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AGENDA

A meeting of the KINGSTON TOWN NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMITTEE will be held at the GUILDHALL, KINGSTON UPON THAMES on WEDNESDAY 14 NOVEMBER 2012 at 7:30 pm

Members of the Committee

Canbury Ward
Councillor Geoff Austin
Councillor Andrea Craig
Councillor Tim Dennen

Grove Ward
Councillor Chrissie Hitchcock
Councillor Rebekah Moll
Councillor Barry O'Mahony

Norbiton Ward
Councillor Stephen Brister
Councillor David Ryder-Mills
Councillor Penny Shelton

Tudor Ward
Councillor David Cunningham
Councillor Dennis Doe (Chair)
Councillor Frank Thompson (Vice-Chair)

EMERGENCY EVACUATION ARRANGEMENTS

On hearing the alarm which is a loud siren please leave the building by the nearest available fire exit and assemble by the triangle at the front of the Guildhall.

Anyone needing help to leave the building should go to the refuge areas which are situated outside Committee Room 1 and the Mayor’s Parlour where you will be met by a member of the building management team and assisted from the building.

RECORDING OF THE MEETING - This meeting will be recorded and the recording will be available on the website with the agenda and minutes.

FILMING – residents and journalists/media wishing to film meetings are permitted to do so but are asked to give advance notice of this and respect any concerns expressed by people being filmed.

INFORMATION FOR MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC - Details on access to the meeting, asking questions, speaking on items and other information are just after the lists of items.

A LARGE PRINT COPY OF THE AGENDA can be requested in advance.

CALL IN - A summary of decisions will be published the day after the meeting; the deadline for the call in of these decisions is 5.00pm on Thursday 22 November 2012
QUESTION TIME

The first 30 minutes are available to deal with questions to the Chair from members of the public. Further details are contained in the Further Meeting Information section overleaf.

RUNNING ORDER

Please note that the list of items below is NOT a running order

Items may be taken in a different order depending on the interests of the members of the public present at the meeting. Please fill out a pink form, available at the start of the meeting, if you would like to request that a particular item is heard earlier.

AGENDA

A APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

B MINUTES

To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on

C PETITIONS

To receive any petitions from residents.

D DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members are invited to declare any disclosable pecuniary interests and any other non-pecuniary interests (personal interests) relevant to items on this agenda.

E NEIGHBOURHOOD MANAGER’S REPORT

The Neighbourhood Manager will report on current Kingston Town Neighbourhood issues.

1. PRESENTATION ON THE BETTER HOMES 5 YEAR PROGRAMME BY MARCUS CARLING

2. PROPOSED EXPERIMENTAL MINI ROUNDBOUT AND ZEBRA CROSSING AT KNIGHT’S PARK & FAIRFIELD SOUTH Appendix A

3. PRESENTATION ON PATHWAYS OUT OF POVERTY PROJECT BY ELAINE MILLER

4. PRESENTATION ON THE WORK OF THE STREET PASTORS BY SYLVIA COLLINS-MAYO

5. PROPOSED CYCLING INITIATIVES THROUGH FAIRFIELD RECREATION GROUNDS AND OUTSIDE ST JOSEPH’S CATHOLIC PRIMARY SCHOOL, KINGSTON TOWN Appendix B
6. KINGSTON ANCIENT MARKET PUBLIC REALM SCHEME Appendix C
7. APPLICATION FOR A HIGHWAY STREET CAFE LICENCE - CAPPADOCIA RESTAURANT Appendix D
8. APPLICATION FOR A HIGHWAY STREET CAFE LICENCE - CAFE BARNARDO Appendix E
9. BOCKHAMPTON ROAD - PROPOSED NEW DOUBLE YELLOW LINES Appendix F
10. NEIGHBOURHOOD GRANTS Appendix G
11. TREE REMOVAL REQUEST 15 LINDEN CRESCENT, NORBITON Appendix H
12. NEIGHBOURHOOD BUDGET MONITORING Appendix I
13. AIR QUALITY MONITORING Appendix J
14. PROPOSED KINGSTON STATION GATEWAY IMPROVEMENTS Appendix K
15. KINGSTON TOWN NEIGHBOURHOOD BUSINESS PLAN Appendix L
16. INFORMATION ITEMS Appendix M
   • One Norbiton
   • Town Centre Walk About
   • Work Programme

17. URGENT ITEMS AUTHORISED BY THE CHAIR

DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

Meetings are held at the Guildhall, High Street, Kingston upon Thames and start at 7.30pm unless otherwise stated.

May 2012– April 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood Committee – meeting marked # could include planning applications</th>
<th>Planning Sub-Committee – meeting marked # will be combined with the Neighbourhood Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 16 January 2013</td>
<td>Wednesday 5 December 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Wednesday 6 February 2013</td>
<td>Wednesday 14 March 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 13 March 2013</td>
<td>Wednesday 17 April 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NEIGHBOURHOOD MEETING INFORMATION

Welcome to this meeting. The following information explains the way some things are done at the meeting and some of the procedures.

Access to meetings

All meetings have access for people who may have mobility difficulties. If there are stairs, a lift or stairlift is available.

- **Toilet facilities** will be easily accessible from the meeting room
- An **induction loop** is also provided; this may, depending on the building, only be available in the first 2 or 3 rows.
- People who may have a **visual impairment** may prefer to sit in the front rows, particularly if they use a viewer. This may appear similar to a camera.

Do you want to ask a question or are you here for a particular item?

There are some pink slips on the chairs and there are more copies. These can be used to ask a question or to ask for an item to be taken earlier in the meeting. Please fill in the relevant part and hand this in to the Committee Secretary at the top table.

Public participation during the meeting

During the course of the meeting, the Chair, at his/her discretion, may allow contributions, including questions from residents of the Area only, on items listed on the agenda. To attract the Chair’s attention please raise your hand.

The exception to this is for planning applications, planning enforcement cases or tree preservation orders where people wishing to comment must register in advance (please see page 2 of this agenda).

Question time

1. Questions may be submitted in writing before the meeting or handed in at the start of the meeting on the pink forms provided. For enquiries please contact Marian Morrison 020 8547 4623 email: marian.Morrison@rbk.kingston.gov.uk

2. After written questions have been dealt with, if time allows, other questions may be tabled at the meeting.

3. Where a full reply cannot be given at the meeting, a written reply will be sent to the questioner, members of the Committee and the local press.

3. The Chair may disallow any question which, in his/her opinion, is scurrilous, capricious, irrelevant or otherwise objectionable.

Speaking at meetings

Speaking at a meeting can be a daunting prospect and every effort is made to make this as easy as possible. Speech friendly arrangements will take account of people who may
have a speech impairment, e.g. they may have a stammer. This is particularly important at meetings where there are set procedures on speaking and time limits – e.g. the 5 minute rule for speaking on planning applications (see the guidance on speaking on planning on page 5). If you have any individual requirements or feel that standing or addressing the meeting may present a difficulty, please let us know beforehand. Arrangements will be made to help you as far as reasonably possible.

Decisions

With the exception of planning applications, most items on this agenda are potentially subject to the ‘call in’ procedure – explained below.

PHRASES USED AT MEETINGS

Like all organisations, the Council has its own ‘jargon’. On the agenda and during debates you will see/hear the following phrases.

Interests

Councillors must say if they have an interest in any of the items on the agenda. Interests may be personal or prejudicial. In general terms, a personal interest is where the item could be viewed as benefiting the well-being or financial position of themselves, a relative or a friend more than it would other residents/businesses, etc. in the borough. A prejudicial interest is where it would be reasonable for a member of the public to take the view that a Councillor’s personal interest in the matter is so significant that their judgement of the public interest may be prejudiced. Depending on the interests declared it may be necessary for the Councillor to leave the meeting. The detail on interests is in Part 5A of the Constitution - Members’ Code of Conduct.

Call In

Most of the decisions made at the Committee, except on decisions on planning applications/ planning enforcement/tree preservation orders and any licensing applications, can be called in for review by 100 people who live, work or study in the Borough. The call in period is 5 days after the decisions have been published. Decisions are not, therefore, acted upon until it is clear that they are not going to be called in.

The call in means the decision will be reviewed by the Scrutiny Panel. The Panel cannot change the original decision, it may decide that no further action is necessary, in which case the decision will be implemented or will refer the issue back to the Neighbourhood Committee with its views and a request that the decision is reconsidered taking account of these views.

Minutes

The minutes briefly summarise the item and record the decision. They do not record who said what during the debate.
PROPOSED EXPERIMENTAL MINI ROUNDBOUD AND ZEBRA CROSSING AT KNIGHTS PARK & FAIRFIELD SOUTH

REPORT BY THE DIRECTOR OF PLACE

SUMMARY

Following the publication of the minutes of this Committee’s meeting held on 13 June 2012, which was to approve the above scheme on an experimental basis for one year, 144 signatures received asking for this resolution to be reconsidered.

On 12 October the Scrutiny Panel examined Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee’s decision and the Panel’s decision was to:

“Refer the scheme back to the Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee for reconsideration, this is to take the form of a ‘beginning to end’ review so that all aspects raised by residents are considered in detail; this to include the safety aspects and costs.”

This report outlines the comments raised at the Scrutiny Committee meeting, and the result of the safety audit stage 2 which was carried out in August 2012.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is RECOMMENDED that members consider the comments raised at the Scrutiny Committee meeting, and the outcome of the safety audit stage 2 and decide on the way forward.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

To establish the impact of changing the method of control of the junction.

BACKGROUND

1. At the Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee held on 13 June 2012 it was resolved that: “the experimental scheme is introduced for one year and its effectiveness reviewed after six months and the results reported back go this Committee when consideration will be given to whether or not to continue the scheme for a full year.”

2. Following the publication of the above resolution a submission was received with 144 signatures, asking for the resolution to be reviewed, on the basis of the consultation failed to include a cost and benefit analysis and other relevant materials considerations/facts.

3. In August 2012 safety audit stage 2 was carried out. The outcome of this report is attached as Annex 1. The report highlights that “the queuing vehicles at the proposed zebra crossing in Fairfield South may affect pedestrians’ ability to safely assert precedence to cross. The report recommends the installation of a refuge island, however, the width of the carriageway cannot accommodate a refuge island.
### OUTCOME OF SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MEETING

4. In 12\textsuperscript{th} October 2012, the Scrutiny Committee considered the petition received and their decision was to “REFER the scheme back to the Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee for reconsideration, this to take the form of a ‘beginning to end’ review so that all aspects raised by residents are considered in detail; this to include the safety aspects and costs”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENT RAISED AT THE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE</th>
<th>OFFICER’S RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor visibility: the visibility sight line at the junction of Knight Park / Orchard Road is a very poor, cars leaving Knight Park not able to see eastbound traffic on Orchard Road till it is too late, and the situation will worsen for larger vehicles – as the width of Orchard Road is not wide enough to accommodate such facility, that is why the stop lines have been back at this junction in order to accommodate the need of these turning</td>
<td>Mini roundabouts operate by sharing priority. They are not expected to operate in an identical manner to full size roundabouts with all vehicles movements circumnavigating and central island. Rather it is accepted that vehicles may run over the white circle when negotiating this central island. The geometry of the proposed new roundabout will be designed to best fit this junction. We are not denying the fact that this junction does not have great visibility sight line, however, the turning circle movements plan prove that tuning could be achieved with some sort give and take between drivers. The uncertainties of the relative merits of signal control –v- control by mini roundabout is the reason why it is being proposed as an EXPERIMENT and this will be monitored to ensure its effectiveness and suitability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of consultation rate – members, felt that the rate of return which is 17% is very low, which means there is no strong support to the scheme from residents.</td>
<td>Each Neighbourhood deal's with this differently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speeding – the result of the speed survey shows that 3 vehicles travelling in access of 60mph, which proves this road is not suitable for such proposal.</td>
<td>Traffic count survey is not 100% accurate, and sometimes give such results particularly during peak hours, cars are not able to do such speed. With regard to such a scheme encourage speed. All roundabouts provide control by a regime of ‘giving way’ where vehicles are expected to slow down and stop if necessary for traffic approaching from their right. The introduction of the raised tables and zebra crossing will further reduce speed on the approach to the roundabout. Since no kerb lines are being changed any vehicle that can currently make the turns will still be able to do so although it is recognised that some ‘give and take’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>According the comments raised by the safety audit stage 2, which has been carried out in August 2012 after the Committee made their decision outlines that; Queuing vehicles may affect pedestrians ability to safely assert precedence to cross, and they recommend for a refuge island in Fairfield South.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The cost of the scheme was not in the report when Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee considered the report in June 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Why the Council is proposing such a proposal and who would benefit from it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>There is no evidence the scheme will benefit cyclist, on the contrary, cyclists do not like mini roundabouts and they consider them dangerous.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VIEW OF THE DIRECTOR OF PLACE**

5. In light of the above and the report to the June Committee, it is recommended that members decide on the way forward.

6. However, if members decide to approve the scheme it would be experimental, the construction will take into account the possibility of reintroducing the traffic signals therefore much of the infrastructure will remain which will assist in the reintroduction, should this prove necessary.

7. The experimental scheme is proposed to be put in place for one calendar year. During this time the speed, volume, and movement of traffic will be monitored as well as pedestrian flows and safety. This will be achieved by automatic traffic counters and video surveys. Comparisons will be made of this data and previous data to establish the effectiveness of the new measures. Also, a further consultation will be undertaken with all local residents to ascertain their experiences from the new measures.
8. A Stage 4 Road Safety Audit will also be undertaken once the scheme has been established.

9. All the results of the experiment will be reported back to this Committee following the review of the scheme with any conclusions and recommendations.

TIMESCALE

10. Subject to approval by Committee, the experimental scheme with construction is anticipated to be completed by March 2013.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

11. The total cost of the works will be £40k which will be funded by Transport for London’s Biking Borough programme.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

12. There are no environmental implications arising from this report.

NETWORK IMPLICATIONS

13. A fundamental purpose of this scheme is to comply with the Mayor for London’s policies to smooth traffic, and to remove unnecessary traffic signals, which it is believed this scheme will achieve.

Background papers: held by
Younes Hamade, Project Engineer,
tel 020 8547 5922, e-mail: younes.hamade@rbk.kingston.gov.uk

- Scrutiny Committee meeting 12th October 2012
- Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee 13th June 2012
- Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee 7th February 2012
- Copy of consultation letter and questionnaire
- Summary of consultation responses
- Petition received 16 November 2011
- Petition received June 2012
FAIRFIELD SOUTH / KNIGHTS PARK
EXPERIMENTAL MINI-ROUNDABOUT

STAGE 2 ROAD SAFETY AUDIT

August 2012

Report Status: FINAL
1.0 DOCUMENT INFORMATION

1.1 Document No: 984-RSA-01

- Issue No: 01
- Date: 28th August 2012
- Prepared by: A. Haunton
- Checked by: J. Thompson
- Approved by: J. Thompson

2.0 INTRODUCTION

2.1 Commission

2.1.1 This report results from a Stage 2 Road Safety Audit carried out on the proposed experimental mini-roundabout at Fairfield South jw Knights Park.

2.1.2 The Audit was undertaken by Capital Traffic in accordance with the Audit Brief confirmed by the Client Organisation on 23rd August 2012. It took place at the Great Yeldham offices of Capital Traffic on 28th August 2012 and comprised an examination of the documents provided as listed in Appendix A, plus a visit to the site of the proposed scheme.

2.1.3 The visit to the site of the proposed scheme was made on 27th August 2012. During the site visit the weather was fine and the existing road surface was dry.

2.2 Terms of Reference

2.2.1 The Terms of Reference of this Audit are as described in TfL Procedure SQA-0170. The Audit Team has examined and reported only on the road safety implications of the scheme as presented and has not examined or verified the compliance of the designs to any other criteria. However, to clearly explain a safety problem or the recommendation to resolve a problem the Audit Team may, on occasion, have referred to a design standard without touching on technical audit.

2.2.2 Safety issues identified during the Audit and site visit that are considered to be outside the Terms of Reference, but which the Audit Team wishes to draw to the attention of the Client Organisation, are set out in section 5 of this report.

2.2.3 Unless general to the scheme, all comments and recommendations are referenced to the detailed design drawings and the locations have been indicated on the plan located in Appendix B. It should be noted that the Option 1 plan has been utilised to show the location of the problems for all options.

2.2.4 This Audit has a maximum shelf life of 2 years. Should the scheme not progress to the next stage in its development within this period it should be re-audited.
2.3 Main Parties to the Audit

2.3.1 Client Organisation

Design Manager: Younes Hamade, Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames
Client Manager: Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames

2.3.2 Design Organisation

Designer: Afe Tesfay, Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames

2.3.3 Audit Team

Audit Team Leader: Andy Haunton, Capital Traffic
Audit Team Member: Jonathan Thompson, Capital Traffic

2.4 Purpose of the Scheme

2.4.1 The scheme proposes to replace the existing signal controlled junction with a mini-roundabout. A new raised Zebra crossing will also be introduced on the eastern arm plus a further raised table on the western arm. The junction is located within an existing 20mph speed limit.

3.0 ITEMS RAISED IN PREVIOUS ROAD SAFETY AUDIT

3.1 The proposals were subject to a stage 1 audit carried out by Capital Traffic in September 2011. All the issues raised in the audit report have been satisfactorily resolved with the exception of Problem 4.2.1, which is discussed again in this report as Problem 4.1.1.
4.0 ITEMS RAISED IN THIS STAGE 2 ROAD SAFETY AUDIT

4.1 PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS

4.1.1 PROBLEM

**Location:** A – Proposed Zebra crossing.

**Summary:** Queuing vehicles may affect pedestrians’ ability to safely assert precedence to cross.

There will only be space for one vehicle to wait beyond the Zebra crossing at the Fairfield South give way line. At times of the day when traffic flows are higher and there is more likely to be a queue at the junction, traffic will queue across the Zebra crossing. This can make it difficult for pedestrians to safely assert precedence to cross as intervisibility between them and drivers on the other side of the carriageway is adversely affected. In this case, intervisibility between pedestrians crossing from the south and eastbound drivers will be adversely affected.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Install a refuge island complete with Belisha beacon so that pedestrians only have to assert precedence to cross one traffic stream at a time.

---

End of list of Problems identified and Recommendations offered in this Stage 2 Audit
5.0 ISSUES IDENTIFIED DURING THE STAGE 2 ROAD SAFETY AUDIT THAT ARE OUTSIDE THE TERMS OF REFERENCE

Safety issues identified during the audit and site inspection that are considered to be outside the Terms of Reference, but which the Audit Team wishes to draw to the attention of the Client Organisation, are set out in this section. These issues could include maintenance items, operational issues or existing poor provision. It is to be understood that, in raising these issues, the Audit Team in no way warrant that a full review of the highway environment has been undertaken beyond that necessary to undertake the Audit as commissioned.

5.1 ISSUE

Location: B – Knights Park.

Reason considered to be outside the Terms of Reference: Existing issue.

There is an ‘ahead and left’ arrow marked on the carriageway prior to the stop line, presumably a relic from a previous iteration of the junction when the right turn was prohibited. It no longer applies to the current junction configuration and won’t apply to the proposed configuration. It should be removed.
6.0 AUDIT STATEMENT

6.1 We certify that we have examined the drawings and documents listed in the Appendices to this report. The examination has been carried out with the sole purpose of identifying any features of the design that could be removed or modified in order to improve the safety of the scheme. The problems identified have been noted in this report, with associated safety improvement suggestions, which we recommend should be studied for implementation. We have not been involved with the scheme design.

6.2 Audit Team Leader

Andy Haunton  
BEng (Hons), MCIHT, FSoRSA  
Associate Director  
Capital Traffic  
The Old Council Yard  
Hedingham Road  
Great Yeldham  
Essex, CO9 4HS  
Signed:  
Date: 28/08/2012

6.3 Audit Team Member

Jonathan Thompson  
I Eng, FIHE  
Associate Director  
Capital Traffic  
The Old Council Yard  
Hedingham Road  
Great Yeldham  
Essex, CO9 4HS  
Signed:  
Date: 28/08/2012
APPENDIX A

Documents forming the Audit Brief

DRAWINGS

- DS/0800/04
- DS/0800/05A
- C/600/049

DOCUMENTS

- 3-year’s accident data to 30/11/11
- Traffic speed and flow data
- Stage 1 Road Safety Audit, September 2011
APPENDIX B

Problem Location Plan
Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee at their meeting 13 June 2012 approved the introduction of segregated cycling facilities along footpath No.14 outside St Joseph’s Catholic Primary School & footpath No.15 through Fairfield Recreation Ground subject to local consultation.

In August this year a public notice was published in the local newspapers as well as placing notices on the footpaths informing all users of these proposals.

This report outlines the outcome of that consultation and the comments received.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is RECOMMENDED that in light of the comments received:

1. the proposal for converting the existing footpath alongside St Joseph’s Catholic Primary School is not progressed at this time; and

2. the proposal for converting the existing footpath through Fairfield Recreation Ground is approved for implementation as shown in the attached Annex2.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

To provide a safer dedicated route for both pedestrians and cyclists through the Fairfield Recreation Grounds.

BACKGROUND

1. The Mayor of London’s vision is to make London a city where people of all ages, abilities, and cultures have the incentive, confidence, and facilities to cycle whenever it suits them. Cycling is integral to helping develop London as an exemplary sustainable world city, and the Mayor for London with the Government are looking to local authorities to build on existing efforts to increase the numbers and safety of cycling.

2. The Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames is proud of its heritage as a cycle friendly borough. It continues to look at opportunities to improve the existing cycle infrastructure, and provide new links with a commitment to completing an efficient London Cycle Network. This has been recognised within the Local Implementation Plan (LIP) which details one of its key actions for Kingston Town Centre to improve
the surface of and widen the Fairfield Recreation Ground footpaths to create a shared use walking and cycling route.

3. At the Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee held on 13th June 2012 it was agreed to take forward a design for upgrading the two existing footpaths that currently run through the Fairfield Recreation Grounds. Funding for these has been secured through the Biking Borough Initiatives from Transport for London (TfL).

PROPOSALS

4. Fairfield Recreation Grounds:
4.1 Fairfield Recreation Grounds is a large open green space situated on the east of Kingston Town Centre, within an existing Conservation Area. As well as providing an attractive route for pedestrians to and from the nearby Leisure Centre and Library it is regularly used by the local schools as their playing fields.

4.2 The attached Annex1 shows the existing paths within the grounds.

4.3 There are two existing footpaths that run through this park. School Passage is designated Footpath No.14 that runs north south on the east side of the park. This path is bound on one side by the park fence and on the other by St Joseph’s Catholic Primary School. This path is currently part paved with an effective width of approximately 4metres. This path serves the entrances to the school and is used by cyclists despite the presence of the no cycling signs.

4.4 Footpath No.15 is a 1.5metre wide paved path that runs through the middle of the grounds connecting the entrances at either end and is lined on both sides with large established trees. This path is currently designated as a public right of way where cyclists should not be using this path. However, it is accepted that cyclists do use this route as a means to travel between the existing facilities to the north of the park and the quiet routes in the south.

4.5 The opportunity is therefore being taken to improve these footpaths for pedestrians and to designate a segregated path for cyclists. The reconstruction will allow footpath No.15 to be significantly widened to safely manage pedestrians and cyclists thereby reducing any conflict between the two users. The improvements will also include upgrading the existing levels of street lighting and trimming of the overhanging tree branches that can currently detract users of the path during the hours of darkness. This will further enhance the widened route.

4.6 It is recognised that footpath No.14 is in need of resurfacing and thus funding from the biking borough has been secured to upgrade this path, which will include the upgrading of the street lighting and the trimming of the overhanging branches. In order for this to be undertaken the cycling prohibition would need to be removed. However, this Council also appreciates the large number of school children with parents and buggies that congregate outside the school entrances within this confined area.

4.7 In order for these footpaths to be designated as a cycle route the footpaths will need to be converted for this use. The legal process that has been undertaken to convert these footpaths for cyclists use has been through the Highways Act 1980 where the appropriate part of the footway is removed under the powers in section 66(4) and the cycle route constructed under section 65(1). Should the
schemes go ahead then the footpath conversion will also be made under section 3 of the Cycle Tracks Act 1984 which will formalise the designated cycle routes through the park.

5. The design of the footpaths, to upgrade them to allow cyclists, proposes two distinct paths segregated by a raised kerb along its middle. Each path is to be laid in a contrasting surface to help distinguish between the two routes, supplemented by road markings and signs, to clearly show which route is to be used by each user. The type and colour of the surfaces will be sympathetic to the green space nature of the park and the recommendations from the Planning and Street Scene sections of the Council due to it being within an existing conservation area.

6. For footpath No.15 (FP15), the path running through the middle of the park, the reconstruction will maximise the available width between the line of trees and the existing line of the lighting columns to create two paths that are each over 2metres wide. These widened paths should safely manage both pedestrians and cyclists thereby reducing any conflict between these two users.

7. At the entrances at either end of FP15 the area of footway is to be assigned as shared use for both cyclists and pedestrians so that cyclists may continue their route, north along Caversham Road, and south via Mill Street, which join the existing cycle network.

8. Footpath No.14 (FP14) that is bound by the park on one side and St Joseph’s Catholic Primary School on the other has no scope for widening the existing path. The proposed reconstruction will therefore look to maximise the available width of this path. With an effective width of approximately 4metres two distinct paths could be introduced. However, with the heavier flow of pedestrians in the vicinity of the schools entrances and the large amount of young children, with parents and buggies the design of the path is narrowed for cyclists to provide additional space around these entrances. This is to be supplemented by small sections of guard railing to deter each user from straying into the others path.

9. The footways at the entrances at either end of this path will also be assigned as shared use and be signed to encourage cyclists to continue towards the existing links via Caversham Road in the north and Villiers Road or Mill Street in the south.

10. For cyclists to be able to join FP14 from Fairfield South at the existing signalled junction the existing road markings are to be remarked with a small feeder lane for cyclists to assist them in joining this new route without having to negotiate the signal crossing alongside pedestrians.

11. These designs were submitted for consultation with the schools and the outcome of this consultation is summarised in the table below.

### CONSULTATION & RESPONSES

12. Due to the nature of the footpaths being in a public open space the consultation for these schemes was concentrated solely within the park itself so that it would be directed to those who use the paths on a regular basis. A decision was made that leafleting all frontages in and around the park would be impractical and would not capture the views of those who use the paths but live outside this area.
13. A copy of the proposals was sent to the Emergency Services, the nearby schools, cycle and pedestrian user groups, as well as other stakeholders within the Council.

14. In response to the consultation comments were received from St Joseph’s Catholic Primary School, Kingston Grammar School, Tiffin School, The Kingston Upon Thames Society, Kingston Cyclists, 4No. of residents living in local roads adjacent to the park, and Mill Street Residents Association.

15. Of those that responded two local residents were in support for these proposals. The response from Kingston Cyclists was positive and included comments on certain aspects of the design that will be incorporated within the final scheme.

16. A summary of the main comments together with officer responses is summarised in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
<th>OFFICER’S RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The footpath alongside St Joseph’s School is too narrow to safely accommodate cyclists with the large amount of children and parents that congregate outside the entrances</td>
<td>It is accepted that, due to the confined nature of the footpath beside the school, and the large number of children and parents that congregate at the entrances, segregating this path would reduce the capacity of the footpath for pedestrians. <em>See para 8 above</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guard railing should be installed alongside the whole route by St Joseph school to separate the two users</td>
<td>Erecting guard railing along the whole length of the segregation would be impractical particularly with the narrow nature of the existing path, and the presence of fencing along both sides would offer no escape route should someone need to make an emergency manoeuvre. This would also give the impression of an even more confined space along the whole route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is the existing 'no cycling' enforced. Cyclists are not considerate of parents &amp; children. Proposals are rewarding cyclists who are ignoring no cycling signs</td>
<td>With respect to the current illegal use of these footpaths by cyclists the responsibility for policing cyclists along footpaths is currently out of the control of this authority and can only be enforced by the Metropolitan Police Service. However, in practical terms enforcement is not always possible due to the constraints of available resources from the Police service. One way to address this would be to provide a dedicated segregated path for both cyclists and pedestrians that are wide enough to cater for the volume of both users which can ensure compliance on the route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The bollards at both ends of both paths must be retained.</td>
<td>The Council acknowledges the historic significance of the existing bollards at both ends of both footpaths. Therefore, the existing bollards are to be retained but they will be repositioned to offer a greater width between each than is currently provided. This should not cause any adverse effect from the existing situation and will allow the safe passage for buggies and should not hinder any deliveries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What consultation is taking place over this change.</td>
<td><em>See para 4.7 &amp; 12 above</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An alternative should be to provide a separate path within the grounds of the park away from the existing footpaths</td>
<td>The option of taking park space and converting it to a separate path for cyclists away from the footpaths is considered to be too expensive due to the large number of established trees within the park. These paths would also need to be self contained to avoid cyclists from crossing the park. Also additional entrances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
will need to be provided for cyclists to be able to join the existing routes. The Council does not see this as a viable option that results in a loss of valuable green space within a conservation area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The regular use of the seats either side of footpath No.15 will inhibit access to the western side of the segregated cycle path</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With respect to the proposed new cycle path through the middle of the recreation grounds this is currently tree lined on both sides with a footpath that is approximately 1.5 metres wide. By making this footpath a segregated route to include cyclists, each route would be at least 2 metres wide. The widened footpath would make footpath No.15 more visible and more attractive for both users, and with both sides being lined with large established trees any persons wishing to cross this footpath would clearly realise that a certain amount of caution needs to be considered when crossing from one side to the other. Enhancing the existing levels of street lighting would also assist in highlighting the new paths. We therefore believe that safety would not be compromised for those persons wanting to cross the footpaths from the current situation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What good practice or previous experience supports these proposals that guarantees pedestrian and cyclists’ safety.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of two wheeled vehicular traffic will compromise safety for the many users giving sanction for greater speed and frequency of use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| The detailed design of these schemes will take into account the design standards set out for cycle route design. The most recent Local Transport Note 1/12 issued by the Department for Transport has been referred to as well as the recent study undertaken by Atkins (‘Shared Use – Operational Review’ Atkins 2012). These studies show that conflict between pedestrians and cyclists is not a common occurrence; nevertheless, perception of reduced safety is an important issue for consideration. They have shown that behaviour by both pedestrians and cyclists on shared use paths and segregated paths was judged to be considerate by both user groups. Agreement is strongest on unsegregated routes suggesting that behaviour is more considerate on these routes where the requirement to interact with other types of user is clearer. Further findings from these studies indicate that average cycle speeds are not significantly faster on segregated routes compared with unsegregated ones. Observations indicate that maximum cycle speeds decreases as pedestrian flows increases on unsegregated routes. This suggests that cyclists moderate their behaviour in the presence of pedestrians. On segregated routes cycle speeds were also seen to decrease when pedestrians are present although to a lesser extent than on unsegregated routes. For full compliance of the segregated routes it is important to clearly define each route. With respect to the path through the centre of the park, the widths of each route is to be as wide as is physically possible giving more width to the pedestrians than the cyclists due to the heavier use by pedestrians. Each route is to be segregated using a raised ‘kerb’ to help demark which path is to be used by which user which should deter pedestrians or cyclists straying into the others path. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What consideration is being made to ensure that street lighting is adequate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See para 4.5 &amp; 4.6 above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is being done about the low hanging tree branches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See para 4.5 &amp; 4.6 above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where is the cycle traffic using these paths going to be directed.

These proposals will encourage the use of other narrow footpaths connecting Minerva Road and Albert Road/London Road

Whilst it is acknowledged that there are existing routes available for cyclists to travel north-south from London Road to Fairfield South that are on carriageway this Council is always looking at improving all existing footpaths with the intention of providing additional routes for cyclists wherever possible particularly through open spaces. The existing link from Queen Elizabeth Road in the north to the south is via Caversham Road where it continues along Fairfield Road and Fairfield West. The inclusion of a more direct route through the recreation grounds would help distribute the existing flow of cyclists who use this route. There is no attraction for cyclists to be using Fairfield East. Pedestrians will benefit from the introduction of a shared use scheme by the introduction of a better surfaced and wider footpath with improved lighting. By providing wider dedicated lanes with a clear demarcation of both routes then users behaviour would indicate that these will be respected by responsible persons. There is no argument for cyclists to be using the narrow passages between Minerva Road and Albert Road and this Council has no intention of providing dedicated routes through these paths.

RESPONSES FROM EMERGENCY SERVICES

17. No comments or observations have been made by the Emergency Services in respect to these schemes.

ROAD SAFETY AUDIT

18. A Stage 1/2 Road Safety Audit has also been carried out on these proposals. The general points that have been highlighted within the report mention additional signing for cyclists and pedestrians within the shared areas, increasing the gap between the existing bollards, the low hanging tree branches, the hazards of narrowing the cycle route at the entrances outside St Joseph’s School, existing guard railing being a hazard for pedestrians and cyclists, the narrow nature of the cycle lane in Fairfield South that would join cyclists to FP14. These points will be addressed within any final design of the schemes.

CONCLUSION

19. This Council would like to see more children encouraged to cycle to school wherever possible. One way to achieve this is by providing safer alternative routes away from the main traffic flow. With the introduction of these two dedicated paths for cyclists through the grounds we believe this would encourage more young people to cycle more often.

20. However, with the objections raised by the local schools as to the narrow and restricted nature of footpath No.14 it is recommended that the scheme for the path alongside St Joseph’s Catholic Primary School is postponed until a design can be agreed with all stakeholders.

21. As a consequence it must be noted that no improvements for this footpath will be made through this funding. The Council will however continue to consider options for enforcing the current cycling prohibition along this footpath but recognises that this route may remain convenient for continued unlawful use.
22. A survey was also carried out over a twelve hour period on two consecutive days during the week to establish the current usage of both paths by cyclists. This confirms that cyclists are predominantly using the centre path on a regular basis throughout the day. Flows past the school are significantly less with usage being concentrated in the morning and evening peaks in both directions.

23. Although some objections have been raised with respect to the improvements for the central footpath it is recommended that this path is reconstructed by maximising the available space between this existing tree lined corridor to provide a much wider path than already exists that will safely accommodate both pedestrians and cyclists.

24. Upon completion, the schemes will be reviewed to ascertain if there has been any significant improvement in the take up by cyclists from the measures and if there has been any increase in congestion or conflict with pedestrian traffic.

TIMESCALE

25. Subject to the approval by Committee the legal process for formalising these footpaths for cycle use will need to be progressed through the Cycle Tracks Act 1984. It should be noted that should further objections be received during this process then these will need to be resolved through a public enquiry. This will mean that implementation cannot commence until such time when the public enquiry has been concluded. The implications of this will be that funding for these schemes may be lost or will need to be set aside through TfL for completion at a later date within future financial years.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

26. The cost for introducing the cycle route along footpath no.15 will be met from the £40K allocation that has been set aside by TfL for this path. It should be noted that if one or both of these schemes is not to proceed then this allocation will be returned to TfL. As a consequence the existing street lighting and the trimming of the overhanging tree branches will not be carried out as these were part of the proposals. However, funding should be sought from other sources for these maintenance issues to be resolved independently from these proposals.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

27. The Council is committed to promoting sustainable travel and reducing the reliance on the use of the motor vehicle. This is achieved through a range of policies and activities, but encouraging cycling as a means of utility transport is a key element of this policy. The development of a cycle route network and promotion of cycling are important contributions to increasing sustainable travel and reducing the dependence upon the private motor car. Creating safer routes and improving existing cycling routes are key to promoting the use of sustainable modes of transport. Achieving a modal shift will benefit the environment for the wider community, reducing the dependence on the motor vehicle will help reduce noise and air pollution.

NETWORK IMPLICATIONS
28. There will be no impact on the Borough’s highway network during construction of any of the approved schemes.

**Background papers:** held by Younes Hamade, Project Engineer, Kingston Town Neighbourhood, 020 8547 5922:

- Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee meeting – 13th June 2012
- Copy of the public notice
- Local Transport Note 1/12
- ‘Shared Use – Operational Review’ Atkins 2012
- Cycle survey data
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SUMMARY

This report provides an update for the Neighbourhood Committee on recent progress with the regeneration of the Ancient Market Enhancement Area in Kingston town centre. The report includes the following key information:

- **Project scope** – it explains the revised scope of the Ancient Market project;
- **Market place** – it describes the detailed design proposals for new paving, enhanced lighting and new street furniture in the market place;
- **Market stalls** – it explains the progress made in designing new market stalls;
- **Market House** – it outlines the further work required to assess the longer term options for reusing the Market House;
- **Project programme** – it highlights the main milestones that will need to be met in delivering the Ancient Market public realm scheme by March 2014; and
- **Financial information** – it sets out the estimated construction costs of the market place public realm scheme.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is RECOMMENDED that

1. The Neighbourhood Committee approves the detailed design for the Ancient Market public realm scheme, as agreed by the Member Officer Group at its meeting on 1 October 2012; and

2. The Neighbourhood Committee provides delegated authority to the Head of Planning and Transport (in consultation with the Kingston Ancient Market Member Officer Group) to procure a suitable contractor to deliver the Ancient Market public realm scheme, including the fabrication of new market stalls.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

We have completed the Stage E/F1 detailed design package for the Ancient Market public realm scheme and this has been endorsed by the Kingston Ancient Market Member Officer Group.

We now require a formal decision approving the scheme, as well as the delegated authority to proceed with the next stage in procuring a contractor.
BACKGROUND

**Kingston Ancient Market**

1. Kingstonfirst (the organisation running the business improvement district for Kingston town centre) currently manages the Ancient Market on behalf of RBK. There are currently 25 fixed market stalls with a standard size of 3 metres by 2.5 metres trading on a daily basis at the Kingston Ancient Market.

2. The market offers a broad mix of traders with a strong emphasis on fresh fruit and vegetables. There are also stalls offering fish, fresh meat, flowers, cakes and baked goods. Not all of the traders operate every day which means that there are some days when the market presents shuttered stall fronts to customers.

3. Although the Ancient Market is popular with both shoppers and market traders, it currently underperforms as a potential driver of increased footfall and associated economic or cultural activities in the town centre. As well as trying to secure the long term viability of the Ancient Market, we are trying to address the following issues:

   - The market place lacks cohesion and a real sense of place. The street scene is cluttered and the open space is not used as effectively as it could be;
   - The quality of the public realm in the market place varies but overall it is not good enough for such a significant public space in Kingston town centre which is also one of London’s Great Spaces;
   - Despite its central location, the market place does not feel that prominent in Kingston town centre. The connections between the market place and the Kingston Riverside are difficult to navigate via a series of narrow alleyways, with links to other parts of the town centre also lacking legibility;
   - The market place currently underperforms as a hub at the centre of the Ancient Market Enhancement Area shown on the plan at Annex A. In particular, the market place does not currently do enough to promote alternative evening economy activities;
   - The market stalls look tired and dated. Their location and stout design obscure the Market House and present blank facades when the stalls close at the end of the trading day; and
   - The Market Hall is a majestic building but is currently hidden from view, both inside and out.

**PROJECT SCOPE**

4. The Kingston Ancient Market project has been running since late 2009. The original project brief was approved by the RBK Departmental Management Team Project Board in February 2010. The Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee endorsed the project brief at its meeting on 10 February 2010.
5. The original intention with the project was to develop an enhancement framework for the Ancient Market area. Annex A to this report shows the Ancient Market Enhancement Area.

6. The core project objectives were:
   - To improve the public realm;
   - To develop and improve links to the surrounding area; and
   - To build on the Ancient Market's historic identity and raise its profile as the town's heritage/cultural area for the future.

7. The original project objectives remain entirely relevant to what we are now trying to achieve with the Ancient Market. However, since 2010 the scope of the project has developed, mainly through its inclusion in a successful bid to the Greater London Authority (GLA) for Outer London Fund Round 2 support as part of a wider package of measures for Kingston town centre.

8. The grant agreement signed with the GLA on 26 September 2012 allows for the use of Outer London Fund (OLF) Round 2 grant totalling £1.4 million on the market place and the market stalls. The Council issued a press release to mark the signing of the grant agreement and the story was covered by the Surrey Comet on 26 October 2012.

9. The Market House will not be supported by OLF Round 2 as it is not possible to deliver a building project by the GLA’s completion date of March 2014. This reflects the timescale that will be required to find a long term solution for the building which is both viable and sensitive to the Market House’s historical importance.

10. This report assumes that the Kingston Ancient Market project will run to March 2014 which reflects the timeframe for delivery of the market place and market stalls activities through the OLF Round 2 programme. However, it is important to note that the project objectives for the Market House and the wider Ancient Market Enhancement Area will be achieved over a longer timeframe.

MARKET PLACE

11. The strategic objectives for the market place agreed by the Member Officer Group at its meeting on 1 October 2012 are as follows:
   - To ensure that the Ancient Market fulfils its potential as a special public place in Kingston and as one of London’s 36 Great Spaces;
   - To preserve and where possible enhance the setting of the historic features in and around the market place;
   - To enhance the quality, amount and flexibility of the available space so that the market place can support a commercially viable market as well as being used for a wider range of creative, cultural and recreational activities; and
• To deliver a high quality public realm improvement scheme which combines subtly toned new paving, stylish but functional street furniture and a creative lighting scheme to create an inclusive public space with character and drama.

**Public realm scheme**

12. At the Neighbourhood Committee meeting on 14 November 2012 there will be a short presentation outlining the key features of the final design for the market place public realm scheme. We will also be able to show Members a 1 to 200 scale architectural model which brings the proposals to life.

13. The two images below provide an overview of how the scheme will look on completion.

- **Image 1** – photograph of scale model showing the indicative layout of the market stalls
  ![](image1.png)

- **Image 2** – View of the new scheme from the south (excluding the market stalls)
  ![](image2.png)
Scheme plans

14. There are a number of plans which relate to this report and will be available for inspection at the Neighbourhood Committee meeting on 14 November 2012. They will be circulated to Members of the committee prior to the meeting.

Key features

15. In summary, the key features of the Ancient Market public realm scheme are:

- **New paving** – creating a single level across the market place in three subtle but distinctive grey tones of granite paving blocks predominantly 300 mm long, 100 mm wide and 100 mm in depth. All the entrances to the Ancient Market will be marked with special granite threshold paving strips engraved with directional information;

- **Lighting scheme** – the new highway lighting will be provided by lights mounted on the facades of buildings in the market place. The facades of the buildings will be illuminated by lamps mounted on the new market stalls. There will also be a separate facade lighting scheme for the Market House building. Taken together the three elements of the lighting scheme will help to create mood and drama in the market place, as well as facilitating a wider range of evening economy activities than is possible at present;

- **Street furniture** – the market place public realm scheme will provide new seating, waste bins, bollards and cycle racks. The number of cycle racks in the market place will increase by 50% from 21 to 32;

- **Shrubsole statue** – this will be moved in its entirety by around 10 metres to the south, thereby freeing up more space in the market place. We will require planning permission to move the statue and the intention is to bring an application to the Neighbourhood Committee Planning Sub-Committee meeting on 6 February 2013; and

- **The fountain** – will remain in its current location in the market place. The granite paving scheme will include the fountain.

MARKET STALLS

16. We are seeking a creative solution to the design of the market stalls which both enhances trading prospects and improves the overall appearance of the market place and the Market House. Given the crucial importance of managing market waste to the design of the stalls, the work will also require an in depth assessment of waste management for the market.

17. The Council’s existing contract with JMP Consultants Ltd (working in partnership with Tonkin Liu Architects) does not provide for the design of new market stalls. With this in mind, we have now begun procurement of the detailed design for the market stalls. The brief can be viewed at [http://www.kingston.gov.uk/ancient_market_area](http://www.kingston.gov.uk/ancient_market_area)

18. The deadline for submission of completed tenders by short-listed firms is 23 November 2012 and tenderers will be presenting their proposals to the Kingston Ancient Market Member Officer Group on 4 December 2012. The intention is to
appoint designers during December so that the detailed design work can be completed by April 2013.

19. We will require a planning consent before commencing construction of the market stalls. The intention is to submit a planning application for the new market stalls as soon as the detailed design work has been completed.

MARKET HOUSE

20. Although the Market House will not be included in the works that will be supported by the Outer London Fund Round 2 grant, we are continuing to press ahead with the development of a long term solution for the Market House.

21. The strategic objectives for the Market House agreed by the Member Officer Group at its meeting on 1 October 2012 are as follows:

- To undertake short term repairs to the external stone work of the Market House and to secure funding for other significant repairs required to improve the structural condition of the building;

- To assess the potential for making short term changes to the mix and type of existing uses on the ground floor of the Market House;

- To identify the best long term solution for the Market House, both as a key part of the RBK property portfolio and as an important heritage asset for Kingston town centre;

- To undertake a historic buildings assessment of the Market House so that we have a full understanding of the building’s heritage importance and to inform any future planning applications on reusing the building. This work will be completed by the end of November 2012; and

- To explore the practicality and commercial viability of alternative uses for the Market House which are in keeping with the building’s historical character, its position at the hub of a working market and its location at the heart of an enhanced cultural quarter.

TIMESCALE AND PROJECT PROGRAMME

22. The main project milestones for completion of the work that will be supported by the Outer London Fund Round 2 grant are as follows:

- RBK signed the Outer London Fund Round 2 grant agreement with the GLA – 26 September 2012;

- Member Officer Group agreed the detailed design for the market place paving, lighting and street furniture (the Stage E/F1 design package) – 1 October 2012;

- RBK technical review of the Stage E/F1 design package – November 2012;

- Neighbourhood Committee approval of the detailed design for the market place paving – 14 November 2012;
• Begin tender process for the main construction contract – **December 2012**;

• Appoint design team for the detailed design of the new market stalls – **December 2012**;

• Submit planning application for the relocation of the Shrubsole statue – **December 2012**;

• Develop a detailed design for the construction and fabrication of the market stalls – **by April 2013**;

• Submit planning application for the new market stalls – **April 2013**;

• Complete tender process for the main construction contract – **May 2013**;

• Construction works start on site – **early summer 2013**; and

• Deliver a major construction programme to implement the building works in the Ancient Market area, including both the market place public realm scheme and the new market stalls – **by March 2014**.

**Christmas 2013 market**

23. Further work is still required to develop a detailed construction programme and phasing plan for delivery of the market place public realm scheme. The exact timings will clearly depend on the contractor appointed to deliver the scheme which means we will not have final programme information until May 2013.

24. However, it should be noted that given the anticipated length of the main construction programme and the need to achieve practical completion by March 2014, it is probable that works will need to continue during the normal Christmas moratorium. It may also be necessary to find an alternative location for the Christmas market during 2013 only.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

25. RBK has a remaining budget of just under £3.1 million to support the regeneration of the Ancient Market area. The main funding sources are the Outer London Fund (£1.39 million which must be spent by March 2014), RBK capital investment (£1.5 million) and Section 106 contributions (£193,000).

26. The estimated cost of building the market place public realm scheme (excluding the cost of fabricating the market stalls) is £2.03 million. The cost of fabricating the market stalls is likely to be between £350,000 and £500,000.

27. Further work is still required to prepare a detailed cost plan for the full range of Kingston Ancient Market project activities. The detailed cost plan will be reported to the Kingston Ancient Market Member Officer Group at its next meeting.
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

Market place public realm scheme

28. In choosing the materials for the new paving scheme the design team has considered the whole life costs of the works. The proposed granite surface provides a robust, natural surface that is highly suited for the intensive use and heavier traffic of the market environment.

29. The finished surface will be very durable, reducing the need for maintenance and repair. Plentiful and commonly used granite types in small sized setts are used to make repairs simple and seamless. The sustainability of the project is enhanced through its extended life. A unique pattern is composed from familiar materials to convey the identity and use of Kingston Ancient Market Place.

30. The design brief called for improvements to the lighting in the Market Place to extend the usage of the space after dark. Care has been taken to specify high efficiency LED light fittings that will minimise the power usage and increase time between replacement bulbs. Each light is also computer controlled to use energy only when it is required throughout the day.

Market stalls

31. During the detailed design of the market stalls we will be exploring whether there are any creative routes to addressing waste as a resource - reducing, reusing, and recycling waste produced in the market place, with disposal as a last resort. Potential options such as composting organic waste will be explored with the RBK Waste Team.

NETWORK IMPLICATIONS

32. The market place public realm scheme will not have any implications for the Borough’s highway or transportation networks.

33. There will be some temporary disruption to the access arrangements for delivery vehicles during the construction of the scheme. These details have still to be worked out but we will liaise closely about what is proposed with businesses in the Ancient Market once we have appointed the main contractor for the scheme.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

The background papers are held by report author, Mark Teasdale (Project Manager, Kingston Ancient Market) on (020) 8547 5996 or at mark.teasdale@rbk.kingston.gov.uk

The key documents used in preparing this report are as follows:

- **Kingston Ancient Market Stage F1 design package** – including both architectural and engineering drawings (JMP Consultants Limited and Tonkin Liu Architects – October 2012);

- **Consultancy brief for detailed design of the market stalls** (RBK – October 2012); and
• Kingston Town Centre Area Action Plan (K+20) – RBK (July 2008).

Drawings and plans

The following plans have been circulated to Committee members and will be available for inspection at the Neighbourhood Committee meeting on 14 November 2012:

• Existing street furniture plan
• Proposed street furniture plan
• Representative paving effect
• Entrance way detail
• Existing lighting plan
• Proposed highway lighting scheme
• Proposed facade lighting scheme
• Proposed Market House facade lighting scheme
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APPLICATION FOR A HIGHWAY STREET CAFE LICENCE – CAPPADOCIA
REPORT BY DIRECTOR OF PLACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An application has been received from the owner of Cappadocia at 2 Station Buildings, Fife Road, Kingston Upon Thames, seeking permission under the Highways Act 1980 to locate two tables and four chairs on the pavement outside the property.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is <strong>RECOMMENDED</strong> that the application for a street cafe licence for Cappadocia be refused.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To determine the application.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The Highways Act 1980 allows the local authority to licence the provision of street cafes, subject to statutory consultation and the application meeting the conditions of the licence. The Council first considered and approved the legal provision of street cafes in June 1995.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Upon receipt of an application formal consultation is undertaken with neighbouring frontagers, Neighbourhood Councillors and members of the Street Trading Panel/Street Activities Working Group, which is a group comprising council officers and the local Police. Public Notices are clearly displayed in the window of the premises seeking the licence. Any objection may result in permission not being granted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Director of Place has delegated powers for the establishment of street cafes and these powers are used when no objections are received. Objections have been received and the Committee is therefore asked to determine the outcome of this application.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. The application for a licence was accompanied by a scaled map (Annex 1) which identifies the location of the two tables and four chairs on the paved area outside of their property.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSULTATION RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. One objection to the application has been received:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a. The Project Engineer for Kingston Town Neighbourhood stated that the area is in the vicinity of Kingston station and is very busy therefore the relevant footway is not wide enough to accommodate the number of pedestrians and two tables and four chairs and therefore would not support the application. However the applicant can explore the possibility of placing two tables and eight chairs at the front of his premises near the phone box however this would be subject to a new opening to serve them. The applicant has previously been made aware of this proposal.

OFFICER COMMENT

6. The provision of street cafes in general has received substantial support from the local community businesses and visitors to Town Centres. Extensive efforts have been made to support applications for street cafes where such provision does not cause conflict with the efficient and effective running of the town centre or cause a serious obstruction.

7. On this application, it is recognised that street furniture would cause an obstruction to pedestrians and the Committee is recommended to refuse the application.

TIMESCALE

8. This application is recommended for refusal; however, if the Committee decides to grant the application, the licence will be operational immediately.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

9. The provision of street cafes can add to the ambience of an area and provide an additional source of seating and refreshment provision. The adverse affects of street cafes can, if not properly licensed and managed, result in an unkempt appearance through litter, discarded food and dirty tables.

Background papers: held by Dawn Bowling, Markets and Street Activities Officer (author of report); 020 8547 5861 e-mail: dawn.bowling@rbk.kingston.gov.uk

- Application file
APPLICATION FOR A PAVEMENT PERMISSION
HIGHWAYS ACT 1980 - SECTION 115A – K STREET CAFÉ

NAME (of Applicant)

ADDRESS

TELEPHONE

NAME AND ADDRESS OF OWNER OF PRÉMISES (If different from above)

______________________________________________________

I/We wish to apply for a permission to place (please state numbers)

___ Tables, ___ Chairs and ___ Umbrellas

on the footway outside premises in Kingston upon Thames between the

hours of ___ 10 AM ___ and ___ 11 PM ___

Address of Premises 2 Station Buildings File Road

Interest of Applicant in Property (ie Owner, tenant etc) 

OWNER

Please confirm what usage the premises has by ticking the relevant boxes:

Class A1 (d) For the sale of sandwiches or other cold food for consumption off the
premises

Class A3 Food and Drink

Class A5 Hot Food Takeaway

Please note that we are unable to proceed with any application that does not have the appropriate use as detailed above

Ref: msa/gbw/sc51
GREENCOAT HOUSE

SERVICE YARD

1. Doner
2. Valentine 4x2
3. Chips 4x2
4. 2200 Cult.
1 - Cooler 12c
1 - Hot Plate 12c
1 - Fir 155x175

Fawford Associates
Architects Designers

10 Warren Hill Epsom Surrey KT18 7BX
Telephone 01372 728807

Project 1-4 Station Buildings, Fife Road

Client

Drawing: Proposed Ground Floor Plan

Scale: 1:100  Drawn by  Checked  Date: Sept.'10

Number  828  B  7  Revision
SUMMARY
An application has been received from the owner of Cafe Bernardo at 42 Richmond Road, Kingston Upon Thames, seeking permission under the Highways Act 1980 to locate two tables and four chairs on the pavement outside the property.

RECOMMENDATIONS
It is RECOMMENDED that the application for a street cafe licence for Cafe Bernardo be refused.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS
To determine the application.

BACKGROUND
1. The Highways Act 1980 allows the local authority to licence the provision of street cafes, subject to statutory consultation and the application meeting the conditions of the licence. The Council first considered and approved the legal provision of street cafes in June 1995.

2. Upon receipt of an application formal consultation is undertaken with neighbouring frontagers, Neighbourhood Councillors and members of the Street Trading Panel/Street Activities Working Group, which is a group comprising council officers and the local Police. Public Notices are clearly displayed in the window of the premises seeking the licence. Any objection may result in permission not being granted.

3. The Director of Place has delegated powers for the establishment of street cafes and these powers are used when no objections are received. Objections have been received and the Committee is therefore asked to determine the outcome of this application.

PROPOSAL
4. The application for a licence was accompanied by a scaled map (Annex 1) which identifies the location of the two tables and four chairs on the paved area outside of their property.

CONSULTATION RESPONSE
5. Three objections to the application have been received:
a. The Project Engineer for Kingston Town Neighbourhood stated that the footway is not wide enough to accommodate street furniture and therefore would not support this application.

b. A neighbouring resident stated that the street furniture obstructs the walkway which is very narrow.

c. A neighbouring business stated that the street furniture continually blocks the footway.

OFFICER COMMENT

6. The provision of street cafes in general has received substantial support from the local community businesses and visitors to Town Centres. Extensive efforts have been made to support applications for street cafes where such provision does not cause conflict with the efficient and effective running of the town centre or cause a serious obstruction.

7. On this application, it is recognised that street furniture would cause an obstruction to pedestrians and the Committee is recommended to refuse the application.

TIMESCALE

8. This application is recommended for refusal; however, if the Committee decides to grant the application, the licence will be operational immediately.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

9. The provision of street cafes can add to the ambience of an area and provide an additional source of seating and refreshment provision. The adverse affects of street cafes can, if not properly licensed and managed, result in an unkempt appearance through litter, discarded food and dirty tables.

Background papers: held by Dawn Bowling, Markets and Street Activities Officer (author of report); 020 8547 5861 e-mail: dawn.bowling@rbk.kingston.gov.uk

- Application file
APPLICATION FOR A PAVEMENT PERMISSION
HIGHWAYS ACT 1980 - SECTION 115A – K STREET CAFÉ

NAME (of Applicant) [Redacted]
ADDRESS 42 Richmond Road, KT2 5EE
TELEPHONE [Redacted]

NAME AND ADDRESS OF OWNER OF PREMISES [Redacted] (If different from above)

I/We wish to apply for a permission to place (please state numbers)____________________
2 Tables, 4 Chairs and 0 Umbrellas

on the footway outside premises in Kingston upon Thames between the
hours of 8am and 10pm.

Address of Premises 42 Richmond Road, KT2 5EE

Interest of Applicant in Property (ie Owner, tenant etc) tenant

Please confirm what usage the premises has by ticking the relevant boxes:

Class A1 (d) For the sale of sandwiches or other cold food for consumption off the premises

Class A3 Food and Drink ✔

Class A5 Hot Food Takeaway

Please note that we are unable to proceed with any application that
does not have the appropriate use as detailed above
SUMMARY

Concerns have been raised by a resident in Park Road, Kingston about the difficulties of access and egress from their driveways due to parked vehicles. In order to resolve these issues the existing single yellow line waiting restrictions across existing driveways in Bockhampton Road are proposed to be made double yellow line ‘at any time’ waiting restrictions as shown on the attached plan in Annex2.

A draft Traffic Management Order (TMO) was advertised in the local press and on-street on 31 August 2012. This invited comments from all those affected by the new restrictions.

Two objections were received against the proposed double yellow lines during the consultation period of the TMO.

This report considers the objections and makes recommendations on the way forward.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is RECOMMENDED that

1. the objection be set aside (over ruled) for the reasons detailed in paragraph 7 of this report and the TMO be made; and

2. the objectors are informed of the Committee’s decision and the reasons for it.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

To ensure that access to driveways are kept clear of parked vehicles at all times.

BACKGROUND

1. Bockhampton Road is currently within the Canbury Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) Zone ‘B’ which operates between Mondays and Fridays from 10.00am to 3.00pm.

2. Outside of these times the existing single yellow lines that stretch between driveways cannot be enforced. If a vehicle should park across driveways during these times, and cause an obstruction for those who wish to access or egress from that driveway, then it cannot be removed under the powers of this Council but can be removed by the Metropolitan Police Service. However, it is appreciated that action from the Police can be rare or not immediate.
PROPOSALS

3. A request was received by a resident in Park Road who has a double garage entrance at the rear of their property with a triple crossover in Bockhampton Road requesting that the existing single yellow line to be made into a double yellow line in order to protect this access because of the continuing problem of vehicles being parked across this entrance.

4. A letter was sent to those directly affected by this access in Bockhampton Road and Park Road a copy of which is attached as Annex 1.

5. The comments that were received following this letter included a further request from residents wishing to have the single yellow line across their double crossover also made into double yellow lines, opposite the original proposals. This was agreed and the full proposals are shown in Annex 2.

CONSULTATION

6. Two objections were received during the consultation period for the Traffic Management Order making process. Details of the objections together with officers response is shown below:

“All public consultations should be full meaningful. TMO’s should be clear and ambiguous. Double yellow lines in residential areas should only be used to ensure safety and eliminate demonstrable/measured nuisance. All public expenditure should be incurred only where shown to be necessary.”

Officer's response:
The consultation was only concentrated on those frontages that are directly affected by these proposals. This was deemed to be satisfactory in informing those residents of this proposed localised change.

Any misunderstanding regarding the description of the TMO, which was based on the borough's land parcel, was not intended to prejudice the procedure for introducing these proposals.

It should be noted that although double yellow lines have no greater legal significance than singles, they are much more respected and seldom suffer the same abuse as do single yellow lines. These would also allow the Council to enforce any obstructive parking taking away the onus on the Police to deal with these matters. As there are existing double yellow lines that protect the junction of Park Road and Bockhampton Road the enforcement of these new restrictions would not incur any additional visits by enforcement officers and will also be patrolled during the times of the CPZ.

To limit the costs involved in introducing small sections of additional waiting restrictions all requests are dealt with as a package so that the TMO advertising costs are limited to one TMO Proposal and not numerous individual Orders. In this case these proposals were included on an existing TMO Proposal and with the small costs associated with the actual road markings the introduction of these new restrictions has been limited to approximately one hundred pounds.
CONCLUSION

7. The proposed double yellow lines will deter parking across driveways to help keep them clear from parked vehicles at all times which is essential for residents to be able to access their garages at the rear of their properties. It is therefore recommended that the proposed double yellow lines be introduced.

VIEWS OF THE EMERGENCY SERVICES

8. As part of the statutory consultation with the emergency services and all key stakeholders during the making of the draft TMO no objections were received.

TIMESCALE

9. Subject to approval by Committee it is intended to proceed with the making of the Traffic Management Order (TMO) and the new restrictions are implemented by March 2013.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

10. The proposed scheme is to be funded by the Kingston Town Revenue budget at a cost of £100.00. Therefore the publication of TMO and the works to implement on site will be met from this budget.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

11. There are no environmental implications arising from this report.

NETWORK IMPLICATIONS

12. The introduction of additional double yellow line waiting restrictions in Bockhampton Road will have no direct impact on the overall road network.

Background papers: held by
Younes Hamade, Project Engineer, tel 020 8547 5922, e-mail: younes.hamade@rbk.kingston.gov.uk
Residents in
Bockhampton Road

Dear Sir or Madam,

Proposed New Waiting Restrictions – Bockhampton Road

Concerns have been raised by a resident in Park Road about the difficulties of access and egress from their driveways due to parked vehicles. In order to resolve this problem I am proposing to introduce double yellow line waiting restrictions.

The plan overleaf shows proposals for converting the existing single yellow line adjacent to No.42 Bockhampton Road to double yellow line 'at any time' waiting restrictions across the existing driveways. These restrictions will assist in keeping this area clear of obstructions which currently cause visibility issues and will improve access for vehicles.

I am now taking the opportunity to inform you of these proposals and seeking your views. Should you have any comments you can write to me at the address shown on the top of this letter or contact me on the number above for more information.

The legal Traffic Management Order (TMO) is also being prepared which will shortly be advertised in the local press as well as notices being put up on street. This will also give you an opportunity to respond directly to the proposals should you wish to do so.

All comments in response to this letter should be received by Monday 10th September 2012.

Yours faithfully,

Paul Drummond
Neighbourhood Manager
Kingston Town Neighbourhood

Enquiries to: Paul Drummond
E-mail: paul.drummond@rbk.kingston.gov.uk
Direct Line: 020 8547 5002
Fax No.: 020 8547 5926
Date: 16th August 2012
My Ref: BOCKHAMPTON/DYL/RESLET1
EXISTING PARKING BAYS

EXISTING DOUBLE YELLOW LINE WAITING RESTRICTIONS

PROPOSED SINGLE YELLOW LINE TO BE MADE INTO A DOUBLE YELLOW LINE 'At Any Time' WAITING RESTRICTION
EXISTING PARKING BAYS

EXISTING DOUBLE YELLOW LINE WAITING RESTRICTIONS

EXISTING SINGLE YELLOW LINE TO BE MADE INTO A DOUBLE YELLOW LINE 'At Any Time' WAITING RESTRICTION
SUMMARY

The Neighbourhood Committees can award grants of up to £750 towards the costs of projects or activities run by voluntary organisations in their area. Subject to certain criteria, the Committee can decide to award grant aid where an activity is of direct benefit to the residents of the Neighbourhood in terms of social welfare, sports, art, play and leisure activities, youth provision or environmental improvement.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is RECOMMENDED that the allocation of grants are awarded as follows:

1. Bounce Theatre £250
   (subject to agreement by Maldens & Coombe Neighbourhood to fund the other £500 of the request – see Officers’ Report)

2. Everyone Matters – ‘Conversation Pieces’ £750

3. Kingston Somali Community Association £600

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION

To assist the voluntary organisations to carry out their activities in the Neighbourhood.

BACKGROUND

1. The total budget allocated for grant making to Neighbourhood Committees in 2012/13 is £19,500. However, taking account of the further reduced contribution to the London Boroughs Grants Scheme, the Policy and Resources Committee on 27 March 2012 agreed to allocate a further £10,000 equally across the Neighbourhoods for small grants that will support Neighbourhood community initiatives and Neighbourhood Community Plans. This brings the total budget to £29,500.

2. The Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee therefore has a grants budget of £9,000 for 2012/13.

3. The resources allocated for Neighbourhood Grants should be used solely for the purposes of grant making.
CRITERIA

4. The criteria for Neighbourhood grants are as follows:
   
   i. The proposed project or activity aims to provide services for the direct benefit of residents of the Neighbourhood area, in social welfare, housing, sports, art, play and leisure activities, youth provision or environmental improvement.

   ii. Proposals for new initiatives must be able to demonstrate that the project meets particular local needs and priorities.

   iii. The proposal should not duplicate work already undertaken by other voluntary organisations in the same locality.

   iv. The voluntary organisation making the application must have a constitution and a system for accounting for income and expenditure.

5. New groups will be particularly welcomed, as will groups which have raised some funds by their own efforts. Applications for grant aid can be made for rent or room hire, administration costs, volunteers’ expenses, training, one-off events/activities, transport etc. Items of equipment and small-scale repair works will also be considered.

6. The maximum grant for each group or organisation is £750.

APPLICATION FOR GRANTS

1) Bounce Theatre Grant request: £750

7. Bounce Theatre was set up in 2006 as a Community Interest Company and provides opportunities for people to join in, watch and create theatre. This is achieved through a programme of workshops, projects and productions which promote confidence and participation in community activities. The organisation is based in the Artistic Director’s home in Kingston. Activities predominantly take place in south west London, in particular Hounslow and Kingston. In the last year, over 1,000 individuals have participated in a workshop, project or production or watched as an audience member.

8. The organisation is run by an Executive Management Committee of three and has Safeguarding Children Good Practice Guidelines and a Health and Safety policy.

9. The grant request is for a contribution towards the running costs of dance classes, including ballet, for older people who are either recovering from illness or are keen to remain physically active and engaged. The classes are held at Age Concern’s Bradbury Centre and began in late June as part of the Big Dance 2012 Festival to promote dance engagement in the borough. The classes are attracting a growing number of participants, mainly through word of mouth.

10. Currently there are 10-12 participants from the Bradbury Centre and around 30 who come from Age Concern’s Raleigh Centre in New Malden. The grant would enable the classes to take place once a week at lunchtimes throughout the Autumn. The
classes are free of charge and are open to everybody. They are also designed to take account of participants’ individual capabilities and requirements.

11. Bounce Theatre’s accounts for the year ending March 2011 show income of £69,882 from workshop fees, grants and donations against expenditure of £67,643 mainly for running costs and staffing costs (including the director’s salary), leaving a surplus of £2,239. The organisation has reserves of £3,709 representing less than one month’s running costs.

12. The project budget sets out projected expenditure of £1,750, mainly for staffing (£750), premises hire (£750) and publicity (£200) with income from in-kind donations of £1,000, leaving a shortfall of £750.

13. Bounce Theatre was awarded an RBK Development Grant for 2012/13 of £8,500 towards a project called ‘Plus One’. This project brings older people together with disadvantaged young people to help develop their confidence and interpersonal skills and employability. The work carried out so far in this project has worked well and further work is planned for the rest of the year.

**Officers’ Report**

14. Much of Bounce Theatre’s work has focused on intergenerational projects. This type of work is not being carried out by any other arts group currently working in Kingston. Bounce Theatre has a good working relationship with the RBK Arts Manager and other partners, and the work carried out during the summer has led to discussions about how the ‘legacy’ of the project can be further developed.

15. The classes that are the subject of this application are very well received and the participants benefit from the exercise and the mental stimulation involved. Although the classes are publicised in and around the Bradbury Centre, and have growing numbers, it might also be worth considering how to extend advertising to other local voluntary groups working with users who might be interested in participating.

16. As a not-for-profit Community Interest Company, Bounce may wish to contact Kingston Voluntary Action about other voluntary groups that are working in Kingston and also to seek advice and support in terms of their development towards becoming more sustainable.

17. However, as far as this application is concerned, because participants from Kingston Town make up between a quarter and one third of the total current numbers, with the rest coming from Maldens & Coombe Neighbourhood, it is recommended that Kingston Town Neighbourhood contributes £250, subject to the agreement of the Maldens & Coombe Neighbourhood Committee to fund the other £500 at their next meeting on 21 November 2012.

18. Grants are expected to be used within one year of the award and a monitoring form is returned confirming how the grant has been used.

**RECOMMENDATION:** a grant of £250, subject to agreement from the Maldens & Coombe Neighbourhood Committee to fund the other £500.
2) Everyone Matters – ‘Conversation Pieces’

Grant request: £750

19. Everyone Matters is a registered charity formed in 2010. They specialise in giving concerts for children with learning disabilities and have worked at many of the special schools in the Borough including Dysart School and St Philip’s School. They have also provided informal concerts for older people in nursing homes and day centres across South East London.

20. The group has a policy for the protection of children and vulnerable adults and is run by a management committee of four which meets two or three times a year.

21. A grant of £750 is requested to cover the cost of six concerts in the neighbourhood. The concerts are presented on the theme of ‘conversation pieces’, with two professional instrumentalists playing a selection of music chosen by the audience from a ‘menu’ of available pieces with opportunity for discussion between the audience and the musicians. The concerts are being planned to take place at Bardwell House Day Centre, Beaufort Lodge Care Home, Bradbury Active Age Centre, Kingston Care Centre, Murray House Resource Centre and one further venue to be confirmed. It has been noted that Kingston Care Centre is just outside of Kingston Town Neighbourhood, but that the four other confirmed venues are all within the Neighbourhood.

22. Projected budget for the events shows income of £251.30, excluding the £750 applied for here, against expenditure of £1,001.30. Expenditure is expected to relate to artists’ fees (£770), administration (£154) and instrument porterage (£77.30). Income is expected from donations of £240, £40 from each of the planned venues.

23. Draft accounts for the period 1 October 2011 to 10 September 2012 show income of £4,485 against expenditure of £4,610.91 leaving a shortfall of £125.91. Expenditure mainly related to artists’ fees (£4,335) and CRB checks (£186). Income came mainly from grants (£3,000) and private donations (£995). The group currently holds no reserves. Accounts for the previous year 11/12 show that the organisation broke even.

24. Everyone Matters has also applied to Maldens & Coombe Neighbourhood for a grant of £750 to run concerts in Maldens & Coombe.

Officers’ Report

25. Although Everyone Matters have only been in operation for two years, their artistic director Margaret Archibald has extensive experience working with the London Mozart Players putting on similar events in the Borough in past years. The proposal for the ‘Conversation Pieces’ concerts represents good value for money based on the projected budget. The theme of ‘Conversation Pieces’ also links to current arts and cultural priorities for participatory arts projects.

26. As the venues in question have shown strong interest in receiving these concerts, a grant of £750 is recommended. This project has the potential to develop further if positive feedback is received from these events. It is also recommended that Everyone Matters looks into joining up with other groups in the Borough who are doing work around music and memory, such as Bounce Theatre.
27. Grants are expected to be used within one year of the award and a monitoring form is returned confirming how the grant has been used.

**RECOMMENDATION:** a grant of £750

**3) Kingston Somali Community Association**  
Grant request: £750

28. Kingston Somali Community Association (KSCA) is a registered charity which was formed in 2006. It was registered as a company limited by guarantee in 2008. KSCA provides a range of services for refugees, migrants and ethnic minorities, particularly for Kingston Somali Community and those at risk of domestic violence or crime, to help them integrate into the broader community. These include:
   - young people’s educational and training services, care and support services;
   - services for people with physical and mental health problems and disabilities; interpretation service;
   - housing and employment support services;
   - various classes including IT training courses, healthy eating classes, dementia awareness, citizenship classes and sports and social events and trips.

29. KSCA’s services are accessed by approximately 250 users, most of whom come from Kingston Town Neighbourhood and are provided by volunteers. Activities take place at Piper Hall, Richard Mayo Hall and Kingsmeadow. The group has adopted a child protection policy with all volunteers undergoing CRB checks.

30. A grant of £750 is requested to undertake a short-term (5 months) health project that will benefit participants through:
   - Offering mental health information and support through a series of five monthly workshops run by a community worker/facilitator based at Camden who is fluent in English, Somali and Arabic. The workshops are aimed at improving the mental health and wellbeing of disadvantaged groups who may be struggling with mild emotional/mental health issues and to encourage participants to seek further help if they need to. The facilitator attended previous KSCA workshops in April 2012 and managed to effectively engage participants.
   - The series of workshops will include one for networking and building links with local voluntary and statutory groups that offer relevant health services and increasing awareness of the relationship between drug abuse and mental health problems.
   - Small focus groups will also be held on different mental health topics to raise the community’s awareness. The facilitator will also provide some ongoing support and follow-up on those individuals who have been signposted through the system.

31. It is intended that the workshops will start late autumn or early winter on the Cambridge Road Estate. The workshops will be open to everyone in need of the service and will be advertised through leaflets posted to KSCA members and others. Posters will be displayed in public places such as Piper Hall and at the Richard Mayo
Centre. It will be advertised via the KSCA website and by word of mouth through volunteers.

32. Funding is requested for the fees of the mental health advice worker delivering the multi-lingual psychotherapy sessions (£400), volunteers’ expenses (£100), publicity (£50) and refreshments (£200).

33. Accounts for the year ending 31st March 2011 show income of £10,009 against expenditure of £8,046, resulting in a surplus of £1,963. Grants were received from RBK and the NHS. The projected budget for 2012/13 shows expenditure of £23,150 but no income, because their current funding is ring-fenced for the delivery of specific programmes (eg Cook and Eat, Prevent). KSCA does not hold any reserves.

34. A Project grant of £1,750 was awarded to this group for 2012/13 towards their running costs and volunteer expenses. The last neighbourhood grant was awarded in 2009/10 when £750 was given towards the costs of football sessions for young members.

Officers’ Report

35. The idea for this project came from consulting with community members during ongoing projects – Cook and Eat as well as mental health promotion work. Users stated that they needed mental health advice sessions due to the high prevalence of mental health problems in the community as evidenced by the increased number of people admitted to Tolworth Hospital.

36. This kind of activity fits with early intervention and prevention and the project is intended to make a difference by helping people to spot signs of mental health early on and help by giving them information and signposting them to mainstream services in Kingston. This would increase confidence in accessing help and reduce the stigma around doing so, as well as educating individuals on the links between mental health and drugs such as Khat. Overall, the project should benefit individuals and families, reduce social isolation and increase social integration.

37. It is recognised that the issues raised have a significant impact (as shown by the three case studies included in the application) and demonstrate a need for promoting access to appropriate services, particularly for the communities that KSCA works with.

38. It is not clear how many people are expected to attend and it would be useful to have an estimate of numbers, how these will be achieved and what impact the workshops will have. Individuals should also be asked how they found out about the workshops. It would also be helpful to look at whether a modest charge (perhaps on a sliding scale) could be made for the workshops or donations encouraged from participants.

39. It is also recommended that KSCA explores how to get some of their volunteers trained on a Mental Health First Aid course that is being organised by Jo Gikuyu from the Equalities and Community Engagement Team. Email: Josephine.gikuyu@rbk.kingston.gov.uk

40. In light of these comments, a grant of £600 is recommended towards the cost of the workshops and publicity.
41. Grants are expected to be used within one year of the award and a monitoring form is returned confirming how the grant has been used.

RECOMMENDATION: a grant of £600

STATUTORY POWERS FOR GRANT MAKING

42. The Head of Legal Services advises that a local authority is able to act only if empowered to do so by statute. This includes, in specific circumstances, the making of grants to voluntary groups. The statutory power under which a particular grant may be awarded will vary according to the type of activity which the grant will support. It is a requirement for every Council that grants made under Social Services legislation be exercised either by the statutory committee responsible for Social Services functions or by the Director. Therefore, any grants deemed to be in this category will be considered by the Neighbourhood Committee and passed to the Director of Community Services so that the Director’s delegated powers can be exercised.

43. Application 1 and 2 may be authorised under Section 19 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 which gives local authorities the power to provide premises for the use of clubs or societies having athletic, social or recreational objectives; to make recreational facilities available free or at reduced charges to such people as they think fit and to make grants or loans to help voluntary bodies provide recreational facilities of a kind which the local authorities have power to provide. This covers recreational facilities inside and outside of the local authority area.

44. Application 3 may be authorised under Section 65 of the Health Services and Public Health Act 1968 which gives local authorities the power to make grants to voluntary organisations in the Health and Social Services field who are providing a service which a local authority must or may provide or who are promoting or publicising such a service or similar one, or giving advice on how such a service or similar one can best be provided.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

45. There is currently £6,900 in the Kingston Town Neighbourhood Grants budget. If the recommendations in this report are agreed there will be £5,300 remaining for 2012/13.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

46. There are no significant environmental implications arising from this report.

Background Papers: held by Jill Darling, Team Leader, Voluntary and Community Sector (author of report), Strategic Business tel: 020 8547 5124, email: jill.darling@rbk.kingston.gov.uk

• Applications and supporting documents from the individual organisations.
SUMMARY

The Council has received a written request to remove a tree from outside 16 Linden Crescent, Norbiton. This request runs contrary to Policy 2 of the RBK Tree Strategy (2008-2018). The tree is a medium sized flowering cherry tree in a healthy condition.

Action proposed by the Executive Member for Sustainability and Sport

It is proposed that the request to remove the tree is refused.

Reason for action proposed

The request does not comply with the adopted policies of the Tree Strategy (2008-2018)

BACKGROUND

1. The Council has received a written request to remove a tree from outside 16 Linden Crescent, Norbiton and replace with another tree for which a contribution is offered towards the cost of replacement. The request was made by the resident of 16 Linden Crescent for the following reasons:

   a. It has grown excessively large when compared to other trees in the road
   b. It is different species to the other trees in the road
   c. Reduces light into the living room of no 16 Linden Crescent
   d. Reduces safe access by ladder for maintenance of 16 Linden Crescent
   e. Movement of paving slabs causing a trip hazard to pedestrians
   f. Fouling of the telephone lines
   g. Leaves fouling guttering

2. This request runs contrary to polices of the RBK Tree Strategy (2008-2018) and hence for the policy to be overturned, on this occasion, the request should be considered by the Committee.

3. The resident has been in communication with the ward member and the Council’s Tree Officer. The ward member was receptive to the resident’s reasons for removal and supports the request for the policy to be overturned on this occasion. The ward member’s view is that the tree is out of character with the other trees in Linden Crescent because it is a different species to the other trees in the road, and that the resident is minded to pay towards the cost of replacement the request should be
considered. The Tree Officer has refused the request in line with the policies of the RBK Tree Strategy.

4. The tree outside 16 Linden Crescent is a flowering cherry approximately 16 years old. It stands on the bend in the road (Fig 1). It is in a healthy condition. The other trees in the road are all flowering cherries of differing species which were planted at the same time in 1996. At the time, the decision to plant trees of the same family (*Prunus* sp.) but of different sub-species was made to provide a diversity of size, flower, leaf form and colour that flower at slightly different times during the spring.

![Fig 1 Tree outside 15 Linden Crescent 10 August 2012](image1)

5. The tree has been maintained under the three year cyclical maintenance regime. It was inspected in 2009 as part of the cyclical Health and Safety survey, and pruned in 2010 as a result of the inspection. In addition in August 2012 the tree canopy was reduced by 20% as it was interfering with the telephone wires (Fig 2).

![Fig 2 Tree outside 15 Linden Crescent 29 August 2012](image2)
6. The council receives many requests to remove trees for a range of reasons, and unless the tree is in a dead, dying or dangerous condition, or there are exceptional circumstances the requests are robustly refused.

7. One of the exceptional circumstances is as a result of a successful crossover application, in which the applicant pays for the replacement of the tree. This payment is dependent on the size and maturity of the tree. For example the removal of a healthy medium sized tree such as the one outside 16 Linden Crescent three trees would be replaced.

8. Often the requests are made because of the shading into the living space of a nearby property. Under Common Law the tree can be reduced back to boundary, and this is the advice given if such a request is made. At the same time the request is noted and at the next maintenance period the tree is reduced back as appropriate.

9. The footway around the tree has been inspected for trip hazards and deemed to be in a non-hazardous condition and posing no disruption to the footway. The footway does not require any attention.

**PROPOSAL**

10. The request to remove the tree is refused.

**RBK TREE STRATEGY POLICIES**

11. The refusal is supported by the policy of the RBK Tree Strategy 2008-2018. Which states:

   **Tree Removal:** The Council receives a great many requests to remove trees. For example: installation of vehicle cross-overs, road traffic improvements, subsidence claims and specific removal of some species which are considered a nuisance. However, often it is only once a tree is removed that its value becomes apparent. Even after replanting the amenity lost can rarely be replaced. The highway environment is a finite space for which there is intense competition from other services gas, water, electric etc. Planting opportunities after a tree is removed are becoming increasingly difficult as a new tree pit not only has to contend with the underground pipes and cables but also has to the aerial competition from street lamps, traffic signs, vehicle sightlines etc. There will be a resistance to the removal of trees unless there is sound arboriculture or risk related reason to do so. This may be dead, dying, diseased or structural damage. Or when a tree is deemed inappropriate for the location and there are resources available to replant with a more suitable species (paragraph 12.1 for further discussion). Trees in a hazardous condition will be considered as an emergency and removed without notification to safeguard the public and property. **Policy 2 Requests for tree removal will be refused unless the tree is deemed to be in a hazardous condition subject to inspection by a qualified Tree Officer.**

12. However, if a healthy tree is removed at the request of a resident it usually as a result of a successful request for a vehicle crossover. If this is the case, the following applies:
In line with Policy 2 trees will not normally be removed to accommodate new vehicular access unless there is good arboriculture reason to do so. In any case where cross over works are approved by the Council and which approve removal and replacement of street trees, the full cost of all such tree works will be borne by the applicant. The size of the tree removed will dictate the number of new trees required. i.e. Young (1-3 years old) = 1 tree, Small = 2 trees, medium = 3 trees, large = 4 trees. The current (2007) replacement and 2 year maintenance cost is £360.00 per tree (this figure will be subject to an annual inflation increase).

TIMESCALE

13. There is no timescale

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

14. The cost of replacing a tree of a similar age and size would be in the region of £3000. The cost of replacing three smaller trees would be £1095. There is no allocated budget for these replacements. The resident has indicated that he would be willing to contribute towards a replacement tree. The current cost of a tree under the tree sponsorship scheme is £365.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

15. Kingston has been losing street trees at a faster rate than replacement. The following demonstrates the number of vacant pits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of vacant pits (includes felled)</th>
<th>Annual loss</th>
<th>Number felled Dead dying or dangerous (not crossover applications)</th>
<th>Number planted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>343</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>98 (to date)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>679</td>
<td></td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. The reasons for tree death are many, but it is mainly through the environmental stress that a tree planted in the street is under. Changing weather conditions and patterns, pollution, restricted growing and vandalism all contribute to the stress.

Background papers: held by Marie-Claire Edwards – 020 8547 5372
e-mail: marie-claire.edwards@rbk.kingston.gov.uk
Author of report

- RBK Tree Strategy (incorporated into the Green Spaces Strategy 2008-2018)
  Adopted by Executive May 2008
SUMMARY

This report updates the Committee on the 2012/13 budget monitoring position as at month 6. The Committee is asked to note the forecast outturn under spend of £9.5k as shown in Annex 1.

RECOMMENDATION

It is RECOMMENDED that the month 6 position be noted.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION

To provide an update to the Committee of the Kingston Town revenue budget monitoring position.

BACKGROUND

1. A report was presented to this Committee on 4 September 2012 updating the Committee on the final 2012/13 revenue budget and the forecast nil variance as at month 3.

2. This report sets out the month 6 monitoring position (Annex 1) and reasons for forecast variances.

MONTH 6 POSITION

3. The forecast outturn variance as at the end of month 6 is an under spend of £9.5k against the latest budget position of £1,636k. This under spend is due to a part-year vacancy in the neighbourhood rangers budget, partly offset by increasing vehicle costs. The full month 6 position is shown in Annex 1.

4. The latest budget is £185.7k higher than the budget reported to the Committee on 4 September. This is due to £177.7k being allocated to the planned maintenance budget from the £700k growth for highways maintenance approved in Destination Kingston 2012-2016, and an £8k increase to reflect minor changes to the recharges for repairs and maintenance.
DISCRETIONARY BUDGET

5. The balance on the discretionary budget is £48,582 and this is made up of a number of allocations from the 2011/12 carried forward under spend and a balance of £882 that remains available to be allocated by the Committee. This is summarised in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation of 2011/12 Under Spends:</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£9k allocation per ward</td>
<td>36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Pastors</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayside Gardens</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canbury Gardens Heritage match funding</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Plaque</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unallocated funds</td>
<td>882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total on discretionary</strong></td>
<td><strong>48,582</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

6. There are no direct environmental implications arising from this report.

TIMESCALE

7. The Committee will continue to receive regular and timely updates on budget planning and in-year budget monitoring.

Background papers: held by Victoria Adams (Author of Report) – 020 8547 5571
e-mail: victoria.adams@rbk.kingston.gov.uk

• Kingston Town Revenue Budget Update 2012/13 – Report to Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee 4 September 2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budgets</th>
<th>2012/13 Budget as per 4 September</th>
<th>Highways Growth</th>
<th>Allocation of Discretionary</th>
<th>Recharges of R&amp;M</th>
<th>2012/13 Latest Budget at M6 Spend to Date</th>
<th>Forecast Outturn</th>
<th>Forecast Outturn Variance</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment, Place &amp; Regeneration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Part-year vacancy savings offset by increasing vehicle costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Rangers</td>
<td>63,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63,200</td>
<td>30,879</td>
<td>53,656</td>
<td>9,544cr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsive Maintenance</td>
<td>209,900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>209,900</td>
<td>126,398</td>
<td>209,900</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Maintenance</td>
<td>358,500</td>
<td>177,748</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>536,248</td>
<td>495,984</td>
<td>536,248</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Management</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>7,946</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>646,600</td>
<td>177,748</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>824,348</td>
<td>661,207</td>
<td>814,804</td>
<td>9,544cr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning &amp; Childrens Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Branches</td>
<td>494,900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,330</td>
<td>498,230</td>
<td>206,926</td>
<td>498,230</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Centres</td>
<td>86,300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>86,499</td>
<td>16,325</td>
<td>86,499</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>581,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,529</td>
<td>584,729</td>
<td>223,251</td>
<td>584,729</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Landlord</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tudor Hall</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>264cr</td>
<td>9,736</td>
<td>5,110cr</td>
<td>9,736</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for Jubilee Celebrations (£4000), Olympics (£3000) and One Norbiton (£8,118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management &amp; Operations</td>
<td>142,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,118</td>
<td>4,736</td>
<td>162,254</td>
<td>55,170</td>
<td>162,254</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants to Voluntary Organisations</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary Budget</td>
<td>63,700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,118cr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48,582</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>48,582</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>212,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,736</td>
<td>217,336</td>
<td>59,320</td>
<td>217,336</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL FUND TOTAL</td>
<td>1,450,400</td>
<td>177,748</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,265</td>
<td>1,636,413</td>
<td>943,779</td>
<td>1,616,869</td>
<td>9,544cr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANNEX 1
SUMMARY

In 2010, a DEFRA grant was secured to carry out a programme of air quality monitoring, including the use of diffusion tubes located at 40 sites across the borough to measure the level of Nitrogen Dioxide (NO\textsubscript{2}) pollution over the annual average Air Quality objective. This grant funded a survey for 24 months from November 2010 to October 2012.

The results of the diffusion tube survey over the two years, are set out in Annex 1 of the report, together with an indication of the trend in results, where this possible. A map showing the sampling locations in the Neighbourhood is attached at Annex 2 of the report.

Analysis of the results indicates that, having averaged all values of the monitoring points within the Neighbourhood, and compared these results to the other Neighbourhoods, the air quality in Kingston Town Neighbourhood is considered worse than in other neighbourhoods, with a number of sites show an exceedance of the monthly air quality objective, and one site in particular appears to be over double the objective.

A proportion of the funding secured from DEFRA has been set aside to fund a continuous air quality monitoring investigation within the Borough, and this equipment is due to be located within Kingston Town Neighbourhood in the near future.

The resulting data from these surveys and the continuous monitoring will be used to inform deliberations on the continuation of the Air Quality Management Area and subsequent revision of the Air Quality Action Plan.

In addition, it is proposed that the diffusion tube monitoring of NO\textsubscript{2} in Kingston Town Neighbourhood will start again in January 2013, and members’ views are sought regarding new locations for 10 diffusion tubes to be sited in the Neighbourhood.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is RECOMMENDED that

1. the results of the Air Quality Monitoring Survey are noted

2. Members consider potential locations for further air quality monitoring (ref para 22).

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

To receive and consider the findings of the diffusion tube air quality monitoring programme and to ensure the limited grant funding available is used to ensure that the most useful air quality data is obtained.
BACKGROUND

1. The whole of the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames was declared an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) in 2006, following a review of air quality undertaken by Kings College London, which predicted that the air quality within the Borough would exceed the National Air Quality Objectives for the annual average limit for nitrogen dioxide ($\text{NO}_2$) and the EU Directive for particulate matter ($\text{PM}_{10}$).

2. The review identified that exceedance of these limits would primarily occur adjacent to kerbside along some of the Borough’s busy trunk roads and that therefore there was also a potential risk of exposure to residents living within these locations.

3. The declaration by the Council of a whole borough AQMA was considered preferable to the declaration of individual hotspot areas of pollution as separate AQMAs. This was judged the best way of addressing AQ issues in a holistic, borough wide way and prevented measures that might only serve to displace pollution from one area of the borough to another (for example, by redirecting traffic flows).

4. Following adoption of the AQMA, an Air Quality Action Plan was developed and identifies a number of steps the Borough seeks to take to address some of the causes of pollution and improve air quality.

5. Kingston is not unusual among outer London Boroughs in having local areas of high particulate matter ($\text{PM}_{10}$) and nitrogen dioxide ($\text{NO}_2$) pollution. The most predominant source of these pollutants in ‘non-industrial’ areas is emissions from motor vehicles and, it is not surprising that the review found higher levels of these pollutants concentrated around the Borough’s main trunk roads and Kingston Town Centre.

6. Whilst the Borough historically benefitted from two fixed location continuous Air Quality monitoring stations, these were withdrawn some years ago for financial reasons. There has been, consequently, no quantitative air quality monitoring in Kingston since 2007.

7. However in 2010, the Environmental Health team were successful in securing funding through the DEFRA Grant Scheme to carry out a programme of air quality monitoring.

AIR QUALITY MONITORING

8. Some of this funding has been used to carry out an air quality monitoring survey using diffusion tubes to measure the level of $\text{NO}_2$ pollution over of the annual average air quality objective period of 12 months.

9. The results of the diffusion tube survey, involving 40 diffusion tubes located at 45 sites across the borough over 24 months, are given at ANNEX 1. The table shows the average monthly reading for each site in each year, together with an indication of the trend. Detailed month by month spreadsheets are available on request.

10. A map showing the location of the monitoring sites in Kingston Town Neighbourhood is attached at ANNEX 2.
11. Air Quality standards are set out in legislation, and for Nitrogen Dioxide two limit values are given:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Averaging Period</th>
<th>Limit Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Hour</td>
<td>200 µg/m³ not to be exceeded more than 18 times a calendar year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calendar Year</td>
<td>40 µg/m³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Diffusion tubes are known to be affected by several sources of interference that can result in significant over or under reading, so we apply a bias factor to the monthly average to reflect this. The value of the bias factor is calculated from submissions nationally, and is specific to the type of tube used and the laboratory where they are sent for analysis.

11. The results indicate that in the first year of the survey, 2 sites marginally exceeded the annual mean limit value (the two sites on Richmond Road). More concurringly, three sites appeared to exceed the objective (Penhryn Road, Kingston Hill and Cromwell Road). The results for Cromwell road are of particular concern producing a monthly average over 2.5 times the objective limit and giving rise to the concern that, at times, the one hour limit value might have been exceeded.

12. It is encouraging that the results in the second year appear to show a general trend downwards, to the extent that the 95 Richmond Road site is now below the annual limit value. The three sites of concern identified from the previous year’s survey continue to show above the average limit value, however the figures have reduced in each case. Cromwell Road is still particularly concerning however.

13. Having averaged all values of the monitoring points within the Neighbourhood, and compared these results to the other Neighbourhoods, the air quality in the Kingston Town Neighbourhood is considered to be worse than in other Neighbourhoods. Of particular note, is that the average reading for the monitoring points in Kingston Town is in excess of the annual limit value in both years (though improved in the second year).

AIR QUALITY AND HEALTH

14. Concerns surrounding Air Quality and health were raised at the Health Overview Board, particularly with regard to the effect of air quality upon people with chronic respiratory illnesses.

15. It is generally accepted that there is an adverse effect upon health of some air pollutants. However, it should be remembered that this is quantified, in that the degree of risk is relative to the period of exposure to the pollutants. Individual reactions to air pollutants depend on a number of factors, including the type of pollutant, the degree of exposure and the individual’s health status.

16. It is difficult therefore for an individual to be subjected to annual exposure levels of Nitrogen Dioxide at a kerbside location. However, exposure to peak one hour concentrations, if measured, would be more significant in terms of health effect and, in some areas, would be more likely. To date, the Council’s modelled data has identified that exceedence of the peak one hour may well occur in the Kingston Town Neighbourhood, at the Cromwell Road site. Analysis has however identified
that Kingston’s air quality is not significantly worse than other similar locations in outer London and surrounding boroughs.

17. It is fair to say that the results for Kingston Town Neighbourhood do give some cause for concern, particularly when compared to the results in other areas of the Borough. Whilst it is of course desirable to work to ensure the general decrease in NO₂ levels across the Borough, this is particularly so at sites where the limit value is exceeded. Officers are continuing to liaise with other colleagues to ensure the measures outlined in the Air Quality Action Plan are implemented.

18. It is also recognised that wider measures are being implemented to assist in the general reduction of pollutants across the Capital, including:

- stricter control on vehicles eligible to enter the Low Emissions Zone
- tougher emission standards on new vehicles
- last year’s used car scrappage scheme
- the Mayor of London’s new Air Quality Strategy.

It is also noted that air pollution from road transport has decreased by about 50% in the last decade.

FURTHER MONITORING

19. A proportion of the funding secured from DEFRA has been set aside to fund continuous air quality monitoring equipment at a location within the Borough where diffusion tube data indicates that there may be a potential risk for that the 1 hour peak limit to be exceeded.

20. It is intended that this stage of the monitoring programme will monitor NO₂ and PM₁₀, with the data measured being used to inform deliberations on the continuation of the Air Quality Management Area and subsequent revision of the Air Quality Action Plan.

21. Assessments of the most appropriate location for this monitoring exercise to be undertaken, based upon the results of our diffusion tube survey and in conjunction with colleagues at the Environmental Research Group, Kings College London, who oversees the London Air Quality Network, have identified a potential site in Sopwith Way. The procurement process for the hire of Air Quality Monitoring Equipment is currently being undertaken, and it is hoped that equipment will be installed in the next few months.

22. Whilst there is a limited budget available for additional monitoring, it is proposed that an additional, fresh, survey is carried out from January 2013. Members are invited to recommend 10 sites at which you would wish for monitoring to be conducted during this survey.

23. In addition, officers continue to investigate alternative funding sources that will enable a further continuous Air Quality Monitoring Station to be located in the Borough.

24. It is intended that the combined monitoring programmes will provide sufficient data to be provided to enable deliberations on the continuation of the Air Quality

25. The Borough has a year’s membership of the London Air Quality Network held in credit to be activated once continuous monitoring goes live, and the Environmental Research Group at Kings College London, who oversees the Network, will be providing analysis and technical support during this period.

26. Members will also wish to note that representations have already been made to the Planning Department about the need to investigate the requirement for developers of major projects within the Borough to provide support for continuous air quality monitoring as part of section 106 agreements.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

27. Air Quality monitoring equipment is very expensive to acquire (or hire) and maintain, and the Council does not currently have a budget set aside for this. We rely on Government Grant funding to undertake our air quality monitoring. However, the availability of grant funds for this purpose is expected to reduce in forthcoming years as a result of funding cuts.

28. Whilst officers will continue to explore funding options, including through the use of LIP2, s106 agreements and other grants, unless a regular source of funding can be secured, any further air quality monitoring to that detailed in this report is unlikely to be possible in the current financial climate.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

29. Poor air quality has a number of impacts on the environment, including contributing to climate change, ozone depletion and manifesting itself in the appearance of smog.

ANNEXES

- Annex 1 – summary of results of 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 diffusion tube surveys
- Annex 2 – map showing location of diffusion tube sites in Kingston Town

Background papers: held by the author of the report, David Kingstone, Environmental Health Manager (Pollution Control & Licensing) – tel 020 8547 5537, e-mail: david.kingstone@rbk.kingston.gov.uk
## Summary of results of 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 diffusion tube surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITES</th>
<th>WARDS</th>
<th>Rd/Kerb</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>AVE 2011</th>
<th>AVE 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17-19 Penrhyn Road</td>
<td>Kingston Town</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>50.79</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>44.47</td>
<td>11 months</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 Queens Road nr Kings Road</td>
<td>Kingston Town</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>30.69</td>
<td>11 months</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>10 months</td>
<td>≠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Kingston Hill</td>
<td>Kingston Town</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>60.02</td>
<td>11 months</td>
<td>54.38</td>
<td>9 months</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station, Richmond Road</td>
<td>Kingston Town</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>40.52</td>
<td>11 months</td>
<td>34.33</td>
<td>11 months</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95 Richmond Road</td>
<td>Kingston Town</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>41.14</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>36.61</td>
<td>11 months</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-16 Cromwell Road</td>
<td>Kingston Town</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>106.16</td>
<td>11 months</td>
<td>93.88</td>
<td>10 months</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milfield Flats, Fairfield South</td>
<td>Kingston Town</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>31.18</td>
<td>11 months</td>
<td>30.12</td>
<td>11 months</td>
<td>≈</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 Latchmere Road</td>
<td>Kingston Town</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>28.67</td>
<td>11 months</td>
<td>27.55</td>
<td>11 months</td>
<td>≈</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildhall Complex</td>
<td>Kingston Town</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>25.93</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>25.15</td>
<td>11 months</td>
<td>≈</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Fife Road</td>
<td>Kingston Town</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>35.93</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>33.23</td>
<td>11 months</td>
<td>≈</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston Road</td>
<td>Malden &amp; Coombe</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>38.09</td>
<td>11 months</td>
<td>33.71</td>
<td>11 months</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248 Malden Road</td>
<td>Malden &amp; Coombe</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>46.64</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>45.68</td>
<td>10 months</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96 Burlington Road</td>
<td>Malden &amp; Coombe</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>42.79</td>
<td>10 months</td>
<td>41.16</td>
<td>11 months</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverley Way Coombe Lane West</td>
<td>Malden &amp; Coombe</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>34.78</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>33.41</td>
<td>11 months</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Coombe Lane West</td>
<td>Malden &amp; Coombe</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>38.97</td>
<td>11 months</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>10 months</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240 Kingston Vale</td>
<td>Malden &amp; Coombe</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>44.25</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>40.97</td>
<td>11 months</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Traps lane</td>
<td>Malden &amp; Coombe</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>33.05</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>32.93</td>
<td>10 months</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113-115 Clarence Avenue</td>
<td>Malden &amp; Coombe</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>34.72</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>33.24</td>
<td>11 months</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Oaks Warren Road</td>
<td>Malden &amp; Coombe</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>24.02</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>23.51</td>
<td>11 months</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325 South Lane</td>
<td>Malden &amp; Coombe</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>28.78</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>27.55</td>
<td>11 months</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITES</td>
<td>WARDS</td>
<td>Rd/Kerb</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>Trend</td>
<td>AVE 2011</td>
<td>AVE 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Bridge Road</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>36.09</td>
<td>37.48</td>
<td>5 months</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>33.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96 Leatherhead Road</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>38.43</td>
<td>35.16</td>
<td>11 months</td>
<td>≈</td>
<td>36.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hook Road South</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>44.46</td>
<td>42.26</td>
<td>11 months</td>
<td>≈</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 Fullers Way North</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>35.66</td>
<td>33.86</td>
<td>11 months</td>
<td>≈</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Cox Lane</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>36.13</td>
<td>36.45</td>
<td>5 months</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Jubilee Way</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>30.89</td>
<td>34.38</td>
<td>11 months</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hook Rise North</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>new site in 2012</td>
<td>51.47</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353 Malden Rushett</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>new site in 2012</td>
<td>40.11</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148 Leatherhead Road</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>new site in 2012</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hook Centre, Hook Road</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>new site in 2012</td>
<td>45.42</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Gilders Road</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>28.82</td>
<td>30.49</td>
<td>5 months</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 Stormont Way</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>25.89</td>
<td>26.97</td>
<td>5 months</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Roebuck Road / Chantry Road</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>27.17</td>
<td>5 months</td>
<td>≈</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Garrison Lane / Reynolds Ave</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>31.75</td>
<td>34.58</td>
<td>10 months</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundial Ct. Roundabout, Tolworth</td>
<td>Surbiton</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>new site in 2012</td>
<td>52.65</td>
<td>5 months</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Kingston Road</td>
<td>Surbiton</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>40.45</td>
<td>40.22</td>
<td>11 months</td>
<td>≈</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewell Road nr jct Elgar Avenue</td>
<td>Surbiton</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>53.21</td>
<td>55.46</td>
<td>11 months</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88 Brighton Road</td>
<td>Surbiton</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>37.42</td>
<td>35.11</td>
<td>11 months</td>
<td>≈</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Surbiton Flyer Victoria Road</td>
<td>Surbiton</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>61.78</td>
<td>53.25</td>
<td>11 months</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 Portsmouth Road</td>
<td>Surbiton</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>38.81</td>
<td>34.21</td>
<td>11 months</td>
<td>≈</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 Chiltern Drive</td>
<td>Surbiton</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>24.76</td>
<td>22.81</td>
<td>11 months</td>
<td>≈</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 Elgar Avenue</td>
<td>Surbiton</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>32.65</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>10 months</td>
<td>≈</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199 Douglas Road</td>
<td>Surbiton</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>27.91</td>
<td>26.71</td>
<td>11 months</td>
<td>≈</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Woodlands Road</td>
<td>Surbiton</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>23.61</td>
<td>22.85</td>
<td>11 months</td>
<td>≈</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Summary of results of 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 diffusion tube surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Surbiton</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>11 months</th>
<th>10 months</th>
<th>10 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78 Knollmead</td>
<td>Surbiton</td>
<td>25.01</td>
<td>11 months</td>
<td>22.65</td>
<td>10 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY

The Kingston Town Area Action Plan (K+20) proposes to create attractive ‘gateways’ to mark and enhance the five main approaches to the town centre and the approach from the river to achieve a sense of arrival and identity.

On arrival at one of the Gateways, Kingston Station, orientation is difficult and unwelcoming, there is also poor linkage and visibility of the local cultural heritage, including the Tourism Information Centre, making it hard to find for those not familiar with the town. It has been also identified by the Kingston Futures group, the key stakeholders in the town centre, as a poor entrance point. Our immediate Gateway priority is therefore for Kingston Station and its approaches.

This report outlines short-term project which can deliver a “quick win” solution to some of the pedestrian and environmental problems outside the station and at the northern end of Fife Road, and a longer-term scheme which will look at a wider area scheme in future to provide a larger transformational change to the area, and seeks the Committee approval to move forward with consultation & implementation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is RECOMMENDED that the committee agrees

1. the short-term project which can deliver a “quick win” solution to some of the pedestrian and environmental problems outside the station and at the northern end of Fife Road is approved as shown on Annex 1, and

2. to re-allocate £120k from footway improvement in Fife Road into the delivery of the short term project.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

The proposed scheme will meet K+20 policy and will better connect the public realm thus improving, and enhancing the appearance and attractiveness of the area.

BACKGROUND

1. The creation of Key Gateways and celebrate arrival has long been an ambition set out in the K+ 20 Area Action Plan for Kingston Town and Destination Kingston.

2. The changes proposed at Kingston Station will be the first of a series of improvements at the Key Gateways intended to reduce the effective 'severance' caused by the carriageway collar.
3. Improving the public realm for walking /cycling and other road users outside Kingston Station contribute toward the delivery of K10, K15, K16, K17 and K18.

PROPOSAL

4. The overall proposals will present an entirely different experience whereby using sympathetic material the roads dominance is reduced, traffic is calmed and is reduced to acceptable levels. Two options are proposed.

5. Option 1: a short-term project which can be delivered within the financial year and which will provide a “quick win” solution to some of the pedestrian and environmental problems outside the station and at the northern end of Fife Road. The scheme will consist of widening the footway outside 1-5 Fife Road, new resurfacing, remove the planters from outside Kingston station while the front wall of the planter remains, the area outside the station will be resurfaced and de-cluttered. See Annex 1 for further details.

6. Option 2: there would be for a more ambitious, a wider-ranging, longer-term and more expensive transformational project in the area including more public realm improvements to paving and the redesign of Fife Road from Wood Street to Castle Street. This project would be the subject of a future bid to TfL as a Major Scheme. However, TfL have made it clear they will not accept any new RBK Major Scheme bids (as would be appropriate for a scheme such as this) until the existing funded Major Scheme at Tolworth Greenway is substantially completed. ‘There is strong interest in new development in the town, and we would prioritise any developer contributions for this scheme.’

7. Within the current financial climate it is therefore recommended that the short term scheme to be approved and implemented, as this will address those problems which are often highlighted by users of the highway in this area i.e. a well-used pedestrian route from the station to the town centre.

8. The proposals for the Gateway will improve the current existing situation where people leaving the station find themselves sandwiched between two threatening three lane ‘motorways’.

9. It will support the objective to attract further development to the town, providing a more diverse range of uses.

10. The project will signal to town centre stakeholders that the Council is serious about realising the potential for growth and demonstrate that the Council will act on the concerns raised by local retailers.

TIMESCALE

11. Subject to this Committee’s resolution, it is anticipated for the scheme could be implemented in March 2013.
FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

12. As proposed the estimated cost for option 1 “quick win project” is £155k. £35k will be from section 106 contributions from nearby development “Quebec House”.

13. There is £120k for footway improvement in Fife Road with Highway Assets, which has been allocated by Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee for 2012/13. This could be re-allocated to fund the short term scheme.

14. Because of the late start on this scheme and the requirement for the £120k revenue funding to have been completed before the end of March 2013 there is the risk that this funding may be lost. It is therefore requested that the Director of Finance authorises the ‘carry over’ of these funds into 2013/14 provided works have started in March 2013.

15. This bid for £150k from RBK Capital (for 2013/14) is being made to cover the possibility that Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee do not support the re-allocation, or if unforeseen issues such as TfL approvals, statutory undertaker works etc, preclude a start in this financial year. This would also mean a later implementation in 2013/14.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

16. Some planters will be removed as part of this proposal; however, new trees will be planted elsewhere within the area in order to create “an avenue” approach into the Town Centre.

NETWORK IMPLICATIONS

17. The area for which change is required is large and the high levels of traffic flows means that change will not be easy, but will require careful and innovative design as well as detailed project management to ensure ‘business as usual’ is not overly interrupted.

18. The introduction of Option 1 will improve and enhance the area, and make it more accessible.

Background papers: held by
Younes Hamade, Project Engineer,
tel 020 8547 5922, e-mail: younes.hamade@rbk.kingston.gov.uk
**KEY**

- **Footway construction–1**: Proposed perfecta paving on segregated footway area.
- **Footway construction–2**: Proposed perfecta paving on shared footway area.
- **Footway construction–3**: Proposed perfecta paving (reconfiguration of planter area).
- **Cycle track**: Proposed perfecta paving
- **Tactile construction**: Proposed crossing point and tactile paving
The principles of the approach to this Business Plan were agreed by majority vote at the KTN Committee of 4 September 2012. What follows is an expansion of those ideas.

Any KTN Business Plan needs to be consistent with the Plans already agreed at Council level, and which themselves will have been checked for consistency with The Mayor’s London Plan. The three main relevant Council Plans are the K+20 Kingston Town Centre Area Action Plan of July 2008, the Kingston (Community) Plan of 2009, and the Core Strategy of 2012. Key elements from the first two Plans that will guide a KTN Plan are quoted as follows –

**K+20 Kingston Town Centre – Area Action Plan: adopted 15 July 2008:**

**Extracts: Key Issues:**

*Kingston is one of the top retail centres in the southeast....The loss of shoppers to other centres and the lack of new retail facilities have raised concerns........Kingston needs to enhance its retail offer in order to strengthen its role as a metropolitan and sub-regional shopping centre....Since 2003 the Council has been working in partnership to identify opportunities for new shopping facilities, as part of mixed-used development within the primary shopping area and by extending it and these proposals form a key element of this Area Action Plan.*

*Kingston’s status as an office centre is weak, much of its office stock is poor quality and its rail services and connections are comparatively poor.......Measures are needed to enhance its attractiveness to commercial office based businesses, especially in the growing creative, knowledge, and information sectors. A vibrant and growing University is seen as a positive factor in helping to enhance the image sought for Kingston.*

*The range of entertainment and leisure attractions has increased significantly......The vibrant facilities attract large numbers of young people in the evenings, which results in some disturbance, crime and anti-social behaviour late at night. There is support for an increased range of attractions to appeal to a wider cross section of the community, especially in the early evening and at weekend, to promote Kingston as a leisure destination drawing upon its heritage and riverside assets and to implement a strategy to better manage the town centre at night, so it is pleasant and attractive to visit in the evenings, as it is in the daytime.*

*There is an uneven distribution of attractions across the town centre, with major shopping facilities concentrated at the western end of Clarence Street with associated parking, whilst parts of the centre, especially in the south-east (Ashdown Road sites) and northwest (Vicarage Road sites), are underused or vacant and lack attractions. This Area Action plan offers the opportunity to rebalance the town centre by providing a better distribution of attractions, in particular new facilities in the south and east.*

**Extracts: Vision for the town centre by 2020:**

*“A thriving metropolitan centre serving the needs of its catchment and providing a sustainable and enhanced range of town centre services, including: retail, leisure, employment, education and community facilities, as well as new homes, and improved job opportunities, in a high quality environment, that is safe, clean, and easily accessible to all. High quality new development will maximise the potential of vacant, outmoded and underused sites. Kingston’s distinctive character, especially its historic environment and*
riverside, will be safeguarded and enhanced. A range of improvements to transport, access, public spaces and the natural environment will enhance its attractiveness for residents, businesses, workers, shoppers, students and visitors, in the daytime and in the evening”.

Kingston Plan March 2009:

“We know that what matters to residents is having access to the services they need, not who is responsible for providing them” – Cllr Derek Osbourne.

We want Kingston to be a place where people are happy, healthy and enjoy a good quality of life, in a clean, safe and tolerant environment, where everyone in our community can contribute to our success and reach their own full potential.

What will the borough be like in 2020?.....

Kingston Town centre will have developed its retail, leisure and cultural offer, seen an improvement in the quality of its office stock, and accommodate around 1,000 new homes. Sustainable transport into the town centre will be improved, through improved walking and cycling routes, better public transport, including upgraded rail and bus stations, and potentially a park and ride service.

Town and district centres will have a good mix of evening attractions suitable for all ages.

Kingston in context........

Kingston town centre serves as a driver of our economy. While retaining its historical character, this is combined with delivering a range of retail and business services as well as leisure and cultural attractions including the Rose Theatre and Kingston Museum. The University and College both serve to boost our reputation for excellence in education provision.

Objective to sustain and share economic prosperity.......  

The regeneration of Kingston town centre will act as a driver of the economy for the whole Borough. A key element of this will include retail led mixed-use development and improvements to transport infrastructure to enhance Kingston’s regional shopping appeal. We want to increase the number of people visiting as well as the amount of time spent here. We will achieve this by diversifying the daytime and night time economy to appeal to a broader cross section of the community and thereby provide a wider range of employment opportunities, particularly in growing sectors such as creative, culture and tourism.

Long term goals: (include) to regenerate Kingston Town Centre to provide a broader offer and maintain the town’s status within the top shopping centres nationally. (Success would mean) increase in footfall in Kingston Town Centre.

The Core Strategy – adopted April 2012

This KTN Business Plan must be consistent with the Core Strategy. Details for the Neighbourhood are listed on pages 27 – 36. The Key Areas for Change are indicated on pages 87 – 90. Page 164 stresses the strategies to protect local shopping parades.

Section 7 emphasises that the Core Strategy cannot be implemented by the Council alone but will need help from significant Partners. Pages 193 – 200 of that section identify key Delivery Schedules.
What follows below in this KT Neighbourhood Business Plan is consistent with the bigger picture painted in the Core Strategy. But the Business Plan tries to scale the bigger picture down to what is within the Committee’s power and remit, be it influence, promoting, facilitating or decision-making.

This Business Plan is also consistent with the 10 objectives of One Kingston

THE PURPOSE OF A KINGSTON TOWN NEIGHBOURHOOD BUSINESS PLAN:

Our intention is to be consistent with the Plans which the Council has adopted after considerable consultation and examination. We must limit ourselves to what WE can do as the KTN Committee. In summary, we shall plan to develop Kingston Town Centre and the Neighbourhood as a place to live, to do business, to work, to learn, to play, to enjoy, to visit and to stay.

Although the Kingston Plan of 2009 highlights footfall as a measure of success this arguably too narrow a criterion. Many factors influence footfall, e.g., “Thumbs up, it’s Thursday”. But the key measure of economic success also includes the level of spend; and that can be influenced by the length of stay.

We acknowledge that many others, both within the Kingston Partnership and outside (e.g., voluntary organisations) are working to the same ends. Our aim is to identify and agree what we as the KTN Committee can do, what we can initiate, what we can facilitate, and what milestones we can identify against which to measure progress. In places we shall be the sole provider; in others we shall stimulate others to be the providers; we shall also work jointly with our Partners. But the Plan aims to enable the Neighbourhood to be more proactive rather than simply reacting to events.

Amongst our Partners we need to work closely with Kingston First. They in turn are considering (i) how retailing is changing and its implications for the retail and commercial sectors within the Town Centre, and (ii) Kingston’s attractiveness to non-retail businesses. We as the KTN Committee need to allow our Plan to be sufficiently flexible to adjust to the Kingston First’s vision for the Town Centre in 2020.

We need also to consider how best we can work with the University. Kingston University is arguably the greatest untapped resource in the whole of the Borough.

Move to landscape sheets........
### KINGSTON TOWN NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN: ITEMS FOR PLANNING AND ACTION

#### A. A PLACE TO LIVE

**Objectives:**
1. To ensure Kingston Neighbourhood gets its fair share of Better Homes investment and Council housing (tenants and leaseholders) continues to improve in standard of maintenance
2. As far as planning rules allow, to promote high quality housing throughout the Neighbourhood
3. To ensure pavements are maintained
4. To promote cultivation and maintenance of wayside gardens, grass verges, floral decorations
5. To ensure the Neighbourhood is safe for its residents day and night
6. To enhance and sustain local shopping parades, their offer and their trade

**What can we do:**
1. Receive regular updates of progress of Better Homes investment programme.
2. Through Planning sub-Committee, strive to maintain high quality developments and minimise back/front filling, unreasonably small units.
3. Assure Street Scene Inspectors reports are analysed and issues brought to Members attention.
4. Use Neighbourhood and Partnership resources to ensure wayside gardens etc look cared-for and attractive.
5. Develop results of the Town Centre Environment Audit
6. Liaise with police through SNTs and take action as necessary, e.g., through Licensing Committee.
7. Work with traders etc in the local shopping parades, outside of Kingston First’s area: Tudor Drive, Richmond Road (north of Kings Road), Kings Road, Cambridge Road, Coombe Road, Park Road/Kingston Hill, Surbiton Road, Springgrove, (and possibly) Richmond Road shops north of railway line

**Indicators of progress:**
1. Progression in programme.
2. Planning permissions and periodic summary.
3. Will depend on learning curve from the analyses and value gained by Members.
4. Members and residents observations and comments.
5. Members and Officers to agree a work programme.
6. Crime reductions. Seek greater enforcement of licenses, by-laws etc which already exist, - and - Reductions in complaints regarding behaviour in public areas.
7. Regular review of each area by Members and officers
### B. A PLACE TO DO BUSINESS *(relate to C below)*

**Objectives:**
1. To enhance Kingston Town Centre as a Metropolitan Centre
2. To help encourage businesses to stay and expand in Kingston Town Neighbourhood
3. To help encourage new businesses to come to KTN
4. To help encourage such businesses to use local employment
5. To encourage businesses to become involved in the life of KTN
6. To provide conference facilities which are economically viable for smaller businesses

**What can we do:**
1. Continue to pursue what being a Regional Centre means and the economic advantages and financial support that are available
2. Work with businesses both in the Town Centre and the local shopping parades to enable staff and customers to travel to the businesses
3. Share in advertising KTN as a place to do business. Publicising successes
4. Encourage businesses that provide local job creation; offer local training opportunities, e.g., via Kingston University.
5. Promote the advantage to both the businesses and the Borough of their becoming involved in the wider life of the Neighbourhood
6. Consider Council assets and which might be converted for conference use and rented out more cheaply than, say, hotels or The Rose

**Indicators of progress:**
1. Regular review of opportunities, working closely, inter alia, with Kingston First, Kingston Chamber of Commerce, Kingston University
2. Regular review of business proprietors, by officers and by Local Councillors in their Ward work
3. Producing, or overseeing the production of promotional material and reviewing its success in helping to bring in new businesses
4. Review of statistical returns
5. Regular review with KVA etc regarding business support, both by the corporate business and by individuals
6. Review progress

### C. A PLACE TO WORK *(relate to B above)*

**Objectives:**
1. To encourage local employment
2. To make travel into and within the Neighbourhood as convenient as possible
3. To review continual traffic ‘black spots’ and identify solutions
4. To consider how school-time traffic might infringe less on business traffic without harming the ease of getting to school

**What can we do:**
1. Encouraging local apprenticeships. Develop with Adult Education and Kingston University training for local employment
2. Ensuring local transport opportunities are supported
3. Re-considering the separation of staying-traffic from through-traffic
4. Supporting school traffic arrangements that ensure as far as possible journeys to work are not encumbered

**Indicators of progress:**
1. Data collection; liaise with Adult Education, Kingston First
2. As the Neighbourhood Committee, ensure our interests are protected and developed through, for example, the Place Directorate
3. Review with Place and Partners the potential and consequences of Town Centre traffic hold-ups
4. Reviews of School Travel Plans and their effect on Neighbourhood traffic
## D. A PLACE TO LEARN

**Objectives:**
1. To ensure as far as possible, by influence if not decision, that KTN is adequately supplied with Statutory-aged learning facilities
2. To encourage the provision of pre-school nurseries, play groups, and post-school-day activities
3. To encourage apprenticeships and work experience, including supporting adult education AND the education of those for whom learning has not been a fulfilling exercise, i.e., through Anstee Bridge, PRUs
4. To improve the offer and take up of the Library Service
5. To make more use of school assets after school day finished

**What can we do:**
1. Maintain a watching brief on education provision
2. Ensure that the KTN is aware of pre-school provision and the market for places
3. Liaise through Adult Education, Kingston University and Kingston College to encourage apprenticeship and work experience, and their take-up by local businesses, together with opportunities offered through adult education and Anstee Bridge etc students
4. Work with Library service to promote their range of services at both Kingston & Tudor Libraries
5. Re-consider how best to use the rich assets of empty schools outside of statutory school day

**Indicators of progress:**
1. Liaising with Peoples Services and Children & Learning Services to ensure that the Neighbourhood plays what part it can in supporting nursery and mainstream provision
2. Liaise with Adult Education to support as best we can work opportunities and training
3. Regular reporting to Members
4. Regular review by Members
5. Review how our schools and their assets, such a playing fields, are used with the aim of considering whether the Neighbourhood can benefit from their wider use

## E. A PLACE TO PLAY

**Objectives:**
1. To help provide sporting and exercise opportunities for all ages
2. To ensure Council owned assets are used where appropriate
3. To ensure Council assets are ‘fit for purpose’
4. To originate, promote, enhance, facilitate cultural opportunities and festivals for all ages

**What can we do:**
1. Build on the ‘Olympics in Kingston’ legacy
2. Audit vacant sites and consider bringing them back into use, if only temporarily
3. Ensure ground maintenance is adequate
4. Be aware of cultural opportunities for community celebrations

**Indicators of progress:**
1. Identify how best to use the momentum of the ‘legacy’ to enhance sport and interest in sport in the Neighbourhood
2. List the assets and review their use; review their maintenance
3. Periodic updates from our Contractors
4. Identify a more structured approach to identifying programmes and opportunities
| 5. To develop community meeting places | 5. Provide and/or support the provision of community meeting facilities; list them; where are the gaps? | 5. Identify facilities which might be used, and/or used more than they are; Council-owned and privately owned |

### F. A PLACE TO ENJOY

**Objectives:**

1. To promote our history and ability to live it/ walk it now. To enable pedestrians and particularly visitors to find their way to points of interest
2. To enhance the Gateways into the Town Centre
3. To promote the historic and cultural centre (incorporating the Parish Church, the Ancient Market, The Rose theatre)
4. To enhance and promote our Green Spaces and living decoration of the streets
5. To enhance the attraction of and promote the river
6. To develop Canbury Gardens as the Town Centre’s park
7. To enhance other parks and wayside gardens
8. To help making shopping an enjoyable experience

**What can we do:**

1. Investigate the opportunities of the London Signage Scheme
2. Produce a business plan for a Gateway Improvement Scheme
3. Through Parish Church and Ancient Market development, re-orientate public awareness of historic Kingston Town as the Town Centre
4. Enhance the linkages from Town Centre to the river
5. Develop river bank activities and offer
6. Development signage that links Town Centre to availability of Canbury Gardens
7. Identify all other parks and wayside gardens and plan their enhancement
8. Promote a varied cultural offer and good tourist publicity

**Indicators of progress:**

1. Discuss with Mayor for London and users such as Richmond and development a progress plan
2. Investigate the implications and, if desirable, develop a plan of approach
3. Ancient Market Member/Officer group progress; audit and support of the Ancient Market and Monday Market’s economic success
4. Audit visitors to the theatre and other cultural events
5. Work with Thames Landscape Strategy and other agencies to enhance the river bank and its usage. Audit moorings and measure effect on business and life of the KTN
6. Monitor progress of Canbury Gardens Working Party and use of money from grants
7. Standard of care of other park areas and wayside gardens
8. Visitors to information offices and questions asked
## G. A PLACE TO VISIT AND STAY (which incorporates many of the other elements already detailed)

### Objectives:
1. To make visiting and shopping a pleasant experience
2. To encourage visitors to stay (i.e., longer than a quick daytime shopping visit)
3. To derive income for businesses catering for visitors
4. To encourage visitors to "sell" Kingston to others

### What we can do:
1. Provide and maintain attractive entrances into Neighbourhood and into Town Centre
2. Review and continually monitor transport methods and convenience – bus intervals, car parks, cycle parks
3. Promote casual river moorings
4. Facilitate signage and maps for walking
5. Facilitate information centres; provide up-to-date web site information
6. Facilitate high quality and varied day time and night time offer
7. Facilitate provision of refreshment outlets
8. Provide public toilets
   a. Richmond scheme?
   b. Bristol scheme?
9. Ensure up-to-date publicity material is available

### Indicators of progress:
1. Footfall count and by hour
2. Business / financial returns
3. Cultural centres returns
4. Information offices returns
5. Sustenance of Highway planning and maintenance of approaches into Neighbourhood and Town Centre
6. Distribution of publicity materials
KINGSTON TOWN NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMITTEE

14 NOVEMBER 2012

INFORMATION ITEMS

Three items are covered in this report:

- One Norbiton Project
- Town Centre Walkabout on Saturday 13 October
- Neighbourhood Work Programme 2012/13

1) ONE NORBITON PROJECT

Purpose

1. The One Norbiton project aims to improve the lives of communities by giving them more influence and control over their services.

Background

2. The project fits within the context of our reputation as a borough for working with communities, dating back to 1994 and the introduction of Neighbourhoods.

3. We have trialled a number of initiatives on particular estates in Norbiton in the past and part of the challenge has therefore been to engage residents with this latest exercise, which covers the whole Ward.

4. For example, we participated in a pilot led by the Cabinet Office to develop ‘Local Integrated Services’ in Norbiton. In essence that sought to better align the resources of Partner organisations to community priorities. As well as engaging with individuals from the community who subsequently formed a Community Working Group, this initial aspect of our One Norbiton activity also succeeded in getting our partners engaged.

5. However, we struggled with capacity locally to sufficiently map and pool Partners’ budgets which was a key element for success. We therefore submitted a bid for and were successful in securing a place as one of twelve pilot areas for Government’s Neighbourhood Community Budget initiative which offered some means to progress this. The pilot takes the principle of our early work around Local Integrated Services to the next level and asks not only what the community can influence, but what can they control.

6. The opportunity to be part of this pilot therefore came along at the right time for One Norbiton. It seemed a perfect fit for us as an extension of the work we had been doing and a further means of demonstrating our commitment to working with the community over the long-term. We are the only place in the country to
have been involved in both the Local Integrated Services and Neighbourhood Community Budget pilots.

**Neighbourhood Community Budgets – explained**

7. The Neighbourhood Community Budget pilots run to April 2013 and are part of the Government’s Localism agenda, championed across Whitehall by Eric Pickles MP, Secretary of State for the Department for Communities and Local Government.

8. The overall aims of the pilots are to work out in practice how neighbourhoods can take more control over local public services and resources, share learning to enable other areas to adopt such approaches, and establish an agreed basis for evaluating costs and benefits. In particular, Government want the pilots to generate a body of evidence showing the effectiveness and efficiency of neighbourhood-based approaches by driving up satisfaction with local public services and ensuring these are more effective and efficient.

**One Norbiton – governance**

9. One Norbiton sits within the Council context but it is community led. A Ward based Community Working Group has been established with a number of Action Groups set up for each of the issues that have been identified as initial priorities by the community. These are:

- Housing
- Policing and Safety
- Youth Activities
- Community Engagement
- Employment 16-24 & Income Maximisation.

10. As well as an Officer from RBK relevant Partners also sit on these groups. The following Partners from across the Kingston Strategic Partnership are now engaged with us on One Norbiton:

- Kingston Council
- Police
- Kingston Voluntary Action
- Kingston Chamber of Commerce
- NHS Kingston
- Kingston University
- Jobcentre Plus
- Kingston College

11. There is also a Member Officer Group which enables issues to be discussed and shared with or escalated to the Neighbourhood Committee.

**Outcomes**

12. This is a pilot and one of the key issues is to establish whether there is a case for replicating the approach elsewhere – in other words, why are we doing it and would we do it again elsewhere?
13. So far in Norbiton we have brought residents and partners together and laid the foundations for a new way of working. We will need to focus activity during the remainder of the pilot between now and April 2013 towards achieving tangible outcomes in one or two areas to demonstrate to all involved, principally the community and our partners, that there is value in maintaining engagement.

14. Kingston’s profile with Government has increased significantly as a result of being part of the pilot. We are opening up channels of communication to Government policy and decision makers via senior civil servants and direct to Ministers. In October we presented our progress to date and plans for the future at a ‘Peer Challenge’ session in central London with the other pilots. This gave us some useful feedback on how we could best use the remaining period of the pilot to realise the potential of our approach.

Next steps

15. Between now and the end of the pilot in April 2013 we will progress the project by:

• Increasing awareness - the Community Working Group is currently made up of around 20 individuals who are conscious that they are far from being able to speak for the entire community. We want anyone who would like to become involved to have the opportunity to do so and at a level of their choosing.

• Developing the Community Working Group – as well as forming their own Constitution and considering how this fits within existing democratic structures there are also tensions between individuals and community groups that need to be carefully managed

• Focussing on some tangible outcomes - this will enable us to demonstrate the added value to all involved of continuing to engage with the project

• Mapping Council and Partner budgets in Norbiton – this requires ongoing engagement from our Partners which will be a test at a time when all are struggling with fewer resources

• Developing the model – being clear about what we are trying to introduce and whether services are suited to a Neighbourhood Community Budget approach, what that looks like, and dealing with the issue of who is ultimately accountable.

• Working with Kingston University who are conducting an external evaluation of the project to see whether the approach could be replicated elsewhere

Further information

16. Available from Dean Tyler, Project Manager for One Norbiton / Relationship Manager for the Kingston Strategic Partnership, Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames (020 8547 5192) dean.tyler@rbk.kingston.gov.uk
2) TOWN CENTRE WALKABOUT ON SATURDAY 13 OCTOBER

1. As part of a regular review of Kingston’s night time, three Kingston Town Councillors – Cllr Geoff Austin, Cllr David Cunningham and Cllr Chrissie Hitchcock, together with Kingston Town’s Neighbourhood Manager, met up at 11pm on Saturday 13th October at the start of their Town Centre Walkabout.

2. The group set off from the Guildhall at 11pm, initially along the High Street where the smokers at the front of Kingston Mill PH were occupying full pavement width, then on to Thames riverside: Eagle Wharf was unlit and only had two couples quietly amusing themselves. We then proceeded to walk the full length of Clarence Street, watching pubs closing with some customers heading homewards while others headed for the Nightclubs to continue their evening entertainment. Some people were clearly in a happy mood, but we saw no evidence of severe drunkenness – proof that our pubs are taking seriously their responsibility not to serve customers who have clearly consumed too much alcohol. Those who went on to nightclubs had their IDs carefully checked before being allowed admission, and a few, who either had no ID or appeared to the bouncers to be already a bit the worse for wear were denied admission. One or two protested but eventually realised that argument was futile. There were no problems as each venue clearly had sufficient security staff in place to ensure that entrance queues were orderly. We were told by staff and Police that this was a ‘typical’ night. Of course, security staff have no additional ‘rights’ to deal with any unlawful behaviour, and cannot venture away from the front of the premises where they are employed, so reasonable Policing is still necessary. This initial walkabout took about an hour and a half.

3. Our party then spent some time at Kingston Police Station discussing night-time Policing with an Officer and watching CCTV videos of the Town Centre taken the previous week. We saw crowds gathering as the Clubs emptied, and people waited for taxis or queued at late-night food take-aways which are also required by their trading licence to employ security staff, and the last of which closes at 3.30am. It was pointed out to us that although nightclub ‘kicking-out’ times, both individually and collectively, are staggered, club goers do take time to disperse from the Town Centre, sometimes causing minor flashpoints.

4. Then we continued our walkabout. By now it was nearing 3am, and we toured the Clubs in succession to observe the departure of the revellers from each venue. Quite a few exiting were boisterous and noisy, but not in a threatening manner to us. We saw the Street Pastors at various points during the course of our travels giving directions and assistance to any who required it, and later on handing out free flip-flops to young women who had been dancing so much they had swollen feet, and had to walk out holding their shoes. The fact that the Clubs close at staggered times means that not all the clubbers hit the streets of Kingston together and the queues for Taxis and all-night buses were manageable and orderly. Again we saw no evidence of violence or severe disorder. One incident worth recording involved some young males who had parked their car in Nipper Alley opposite Oceana, opened the doors and turned on their in-car sound system at full blast, attracting an audience of people leaving the club and encouraging them to continue dancing in Clarence Street (and on the roof of their own car!). Although this seemed amicable, it is not really a good idea due to volume and speed of the traffic, and the noise would undoubtedly have disturbed anyone living nearby. However, they soon ceased and drove off. We returned to the Hippodrome Nightclub and saw groups leaving the Club but stay together chatting prior to seeking transport home.

5. Having seen all this, the four of us finally left the town centre and headed home at 4.00am. We hadn’t seen any of the carnage that had been suggested in recent press articles, and, although the four of us kept loosely together as a group, as in previous years’ walkabouts, at no time did any of us feel threatened. In fact several young people came up to us, and asked what a group of oldies like us were doing in the Town Centre at that time.

Neville Rainford, Neighbourhood Manager
### 3) WORK PROGRAMME 2012/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 January 2013</td>
<td>Response to Petition – Canbury Gardens CPZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Library Fines and Charges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kingston Community and Police Partnership Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Removing Traffic from Memorial Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Implementation Plan Funding Application for 2012/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 February 2013</td>
<td>Proposed Signalled Crossing – Surbiton Hill/Maple road/Beaufort Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planned Highway Maintenance Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium Term Service and Financial Plan 2013/14 to 2016/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Better Services Better Value Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grants Guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 March 2013</td>
<td>Hogsmill Valley Area update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May/June 2013</td>
<td>(date to be confirmed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note that the work programme is subject to change.