lived in Merton Park since 1986, and I am not aware of any such accidents on the roads in question. The 20 mph limit would not be enforced by police. If, however, the only alternative to this would be a 20 mph zone, given the Administration's manifesto commitment (of which, I admit, I was unaware), a 20 mph limit is preferable. I would like to add that I consider the current traffic calming measures in Dorset Road totally inadequate. It is still possible for cars to drive fast down the road, often in a hazardous manner, zigzagging to avoid the humps. If the Administration is serious about reducing speeds along Dorset Road, chicanes should be installed.

Officers comment
No supporting evidence was included, however, volume and speed surveys would be conducted before and after the scheme is implemented. Installing chicanes on Dorset Road would result in the loss of too many residents' parking spaces, which currently is in high demand. Since only the Police are responsible for enforcement, due to their priority and limited resources, it is unlikely that the proposed limit would be enforced.

22013159
I am opposed to the 20 mph speed limit in Merton Park. It is unenforceable and the cost of implementation is to create in the current economic climate in Merton.

Officers comment
It would not be enforced by the Police, however, combined with the existing traffic calming, legally reducing traffic speeds to 20mph on most of the roads within the area will improve safety for all road users.

22013161
I am opposed to a 20 mph limit in Merton Park area. It may be appropriate in the Town Centre, but I have never seen the need for this in this area. It is an unnecessary measure and therefore a waste of public funds, especially when there are so many demands at present, and more worthy causes/issues to be addressed.

Officers comment
Comments noted. The measures are necessary to help improve safety within the area for all road users.

22013164
I am OPPOSED to a 20mph speed limit in Merton Park. We already have the area strewn with speed bumps which as a resident make it extremely annoying coming in and out of the area in any direction without having to go over a dozen or more speed bumps, which has proved very destructive to the cars. This however already does reduce the overall speed in the area so is it really necessary to impose yet more restrictions in the area? I note we have not be given any figures on average traffic speeds in Merton Park, or what traffic accidents have been caused by speed if any. Indeed as a long term resident in the area I am unaware that there have been any issues with excessive speeds causing any accidents. Why then are you wishing to introduce this in this area as opposed to any other area of Wimbledon? The only areas justified in having a speed restriction perhaps would be immediately around the schools in the area. I cannot see that the introduction of this would make any significant difference in the area - those that choose to speed will continue to do so whether there is a 20mph sign or whether they choose to drive fast over the speeds bumps already introduced! This seems a belt and braces job!

Officers comment
No additional traffic calming features are required as part of the proposed 20mph speed limit. It is considered that combined with the existing traffic calming, legally reducing traffic speeds to 20mph on most of the roads within the area will improve safety for all road users. No supporting evidence is currently available, however, volume and speed surveys would be conducted before and after the scheme is implemented. There are approximately 18 proposed areas within the borough, which are being considered for either a 20mph zone or speed limit.

22013166
I write to oppose the introduction of a 20 mph limit on roads within Merton Park. My reasons are as follows: I think the signage for the speed limits will be unsightly and inappropriate in an area such as Merton Park; We have many speed calming measure on our roads in this area, most of which were unnecessary in the first place and have destroyed the amenity of our area; There is very little traffic within Merton Park, even at peak times, and so any further traffic calming measures, including the introduction of
a 20mph limit is completely unnecessary; In all the time I have lived in the area (18 years) I have never heard of any traffic incident within this area, certainly nothing that resulted in a fatality. This again would point to the fact that we do not need any further traffic enforcement measures by the Council; I understand that a 20 mph limit would not be enforced by the police, so it seems pointless; Due to the narrow width of most roads within Merton Park and the unnecessary traffic calming measures that have already been imposed on the residents of this area, it is almost impossible (and always has been) to drive at much more than 20mph anyway, so again this measure seems pointless and an unnecessary expense; Perhaps you are unaware that the traffic in this area is so light that it is used a great deal by driving schools to train learner drivers. That in itself indicates that there is simply no problem relating to traffic in Merton Park and thus no need for any further money to be spent in this regard. Please do not waste my and other taxpayers’ money. A REFUND would be gratefully accepted if you have any sums to spare as a result of NOT carrying out any further interfering works in relation to traffic in Merton Park. I am fed up with road humps, parking restrictions (to the extent that I can't even go to the doctor without paying to park my car nearby when I am unwell) and the like. PLEASE leave us ALONE. I would appreciate a response to this email or, at the least, an acknowledgement.

Officers comment

The area is within a conservation area, however road safety must also be considered. Since only the Police are responsible for enforcement, due to their priority and limited resources, it is unlikely that the proposed limit would be enforced.

22013168

I am emailing you to inform you that my wife and I are opposed to the introduction of a 20mph speed limit in the Merton Park area. We have lived here for over 30 years and feel we have some idea of the traffic situation here. We have one car and one motorcycle between us. The reasons that we are opposed are as follows. Much of the area now has speed bumps of one sort or another. Inconvenient though they are, these have had the effect of slowing traffic to a little over 20mph although there are a few vehicles that exceed this and probably break the 30mph limit that already exists. The side roads, i.e. not Dorset Road or Mostyn Road, have plenty of parked cars at most times of the day and night and these, together with the speed humps, contribute to quite modest speeds of the vehicles passing through. Introducing yet more speed humps would in our view be an unnecessary expense and an extra irritation to the majority of drivers passing through the area. Drivers of those vehicles that currently do speed are unlikely to be affected by more humps since the current ones don’t inhibit them. Neither are they likely to be cowed by signs of 20mph, which I understand are not going to be policed anyway. The number of accidents in Merton Park has not been mentioned in any of the documentation that I have seen. We are certainly not aware of any accidents and therefore see no point in easing a problem that doesn’t exist. The main roads where speeding is likely to be a danger and does seem to happen within Merton Park are those two I mentioned previously, Dorset Road being the main offender in this respect. It seems that large vehicles are occasionally seen speeding down this road and the nature of the speed bumps, whilst it does slow some vehicles down, clearly doesn’t stop others. One of the down sides of traffic calming measures is the affect they have on the emergency services. We would be very concerned if extra bumps caused these vehicles to be slowed down even more. For the vast majority of traffic, just reaching the current limit of 30mph is quite an achievement and therefore we consider further restrictions, unnecessary and wasteful in financial terms. The money set aside to pay for this scheme could be put to better use in policing in some way the traffic through Dorset Road. The flashing warning signs indicating the speed of vehicles might be a useful addition here. Finally, on a slightly different but not unconnected point. The work done in the Kingston Road at the junction of Church Lane seems to have been rather wasteful of public money. The broadening of the pavement has meant that traffic turning into Church Lane coming from the West is bound to hold up the traffic behind it, as there is no space in the centre of Kingston Road anymore for a central turning lane. The advantages gained to cyclists and disabled people, the groups that presumably the changes were aimed at, are fine but surely it was not necessary to broaden the pavement in that way to achieve that.

Officers comment

No additional traffic calming measures are required as part of the 20mph speed limit. No records of accidents have been included, as this proposals are part of Merton’s commitment in reducing speed through 20mph zones and limits. Funding is allocated for a specific use and cannot therefore be used in enforcement by external bodies such as the police. Merton Council do not have the powers to recruit policemen/women. Since only the Police are responsible for enforcement, due to their priority and limited resources, it is unlikely that the proposed limit would be enforced.
I oppose the 20mph zone as follows:
It would be a gross misuse of taxpayers’ money to pay for the installation of new signage etc. if you do not intend to legally enforce the speed limit in some way.

b. As a resident of Mostyn Road, I consistently witness cars speeding over our so called “traffic calming” (and totally ineffective) speed bumps, especially during busy times when Merton Park is used as a commuter cut through. If people can’t adhere to the 30mph limit - why should they bother to adhere to the 20mph you are proposing - already we see articulated lorries coming up and down the road at all times despite the “signage” telling them otherwise!

c. The literature circulated also says there have been no traffic surveys done. How can a spend of this significance be given credence without surveying the area first? I would respectfully suggest the council members make better use of their time to survey the area at the busiest times to see exactly where the problem areas are, with a view to introducing some sort of legal enforcement at the "hotspots".

Officers comment
a. Since only the Police are responsible for enforcement, due to their priority and limited resources, it is unlikely that the proposed limit would be enforced.
b. In the absence of any traffic data, officers are unable to comments on the current speed; however, it is considered that the proposed limit will complement the existing traffic calming measures and it is likely to encourage drivers to travel at a lower speed.
c. Due to time constraints, officers were unable to obtain the necessary data, however, if approved, it is proposed to undertake the necessary before and after speed and volume surveys that would allow officers to assess the effect of the proposals.

I am against the introduction of a 20mph in Merton Park. At 20mph many vehicles will be in second gear which will use more fuel and be bad for the environment in terms of fuel use and air pollution. I am not personally aware of any excessive speeding in the area and doubt if it is possible to do as much as 30mph in many of the local roads. I am also not aware of many traffic accidents in the area and feel that the present limit is adequate.

Officers comment
We understand that drivers would be driving at lower speeds and this may lead to usage of more fuel, however the Council has a duty to improve road safety on the borough roads. It is considered that the benefits of a 20mph speed limits out weigh the disadvantages.

I am opposed to the 20 Mph limit in the Merton Park area because:
If a 20 Mph speed limit is introduced, it will be a waste of public money as there is no enforcement of the 20 miles per hour speed limit. Furthermore there is no enforcement of any sort currently of 30 Mph limits in Merton Park nor is there any enforcement against large commercial lorries that regularly use our street, Sandbourne Avenue. 1. There is no information available on average traffic speeds in Merton Park, so no informed view can be taken on what the speed limit should be.
2. There is no information available on traffic accidents in Merton Park in which speed has been a contributory factor.
3. In conclusion the thinking behind this proposal is unclear as it will neither reduce traffic speed or traffic levels. I would question the proposed limit’s effectiveness as a deterrent.

Officers comment
It is considered that the proposed 20mph speed limit would benefit all road users as it is likely to reduce the number and severity of accidents. Although the police may not enforce, it is believed that the proposals would complement the existing traffic calming measures and encourage drivers to drive at lower speeds and with due attention. Due to time constraints, officers were unable to obtain the necessary data, however, if approved, it is proposed to undertake the necessary before and after speed and volume surveys that would allow officers to assess the effect of the proposals.

We are in receipt of your letter of 19th September concerning the proposed 20mph speed limit in Merton Park, and have to confess that we find it difficult to come to a conclusion one way or the other given the lacuna of information that you have provided on the matter. What problem are you trying to solve with your recommendation? What is the case for change? What statistics support the case for change? How are you co-ordinating your implementation of this new scheme with our bodies such as the Metropolitan
Police, etc. These and many other questions remain unasked and unanswered. Your website and newsletter are similarly vague on these topics, merely restating what was included in your letter to us. Further, the Government’s own advice recommends that...“Extreme caution should be exercised when considering making 20mph speed limits using speed limit signs with no supporting speed reducing features. The weight of evidence points strongly to signed only 20mph limits having little or no effect on traffic speeds”... yet you seem to want to steamroller through this ‘recommendation’ without going to the trouble of making the case for change! On Balance, and for the moment, we are opposed to you recommendation as:

- We are not convinced of the case for change – how can we be? It was not made!
- We do not understand the alternative courses of action open to us – surely the matter is more complicated than a simple choice between humps and signage
- Your track record in implementing traffic management solutions to date has arguably not been good – to some it seems that you have in the past shamelessly used these as a ‘stealth tax’ on local residents – we have heard many examples of over-zealous parking wardens and rigidly enforces traffic restrictions, not to mention the un-necessary expansion of permit parking locations and ever increasing parking charges in the borough over the past few years
- It seems like the cheapest and most expedient solution – though we feel sure that this would not be the reasoning to support your recommendation, given the paucity of information provide it remains as suspicion
- You have made no commitment on what might follow the implementation of your recommendation – will we end up at some time in the future with cameras sited across the breadth and depth of Merton Park?
- We feel that the Government’s advice should be headed and a more ‘considered’ approach taken to deciding this matter – in short exercising ‘extreme caution’ in making this decision.

We have consulted widely with our neighbours, find few that support you recommendation and many that verbally oppose it for varied reasons. Surely taking the time to share the, no doubt extensive, research that you have already undertaken in order to come to your conclusion, and providing some insight into the alternatives that you have considered would allay some of the concerns of these residents. Indeed this might be considered ‘Best Practice’ in some circles. We trust that you will take our comments into account when coming to a conclusion on this matter, and look forward to more comprehensive consultation on this proposal. In this way we may all have the opportunity to come to a more ‘informed’ decision whether or not to support your recommendation, and come a conclusion that we will not regret in future years.

Officers comment

Comments Noted. The Council has provided all necessary available information. It is considered that the proposed 20mph speed limit would benefit all road users as it is likely to reduce the number and severity of accidents. Although the police may not enforce, it is believed that the proposals would complement the existing traffic calming measures and encourage drivers to drive at lower speeds and with due attention. Due to time constraints, officers were unable to obtain the necessary data, however, if approved, it is proposed to undertake the necessary before and after speed and volume surveys that would allow officers to assess the effect of the proposals. The introduction of cameras would be based on meeting the criteria as set by DfT and the Police and it is extremely unlikely that this area would meet the criteria in the future. It is also considered that the Council has carried out the necessary legal consultation necessary for introducing such a measure. The fact that such numbers of representations have been received, indicates that the Council has been successful in its consultation.

22013195

In reply to the proposed 20mph limit news letter I would comment that as you state no traffic calming features are necessary for this legislation, why was this course of action not taken as the first step so saving the not inconceivable expense of putting in all the humps etc. It strikes me as mal administration on a large scale and not using the funds provided to the best possible effect. The humps have had a detrimental effect both on passengers and vehicles, not to mention the noise created by vehicles humping and the adverse carbon footprint of all the extra breaking and acceleration. I would also mention the safety hazard for motorcyclists coming round bends pending an adverse camber-hump in front of them on a frosty morning. I site the humps north of Erridge Road in Dorset Rd. Please confirm to me that if the 20mph limit is introduced, which in any event will be very difficult to police, all the humps and platforms will be removed so returning the area to the original conception of a quite garden suburb and we can enjoy smooth travelling on our roads again.

Officers comment

No traffic calming features are required as part of the legal requirement, but the existing features are required to reduce traffic speeds. The existing traffic calming features were first introduced to reduce traffic speeds to 30mph and the number of personal injury accidents. It is considered that the advantages
of the traffic calming features outweigh the disadvantages. If motorcyclists ride within the speed limit, the number of accidents and severity would be reduced. It is considered that road humps are not dangerous when approached at the appropriate speed. There are currently no plans to remove any of the existing traffic calming features. It is believed that the proposals would complement the existing traffic calming measures and encourage drivers to drive at lower speeds and with due attention.

22013213
I refer to the letter, dated 19th September, put out by your office. I am concerned that this proposal is an unnecessary expenditure as, with the current speed bumps in both Mostyn Road and Dorset Road, the average vehicle speed cannot currently be a great deal faster than 20 / 25 mph. Therefore I would be grateful if you could advise me whether there has been any monitoring of the current average vehicle speed in the Merton Park area and, if so, what was the outcome. Without this sort of analysis or substantial local demand, there is the inference that money is being thrown at a non existent problem.

I am certainly adamantly against a 20mph zone based on the comments in your letter. It appears very inconvenient for the local residents and I have always found the so called "traffic calming" features dangerous for cyclists and riders of powered two wheel transport. In support of this statement I would draw your attention to the traffic chicanes on Martin Way, which has caused two distinctive ruts to appear. A drop of diesel, a few leaves and a bit of rain and you have a skating rink for two wheel transport. I suspect some one will talk about "environmental pollution" and I would point out that I understand most modern cars do not produce their best emissions at low speeds. I apologise for being very negative but, with the continually annual rise of the rates bill but static income, any unnecessary council expenditure should be curtailed.

Officers comment
The proposals are in line with Merton’s commitment to reduce speed and accidents through 20mph zones and limits. It is believed that the proposals would complement the existing traffic calming measures and encourage drivers to drive at lower speeds and with due attention. Almost all schemes may have an impact on the environment, however, road safety must take priority.

22013216
Thank you for your consultation letter, and for the opportunity to comment. I do believe that the proposed speed limits will have very little impact on vehicle speeds. You say in your letter that with a 20 mph speed limit "Traffic speeds within this area are not to exceed 20 mph” How on earth can you say that when several roads haven't even got any form of traffic calming, and the Police have no type-approved equipment that permits them to enforce below 30mph? Your proposed 20 mph limits are an abuse of the DfT guidance on 20 mph limits - they are only supposed to be introduced where 85th%ile speeds are already at or below 20 mph. Your scheme will be unlikely to reduce vehicle speeds (where is your evidence that it will?), and so the 20 mph limit will quickly fall into disrepute. The funding for these proposals is a flagrant waste of public money. Where is the justification in terms of personal injury accidents with speeding as a contributory factor? What are existing vehicle speeds? Are the existing measures working? – I am thinking of the cushions on Dorset Road where motorcyclists speed merrily along.... What are the views of the Police? If there are high profile accidents along the roads - particularly those without any traffic calming - following the introduction of your "suitable 20 mph limit", where drivers have been found to be speeding, then the Police will be under pressure to enforce, and you will be under pressure to install measures - whether you have the budget or not at the time. I do support the Council’s general commitment to reducing speeds through 20 mph ZONES, but only where these are justified - in accident terms etc. You say in your letter that a 20 mph limit would be preferable due to the cost of having to introduce traffic calming in my road and others - where is the justification for that statement? Imagine if you go ahead and I then send my 9 year old daughter out to cycle up and down Daybrook Road because you think I will perceive it safer, and she is killed or injured by a motorist doing over 20 mph because you haven't provided any vertical deflection traffic calming? These proposals may encourage more people to cycle but the exposure to risk won't change, the probability is there will be more accidents involving vulnerable road users. As you are proposing a 20 mph limit but no traffic calming in my road, whereas other roads have traffic calming that probably already ensure most traffic does less than 30 mph, I can only conclude that I am being discriminated against. This is clearly unequal treatment! I am disappointed that there has been no informal consultation, or public meeting / exhibition. Do I need to remind you about good practice in consultation:
1. to be undertaken when proposals are at a formative stage
2. include reasons for particular proposals to allow consultees give intelligent consideration & response
3. allow adequate time to consult
4. results must be conscientiously taken into account when the final decision is made
In my view you have not met 1. or 2., 3. is the absolute minimum you could have done, and 4. as the
consultation is flawed, then 4. won't happen. I dread to think of the cost of your work to date in officer time, materials, TMO processing, and the amount of time of my fellow residents you have spent responding to you. So I object to the proposed 20 mph limit, but would like a zone considered please if there is justification for it (Hint - why don't you consider it near the primary school on Eridge Road - ironically not currently traffic calmed and probably one of the locations that most merits its consideration!) As an industry professional I don't normally involve myself in these matters, but this is such a poor effort - particularly following a recent leaflet I received from your Chief Exec encouraging residents to get more involved in place shaping etc. - that I feel compelled to write. I will resist an FOI - but it would certainly be interesting to see copy of your dialogue with the Police. At least my ward Councillors have tried to make up for you with a letter drop - although Councillors I have to say that, given the items you bullet pointed in your letter, why did you let the project / consultation go ahead in the first place? Finally have there been any notices on lamp columns? I have seen none.

**Officers comment**

The Council is not legally obliged to undertake an informal consultation. Although, it is normal practice, there are occasions when the Council may decide not to undertake an informal consultation. A newsletter was distributed to all the premises in the consultation area. It detailed the Council's intentions and the undertaking of the formal consultation on the proposals and invited all to make representations. This was done in line with the decision made by the Cabinet Member. Within the same newsletter advice was given with regards to making representations with the closing date. The Notices were also erected on lamp columns in the area and published in the Local Guardian and the London Gazette. The documents were also available at the Civic Centre. This formed part of the Formal consultation. The fact that representations have been received, it can be considered that the Council succeeded in reaching the local community. The objector has forwarded a representation, which is being considered; the formal consultation between the Council and residents, has been carried out.

The letter newsletter made reference to the high number of measures required for a legal zone and the reasons a limit is being proposed. Majority of the roads within the area have traffic calming features in place and those, which do not traffic calming features, have parking on both sides of the carriageway that often act as speed reducing features. Due to time constraints, officers were unable to obtain the necessary data, however, if approved, it is proposed to undertake the necessary before and after speed and volume surveys that would allow officers to assess the effect of the proposals.

The proposals are in line with Merton’s commitment to reduce speed and accidents through 20mph zones and limits. It is believed that the proposals would complement the existing traffic calming measures and encourage drivers to drive at lower speeds and with due attention.

**22013086**

Lately we have all heard the sad state of the economy and recession and God knows we all feel it, yet the Council comes with the proposal to more roads (savagery) alterations. Which nobody asked for nobody needs them and nobody want. We heard rumours in the past of the existing humps being raked out and taken away, now you come to tell us you are going to put more of them; and even in the cul-de-sac roadway! My God you must love them a lot. But of course, the Council has the licence to print money, and the roads are as good a way as any to bury it.

**Officers comment**

There are no proposals to introduce further measures.

**22013004**

You mention that you have no information on traffic accidents in Merton Park, then one would conclude that there is no problem. Then why fix it if it ain't broke. It will put extra legislation against the public, at an extra cost to the council tax payer, and extra roadside clutter with the 20mph signs.

**Officers comment**

Due to time constraints, officers were unable to obtain the necessary data, however, if approved, it is proposed to undertake the necessary before and after speed and volume surveys that would allow officers to assess the effect of the proposals. The proposals are in line with Merton's commitment to reduce speed and accidents through 20mph zones and limits. It is believed that the proposals would complement the existing traffic calming measures and encourage drivers to drive at lower speeds and with due attention.

**22013049**

I am writing to make representation in relation to the above proposal. Guidance from DfT (Circular 5/99) states that: “Extreme caution should be exercised when considering making 20mph speed limits using speed limit signs with no supporting speed reducing features. The weight of evidence points strongly to signed only 20mph limits having little or no effect on traffic speeds”. In August 2006 DfT issued new...
guidance on speed limit setting (Circular 01/06) - this reiterated previous guidance related to 20mph speed limits and zones indicating that:

(a) 20mph Speed Zones should be predominantly used in urban areas, - both town centres and residential areas - and in the vicinity of schools. It is generally recommended that they be implemented over an area consisting of several roads.

(b) 20mph Speed limits should not be implemented on roads with a strategic function or on main traffic routes.

(c) 20mph speed limits should be used for individual roads or a small number of roads.

(d) Successful 20mph zones and limits should generally be self enforcing and 85 percentile traffic speeds should be no more than 24mph. 20mph limits are unlikely to be complied with on roads where speeds are substantially higher than this and unless such limits are accompanied by the introduction of traffic calming measures police forces may find it difficult to routinely enforce 20 mph limits.

The proposals for Merton Park are for a 20 mph limit, which has no traffic calming measures. It is therefore not self-enforcing. The proposals are therefore:

. Against DfT Guidance 5/99 in that there are no supporting speed reducing features.
. Against DfT Guidance 01/06 in that the proposals are for a large number of roads and are not self enforcing.

In addition, OfT Traffic Advisory Leaflet 09/99 states: "The police need to be consulted about a scheme, particularly where a 20 mph speed limit is proposed. If sufficient measures to reduce and control speeds are not installed, then the zones or limits will not be self enforcing and the police could be faced with calls upon their time to enforce the 20 mph speed limit". There is no information in the consultation literature about the view of the proposals taken by the Metropolitan Police. However, Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) Guidelines indicate that police forces are unable to enforce 20mph speeds limits due to limited resourcing and equipment type approval. ACPO therefore supports the stance that 20mph limits and zones should be self-enforcing. It therefore seems unlikely that the Police will support the proposals. It would therefore be unreasonable for Merton Council to proceed with a scheme that is not self-enforcing and which is for a large number of roads.

Officers comment

The proposals are in line with Merton’s commitment to reduce speed and accidents through 20mph zones and limits. It is believed that the proposals would complement the existing traffic calming measures and encourage drivers to drive at lower speeds and with due attention. Due to time constraints, officers were unable to obtain the necessary data, however, if approved, it is proposed to undertake the necessary before and after speed and volume surveys that would allow officers to assess the effect of the proposals.

It is believed that the proposals would complement the existing traffic calming measures and encourage drivers to drive at lower speeds and with due attention.

The police have been consulted and all their comments have been included and addressed in this report. All road markings and signage will be introduced in accordance with the regulations.

Comment

22012976 / 22013009

I read with interest the proposed plans to introduce a 20mph speed limit in our area. I have had the benefit of the speed humps in the road for as long as we have lived here. The current proposals, I doubt will make much difference to traffic on our road. Dorset Road, is widely used as a cut-through to avoid the South Wimbledon traffic light junction, and as a way to cut through onto Hartfield Road and thus into Wimbledon centre. As such it is a busy roads during rush our (early mornings and late afternoons). Being a car driver myself, I know that the speed humps do moderate speed, although with time, the speed humps erode and it is possible for cars to pick up considerable speed whilst steering across the edges of the humps. My primary concern, however, focuses on the large vehicles e.g. HGV and articulated lorries. Because of their wider wheel base, speed humps are ineffectual and I have been shocked at the speeds with which some drive up and down our road. What can be done to curb the excess speeds on our road of these larger vehicles?

Officers comment

The only type of traffic calming features, which would force drivers of HGV’s to reduce their speed, is road hump. However, in certain roads such as Dorset Road and Mostyn Road due to the nature and usage, roads humps cannot be introduced. Traffic speed enforcement is carried out by the Police, who have informed us that due to lack of resources and priorities, they would not be able to enforce limits. The proposals are in line with Merton’s commitment to reduce speed and accidents through 20mph zones and limits. It is believed that the proposals would complement the existing traffic calming measures and encourage drivers to drive at lower speeds and with due attention.
With reference to your Newsletter re 20mph zone Parkway area. I have owned my house in Southway for 59 years on the 31st December next. Naturally during this time transport has increased tremendously and most houses in Southway have at least one if not more, per family and consequently many are parked on either side of the road. This results in the narrowing of the road for all through traffic. At present there are humps in Parkway and consequently motorists morning and evening use the road and either turn right into Grand Drive or cross over Westway and through onto the A3. Many drivers are quite reckless and where some commercial vehicles are parked in the road they also make the space even narrower. On many occasions I have been alarmed at the speeds used without due care. I did notice recently just close to the entrance to Woodlands, cables stretched across Southway counting the traffic obviously part of the Council's investigations. Personally I am all in favour of the introduction of 20mph restrictions being introduced in this area and look forward to the final decision to be made known in due course. I would like to monitor the volume of traffic now using Grand Drive including tremendous heavy vehicles, some with fourteen huge wheels. When waiting for the 163 bus the ground virtually shakes and no wonder the surface gets damaged. I might add the road surface, together with the pavements are long overdue for repair work in Southway perhaps this might be accomplished during the coming period. In all the years I've lived here I cannot recall the road surface being renewed only patched up. Recently Elm Walk received wonderful new pavements. Councillor Williams Brierly happens to live at no ??!!

Officer’s comment
Comments noted and those relating to conditions of the road and footway will be forwarded to the maintenance team.

Residents in many of the streets in West Barnes have asked us to lobby the Merton Council for a twenty mph speed limit. Near misses between pedestrians and drivers, minor collisions between vehicles and damage to parked vehicles are regularly mentioned. From the Autumn of 2006 to Spring 2007, Merton Liberal Democrats carried out a door to door survey of residents in the TA polling district of West Barnes. The following questions were included: Are you worried about vehicles going too fast in your street? Would you like a 20 mph limit in your street? As well as being asked about their own street, residents could suggest other roads where they feel that vehicles go too fast. The table below summarises the results received.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>% Return of Survey</th>
<th>% Worried about speed</th>
<th>% in favour of 20mph limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnard Gardens</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnes End</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont Avenue</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blakes Terrace</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byron Avenue</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavendish Avenue</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claremont Ave (part nearest to Burlington Ave)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COBHAM Ave</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consfied Ave</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Errol Gardens</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley Ave</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Barnes Lane</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Such a short road that getting above 20mph would be difficult.

Our findings for the TA polling district were first reported to The Director of Street Management, on the 10th December 2006, followed by other letters. As you can see, there is great support for having 20mph speed limits. Although people living in cul-de-sacs, like Barnes End, did not feel the need for one in their own road they suggested the stretch of West Barnes Lane between Claremont Avenue and Blakes Lane (continuing on from the 20mph limit in RBK’s Blakes Lane). Members of the West Barnes Focus Team were told of narrow escapes from speeding vehicles and pets being run-over. Some parents are worried about letting their children walk to school. Elderly people also expressed worries about not being able to
Damage to cars (eg wing mirrors) was also mentioned, as were minor collisions between vehicles. One additional point was clearly made: speed cushions are no deterrent to motorcyclists or drivers of vehicles with a wide wheelbase. The longer streets might benefit from painted 20mph signs on the road or perhaps, the painted pretend humps, as used in Kingston. However, active policing with portable speed cameras will also be needed. Merton Liberal Democrats welcomes the introduction of 20mph limits in the borough, which will improve safety. However, we are disappointed that the TA area has not been included despite the wishes of so many residents. I look forward to hearing that the area will be soon be consulted.

**Officer’s comment**
Comments noted. Parkway area is being considered for a 20mph zone and consultation for this area ended on 26 September 2008. West Barnes area is also being considered for a 20mph zone with the area south of West Barnes Lane for a 20 mph speed limit.

22012459
I would like to support the introduction of a 20mph limit in the Parkway area. I walk my dog on the Common side of the road and cars avoiding going between the humps often drive dangerously close to the kerb. The fact that I suffer from a degree of deafness makes me feel insecure when vehicles travel at speed - often white vans. I think it is sad that so much money will need to be spent to achieve a 20mph limit. Would not signs be obeyed eventually?

**Officers comment**
Comments noted.

22012667
Merton Liberal Democrats asked residents in some streets their views in the Spring of 2007. Of those who responded to the survey, the greatest support came from 80% of Southway residents who were in favour of a 20mph zone.

I hope the zone is set up soon but would like to raise a number of issues:
- a) On the website and in the table in the leaflet, Elm Walk is incorrectly named Elm Park.
- b) The map shows blue lines on some of the roads, but their meaning is not explained in the key. I'll see if it is clearer on a hard copy at the library.
- c) I am fairly sure that Heath Drive also has speed cushions, as well as Parkway and Elm Walk.
- d) Residents in Heath Drive, Elm Walk and Parkway know that motorcyclists and drivers of vans and lorries are able to speed despite the cushions. Either further calming measures are needed, or the scheme will need regular speed checks by our SNT.
- e) It seems unnecessary to put cushions on the short section of Southway between Parkway and Heath Drive because drivers have already slowed at the junctions and because of the hill. Perhaps a table at the Elm Walk, Southway crossroads would be more effective.

You will also have received my letter about the TA polling district. In addition, there are other areas in the ward where our residents' surveys have identified a need for the lower speed limit:
- Seaforth Avenue 73% in favour of 20mph (32% survey return)
- Marina Ave 83% in favour (41% return)
- Westway, Linkway, Fairway which are used by commuters avoiding Grand Drive

**Officer comments**
Elm Walk being referred to as Elm Park in the table was a typing error. Also, we are aware that Heath Drive has traffic calming measures. The measures on Heath Drive, Parkway and Elm Walk will be investigated and issues raised will be addressed accordingly. The legal requirements for a 20mph zone necessitates traffic calming features as detailed in DfT guidelines on Southway. The legal requirements for a 20mph zone do not regard ‘give way’ as a traffic calming measure, since they are advisory.

22012727
I agree with the traffic calming proposals in Parkway area, as set out in your newsletter dated 29.08.2008. These measures are long overdue and should be implemented without delay.

**Officers comment**
Comments noted.

22012728
I write in support of the proposal to create a 20mph limit in the Parkway area. Your Newsletter of 29

www.merton.gov.uk
August does not make clear the difference between a 'limit' and a 'zone'. If, as I have been led to believe, a 'zone' as supposed to be 'self-monitoring' following the installation of calming measures, I would regard this as inadequate. We have had humps in Parkway for several years now and their effect on speeding is negligible. Young drivers, commercial vehicles and others not actually owned by the driver simply ignore them. They do however cause damage to the underside of vehicles, particularly the one opposite 84 Parkway where one regularly hears a crunch as a car goes over it, and create discomfort for elderly and disabled passengers when the cushion cannot be approached head on because of parked cars. I therefore support the 20mph proposal in principle but would prefer a limit to a zone.

Officers comment
The speed hump located within the vicinity of 84 Parkway would be investigated and if necessary measures would be taken to rectify it.

22012742
As a resident in Oakway with 2 young children I welcome any scheme that will make the surrounding roads safer. I would like to make you aware of one particular danger spot which we pass every day on our walk to school (St John Fisher, Grand Drive) Coming from Oakway we walk south along Grand Drive and have to cross Southway near the mini-roundabout. Here many cars driving southbound along Grand Drive turn into Southway without indicating, thus making this crossing very dangerous for pedestrians. I would welcome a speed cushion to slow down cars right at the beginning of Southway as well as a traffic island to allow pedestrians to stop halfway when crossing Southway. I would be grateful, if you gave my concerns careful consideration and included appropriate measures to improve safety for pedestrians at this particular crossing.

Officers comment
The proposed speed cushion in Southway exiting the mini roundabout would help reduce traffic speeds at this location, hence allow pedestrians to cross this section of the road safely.

AGAINST

22012404
This is a question about your reference in the proposal to sets of cushions. Some of us often refer to road humps and I appreciate there are different designs. Do you mean individual small humps, which come in pairs or threes, a single hump, which straddles the full width of the road, or do you mean a table? Also when you mention 2 sets do you mean two separate sets of humps, close together, within a few metres, but basically at the same location or are you referring to 2 different locations? I am concerned about the design you are going to use as there are some very large and steep types used in some locations. The concern is for the vibration damage to properties in a location where the road surface is not very stable due to underground streams. What sizes are you proposing to use? Personally as only 15% of the traffic is causing concern at the present speed limit I think these proposals are overkill. The sort of driver, usually young, who breaks the 30 mph limit is going to break the 20mph limit even more frequently, hitting those cushions hard and causing noise pollution, especially late at night. I would also point out that those of us who comply with the limit will all be driving our cars in lower gears than at present and that will use more fuel which is hardly a very environmentally friendly result!

Officer’s comment
The proposed speed cushions will be 1.7metres in width, 3.0 metres in length and 75mm in height. These are laid side by side. These are designed to minimise noise & vibration. Although 15% may exceed the speed limit; it often takes less than that to cause a severe accident. The council is being proactive in creating a safer environment for all road users.

22012680
I understand that Merton Council is planning to install road humps/speed cushions in Southway. I would like to say that in keeping with many thousand of other people in the UK I disapprove of these measures. They are not effective they create additional traffic engine pollution and noise. In addition they cause a lot of damage to vehicles. I understand local government pays out in access of £50 million per annum to damage costs to vehicle owners. I feel the London Borough of Merton should fellow the lead of other local authorities and remove all road humps. It can also be shown that they are responsible for ill health, brought about by traffic slowing and then accelerating, diesel engines especially producing black particulates into the air, and then taken into our lungs as we breathe the

Officers comment
Comments noted.
I write to object to these proposals on behalf of my mother, who lives in Southway. We do not consider that traffic movement in Southway has become significantly worse, or that vehicles travel more quickly following the introduction some years ago of speed humps etc in Parkway and Elm Walk. As such, unless there have been serious accidents during this time which we are not aware of, this proposal would appear to be a rather costly and over engineered solution to a non existent problem. The heavy on street parking in Southway acts as a considerable deterrent to potential speeding and we see no obvious reason why the Council should wish to impose speed cushions in this road. If however the Council is minded to proceed with these works, then we would urge that due consideration be given to siting the cushions so that they are not likely to obstruct existing vehicle crossovers, particularly as my mother is housebound and dependent therefore on visitors with cars being able to access easily the existing front garden parking.

Officers comment
Although it is acknowledged that parked vehicles have a speed reducing impact, it is not an approved mode of permanent traffic calming feature. Since 20mph zones must be self-enforcing, there must be physical measures to reduce speed. The locations of the proposed speed cushions will not obstruct / hinder parking or driveways.

I am writing to you to let you know that I am against the proposed traffic calming measures for Meadow Close and Southway. The whole immediate area is already full of cushions (bumps), min roundabouts and kerbs that stick out in all the wrong places. In heavy rainfall they cause a lot of standing water, which collects leaves, paper, and rubbish which in turn blocks the drains. There is no real problem with speeding in Meadow Close that would warrant the spending of money or cushions (road bumps). It would be better spent resurfacing the road. Meadow Close has a very poor surface - cracks etc. With the proposed new housing estates at the St Catherine's School site and Lessa sports ground the traffic in Grand Drive and surrounding area will grind to a vertical halt anyway.

Officers comment
These measures are required as part of the legal requirements for a 20mph zone.

I am writing in opposition to the proposed 20mph traffic zones in the Parkway area. I do not believe that the introduction of speed cushions in Southway and Meadow Close will make any difference to traffic speed. In fact, your own survey bears this out, since the speeds recorded in Parkway, which has speed cushions, are virtually the same as the speeds in Southway, which doesn't. These cushions certainly don't reduce the speeds of the majority of vans and trucks, as their wheelbase is wide enough to straddle the speed cushions without slowing down. If anything, the 'sleeping policeman' road hump is more effective, as proved by considerably slower recorded speeds in Elm Walk. I also believe that 20mph zones are unenforceable. I drive through Richmond Park daily, and the 20mph limit there is largely ignored, unless police are patrolling. Unless you propose cameras and police patrols in the area, I would not expect the 20mph zoning to make any difference. Although I live in Parkway, I accept that a certain amount of traffic will cut through from Grand Drive to Cannon Hill Lane using either Parkway or Elm Walk. Why deter drivers with speed restrictions and more cushions? At the present time Grand Drive is impassable for substantial periods of the day, and any alternative routes, which alleviate the weight of traffic on this main artery, should be encouraged. The scheme states a commitment to 'reduce traffic', but a better proposal would be to improve traffic flow in the area. This means less road furniture, more route options, and reconsideration of the layout of the major bottleneck in the area, the Beverley roundabout.

Officers comment
For an effective and enforceable zone, it is necessary to introduce the appropriate traffic calming features, signage and road markings.

Having lived with speed cushions within a few yards of our home for approximately 10 years I would not support further use of these methods of traffic calming for several reasons: The effect on the residents and their property:

1. Vibration - the presence of speed cushions remains a constant anxiety to us as our 100 year old house vibrates to a more or lesser degree almost every time any vehicle passes over the speed cushions. Heavy
vehicles, many of which use this road as a cut-through from 6.45am onwards, cause particularly violent effects.

2. Noise - The noise produced is very disturbing, both night and day, as vehicles accelerate after every cushion as they come up the road, the sound of heavy vehicles being particularly pronounced. In addition, many car drivers misjudge their vehicles' clearance, hitting the underside of their vehicles and causing sudden, extremely loud scraping sounds.

3. Pollution - The state of our curtains and windowsills (inside and outside) is testament to a noticeable increase in pollution since the cushions were installed. The effectiveness on the reduction of traffic speed: Your statistics show that these measures have failed to bring the speed of vehicles down to 20mph. Many heavy vehicles, particularly those, which are not owned by the driver -often rubbish collection vehicles -, are observed to drive much faster than 30mph.

Solutions
- One traffic-calming measure you do not mention in your first paragraph is speed signs. I have just retired and was about to write to the council anyway to try at least to get some more speed limit signs put along our streets. Many drivers are watching other traffic whilst they are turning into the road and do not see the signs right at the entry point. Suitable signs placed further along the road, particularly the newer type of sign, which is interactive with the oncoming vehicle, (lighting up to tell the driver that they are exceeding the speed limit), would help. Something like this would, in my view, make a significant difference in the case of Russell Rd, perhaps placed near St Mary's school. As far as Griffith Rd is concerned, one or two of these signs, together with one or two extra static signs around the connecting roads, should have a measurable effect on the road itself as well as on the whole area.

- The other obvious solution, which is not mentioned, is enforcement. Without this, all drivers will tend to go as fast as they think conditions will allow regardless of the council's efforts. Therefore there should be a visible police presence in some form in the area.

- Another measure, which could be helpful, is to require public service vehicles to display an easily visible number so that poor driving or speed violations could easily be reported.

We live in hope that the speed cushions in Russell Rd will eventually be removed and certainly do not support any additional measures anywhere, which cause this serious disruption of road surfaces.

Officers comment
For an effective and enforceable zone, it is necessary to introduce the appropriate traffic calming features, signage and road markings. Speed activated signs are not recognised as speed reducing features. These are only effective for a short period of time.

COMMENT

22012652
Thanks very much for speed survey done in Parkway and adjoining roads. I was very disappointed with the position where you took the measured speed in Parkway as that was at a point where traffic would either be slowing down or hadn't built up speed, depending on which way they were travelling. If you wanted to measure speed it would have to be taken half way along Parkway where lorries and large vans reach a speed well over 40. I am disappointed that you are not putting a width restriction in Parkway at the junction with heath Drive. As regards the 20 mph, what means are you going to have of checking vehicles speed? Are you going to put in cameras, if not this is all a waste of rate payers money. I would like to hear from you with some answers and comments on my suggestions.

Officer comments
Width restrictions cannot be considered as part of this scheme, but will be added to the future programme for investigation subject to available funding. The 20mph zones are self-enforcing, hence the proposed traffic calming measures, which are required as part of the legal process. If approved, to determine the effectiveness of the proposal, further surveys at key locations will be undertaken before and after the implementation of the proposals.

22012664
Parkway area
Ms ?? lives in Grand Drive, opposite the St. Catherine's site, and walks her dogs up and down Southway to and from Cannon Hill Common several times a day. As you will note from her e-mail, this presents a number of problems which I would be most grateful if you would pass on to the appropriate HOD's. On the 'calming cushion' front, is it really necessary to do this until the consultation re 20 mph for Southway (advertised in the 'Parkway Area' in Guardian 7.9) has been completed. The Association's members have been crying out for this for many months so I would think the consultation results for all the residential roads mentioned in this area would be positive. Members also relate that whatever kind of calming hump is used and however slowly they drive over them, they result in damage to the underside of...
their cars unless they are higher than most. We have noted on numerous occasions that lorry drivers in a hurry take no notice of them and bounce over them. The worst problem resulting from this is the vibration caused to houses near the centre island at the Southway/Grand Drive/Westway junction where some juggernaut drivers go straight over it and also the calming table at the junction of Cannon Hill Lane and Grand Drive (if drivers see a green light as they drive towards it). This is damaging to buildings' structure and wakes people up during the night. Surely humps/cushions on side roads such as Southway should be a secondary measure, only to be installed if residents don't support the 20mph limit or (if the do support it) if a survey, following the erection of 20 mph signs, does not demonstrate reductions in speed. While dealing with this matter, I should mention one particular 'hump' close to 72/78 Parkway which seems to be higher above the normal road surface than usual and has caused rather more damage to cars than some others. Is it possible for this 'hump' to be reduced in height?

Officer comments
The concept of having only one speed cushion in the middle of the road on Southway can be appreciated, however, the legal requirements does not permit this. The reason being that there must be a physical measure to reduce speed and not to rely on parked vehicles as a source of speed reducing measure. If there are no parked vehicles within the vicinity of the speed cushion (in the middle of the road), drivers would negotiate and avoid the speed cushions at a faster speed than they would when driving over it. We can consider one speed cushion in the middle of the road if a build-out is incorporated within the vicinity of the speed cushion. This would, however, result in the loss of parking spaces, which at presents is in high demand, and residents would not be in favour of this option. A formal consultation must be carried out prior to the introduction of any vertical deflection and change in the speed limit. The size of the speed cushions to be installed is 1.7 metres in width, 3 metres in length and 75mm in height. This height will reduce the grounding effect suffered by some vehicles and reduce noise suffered by residents. The speed reducing features within the area are required as residents are in favour of the 20mph zone (where calming features essential to satisfy the legal requirements) compared to the 20mph speed limit (where no physical measures are required). A major advantage of a 20mph zone over a 20mph speed limit is that the 20mph zone is self-enforcing whilst a 20mph speed limit would require the police to enforce. The road hump close to 72/78 Parkway will be investigated and the appropriate action will be taken if and when necessary.

22012672
I hope the council are just putting one cushion in the middle of the road in Southway. That is the only part of the road one can use at it seems to be a giant car park now. Also residents along Southway need to cut back their bushes as I have been scratched by holly, caught up by my hair on a rose bush and been hit in the face by a very wet bush. (Do not laugh.) They are all coming out 2 feet onto the pavement. Not to mention going through the maze of wheelie bins, recycling bins and a number of black sacks all put out on the pavement, Tues night, Wed morn. Plus people carriers too big to fit onto drives poking out onto the pavement. Am I the only pedestrian trying to walk along here?

Officers comment
The proposed cushion will be introduced in accordance with the regulation and in the absence of build outs it would not be possible to introduce a single cushion in middle of the road. Parked cars cannot be used as a permanent traffic calming feature. Comments will be forwarded to the appropriate department in the team.

22012886
I enclose a copy of your e-mail to one resident of the Raynes Park and West Barnes Residents Association about 20 mph ‘zones’ and road humps. I am told by Mrs B that there is great animosity by residents of Southway to humps because of potential damage to their cars. In your e-mail you indicate that legal regulations do not allow one cushion in the middle of the road unless a build-out is incorporated. Instead of introducing road humps in Southway, would it not be possible for the Council to consider using electronic speed signs indicating whether people are speeding or not by giving their mileage (as on Park side and the Ridgeway) or speed cameras? These have been shown to be more effective methods of speed control than road humps. I should welcome your comments on the matter.

Officers comment
This area is being considered a 20mph zone and not a 20mph speed limit and there are legal requirements, in terms traffic calming measures, which must be met. With 20mph speed limits, there are no legal requirements in terms of physical measures, other than the appropriate signs and road markings.
20mph zones must be self-enforcing, thereby necessitating the need for speed reducing features; these speed reducing features must be in line with the regulations and DfT guidelines. A build out should be incorporated if only one speed cushion is considered in the middle of the road. Although parked vehicles may reduce traffic speeds they are not classified as a permanent physical measure. In the event that there is no vehicle parked adjacent to a speed cushion drivers would negotiate around the cushion at a faster speed than they would if they were to drive over it and the objective of the measure would not be met. Southway does not satisfy the requirements for a speed camera. The criteria for speed cameras are set and installed by Transport for London and Metropolitan Police; additionally, cameras are maintained and enforced by the Police. Vehicle activated signs cannot be used as self-enforcing measures. Those on Ridgeway and Parkside were installed by the Council at the request/demand of ward councillors to alert drivers of their speed. These two roads are not within a 20mph zone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22012926</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Without speed cameras, vehicles will not observe the 20mph zone, whether or not there are speed humps. Despite these in Parkway, commercial vehicles regularly speed. There needs to be a ban on all commercial vehicles, lorries and vans, turning left on any streets on Grand Drive between 3.30pm - 6.30pm. Width restrictions would also be needed at other times.

**Officers comment**
Further investigations would have to be conducted for the lorry ban on all the side roads off Grand Drive. Width restrictions would be investigated in future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22012971</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
I am pleased to see that something is being considered to reduce traffic speed in our area and also pleased that Merton is looking at it as a 20mph limit rather than a zone thus eliminating the need to put in more humps. However, I am disappointed that the 20 mph limit is not going to extend onto Revelstoke Road. Because this Road is wide people travel at great speed down it. I think that this is extremely dangerous for several reasons. The many crossroads along the length of the Road with limited vision. If you are coming from the side turnings, due to parked vehicles means that you have to jut out into the road in your car to see if anything is coming. It would obviously be much safer if the traffic travelling along Revelstoke was moving slower. This is also a very busy Road with small children going to school and to the park. Again with limited visibility due to parked cars, it makes crossing the numerous roads very dangerous. We do have 2 nursery schools for under 5's on this Road as well. I think that the 20mph limit should be extended to Revelstoke Road. I know that this will be an issue as it is a shared Road with Wandsworth. But I think that some agreement should be able to be reached in order to make it safer for pedestrians, particularly children.

**Officer comments**
Revelstoke Road does not form part of the natural boundary in the Melrose Avenue Area and consultation with the London Borough of Wandsworth is also required. In order to avoid delaying the implementation of the proposed Melrose Avenue 20mph Limit Revelstoke Road would have to be considered separately for a 20mph limit or zone during the next compilation stage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22012972</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
I heartily support the 20mph Limit proposal. I would like to suggest that consideration be given to slowing traffic on Revelstoke Road. This is the widest and longest uninterrupted road on the grid. There are two nursery schools on Revelstoke Road (one at the junction with Heythorp Road and the other at the Durnsford Road junction) and an entrance to Wimbledon Park at one end. As a result Revelstoke Road has a tremendous * through put of parents with young children on foot and yet it is the single road on the grid where traffic can, and frequently does, travel at speeds greater than any of the areas where the 20mph Limit is proposed. Besides people speeding along the length of Revelstoke Road, many enter Wimbledon Park at unsafe speeds; again with the preponderance of young children in the park it is surprising that nothing is done to slow traffic in and out of Wimbledon Park. Speed humps or speed signs that flash a driver’s speed would be effective. *Our neighbour used to be a maternity clothes shop. When we moved here in 2001 the owner of the shop told us she chose the grid because it had the highest population of under 5’s in the whole of Europe. I heard this same statistic quoted on Radio 4 in 2006 during a programme on the availability of places for new starters at schools. Clearly calming traffic on the whole of the grid must be a priority to protect the many children that live here and Revelstoke Road, being...
a critical link road, the widest and longest road, must surely be appropriate for the implementation of speed restrictions. One final point, in 2003 road centre lines were marked on Revelstoke Road. These road markings are no longer straight' and are barely visible. Consequently drivers are regularly driving too near the centre and obstructing oncoming traffic, resulting in last minute adjustments to avoid collisions. All of the factors above increase the probability of a road accident, which might well involve a young child. Please do consider any and all preventative measures for Revelstoke Road.

Officer comments
Revelstoke Road does not form part of the natural boundary in the Melrose Avenue Area and consultation with the London Borough of Wandsworth is also required. In order to avoid delaying the implementation of the proposed Melrose Avenue 20mph Limit Revelstoke Road would have to be considered separately for a 20mph limit or zone during the next compilation stage.

22012973
I have lived in "area" for 22 years. The traffic is no calmer now than then, and I fear for people with children and animals as much now as then. Because there is little traffic from the Arthur Road end (which is one way) people feel free to speed up from Revelstoke towards Arthur Road, as they know from experience that only a few cars come the other way. So the one way section at the Arthur Road end has been a waste of money. The current traffic humps are not close enough to each other and permit cars to accelerate up to 50 before needing to slow down again. The bicycle marking encourage bicyclists to think they are safe - I have seen so many near misses (including nearly being hit by speeding bicyclists as a pedestrian). The humps at the intersections encourage pedestrians to cross there (as is their right) but are so mild that cars do not slow down, which is adding and not reducing to the danger. I am all in favour of a 20mph limit but how will you enforce it without making it into a 20mph zone? The current measures don't work and why should adding some speed limit signs? I see the raised crossing outside the mosque as a case in point. You could drive across at 50mph and it wouldn't be uncomfortable - I believe Merton spent £100,000 on that nonsense and I regularly see people drive past at well over 35mph (why have a hump warning when there's no hump?). Once you've driven across it once you know it's not worth slowing down for. There's nothing like lots of vicious road bumps or tooth-shattering rumble-strips to slow people down if you are serious! So let's have a 20mph zone please!

Officer comments
After implementation of the proposed 20mph limit, traffic volumes, speeds and accident statistics will be reviewed in order to determine the impact of the proposed measures.

22013014
I have seen notices stating that the Council proposes to introduce a 20mph speed limit to several streets, including Melrose Avenue and Braemar Avenue. I cannot find the proposal on the Council's website, however. As a resident "in the area" with two young children, I would like to support the proposal. I am often concerned by the speed at which cars and vans drive in this area. Visibility when crossing the roads, even at junctions, is poor, due to the fact that cars are parked on both sides of the roads. This is often exacerbated by cars parking on the single yellow lines at the junctions. I have even twice witnessed cars driving the wrong way down the part of Melrose Avenue, which is one-way. This makes it difficult to teach young children about crossing the road safely when it is often necessary to edge out between cars before you can see whether it is clear to cross. So, as pedestrian escorting young children, I would feel safer if cars were required to travel more slowly. As a driver in the grid streets, I would also support the proposal. I rarely drive above 20mph in any event, due to the risk of pedestrians stepping out. A reduced speed limit would help to reduce the risk of collision at junctions - the poor visibility described above makes it very difficult to pull out. I would also request that you encourage your neighbouring Council, Wandsworth, to consider introducing a similar limit to the other half of the "grid" streets, which are perpendicular to Revelstoke Road.

Officer comments: Comments noted.

22013060
As residents we wholeheartedly support the introduction of a 20 mph limit in the whole area as there are so many children and schools but hope this can be achieved with signs rather than the disruption of changing the roads and suggest they try that first.

Officer comments
Comments noted.

22013041
I write in full support of your proposals to set up a 20mph limit in the Melrose Avenue Area of SW19. My Husband and I are both fully in agreement with the introduction of the limit rather than the zone, as we believe it will be achieved without unnecessary expenditure – some reduction in traffic speeds. We do not believe further traffic calming measure e.g. Speed bumps, do any more than cause traffic to speed up in between, as well as increasing noise levels around the bumps. We have long believed an area of such high density housing, which is full of young children, should have a 20mph zone, and like many of our neighbours, believe this is the best way. We would hope you have spoken to the Wandsworth end of the ‘grid’ to try and co-ordinate the approach cross-borough. We did not write in support of an earlier proposal regarding parking and found it was rejected- whilst we fully supported it. Hence, this letter of support.

Officer comments
Comments noted.

22013141
I am writing in support of the proposed 20mph limit in the Wimbledon Park Grid. As a resident in the area for over 10 years I have long felt that some people drive much too fast along these very narrow roads. I do not support additional traffic calming, particularly not speed humps. They create noise and pollution and they have a very different effect on different vehicles - On the same hump some can travel at well over 30mph while others are kept below 20. A 20mph limit will need to be enforced or it will be ignored (plenty of people now drive at 40mph in the 30 limit). I suggest speed camera positions at each street, with a couple of moveable cameras that can be moved around at random. Alternatively the radar speed displays seem to slow most drivers down to the limit. I am in support of the limit, to make the streets safer and more pleasant, but it needs to be enforced.

Officer comments
Comments noted. This area does not have the accident history required to warrant speed cameras.

22013225
I am writing to object to the above proposed speed limit. Whilst I am not against the introduction of a 20 mph speed limit in this area, the proposed scheme fails to address the issue of higher traffic speeds on Revelstoke Road. The speed of traffic on most of the streets in this area is limited by fact that they are single lane between parked cars. Traffic on Revelstoke Road travels at higher speed as the width permits two lanes of traffic. Revelstoke Road is particularly busy with pedestrians (many of whom are with children) walking to and from Wimbledon Park and there are also two nursery schools on the street. Revelstoke Road is also more heavily trafficked than neighbouring roads with vehicles accessing the Park. As your Council was able to work with Wandsworth Council to provide an overlap between the two controlled parking zones that meet on Revelstoke Road, I would hope that you could also achieve a combined approach to implementing a 20 mph zone that includes Revelstoke Road. Without this, the scheme currently proposed is of little real benefit. The changes already proposed to the CPZ bays will reduce visibility for pedestrians crossing Revelstoke Road, and an effective scheme to reduce the speed on this road would provide a real benefit on what is the most hazardous road in the area. Such an approach would also reduce the clutter of street signs with signs only at the junction of Revelstoke Road with Merton Road/Durnsford Road.

Officer comments:
Revelstoke Road does not form part of the natural boundary in the Melrose Avenue Area and since Revelstoke Road is the borough boundary border consultation with the London Borough of Wandsworth is also required. In order to avoid delaying the implementation of the proposed Melrose Avenue area 20mph Limit, Revelstoke Road would have to be considered separately for a 20mph limit or zone during the next compilation stage, subject to available resources and funding.

22013209
I am writing in support of the reduction of speed limits to 20 mph in the Wimbledon Grid area but to express serious concerns about the omission of Revelstoke Road from the proposed new speed limit restrictions. Revelstoke Road runs directly into the eastern car park of Wimbledon Park, which is very popular with families and small children. As Revelstoke Road is twice the width of most other roads on the Wimbledon Grid cars tend to drive faster than on other roads nearby. I have witnessed a number of close incidents, involving cars driving too fast whist accompanied or unaccompanied children are crossing the road, and think it is no exaggeration to say that the extension of the revised speed limit to cover this road could be life saving. May I urge you to give this matter your urgent attention and to assist in getting the speed limits changed, and the scheme extended to include Revelstoke Road.

Officer comments:
Revelstoke Road does not form part of the natural boundary in the Melrose Avenue Area and since Revelstoke Road is the borough boundary border consultation with the London Borough of Wandsworth is also required. In order to avoid delaying the implementation of the proposed Melrose Avenue area 20mph Limit, Revelstoke Road would have to be considered separately for a 20mph limit or zone during the next compilation stage, subject to available resources and funding.

**AGAINST**

**22013234**

Police would object to the proposal, as we do not believe it to be legally signed. There is no proposed traffic calming, as we believe is necessary to create a zone, and there is no indication that there will be any repeater signs as required to sign a 20mph limit. The only signing appears to be a zonal entry style signing, which is in keeping with a 20mph zone, but not the proposed limit. Police are also somewhat curious as to why the need is felt to let traffic entering Melrose Avenue from Arthur Road, contrary to the “No Entry” signs, that they are limited to 20mph? Indeed, police feel that signing the speed limit in this manner may actually encourage people to contravene the No Entry restrictions; as if they can see a sign explaining the new speed limit to them then they might not unreasonably consider that they can drive down Melrose Avenue in that direction. Finally we note that whilst the eastern end of Ryfold Road is shown within the 20mph limit on the plan and listed in the schedule, there appears to be no intention to sign the road to that effect.

Officer comments:

After implementation of the 20mph limit traffic volumes, speeds and accident statistics will be collected in order to determine the impact of the proposal. If necessary further traffic calming measures will be investigated. With regards to the need for repeater signs these will be installed where necessary in accordance with the regulations. The signing of Melrose Avenue from Arthur Road shall only include an exit sign showing the increase in speed to 30mph on Arthur Road. A speed limit entry or exist sign is not required at Ryfold Road as there is no access from Durnsford Road.

**COMMENTS**

**22013250**

London Borough of Wandsworth

Thank you for your email of 23rd September 2008 sent to ?? and attachments, regarding the above proposed scheme. I have the following comments to make regarding these proposals.

(a) It would appear from your proposals that the 20 mph limit is not proposed for Revelstoke Road. Please confirm that this is the case. This Council would object to Revelstoke Road being included in a 20mph limit, on the basis that recorded vehicular speeds are not below 24mph and that traffic calming would need to be implemented to help reduce speeds. You may be aware that our Executive has approved a London Cycle Network scheme to introduce traffic calming measures along Revelstoke Road, subject to the outcome of consultation. We have undertaken consultation with Merton Council on these proposals and it would appear that there are concerns that would need to be resolved to progress this further. In light of your proposals for this 20mph limit adjacent to Revelstoke Road, I would welcome the opportunity to discuss our proposals for Revelstoke Road with the appropriate officers at Merton. I will contact you next week to discuss this issue.

(b) Do you have vehicular speed survey information available so that we can understand and comment on how you intend on implementing a 20mph limit in the surrounding roads.

(c) From my understanding it is a statutory requirement for a 20mph limit to have regular repeater signing in accordance with paragraph 11 of the Traffic Sign Regulations and General Directions 2002. The Council has also received guidance from our local Police representative regarding the signing of 20mph limits. This states that repeater signs need to be erected. Therefore can you please confirm that additional repeater signs will be installed at regular intervals in accordance with the regulations?

(d) Is this proposal part of an area wide or borough wide Council initiative to introduce 20 mph zones in Merton? You will be aware of the Mayor’s recent statement regarding “blanket” 20 mph speed limits/zones in London.

(e) How would any approved works associated with these new speed limits be funded? I await your response to these comments and will contact next week regarding the issue outlined in (a). However if you require any clarification of the points made then please contact me.

Officer comments:

The below comments have been made in regards to the each part of the response.

a) Revelstoke Road is not included within the Melrose Ave Area scheme. However, Revelstoke Road
is being considered separately for a 20mph Zone/Limit. A liaison meeting shall be held with LB Wandsworth to progress this matter further and independently of the proposed Melrose Ave speed limit area.

b) No vehicular speed surveys have been conducted, but these shall be complete before and after the implementation of the proposed scheme, after which the impact shall be reviewed to determine whether or not further traffic calming features are required.

c) Repeater signs will be installed where necessary in accordance with the regulations.

d) This proposal is in line with Merton’s commitment to reduce speed borough wide, particularly on existing traffic calmed roads.

e) The scheme is council funded.

**MERTON HALL ROAD AREA**

**SUPPORT**

**22013048**

I am writing to give my warm support to the proposal to introduce a 20mph zone in this area. Among the many arguments in favour are the following:

1. the presence of the schools in this area (particularly junior schools)
2. the growing number of crèches and playschools in the vicinity
3. the location of Dundonald Park attracting families with young children
4. the use of some roads in this area (e.g. Henfield Rd) as cut through routes, particularly when Kingston Road traffic is heavy. Many drivers are using excessive speed with little or no care for young children along these cut through routes.

Concern among residents that the behaviour of some motorists will cause bad accidents
Concern that cyclists will likewise be hurt

In short this is a good proposal and I know I speak for other residents in this block of flats in supporting this scheme. It is of course vital that the scheme have proper traffic calming measures to enforce it.

**Officer comments:**

Before and after the implementation of the proposed 20mph limit traffic volumes, speeds and accident statistics will be undertaken to assess the proposal. If necessary further traffic calming measures shall be investigated subject to available funding.

**22013062**

I would like to say how pleased I am that a 20mph speed limit has been proposed for Merton Hall Road and surrounding area. The only problem I can see for the future is that no one will take notice of the speed restrictions in the first place as people do not take any notice at present. The road is used as a rat run by all and the level of traffic coming down Merton Hall Road to the Kingston road is constant as it is going towards Dundonald Road. I would like to know if a proposed one way system would be to an advantage to this area making Merton Hall Road one way would slow the traffic down and push the traffic on to the main road leaving Merton Hall road and surrounding roads rat run free. as we have a School and a College / kinder garden and shops. I believe this would make the whole area a much safer.

**Officer comments**

Before and after the implementation of the proposed 20mph limit traffic volumes, speeds and accident statistics will be undertaken to assess the proposal. If necessary further traffic calming measures shall be investigated subject to available funding.

**22013057**

Thank you for your newsletter 26 September 2008. It makes the proposals very clear. I readily support the proposals with one condition that the redundant traffic calming features are removed in the five roads. I know only too well there are two other areas that are screaming for your attention:

1. The junction of Kingston Road and Lower Downs Road. This is chaotic especially when the pedestrian crossing is open. Two-way traffic is anticipated at the southern end of Burstow Road but this never happens because of vehicles always parked on the western side. There is always a fight for the remaining stretch of road. If the double yellow lines were extended north just a little on the west side it would give traffic entering Burstow Road more of a refuge and encourage them to look down the road (which of course they should do anyway) before charging down it. As for the junction itself, just try driving north up Kingston Road and getting into Burstow Road in the rush hour. It is murder. Two possible improvements:-
   a) a roundabout.
   b) traffic lights phased with the pedestrian crossing.
2. parking in the stretch of Toynbee Road between Burstow Road and Lower Downs Road. This causes perpetual difficulties and should be stopped by double yellow lines.

**Officer comments:**
All comments have been noted and will be added to programme for future investigation subject to funding and consultation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22013088</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We write to support your proposals to introduce 20mph speed limits as proposed in your consultation document relating to the Merton Hall Area. We write as residents and as parents. The area in question (and in particular Dundonald Road) has three features which make slower speeds particular important: (a) the presence of a local infant school (and also nurseries close by on Dundonald Road); (b) a large park (Dundonald Park) with sports facilities, swings and which attracts lots of children; and (c) many local families with young children. The combination of these factors mean that many children will cross the roads in the area (particularly those next to the park) often independently, potentially running to or from the park or school. Children may wrongly feel there are no risks on such short and everyday trips. The roads themselves are not wide, and visibility is often impinged by cars parked on the side of those roads. These factors mean that I am anxious that children are potentially at risk of road traffic accidents. I would take further comfort from the existence of a 20mph zone. I therefore support the existing traffic calming features and believe that it is wholly appropriate to give these practical speed limiting factors legal support in the form of a 20mph speed limit. Given the conditions, no car should be going above that speed. However, some drivers still do - and the traffic calming measures do not make this impossible. I would also support, if the council were minded, the deployment of safety cameras - either on a permanent or occasional basis - to monitor compliance with the speed limit. If, for example, this were considered too intrusive there are other measures - e.g. read-outs displaying drivers' speeds (such as are used elsewhere in Merton) - which might increase drivers’ awareness of their speed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Officer comments:**
Comments noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22013223</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I write to say I support the TMO for 20mph limit. I think it will make the area safer for children and families. (I feel all residential roads should have 20 mph as the limit by default.) I would also like to propose/ask: - What about making some of the roads at southern part of Dundonald one way (Merton Hall Road + Wilton Crescent (as far North as Avebury Road), and Cliveden and Rayleigh). - What about (after making them one way), making the parking bays at an angle (say 45deg) to the pavement rather than along the pavement. This would allow more cars to fit in. (This could be applied also Chatsworth Avenue.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Officer comments**
Comments noted. Any additional investigation must be considered within a future programme subject to available funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22013199</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Further to your Newsletter regarding the proposed 20mph limit around the Merton Hall Road area. We think this a good idea on the whole, although we can’t see it making any great different whatsoever down Toynbee Road, we have spoken with some of our neighbours and the overall feeling is the same. There are so many cars parked down Toynbee Road, mainly by commuters and students from the Art College on Merton Hall Road, that between the hours of 8am-10am and 3pm-6pm the traffic is at a virtual standstill (as highlight in yellow on the map). The pink highlighted part is the part of the road where cars will travel at such speed to try and beat the traffic on the main Toynbee Road. We live on this stretch and it so very dangerous, with cars often mounting the pavement to avoid on coming speeding traffic. Toynbee Road used to be a pleasant road to live in, we have lived here for 25years, over the last few years is has changed so much, mainly down to the traffic and parking situation we have to put up with. Some homeowners on many occasions can’t actually get out of their drives due to the parked cars. On a daily basis the noise and air pollution down this relatively short road is unacceptable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Officer comments**
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Many thanks for your newsletter entitled ‘Proposed 20mph Speed Limit, Merton Hall Area’. My wife and I are very in favour of your 20mph Speed Limit proposal. Indeed we have been asking our local MP for such a measure for many years. Is there any intention for this 20mph limit to be extended to Lower Downs Road? We strongly feel that this would be beneficial as many vehicles do speed down the road, which is unsafe generally but also specifically because of the number of families (including our own) that live on this road. In addition, many pupils from neighbouring schools use this road every day when going to and from school. I would be very much in favour of extending the 20mph limit to cover Lower Downs Rd. Could you let me know if there is any intention of doing this in the future?

**Officer comments**

Lower Downs Road does not form part of the natural boundary in the Merton Hall Road Area. This road shall be considered at the next compilation stage subject to available funding.

We are residents (home-owners) in Mayfield Road, Wimbledon, and this email is to express our strong support for the plans to reduce the speed limit in our area to 20mph. Furthermore, we agree with your approach of sign-posting the new limit, without installing road bumps at this stage. In the future, all of us can assess the success of the initiative and determine whether further traffic calming is needed.

**Officer comments**

Comments noted. Before and after the implementation of the proposed 20mph limit traffic volumes, speeds and accident statistics will be undertaken to assess the proposal. If necessary further traffic calming measures shall be investigated subject to available funding.

I heartily endorse the speed limit introduction. There are two schools, an art college, a very well used park and 3 nurseries in this vicinity. In addition, with many houses, there are an abundance of families with young children. Speed reduction will aid all residents but in particular the younger ones who are yet to understand the need for road safety. On Merton Hall Gardens, cars speed at more than 20 mph. Local residents suggest that a speed table in established outside 11 to 13 Merton Hall Gardens where the road meets The Quadrant. By doing this, cars will reduce their speed before swinging into The Quadrant and slow down on Merton Hall Gardens. This is very important as the two roads form a cul-de-sac and children have an unrealistic sense of safety. The table will actively reduce speed and give children a real sense of safety. The table is supported by many residents in both roads who have approached me on this matter. I hope you acquiesce to this request.

**Officer comments:**

Comments noted. The request for a speed table at the northern junction of Merton Hall Gardens and The Quadrant shall be considered during the next compilation stage and subject to funding and the consultation process.

Thank you for the newsletter regarding proposals for the 20mph area, we are in complete agreement with this proposal but would like to see calming measures other than sleeping policemen as these cause considerable damage to cars over a period of time. We have enclosed additional proposals to ease traffic flow and make the area safer for all. These are for a one way system in part of Merton Hall Gardens and the whole of The Quadrant. Two way traffic is causing difficulties for all residents as there is insufficient room for two way traffic. The access part of Merton Hall Gardens would remain two way. The second proposal for another one way system would put a stop to the severe log jam caused by commuter parking in Toynbee Road and Burstow Road and it could also incorporate a roundabout at the Kingston Road, Burstow Road and Lower Downs Road which would improve the traffic flow.

**Officer comments:**

Comments noted. The implementation of a one way system would require an area wide investigation whereby the impacts on neighbouring roads can be determined. This would be subject to available funding and the consultation process. One-way systems often result in higher traffic speeds and a potential increase in accident and severity.
I have received your newsletter concerning the proposed 20mph speed limit in the Merton Hall Road area.

While a speed limit is to be welcomed, this does not address a major problem, particularly at peak hours morning and evening in Toynbee Road. I live at No. 25, in the section between Lower Downs Road and the Burstow Road mini-roundabout and this section of the road is only wide enough for two cars. As there are always some cars parked on one side of the road, at peak hours, with cars coming in both directions, there are often no spaces for cars to go into to give way to traffic coming the other way, so gridlock ensues. Perhaps a possible solution would be to make this section of Toynbee Road one-way, doing the same with Burstow Road. Another gripe - cars can park much too close to the Lower Downs Road end of Toynbee Road. It is a very tight junction and very busy at peak times.

Officer comments:

Commented noted. The implementation of a one way system would require an area wide investigation whereby the impacts on neighbouring roads can be determined. This would be subject to available funding and the consultation process. One-way systems often result in higher traffic speeds and a potential increase in accident and severity. The provisions of parking restriction will be investigated outside these proposals and these would be subject to Cabinet Member approval and a formal consultation.

22013219

I would be in favour of the 20mph zone around the Merton Hall Road (SW19) area.

Officer comments

Comments noted.

AGAINST

22013204

The council’s ‘Statement of Reasons’ continues but one reason; why is this so? Said reason refers to ‘vulnerable road users’; this is unnecessary to mention, as all road users are vulnerable. Are there any that are not? Why is there a need to improve road safety in this particular area? Have the actual advocates of this proposed scheme any solid evidence with which to back up the apparent desire for a lower speed limit? For example, has there been a strong call from local residents for this action? Furthermore, are there any accident figures to back up the proposals? As far I know, none of the local people have been consulted at all. In my view the proposed scheme is unnecessary.

Officer comments

The proposal is inline with Merton’s commitment in reducing speed, accidents and severity of accidents through 20mph zones and speed limits. Before and after the implementation of the proposed 20mph limit traffic volumes, speeds and accident statistics will be undertaken to assess the proposal. If necessary further traffic calming measures shall be investigated subject to available funding.

22013047

I am writing in response to the proposed Merton 20mph Speed Limit Order – Merton Hall Road Area. I am only aware of one issue that needs attention, namely vehicles speeding down Avebury Road. I believe that a much cheaper, lower maintenance and more effective solution than the blanket 20mph requirement on 26 roads in the area is imply to add road humps to this one road.

Officer comments:

Comments noted. The proposal is inline with Merton’s commitment in reducing speed, accidents and severity of accidents through 20mph zones and speed limits. Before and after the implementation of the proposed 20mph limit traffic volumes, speeds and accident statistics will be undertaken to assess the proposal. If necessary further traffic calming measures shall be investigated subject to available funding.

22013221

Whilst I am totally in favour of any implementation to enhance road and pedestrian safety in all areas, I cannot endorse your proposals as they stand until other factors are actioned and adopted. Will you or your team look again at Toynbee Road and in particular the stretch between the railway bridge and Lower Downs Road? To the west of the bridge there are central bollards and road dividing hatched markings. I believe it is contrary to the highway code and other traffic ordinances that vehicles are permitted to be parked in such locations whether such parking is on the road or partially on the pavement. Such is an every day occurrence both by non-residents private cars and in some instances commercial lorries. There is presently no enforcement of what is illegal although I have it in writing from an authority that pavement
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parking is condoned!!! Further to the west, at most times it is almost impossible to negotiate the road due again to haphazard parking on both sides of the road. Kindly observe between 8am and 9am in particular. I realise that to solve this problem is not easy but the majority of vehicles so parked are not residents of the area. You do have provisions to eliminate this. When the foregoing has been sorted out then your proposals for speed calming humps, 20mph limits can be looked at. Then it is as with most things very simple to legislate but how will such be implemented? I presume there will be signage but how will such be enforced? Policing? Cameras? I do not think so. Therefore until the issue has been really thought through so that effective measures are taken, I consider the initial proposal to be ineffective and sorry to say another costly action to justify that something is being done. Once the matters that I have highlighted have been implemented your proposal will have my fullest endorsement provided that such can be enforced.

Officer comments:
Comments noted. The proposal is inline with Merton’s commitment in reducing speed, accidents and severity of accidents through 20mph zones and speed limits. Before and after the implementation of the proposed 20mph limit traffic volumes, speeds and accident statistics will be undertaken to assess the proposal. If necessary further traffic calming measures shall be investigated subject to available funding.
Other traffic issues raised would require the appropriate investigations within a future programme subject to available resources.

22013104
Further to your newsletter with regard to the proposed 20mph speed restrictions in the Merton Hall Road Area, I have the following comments. I agree that a 20mph zone should not be imposed. However, I disagree that a 20mph limit should be imposed. Please not that I work during business hours outside of Wimbledon, hence I have not had a chance to read the reason’s the Council want to impose the speeding restrictions. If there have been fatalities in the area as a result of traffic moving at 30mph, please ignore this letter. My reasons for objection are as follows:
• I do not believe that vehicles move at an unsafe speed. When driving in the area over the last few days, I found that I was driving in the 20-25mph bracket, depending upon the road and various conditions that I deemed was safe.
• As a pedestrian, I often walk down the middle of the road on Wilton Grove due to its increase openness and that I don’t feel any traffic will pose a danger to me.
• Unfortunately the country is moving in recessionary times. I do not want my council spending money where it is not essential. I believe they should be seeking to reduce taxes and to me this is one area where it can be done.
• I note that money has already been allocated and I would not accept this as an argument to continue with the proposal.
I hope my comments are of use.

Officer comments:
Comments noted. The proposal is in line with Merton’s commitment in reducing speed, accidents and severity of accidents through 20mph zones and speed limits. Before and after the implementation of the proposed 20mph limit traffic volumes, speeds and accident statistics will be undertaken to assess the proposal.

22013201
I wish to strongly object to the proposed introductions of a 20mph speed limit in the road in which I live and the surrounding area. I do not see any need whatsoever for this speed limit. These roads are quiet and I can’t see how traffic calming will add any benefit to mine or anyone else’s lives and I object to the restriction it imposes on me. Also, the lower limit will only add to congestion around edges of the zone. I find it incredible how much council tax has increase over the last few years. We are all feeling the pinch so it is irresponsible for the council to spend our money restricting our day to day lives unnecessarily. Find some really valuable projects to spend the money on. Get resident playing a lot more sport for example and invest in the infrastructure and coaching needed to do that.

Officer comments
Comments noted. The proposal is in line with Merton’s commitment in reducing speed, accidents and severity of accidents through 20mph zones and speed limits. Before and after the implementation of the proposed 20mph limit traffic volumes, speeds and accident statistics will be undertaken to assess the proposal.
I refer to your proposal to introduce a 20mph speed limit in the above area, in which I am a resident. I wish to express in the strongest terms my objection to the introduction of such a limit, for the following reason:

- There is absolutely no necessity whatsoever for the introduction of a reduction in speed limit. I frequently pass from one end of the zone to the other on foot and by bicycle (being my main modes of transport in the local area) and I have never had occasion to feel unsafe or have been troubled by the speed or behaviour of any drivers. Neither can I or any of the neighbours I have spoken to recall any traffic accident in the planned zone. I am unable to envisage what benefit such an additional and unwanted restriction on our lives will bring.

- On the basis that there is no necessity for such a zone, I strongly object to the use of local taxpayers’ money, including my own, in implementing a scheme where I can perceive no tangible benefit whatsoever to the residents or to the wider community.

- As a resident, I consider that of far greater priority is the reduction of points of congestion in the area. Having large amounts of near stationary traffic creating fumes, combined with the associated frustration of drivers, is far more noxious and hazardous in my experience than having a car drive freely at 30mph past my house.

- In this regard, there are only three points where there is vehicular access to cross the railway line between Wimbledon and Raynes Park (Wimbledon itself, Rayne Park and Lower Downs Road). The access at Lower Downs Road is only single file under the railways bridge. This, combined with all the speed bumps along Toynbee Road has the result of creating a large amount of congestion and standing traffic at peak times. It particularly affects the Lower Downs Road/Kingston Road junction close to my home and is very unpleasant. Making Toynbee Road subject to a 20mph limit will only aggravate this problem still further.

- There are similar congestion problems all the way along Kingston Road, which are equally unpleasant for bus users and pedestrians as motorists. I have to say that in the past, Merton’s traffic management schemes have been in some areas counter productive in terms of congestion, so I believe congestion reduction could be a real area of focus and benefit for the whole community.

All the above is to say that I urge in the strongest terms that, in these times of present and future austerity for Merton residents that the authority prioritises schemes of clear value and benefit to the community and residents. This would have my strong support, rather than the roll out of a policy, which brings unwanted restrictions to many with no tangible benefit to anyone. I understand that the Mayor of London is only supportive of such 20mph zones where the residents are in favour, so I will forward a copy of this letter to him as well as my local ward councillors.

Officer comments:

Comments noted. The proposal is inline with Merton’s commitment in reducing speed, accidents and severity of accidents through 20mph zones and speed limits. Before and after the implementation of the proposed 20mph limit traffic volumes, speeds and accident statistics will be undertaken to assess the proposal. If necessary further traffic calming measures shall be investigated subject to available funding.

I am in support of reducing speeds in the roads covered by this proposal, particularly in light of the fact that there are two primary schools and a park within the area. However, I have concerns over the proposed choice of solution. Your letter explains that there are two ways in which this could be done – a 20 mph zone or a 20 mph limit, and that your proposal is for a limit. I appreciate that this is the cheaper solution, but I was very disappointed that your letter did not make any comment on the comparative effectiveness of the two approaches. I understand that the limit will make it illegal to travel faster than 20 mph and that drivers will be informed of this by signposts. However, there does not seem to be any provision made for the enforcement of this limit, therefore I am not convinced that this is an effective approach. Although more expensive, I would prefer to see alterations to the street design to encourage drivers to travel more slowly. Not only would this be effective without the need for enforcement, but it would give the opportunity to incorporate features to benefit modes such as walking and cycling. (For example, the shopping parade at the end of Merton Hall Road would benefit from cycle parking. I have in the past had to tie my bike to the road sign as I could not find a suitable place to secure my bike near there, which is not ideal.) It also would not introduce more ‘street clutter’ in terms of signage. It would have been helpful to have some more detail in the consultation material. What is the current average
speed on the roads in question? What is the average speed at the times of day when children are more likely to be around? I noticed traffic counters were down in Merton Hall Road for a few weeks - how many cars use that road? How many accidents have happened in these streets over the last few years? The letter mentioned that this was part of a borough-wide policy. How effective have similar measures been in other areas? Although I am support of making roads safer for children and of encouraging walking and cycling, and I appreciate that reducing vehicle speeds is one way to do this, I do not support this proposal. I feel that the decision is being made on the grounds of cost and being able to ‘tick a box’ against a transport policy commitment, rather than effectiveness. I trust you will take my views into account in coming to your decision and hope that you will improve the proposal.

**Officer comments:**

Comments noted.

22013200

I fully support the Council reducing vehicular speeds, per the Newsletter dated 26 September 2008 and citing reference above. My reasons are that I ought to result in a reduction of speeds, injuries and noise levels in our local area. I have witnessed vehicles driving at excessive speed in Wilton Crescent and its surrounding, despite speed bumps. I am aware that pedestrians are likely to overestimate speeds, but even allowing for that, 40mph is not uncommon. My wife was once almost hit (and could have been seriously injured or killed) at the Wilton Crescent/Fairlawn Road/Avebury Road junction due to a vehicle driving at excessive speed and cutting the corner on the wrong side of the road. High noise levels, particularly due to large commercial vehicles taking speed bumps fast, or cars grounding on the road surface after crossing the bump, occur regularly and often at unsociable hours.

**Concerns.**

By introducing a 20mph speed limit (as opposed to a zone), you seem to imply that traffic calming will be dispensed with. Hence the limit would Have to be enforced by other means. In light of the points listed above, my concern is that maximum traffic speeds will in fact rise rather than be reduced. What measures will be introduced to police it and ensure enforcement?

**Representation.**

I would urge the Council to reconsider and propose a 20mph zone, with calming measures, rather than a 20mph limit.

**Officer comments**

Due to the number of features necessary for a legal zone, it was considered appropriate to consider a limit. Before and after the implementation of the proposed 20mph limit traffic volumes, speeds and accident statistics will be undertaken to assess the proposal. If necessary further traffic calming measures shall be investigated subject to available funding.

22013233

Thank you for your letter of 26th September and the accompanying plans in relation to the above-mentioned proposal. Police would make the following observations. The first observations, in general terms, is that police do not object to 20mph speed limits in residential areas provided that they are legally signed and installed in accordance with DfT guidelines. The second observation we would make is that these 20mph zones and limits should be self-enforcing. Should it be found that the proposals do not bring about the expected lower speeds, police would expect further measures to be added to achieve the necessary speed reduction. Speed enforcement in these areas will not be a police priority. As regards the proposals for these area, police would object to both in their current form, as we do not believe it to be legally signed, and because we have grave concerns about the wisdom of such a layout. A number of roads in both proposed areas have existing calming, so adding to this would easily create a zone. The proposal appears to be to sign zonally so there needs to be some additional traffic calming to make this lawful. However the proposal is for a 20mph limit, apparently without repeater signs, and so therefore no legal. This is bad enough in itself, but to sign a 20mph speed limit in areas so rich in existing calming will only serve to add confusion to existing zones where there are no such repeater signs. If the proposal is to achieve its intention as described in the statement of reasons then police believe it needs to be better designed; as it stands it is, in our opinion, halfway between two stools and as such we feel it is unlikely to achieve its stated aims, and could well drag other existing zones into disrepute.

**Officer comments:**

The proposal is inline with Merton’s commitment in reducing speed, accidents and severity of accidents
through 20mph zones and speed limits. Before and after the implementation of the proposed 20mph limit traffic volumes, speeds and accident statistics will be undertaken to assess the proposal. If necessary further traffic calming measures shall be investigated subject to available funding. With regards to the need for repeater signs these will be installed where necessary in accordance with the regulations.

22013256

I wish to convey my objection to the above scheme. I feel that the scheme is unnecessary and a waste of money. Does anyone ever get to drive over 20mph in these roads? Traffic is so slow. I rather doubt it. Can you give details of accident rates in these areas – are they above average in order to warrant these measures? How will the new speed limit be enforced? Will the council be plaguing the streets with yet more speed cameras? I do think there must be so many more worthy causes that could use the funding allocated to this project. As a resident, I can assure you that a 20mph speed limit will do little to improve ‘the quality of my life’.

Officer comments:

Comments noted. The proposal is inline with Merton’s commitment in reducing speed, accidents and severity of accidents through 20mph zones and speed limits. Before and after the implementation of the proposed 20mph limit traffic volumes, speeds and accident statistics will be undertaken to assess the proposal. If necessary further traffic calming measures shall be investigated subject to available funding.

COMMENT

22013058

You may recall we corresponded a while back - I believe my last letter was to congratulate you on the CPZ removing so many cars (moving & parked) from the road that children were once again able to play in it. Well I’m sorry to report that that’s all changed again. So what’s the remedy? A good cure would be to show each driver a map, to show the road goes nowhere, or even draw them a simple triangle; but yes, implementation would be hard and probably unsuccessful. Humps or obstructions would be hardly the answer, and I see no sensible reason why residents should be inconvenienced and have their own cars damaged in this way. Also they cause their own noise problems as vehicles either skate over them or accelerate between them. So, short of closing the road a speed limit seems the best if not only solution in so many ways (here I add that I’ve not polled residents and barely discussed it); residents are hardly likely to mind - except for the signage - and anyway most don’t have time to reach much speed from their house to the end of the road. Frankly I reckon 20 is too high, it’s so easily broken and is anyway quite fast. 10 would be best, though I suppose it is a hard speed to keep to, so a limit of 15 mph would seem sensible and I wonder if you have any views on all this. Yes I do realise the "nimby" aspect of this but it can't be helped. I also fully realise that Kingswood has its own similar traffic problem, possibly even worse than ours - though at least Kingswood does (it can't be helped) lead somewhere. However, a 15 mph limit there too would likely reduce those traffic volumes too, and certainly reduce the possibilities of danger.

Officer comments:

Comments noted.

22013073

Great idea – but not obeyed in Wimbledon Centre so can’t see it will here. Toynbee Road is the main problem other than speed. Cars parked here for Wimbledon Chase and Wimbledon Stations (previously parked in The Quadrant) and also under/near the railway bridge. I suggested some years ago a part one-way system in Merton Hall Gardens/The Quadrant and also Bustow Road/Dennis Park Crescent. These later roads and Toynbee should be resident parking only. Your plan shows entry to Burstow from Toynbee. Is that what is proposed?

Officer comments:

Comments noted. Must be noted that the plan in fact shows exit from Burstow Road into Toynbee.

ASHBOURNE ROAD AREA

SUPPORT

22013001

I am in full agreement with this as local residential streets are dangerous for children and the elderly. When this scheme is implemented I would ask and beg that you also put road humps in St James Rd. Every evening from about 4pm onwards our road turns into a race track with cars and motorcycles...
treat it as a fast cut through. I promise I am not exaggerating when I say that it is normal for bikes and
some cars to travel in St James at speeds in excess of 50 MPH, some bikers seem to think it is a test
track. Last night 2 bikes were going at 60 or 70. This is a regular occurrence. I would be happy for council
officers to come to the street and observe this behaviour. Please consider doing something about this
before there is a real tragedy. At the speed some vehicles are travelling they will take out themselves and
other people and property.

**Officer comments**

Before and after the implementation of the proposed 20mph limit traffic volumes, speeds and accident
statistics will be undertaken to assess the proposal. If necessary further traffic calming measures shall be
investigated subject to available funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>22013087</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| I was shocked to receive your Newsletter about the possible introduction of traffic calming restrictions in
the roads I use frequently-Grenfell Road, Bruce Road and Inglemere Road. I object on personal grounds
to changes being made to the road surfaces because I am registered disabled and have a serious spinal
condition which would be aggravated by having to go over even more road humps etc. than I have to cope
with already. I also do not think speed restrictions are necessary in the above-mentioned roads because
they are very narrow roads and usually there are cars parked on both sides, leaving only room for single-
line traffic to pass between them. Consequently drivers are already forced to drive slowly and carefully, to
be prepared to pull into any available vacant space to give way to an oncoming car. Therefore, drivers are
rarely [if ever] able to drive more than 20 miles an hour on these particular roads. If you still decide
restrictions are necessary, I think it would be best if you introduced the 20mph limit on these roads with
the appropriate signs, as you are proposing to do at present. Thank you very much for taking the trouble
to consult us. |
| **Officer comments:** |
| Comments noted. It must be noted that no changes will be made to the road surfaces as part of the
proposed scheme. Signage is the only requirement for the proposed 20mph speed limit area. |

---

**AGAINST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>22013064</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| I oppose the 20mph limit proposal for the Ashbourne Road area. The area is already highly congested
and this is going to make it worse and create further traffic jams and noise thus defeating the council’s
objective of improving the quality of life of local residents. I cannot see what changing the speed limit from
30mph to 20mph is going to achieve in the proposed zones? A large stretch of the proposed 20mph limit
on Streatham Road – running parallel to Figges March – is an industrial estate so is therefore not
residential. The London Road has a bus lane so the traffic is already very slowly moving at most times of
the day. To avoid the added congestion that this proposal would, in my opinion, create, vehicles will cut
down the side streets running off the London Road and Streatham Road, in areas where children play.
This also sounds like it has the potential to be a further money-making scheme for the police with speed
cameras and speed traps. |
| **Officer comments** |
| Comments noted, however, it should be noted that neither Streatham Road nor London Road are included
within the proposed 20mph limit area. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>22013067</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| I wish to object to the proposals for the 20mph zone in the Ashbourne Road area for the following
reasons. A) It would already be difficult, in many cases impossible, for anyone to drive quickly in the
proposed area. B) I am not aware of any evidence of traffic accidents caused by drivers proceeding at
speeds between 20 and 30 mph in the proposed area. C) The never-ending construction of ever more
“traffic calming features” is providing an ongoing waste of public finance, which could be put to much
better use. D) The construction of yet more “traffic calming features”, will reduce still further the amount of
available parking space, recently significantly diminished by the widespread extension of double yellow
lines, on streets where parking for residents has long been extremely difficult. |
| **Officer comments:** |
| Comments noted, however, no traffic calming features are included within the proposed scheme. |
I write with regard to the recent proposal for a 20mph Limit in this and surrounding roads. Whilst I will happily support a scheme that increases road safety, I am sorry to say that this scheme will not and I find myself with two objections.

1) Signage:
This is my main objection, and follows the introduction of similar zones in this area ("Upper Tooting" and "Lavender Avenue) which have been handled very poorly, and seem to provide a way to trap innocent (i.e. 30mph limit following) rivers. Consisting only of signs on the entrance to the zone, drivers are often unaware of the reduced limit. These signs are often missed due to vandalism (signs being defaced or turned) or not being visible at the point of turning into the road (for example, Lavender Avenue where a driver approaching from the Colliers Wood end of Western Road turns left). It used to be a requirement of the Highway Code, and I believe this is still true today, that non-standard speed limits must have "repeater" signs every 200 meters or so. I quote from the government website page at http://www.direct.gov.uk/en/HomeAndCommunity/WhereYouLive/StreetsParkingCleaningAndLighting/DG10028438 "If the road in question has a system of street lighting, with no speed limit repeater signs, the limit is usually 30mph. The Traffic Authority is not permitted to place 30mph repeater signs on these roads. The system of street lighting in an area should be sufficient evidence of 30mph limit. There were no such indications in either of the aforementioned zones last time I drove through them. Therefore it would be perfectly reasonable for a driver to maintain a speed of 30mph if they had not seen the single sign, and this would leave innocent motorists guilty of breaking the speed limit in this zone. It would be interesting to see if any attempted prosecution brought to court would find in favour of a council that had not correctly repeated their reduced speed limit. This objection would be withdrawn if sufficient repeat signage were available to the driver, both road painted signs and lamppost repeaters.

2) Usefulness:
The stated aim of the proposal is sound, and given that children, the elderly and animals all cross this road I applaud this aim of the proposal. However, this proposal simply cannot be expected to achieve its stated aim. In short, non-enforced speed limits simply do not work! Many drivers use this road as a short cut between London Road and Streatham Road avoiding the road humps in Gorringe Park Avenue. Even whilst writing this (loam on a weekday) several cars per minute are driving past. Whilst some stick to the reasonable 30mph limit, most don't. The most common speed of a car outside of rush hour is around 40mph with many travelling much faster, and during rush hour the speed is even greater. Motorbikes are worse, reaching speeds of over 70mph in several cases and using the road for racing. No part of the proposed 20mph limit will have an effect on the actual problem, which is drivers not sticking to the speed limit. It is laughable to believe a driver willing to exceed a 30mph at 40mph or 50mphwill not similarly exceed a 20mph limit. Worse still is the case where slower drivers will be expected to provide a "rolling block" to these speeding cars. In these cases, aggressive driving becomes more common, and dangerous overtaking is often occurs. This increases the risks for pedestrians crossing the road rather than reducing them! It would be much more sensible to seek to enforce the current speed limit of 30mph, through the use of traffic calming measures and proper enforcement. Despite assurances from local police teams that speed checks will be performed in this street, not once has this happened and the problem of speeding cars continues.

Officer comments
Comments noted.

Metropolitan Police
Thank you for your letter of 26th September and the accompanying plans in relation to the above-mentioned proposal. Police would make the following observations. The first observations, in general terms, is that police do not object to 20mph speed limits in residential areas provided that they are legally signed and installed in accordance with DfT guidelines. The second observation we would make is that these 20mph zones and limits should be self-enforcing. Should it be found that the proposals do not bring about the expected lower speeds, police would expect further measures to be added to achieve the necessary speed reduction. Speed enforcement in these areas will not be a police priority. As regards the proposals for these area, police would object to both in their current form, as we do not believe it to be legally signed, and because we have grave concerns about the wisdom of such a layout. A number of roads in both proposed areas have existing calming, so adding to this would easily create a zone. The proposal appears to be to sign zonally so there needs to be some additional traffic calming to make this lawful. However the proposal is for a 20mph limit, apparently without repeater signs, and so therefore no legal. This is bad enough in itself, but to sign a 20mph speed limit in areas so rich in existing calming will
only serve to add confusion to existing zones where there are no such repeater signs. If the proposal is to achieve its intention as described in the statement of reasons then police believe it needs to be better designed; as it stands it is, in our opinion, halfway between two stools and as such we feel it is unlikely to achieve its stated aims, and could well drag other existing zones into disrepute.

Officer comments: Before and after the implementation of the proposed 20mph limit traffic volumes, speeds and accident statistics will be undertaken to assess the proposal. If necessary further traffic calming measures shall be investigated subject to available funding. With regards to the need for repeater signs these will be installed where necessary in accordance with the regulations.

22013061

Thank you for the info on the proposed zone, a bit of a curates egg, good in parts. Your proposal does nothing to address the problem we have in St James Rd namely excess speed. We all know the current limit is 30, but this does nothing to stop vehicles and motorcycles regularly travelling at speeds of 50mph or more some motorcycles seem to use it as a test track. Yesterday several bikes travelled along our road at what seemed to be 60 or 70. I know you have many calls upon limited funds but I would ask you to reconsider traffic calming in St James. It is the widest residential road in Merton and is treated as a cut through by many dozens of vehicles a day. Most other roads in the area are too narrow to allow speeding or they are calmed. There will be a tragic incident in the road soon if nothing is done. For St James Rd a 20 Zone would be meaningless without traffic calming.

Officer comments
After implementation of the scheme traffic volumes, speeds and accident statistics will be reviewed in order to determine the impact of the signing in all roads. If necessary further traffic calming measure shall be investigated.

22013065

Thank you for your newsletter dated 26 September 2008. I note with interest you proposed 20mph speed limit for the area, but you did not indicate how this speed limit will be policed, enforced, or controlled. The mere fact that you propose to erect 20mph signs will not in itself stop drivers exceeding the limit. It is also noted that you mention St James Road as part of the zone, but there will not be any traffic calming measures for that road. Please be advised that I have been in communication with your office for more than four years with a view to install speed control measures on this road, but to date, nothing has been done. One of your officers, in writing to me, indicated that until a serious accident occurs, there is nothing that your office can do. That is the most complacent comment and attitude that I have ever heard from any bureaucrat. St James Road is the widest road in the area and it is the only unofficial race track in Mitcham. If traffic calming measures are not installed on St James Road as a matter of urgency, somebody will be killed or seriously injured because of excessive speeding by motorist and motor cyclists. Most of the other roads in the area, as mentioned in your newsletter, are already too congested and your 20mph limit will be purely of a notional or academic nature. You are wasting your time and taxpayers money by just installing 20mph signs.

Officer comments
Before and after the implementation of the proposed 20mph limit traffic volumes, speeds and accident statistics will be undertaken to assess the proposal. If necessary further traffic calming measures shall be investigated subject to available funding. Due to other priorities and lack of resources, the police will not actively enforce 20mph limits.