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AGENDA

Questions and public participation

• a 30 minute question and answer session at the start of the meeting – advance notice of questions is encouraged.
• contributions during the debate on items at the discretion of the Chair

1. Apologies for Absence

2. Appointment of Chair and Vice Chair of the Neighbourhood Committee

To agree appointments for the 2015/16 Municipal Year

3. Appointment of the Chair and Vice Chair of the Planning Sub Committee

To agree appointments for the 2015/16 Municipal Year

4. Declarations of Interest

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

5. Minutes

To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 18 March 2015

6. Petitions

To receive any petitions from residents.

7. Neighbourhood Manager’s Report

The Neighbourhood Manager will report on current Kingston Town Neighbourhood issues and topics

Presentation from the Metropolitan Police on the first Anniversary of implementation of the Kingston Town Neighbourhood Designated Public Places Order

Sgt Dave Williams will update on progress

8. Proposed New Traffic Management in Memorial Square, Kingston

Appendix A

To consider proposals to change the vehicular access to Memorial Square
10. Proposed new "at any time" waiting restrictions in Coombe Road, Kingston - Objection to draft Traffic Management Order

To set aside the objection and agree that the TMO is made

11. Introduction of Control Parking Zone in Lower Ham Road, Bank Lane, Albany Mews and Albany Park Road - Objection to draft Traffic Management Order

To set aside the objections and agree that the TMO is made

12. Application to Designate Buildings of Townscape Merit - Park Works (18-20 Borough Road), the Pottery Tapas Bar, 20 Park Road

To designate the above sites as Buildings of Townscape Merit

13. Neighbourhood Budget Outturn 2014/15

To receive the budget outturn and note the decision of the Policy and Finance Committee regarding use of the underspend

14. School Crossing Patrols Review

To consider the findings of the review

15. Neighbourhood Grants

To consider three applications for Neighbourhood Grants

16. INFORMATION ITEMS

- Update on members of the public circulating information at Planning Meetings
- 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood Committee</th>
<th>Planning Sub-Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 2 September 2015</td>
<td>Wednesday 8 July 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 10 November 2015</td>
<td>Wednesday 16 September 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 3 February 2016</td>
<td>Wednesday 25 November 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 13 April 2016</td>
<td>Thursday 14 January 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wednesday 16 March 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Welcome to this meeting

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

Information about the Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee

The Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee is made up of your local elected Councillors and is responsible for making decisions about local services, which can be tailored to the local area

Do you want to ask a question?

There is a Question Time of up to 30 minutes from 7.30pm – 8pm. Questions may be submitted in writing before the meeting or handed in at the start of the meeting on the green forms provided. (There are some green slips on the chairs and there are more copies.) Please fill in the relevant part and hand this in to the Committee Secretary at the top table. For enquiries please contact Marian Morrison 020 8547 4623, email:marian.morrison@kingston.gov.uk.

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

Running order

Are you here for a particular item? 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 green form at the start of the meeting and hand this to the Committee Secretary if you would like to request that a particular item is heard earlier in the meeting.

Taking part in the meeting

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

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. 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.

Emergency evacuation arrangements

If the fire alarm sounds, please leave the building by the nearest exit. If you require assistance, please remain seated and an Officer will assist you from the building.
More meeting information

Accessibility

- All meetings have access for people who may have mobility difficulties. If there are stairs, a lift or stairlift is available. Disabled parking spaces are available on site.
- Toilet facilities will be easily accessible from the meeting room.
- For people who have hearing impairments, there is an induction loop (depending on the building, this may only be available in the first 2 or 3 rows).
- **A large print copy of the agenda can be requested in advance.**

Recording of the meeting

This meeting will be recorded and the recording will be available on the web site (www.kingston.gov.uk) 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 on being filmed.

Interests

Councillors must say if they have an interest in any of the items on the agenda. Interests may be personal or pecuniary. Depending on the interests declared, it might 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 minutes have been published (the deadline for the call in of any of these decisions will be set out in the Minutes). 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 considered at a meeting of full Council which may either

i. agree a response to the Call in .[If Council raises no objection to the decision the decision becomes effective from the date of the Council meeting and may proceed to implementation.] or

ii. establish a Task and Finish Group to review the decision in more detail. The Task and Finish Group will report recommendations to the original decision making Committee which may either accept them or send a recommendation to Council to (i) reject the recommendation or (ii) to accept the recommendation in part or (iii) to adopt an alternative course of action.

Minutes

The minutes briefly summarise the item and record the decision. They do not record who said what during the debate.
Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee

3 June 2015

**Proposed New Traffic Management in Memorial Square, Kingston**

Report by Director of Place

### Purpose

To consider proposals for changing vehicular access to the Memorial Square and decide the way forward

### Recommendations

1. Members to approve the principle of extending the current access restrictions that exist for the Ancient Market is extended to operate in Memorial Square. This will provide access only for servicing vehicles between 6 a.m. and 10 a.m. and between 4 p.m. and 6 p.m., Monday to Saturday, with no entry at all on Sunday. Any restriction will make provision for special access arrangements for All Saints church as currently in place for the Druids Head in the Ancient Market; and

2. A further report is brought to a future Committee meeting, outlining how the needs to current users, including blue badge holders, service vehicles and All Saints church may best be met, and recommending the nature and extend of the consultation can be achieved.

### Key Points

A. The Area Action Plan (AAP) for Kingston Town centre K+20 is part of the Council’s emerging Local Development Framework for the borough, as set out in the Local Development Scheme. It sets out planning policy for Kingston town centre over the period to 2020. Policy K10 (K10 (Town Centre Public Realm) outlines improved pedestrians link between Clarence Street and the Ancient Market.

B. Memorial Square plays a major link between the pedestrianised Clarence Street and Ancient Market place. K+20 has identified the link as an area for improvement.

C. The purpose of this proposal is to extend the pedestrianised area and create a much larger area for pedestrians where only servicing vehicles would only be allowed to access the area for loading between 6 a.m. and 10 a.m. and between 4 p.m. and 6 p.m., Monday to Saturday, with no entry at all on Sunday. This would introduce the same controls as exists within the Ancient Market Place. Cyclists would not be affected and will still be allowed to cycle through the area between Wood Street and Union Street.

D. The space has 9 disabled parking bays which are usually occupied and a loading bay. In addition, two or three more cars showing blue badge are normally parked on yellow lines despite the presence of the poorly marked and signed loading restrictions.

E. This small space is dominated by this parking. The associated manoeuvring into and out of spaces create a chaotic situation and real risk to the many pedestrians that use the area and creates a barrier between the two major shopping areas.

F. The current arrangement also causes problems and conflict between pedestrians and services vehicles because of the restricted space create by the current levels of parking.
G. The removal of vehicles from this area would co-join Clarence and Church Streets creating a seamless commercial environment and a significantly improved route the Ancient Market, river and Rose theatre.

H. Any changes will need to provide reasonable alternative parking for blue badge holders so that they are not disadvantaged by the change.

**Context**

1. Memorial Square was repaved a number of years ago to provide a high quality link between the major shopping attractions of Clarence Street and Church Street and the Ancient Market.

2. The area became quickly established as the most popular and central parking location for blue badge holders because of its proximity and convenience for all the town centres attractions.

3. This over popularity has lead to numerous issues such as:
   a. Conflict between manoeuvring vehicles and pedestrians as cars reverse into or out of spaces;
   b. Conflict between cars and servicing vehicles in a small confined space;
   c. Conflict between cyclists and cars;
   d. Vehicles arriving to park, but finding all spaces already taken. These vehicles then wait in an obstructive location or add to manoeuvring as they leave to find alternative parking; and
   e. Potential security hazard. The police have previously suggested that no parking should be allowed at such a central location.

4. Although the accident record for the location is good, with no recorded personal injury accidents, observations of the site will confirm that near misses and conflict between pedestrian and vehicles is commonplace. The large pedestrian flows including many children and elderly users makes this an ongoing concern that should be addressed.

5. The area is also a barrier and disincentive for people to explore the town and its other attractions. The removal of traffic from this area would make the whole pedestrianised area read as a single entity and increase footfall to the Market Place and river.

6. However, the importance of the area to disabled users cannot be ignored. The area is undoubtedly the most popular for blue badge holders offering direct access both to Clarence Street and the Market Place. Any proposed removal of blue badge parking from this area will need to take note of this and make changes to provide alternative parking opportunities having regard to the benefits that would accrue as result of the change.

7. The area is also very important for servicing businesses in the area as the existing loading bay offers all day loading opportunities. A change to the restrictions to match the Market Place will still maintain a reasonable level of service but will place additional pressure on areas where servicing can take place during the middle of the day.

8. All of these considerations, both for and against change need to be weighed and balanced. But it is the view of officers that the most benefits would be derived if traffic is removed from this area. It is recognised that this will need a significant review of other parking arrangements within the Relief Road to offset any negative impact on disabled users and to ensure that their needs are met. This will include both the on and off street disabled parking facilities. It will also be necessary to review how servicing is carried out and include this in the review.
9. The needs and consideration of All Saints church is also highly important. It has a small number of car parking spaces and an occasional need to receive deliveries to this access. Young Choir members also must be considered and their collection and delivery to services and practice. Officers are none the less confident that any changes can be modified to ensure the church is not disadvantaged by change and that an accommodation can be made as was done for the Druids Head in the Market Place.

10. The manner in which any new restriction should be enforced needs also to be considered. The use of rising bollards as used elsewhere is not considered an option as they have not proved as effective as had been hoped. Our experience has shown the rising bollards to be prone to damage, can cause insurance claims when rising and are expensive to maintain. A change in this area therefore provides an opportunity to review the operation of the existing rising bollards and how else these areas might be managed most cost effectively.

Options

11. It is recommended that the committee approve the principle of the removal of traffic from Memorial Square with the same restrictions as currently apply in the Market Place and Church Street so that a further report may be submitted to a later meeting setting out the options of achieving this.

12. The report will explore how the needs of current users, including blue badge holders, service vehicles and All Saints church may be best met as well as how this area along with others is controlled and enforced in the future. It will also recommend the nature and extent of consultations.

Timescale

13. It is anticipated that the report will be submitted in the Autumn in either September or November.

Resource Implications

14. The initial study will be undertaken as part of the traffic team normal revenue duties. The report in the autumn will set out full costs and funding opportunities.

Equalities Impact Assessment

15. Equality impact assessment is not needed at this stage, however, discussion will be taken with relevant stakeholders, and report back to this Committee as part of the autumn report.

Consultations

16. Consultation will be carried after the autumn report with all stakeholders.

Background papers – held by the author of the report

Author of report - Younes Hamade, Project Engineer, KingstonTown Neighbourhood – 020 8547 5922

e-mail: Younes.hamade@rbk.kingston.gov.uk
Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee
3 June 2015

Proposed New ‘At Any Time’ Waiting Restrictions in Coombe Road, Kingston – Objection to Draft Traffic Management Order

Report by Director of Place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To consider an objection to the draft Traffic Management Order and decide the way forward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To RESOLVE that</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

2. the objector is informed of the Committee’s decision and the reasons for it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

A. Coombe Road (A238) from Cobham Road to Wolverton Avenue currently has a single yellow line waiting restriction operating from 8.30am to 6.30pm, Monday to Saturday along with peak hour loading restrictions. In addition, the junction of Norbiton Avenue is protected with double yellow ‘At Any Time’ waiting restriction for approximately 10 metres either side. Cobham Road junction has similar protection afforded by the zig zags of the zebra crossing.

B. There has been one serious and two slight accidents from August 2014 in the last five years.

C. Several requests were received last year from local residents asking for double yellow line restrictions on Coombe Road close to the junction with Norbiton Avenue to supplement the existing day time restrictions. Officers considered the request and drew up proposals for double yellow line ‘at any time’ waiting restrictions between Station Road and the rail bridge as shown on the attached plan Annex1. The reason for the change was to improve safety, through better sightlines particularly for the vulnerable road user such as cyclists.

D. This proposals was originally consulted upon in November 2014. At that time the proposal was to extend the double yellow lines from Cobham Road and Manorgate Road. Following comments from the residents of 17 to 23 Coombe Road the proposals were reduced and modified to extend only as far as the railwaybridge.

E. A revised draft Traffic management Order (TMO) was advertised in the local press and on-street on 30 January 2015. One objection was received.

Context
1. Last year several complaints were made concerning evening and night time parking on the single yellow lines between Cobham Road and Norbiton Avenue and the way that vehicles parked here force traffic from the hospital closer to the centre of
the road. This combined with the speed of these vehicles was considered to be hazardous to vehicles waiting to turn right in to Norbiton Avenue, and particularly so for cyclist who felt very vulnerable.

2. Officers therefore prepared a proposal to remove the 20 metres of single yellow line between the double yellow lines at Norbiton Avenue and the zig zags for the crossing to remove this parking. So as to ensure that the parking did not just move to the north side of the road and perpetuate the issue, double yellow were proposed for that side too. On further examination it was noticed that no parking occurs further to the east along Coombe Road, so the proposals were extended as far as Manorgate Road for the double yellow lines to reduce any confusion.

3. Consultation letters were sent to effective residents in November 2014 explaining why these restrictions were proposed and seeking comments. Two responses were received from residents of nos 17 & 19 Coombe Road, the elevated houses close to the rail bridge, concerned that they would no longer be able to unload from their cars or receive deliveries. Although it was explained that there was no changes to loading restriction and therefore deliveries would still be possible it was decided to amend the proposal so as to only introduce double yellow lines in the vicinity of Norbiton Avenue on both sides of Coombe Road. Therefore the existing single yellow lines between the railway bridge and Manorgate Road would remain unchanged. This was not considered an issue as parking does not occur here due to the narrowness of the road and this meant it was highly unlikely that the area would suffer from any displacement resulting from the new restrictions.

4. The draft TMO for the reduced scheme was advertised in January 2015, but unfortunately the published notice still suggested the original longer scheme was proposed. This caused the same two people to phone questioning why the proposal had not been amended as previously agreed. Following reassurance only one of these persisted with their objection as described below.

5. Following the publication of the draft traffic management order, one objection to the proposed double yellow lines was received from a resident in Coombe Road and was as follows:

a) The proposal was advertised incorrectly as the double yellow lines extend under the railway bridge. The introduction of double yellow lines will have a negative effect on the local businesses. A much better consultation should have been carried out by the council and local ward members.

b) Officers' response: The incorrect advertising is regretted but it does not detract from validity of proceeding with the amended scheme which is less than the published proposals. Additionally the regulations do provide an ability to reduce the impact of an advertised TMO provided the effect is to lessen the effect of the restriction, so in either event there is no legal reason not to proceed with making a TMO to enable the changes shown in Annex 1 to proceed.

c) The main area where parking currently occurs and causes the issues described is on the single yellow lines on the south side of Coombe Road in the 20 metre length between Cobham Rd and Norbiton Avenue, No parking habitually occurs on the north side. This means that the new restrictions remove only 4 parking spaces. Although it is recognised that there is pressure on parking in the evenings, the relocation of this small number of vehicles into the surrounding roads should not cause significant issues to either residents or local businesses. The measures proposed will ensure accessibility for emergency services. It will also increase visibility for cyclist and pedestrians.
6. 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.

Options

7. The proposed double yellow lines will protect the area of Coombe Road from Cobham Road to the rail bridge, beyond which parking does not and is unlikely to take place. This will improve visibility and road safety for all road users. Officers have sought to minimise the length of restriction introduced, mindful of the significant pressure on on-street parking spaces in the area, outside of the hours of the existing CPZ.

8. It is therefore recommended that the objection is set aside and the TMO as shown in annex 1 is made so that the double yellow line waiting restrictions may be introduced.

9. It is also recommended that the objector be informed of the Committee’s decision.

Timescale

10. If members support the recommendations the restrictions could be introduced in the next four months.

Resource Implications

11. The proposals would be implemented using funding from the Neighbourhood Traffic Management budget, at a cost of approximately £1,500.

Equalities Impact Assessment

12. Equality impact assessment is not needed, as there is no change to the existing policy.

Background papers – held by the author - Younes Hamade, Project Engineer, Kingston Town Neighbourhood, 020 8547 5922

Copy of the draft traffic management order
EXISTING SINGLE YELLOW LINE TO BE CONVERTED TO A D/Y LINE Dia 1018.1

EXISTING SINGLE YELLOW LINE TO BE CONVERTED TO A D/Y LINE-"NO WAITING AT ANY TIME" L=21.78M Dia 1018.1

Existing S/YLINES Mon - Sat 8.30am to 6.30pm
No Loading Mon - Sat 8.30 - 9.30am, 4.30 - 6.30pm

-existing d/y waiting restriction

Existing S/YLINES Mon - Sat 8.30am to 6.30pm
No Loading Mon - Sat 8.30 - 9.30am, 4.30 - 6.30pm

COOMBE ROAD

NORBITON AVENUE

FACTORY
Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee
3 June 2015

Introduction of Control Parking Zone in Lower Ham Road, Bank Lane, Albany Mews and Albany Park Road - Objection to draft Traffic Management Order

Report by Director of Place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To consider objections, including a petition, to the proposed Traffic Management Order</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To RESOLVE that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The objections be set aside for the reasons detailed in para 2 of his report and the Traffic Management Order be made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The objectors are informed of the committee’s decision and the reasons for it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Points

A. There have been several previous resident lead requests for parking controls in these roads, which for various reasons have not been introduced due to opposition from other residents.

B. This most recent application was the result of combined but separate requests from residents of Lower ham Road and Albany Park Road.

C. Further to this Committee’s decision to introduce a Controlled Parking Zone in Albany Park Road, Albany Mews, Bank Lane and Richmond Road, based on the report that was presented at the meeting held on 5th February 2014, a draft Traffic Management Order (TMO) was advertised in the local press and on-street on 25th March 2015. This invited comments from all those affected by the new restrictions.

D. Following the publication, several objections, including a petition, were received against the proposed Control Parking Zone in these roads and these are reported below along with officer comments.

E. One of the objections received is a petition from residents of the flats at 42a & 42b Albany Park Road, who by virtue of a Section 106 agreement are prevented from purchasing permits.

Context

1. The following table outlines the objections received and the officer’s comments on these objections.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objection/Representation</th>
<th>Number of objections received</th>
<th>Officer Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is not an issue with parking in these streets.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>This scheme was developed due to local residents concerns regarding parking capacity, commuters parking blocking access in these roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticket machines are an eyesore</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Within the Canbury Gardens zone unusually all bays are shared use. To reduce costs and clutter no ticket machines will be used within this expansion of the zone. Instead there will be a pay by phone facility available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of the CPZ will make the road feel urban</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Every effort will be made to reduce street clutter and signs will be kept to the minimum required to enable the scheme to be enforced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPZ will encourage residents to pave over their gardens will have a negative effect on the character of the road</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Most if not all residents already have adequate off street parking so this is unlikely to be an issue. But there are criteria that must be met before crossovers are approved by the council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose no reason</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of permits</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The permit scheme is the same charge across the whole borough. The residents of the area are fully aware of the cost associated with this scheme as this was made known in the earlier consultations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Rd residents were not consulted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Those residents of Richmond Road that would have qualified to purchase permits within the zone were consulted. This amounted to ?? households. Properties on the east side of Richmond Rd would not qualify for permits and were therefore included in the consultation on a potential scheme for roads to the east of Richmond Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot make usage of the drop kerb area as there will be a yellow line</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Within the hours of operation no one will be able to park across crossovers. However the council feel there will be ample space for residents once the CPZ is introduced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will the rowing club function when they have events. The controls will prevent people wishing to participate in</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The scheme was designed to remove all day parking by commuters whilst minimising the impact on visitors to the area including the river and Canbury gardens. The short duration of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities longer than two hours coming to the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zone, three hours, means that people can still park for free if they choose to arrive outside of the operational hours. It is not true to say you cannot stay for longer than 2 hours, the two hour limit only exists between 11am and 2 pm when the zone operates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter and petition regarding the eligibility of 42A Albany Park Road for parking permits. Legality of Section 106 agreement. 65 signature petition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is not a consideration regarding the making of the TMO for a CPZ but a legal matter which is being dealt with separately.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not democratic as only 16% response rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The council encourages all residents to respond to the consultation and can only make a decision on the responses received which was 48% response rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will cause more congestion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long stay parking will be removed causing less congestion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sight lines will be hindered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiting restriction are implemented at the same time as the CPZ to improve sight lines for all users</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speeds may increase with less vehicle parked on street.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The onus is on the driver to adhere to the speed limit. However if this becomes a problem this will be addressed at a later date.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce free parking with waiting restrictions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This was an option put to residents who rejected such an idea. The CPZ as described was supported by the majority of respondents of the consultation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Options**

2. Taken into consideration the previous result of local consultation “48% of residents in the area responded to this consultation, with 65% want CPZ operating between 11am to 2pm Monday to Saturday, and 35% do not support the proposal.”, and the purpose of this scheme, which is to remove all day parking by commuters, improve road safety and reduce congestion in these roads. The officers recommendation is that for members to note the objections received, and;

3. To set aside these objections and the TMO is published in order to implement the extension of the Canbury Gardens controlled parking zone in Albany Mews, Albany Park Road, Bank Lane and Lower Ham Road (between Bank Lane and Richmond Road). The extension to operate between 8.30 am and 6.30pm, Monday to Saturday with all bays being shared use.

4. It is also recommended that the objectors be informed of the Committee’s decision.
Consultations
5. 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
6. If members support the recommendations the restrictions could be introduced in the next four months.

Resource Implications
7. The proposals would be implemented using funding from the On Street Parking Account Surplus from which £40,000 has been allocated.

Equalities Impact Assessment
8. Equality impact assessment is not needed, as there is no change to the existing policy.

Environmental Implications
9. It is not anticipated for the proposed scheme to have any negative environmental implications.

Background papers – held by the author/ Younes Hamade 020 8547 5922

Copy of draft Traffic Management order
Objections received
Result of local consultation
Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee
3 June 2015

Application to designate Buildings of Townscape Merit:

- Park Works (18 - 20 Borough Road)
- The Pottery Tapas Bar (20 Park Road)

Report by Director of Place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To review the recommendations by independent heritage consultants, Drury McPherson Partnerships to designate Park Works (18-20 Borough Road) and The Pottery Tapas Bar (20 Park Road) as Buildings of Townscape Merit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To RESOLVE subject to a review of consultation responses, to delegate to the Director of Place that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Park Works (18 – 20 Borough Road) is designated as a Building of Townscape Merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Pottery Tapas Bar (20 Park Road) is designated as a Building of Townscape Merit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. The Council recognises the quality of Kingston’s built heritage and the importance of protecting this for future generations, together with its contribution to the landscape and built environment of Kingston. Throughout the borough there are buildings and structures which, although not necessarily of statutory Listed Building quality, nonetheless add to the richness of the local built environment and local distinctiveness. These buildings and structures are known as Buildings of Townscape Merit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Backgroud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Drury McPherson Partnerships were commissioned by the Council to produce an independent Heritage Assessment of Princes Road, Arthur Road and Borough Road in March 2015 after concern was raised by a local resident about the potential heritage value of the area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Backgroud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Drury McPherson Partnership’s report Borough Road, Arthur Road and Princes Road Kingston Upon Thames Assessment of Potential for Heritage Designation made the following recommendations:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix D
• Park Works (18-20 Borough Road), The Pottery Tapas Bar (20 Park Road) and 28-30 Princes Road should be added to the local list of Buildings of Townscape Merit.
• Borough Road, Arthur Road and Princes Road lacks the special architectural or historic interest that would justify designation as a conservation area but is well suited to the protection offered by designation as an Area of Special Local Character.
• 18-20 Borough Road may be worthy of statutory listing with Historic England subject to further research.

3. As a result of the recommendation for Park Works (18-20 Borough Road), a statutory listing request was made to Historic England which is now ongoing.

4. Drury McPherson Partnerships were then commissioned to produce four further reports to ascertain how each recommendation fulfilled the Council’s draft criteria for Buildings of Townscape Merit and Areas of Special Local Character. Those areas considered worthy of protection are the subject of this report.

5. As part of this more refined assessment it is concluded that 28-30 Princes Road does not fulfil the Council’s criteria for Buildings of Townscape Merit. A further assessment is still being undertaken to consider designation of Borough Road, Princes Road and Arthur Road as an Area of Special Local Character.

6. Buildings of Townscape Merit in Kingston are designated according to draft criteria set out by the Royal Borough of Kingston. The criteria used for assessment are set out below. These have been developed from criteria adopted by a neighbouring authority and are considered appropriate to be used within this assessment.

Assessment Criteria
1. Any building, not statutorily listed, which can be proved to date from before 1840.

2. Selected buildings, not statutorily listed, dating from between 1840-1939 of definite quality and character. These are assessed by whether a building comes under one or more of the following categories:

   (a) was included as Grade III on the former statutory list;
   (b) retains a substantial portion of original features;
   (c) has group value;
   (d) has association with well known characters or events;
   (e) displays special value within a certain type or illustrates social, economic or industrial history (e.g. railway stations, schools, almshouses, etc);
   (f) by reason of its appropriateness to the site and inter-relationship with other buildings makes a unique contribution to the townscape.

3. Post 1939 buildings, not statutorily listed, which are exceptionally good examples of the architectural output of the period and/or are the work of principal architects.
Context

**Park Works (18-20 Borough Road)**

7. 18-20 Borough Road (see Annex A for location) is a small building attached to the industrial premises known as Park Works. It dates from the late 1930s but its special interest and townscape merit derive principally from the World War Two air-raid watchers’ post that surmounts the street (approximate north) elevation, which was built in 1939 either as a single phase of construction or as an addition to a recently constructed office building. It should be noted that Park Works (HD Symonds & Co Ltd) made specialist glass fibre fabrics for aircraft insulation. Because of its importance to the war effort, the factory complex may be of national significance and as such a listing request has been made to Historic England.

8. 18-20 Borough Road also meets most of the Council's designation criteria for Buildings of Townscape merit. It has considerable local historic interest as a relatively rare survival of a building type that directly connected with the role of the area in World War Two and the history of the aeronautical industry. It has a distinctive appearance in the streetscape, marking the location of the former factory in this otherwise residential neighbourhood and adding variety and interest to the street scene. For the reasons, the block at 18-20 Borough Road as far back as the line of the northern entrance to the covered way, merits consideration for inclusion on the local list of Buildings of Townscape Merit.

Assessment

9. The criteria that apply to 18-20 Borough Road are 2(b); 2(c); 2 (d); 2(e) 2(f) and 3. The building was not included on the old grade III list, which was extremely selective with regard to 20th century industrial architecture.

Retains a substantial portion of original features Criterion 2(b)

10. The block at 18-20 Borough Road appears to be substantially unaltered externally. The watching post appears to be intact. The building retains its steel-framed windows.

Has Group Value Criterion 2(c)

11. 18-20 Borough Road has group value with the rest of the street, despite its industrial and civil defence functions. The building occupies the site of a pair of mid-Victorian houses. Its scale and materials conform broadly to the scale and height of the surrounding proposed Local Area of Special Character that encompasses Princes, Borough and Arthur Roads. It forms part of a group with the rest of the factory.

Has association with well known characters or events Criterion 2(d)

12. As a World War Two civil defence structure that served a factory contributing to the war effort, 18-20 Borough Road is associated with both a great national event that is still deeply resonant today, and with the local community's part in the war. The aircraft industry is particularly significant locally and to the national struggle. The building sheds light on the way in which the war effort was inseparable from the Home Front. The factory brought the danger of the front line to a quiet residential
backwater, and the watching post is a visible monument to those times and helps tell the story of this community.

13. Displays special value within a certain type or illustrates social, economic or industrial history (e.g. railway stations, schools, almshouses, etc) Criterion 2(e)
There has not been a comprehensive national survey of factory watching posts or similar buildings, so its rarity in the national context is difficult to judge. Its design is fairly standard, albeit as an unusual building type. War-time design and construction aimed at utility and strength- decoration was superfluous- and these are expressed in this example. However, such buildings are certainly uncommon today, and no other examples are known to survive locally.

14. By reason of its appropriateness to the site and inter-relationship with other buildings makes a unique contribution to the townscape Criterion 2(f)
The building is an unusual building type. It is a prominent landmark and can be seen from both ends of the street. As noted, its scale is sympathetic to the residential neighbourhood of which it is a part. As such it adds historic interest and resonance to the area.

Context

The Pottery Tapas Bar (20 Park Road - The Former Borough Arms)

15. The former Borough Arms (see Annex A for location) was built between 1840 and 1865 but its location on the corner of a street that was only just being laid out at the date of the Ordnance Survey, makes a date of c1865 most likely. Its style is sometimes called the Northern Renaissance style or late-Victorian pub architecture which reached its architectural height at the end of the 19th Century.

16. The former Borough Arms meets most of the Council's designation criteria for Buildings of Townscape merit. It has both visual quality in the streetscape and considerable local historic interest. Pubs are almost by definition, places with strong community associations, and they are also, as a building type, at risk. Many thousands of pubs have shut in the past decade and a substantial number of these have been demolished. The former Borough Arms is a good and relatively early example of the type, and is a prominent feature in the streetscape of Park Road. Its late Victorian pub frontage is of notably high quality, and intact. For the reasons set out below it merits consideration for inclusion on the local list of Buildings of Townscape Merit.

Assessment

17. The criteria that apply to the former Borough Arms are 2(b); 2(c); 2(e) and 2(f). The building was not included on the old grade III list, which was selective with regard to 19th century architecture. It would not have been considered for listing prior to 1970.

Retains a substantial portion of original features Criterion 2(b)
The building retains most of its original external features and the pub-front windows added c1897 adds to the interest of the original building, emphasising its specific use.
Has group value Criterion 2(c)

18. The pub is a key element of the group of residential and commercial buildings that surround it. The much altered shops to its north on Park Road and the residential streets to the east (the proposed Area of Special Local Character (ASLC): Princes, Borough and Arthur Roads) date from the same period of c1860-1890 and together they make up a typical outer suburban development of this date. The pub was often a focal point in such developments, for example, occupying a prominent and highly visible location such as a corner site on a main road, as here.

19. Displays special value within a certain type or illustrates social, economic or industrial history (e.g. railway stations, schools, almshouses, etc) Criterion 2(e)
Whilst it is not exceptional, the building is a good example of its type- a plain mid-century building enhanced by its decorative pub-frontage of 1897, and is of greater interest because it is relatively unaltered when so many similar pubs have been demolished, or converted into new uses at the expense of the features that distinguish them as serving their particular purpose.

20. By reason of its appropriateness to the site and inter-relationship with other buildings makes a unique contribution to the townscape Criterion 2(f)
The pub occupies a prominent site and marks the social centre of the small sub-neighbourhood of which it is a part. It has been designed to make the most of its corner site. Thus it has considerable visual importance in the streetscape, which reflects its historic role in the community.

Options

21. For the reasons noted above, it is recommended that 18 – 20 Borough Road as far back as the northern entrance to the covered way of Park Works and the Pottery Tapas Bar (20 Park Road) is considered for inclusion on the local list of Buildings of Townscape Merit. See Annex A for a location plan.

Consultation

22. For new BTMs, owner’s will usually be given advance notification of the designation and the implications of the designation will be explained. However, where buildings are considered to be under immediate threat, advance notification will not always be possible, as to do so might occasionally result in pre-emptive demolition or alterations, and in these instances protection measures will be instigated as soon as possible. In this case the owner’s have been notified prior to this report’s publication.

23. There is no formal or statutory right of appeal against a building being placed on the list. However following the inclusion of a building on the list and within 21 days of notification to the owner, the Council will consider objections to a building’s inclusion on the list. Objectors will need to challenge the reasons for inclusion of a building on the list bearing in mind that it is the building’s architectural or historic interest that is the reason for its inclusion on the list.

24. Grounds for objection will therefore be restricted to the fact that the building does not meet the designation criteria or that existing valid planning permissions, or other permissions, are in existence which allow demolition or alteration. For both of these, relevant evidence should be provided. Personal circumstances or other factors will not normally be taken into account.
Timescale
25. Subject to the Committee approving designation, it is proposed that a consultation feedback report be produced following of the completion of the notification period. This will complete a technical review of responses received. To ensure appropriate action is taken to protect the buildings from potentially damaging works it is proposed that delegation be given to the Director of Place to consider the findings of the report and instruct inclusion of the buildings on the local list as appropriate.

Resource Implications
26. None

Legal Implications
27. None

Risk Assessment
28. There is a risk that heritage assets will be lost if the proposed Buildings of Townscape Merit are not designated.

Equalities Impact Assessment
29. N/A

Environmental Implications
30. In developing future proposals for extensions and alterations of Building of Townscape Merit, the parameters which need to be taken into account would have a positive impact on the environment, these parameters include:

- Historic features should be conserved or restored. Where possible the historic fabric of the BTM should be retained or repaired and traditional materials and methods should be used.

- Extensions should be well designed and preserve the scale, character and setting of the BTM and can be done either by adopting an historic approach or in some cases, a contemporary one may be appropriate. Attention to historic detailing, materials and methods is important. Whether the approach is historical or contemporary in style, the scale, bulk and massing must relate well to the original building and the extension should always remain subordinate to it. The quality of materials and design, design detailing and context will be important in ensuring that extensions integrate well with the often fine quality, craftsmanship, traditional materials and careful detailing of a traditional building.

- The setting of the BTM is important in terms of its character. Proposals for alterations, extensions or even new buildings nearby should take into account the quality, nature and significance of the setting of the building.

- Landscaping, boundaries and external materials e.g. driveways are also important to the setting of a BTM and their positioning, layout and design should preserve or enhance the setting of the BTM.

- New development or extensions should respect, and where appropriate, contribute to traditional building groupings, such as farm courtyards and enhance and protect views into, from and through the site; traditional
boundaries; and other minor features of interest using landscape features to screen or enhance buildings as appropriate.

- In the exceptional circumstance that demolition is allowed, the Council will require that the provision of a suitable high quality replacement scheme is made.

Network Implications

31. N/A

Background Papers – held by Charlotte Gilhooly – 020 8547 5361, email charlotte.gilhooly@kingston.gov.uk, author of the report

- Borough Road, Arthur Road and Princes Road Kingston Upon Thames, Assessment of Potential For Heritage Designation (March 2015)
- Borough Road Study Area, Annex: Historic Maps
- 18-20 Borough Road, Kingston Upon Thames, Assessment for Potential Designation As a Building of Townscape Merit (May 2015)
- Former Borough Arms PH, Park Road, Kingston Upon Thames: Assessment for Potential Designation As a Building of Townscape Merit (May 2015)
- 28-30 Princes Road, Kingston Upon Thames: Assessment for Potential Designation as a Building of Townscape Merit (May 2015)
- Borough Road, Princes Road, Arthur Road and Part of Park Road: Proposed Area of Special Local Character
- Borough Character Study (2011)
- Draft Procedure for Designating Buildings of Townscape Merit (BTM) in Kingston
- Draft guide on “What BTM status might mean for you”.

Annex 1: Location of Recommendations
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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This report supplements the report entitled *Borough Road, Arthur Road and Princes Road, Kingston Upon Thames: Assessment Of Potential For Heritage Designation*, by Drury McPherson Partnership for the Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames, 2015. It has been produced by Michael Copeman. In addition to the sources cited in the initial report, it draws on and to the Council's historic planning and building control plans, leases and other material in the Borough archives and published sources.

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 18-20 Borough Road (part of Park Works) Kingston upon Thames, was identified as a building potentially meriting inclusion on the local list of Buildings of Townscape Merit during the process of evaluating of Princes, Borough and Arthur Roads for possible designation as a Local Area of Special Character.

2.2 Buildings of Townscape Merit (or locally listed buildings) are those, which although not of the special architectural or historic interest quality that would justify their inclusion on the statutory list, nonetheless add to the richness of the local built environment and contribute to local distinctiveness. The Council has formulated policies for their protection (CS8 and DM12) and a guidance document *Procedure for Designating Buildings of Townscape Merit (BTM)*, June 2014, which supports the implementation of the Core Strategy policies.

2.3 This report assesses the eligibility of 18-20 Borough Road, against the designation criteria contained in the document, and recommends that the building should be added to the local list as a Building of Townscape Merit.

2.4 Buildings of Townscape Merit in Kingston are designated according to the following criteria:

1. Any building, not statutorily listed, which can be proved to date from before 1840.
2. Selected buildings, not statutorily listed, dating from between 1840-1939 of definite quality and character. These are assessed by whether a building comes under one or more of the following categories:
   (a) was included as Grade III1 on the former statutory list;
   (b) retains a substantial portion of original features;
   (c) has group value;
   (d) has association with well known characters or events;
   (e) displays special value within a certain type or illustrates social, economic or industrial history (e.g. railway stations, schools, almshouses, etc);
   (f) by reason of its appropriateness to the site and inter-relationship with

---

1 The non-statutory listing category abolished in 1970.
other buildings makes a unique contribution to the townscape.

2.5 Post 1939 buildings, not statutorily listed, which are exceptionally good examples of the architectural output of the period and/or are the work of principal architects.

3 HISTORY AND DESCRIPTION

3.1 18-20 Borough Road forms part of a factory known as Park Works, which occupy the backlands between Borough Road and Brunswick Road. 18-20 Borough Road, along with 14-16 and 22-24, all now part of Park Works, were originally occupied by three pairs of semi-detached houses, built before 1865 and demolished in the mid-20th century to make way for Symonds enlarged factory.

3.2 18-20 Borough Road itself is a small building attached to the industrial premises known as Park Works. It dates from the late 1930s but its special interest and townscape merit derive principally from the World-War Two air-raid watchers' post that surmounts the street (approximate north) elevation, which was built in 19392, either as a single phase of construction or as an addition to a recently constructed office building. The watching post is a small rectangular tower in the same English Bond brickwork as the rest of the factory, with concrete-framed viewing slits, designed to offer some protection for shrapnel, to each elevation.

3.3 The earliest parts of the factory complex date from the late 19th century, but most was built during the 1930s. From c19223 it was the premises of HD Symonds & Co. Ltd., insulating material manufacturers. The 1932 Ordnance Survey map shows that the works occupied the 16-18 Park Road and a large shed to their rear. By 1959 the works occupied almost the whole of the backlands between Park Road and the former school (now Greek Orthodox Church) on the east side of Borough Road, adjacent to no. 24. The Council's planning and building control records show that the principal existing building to the rear of 16-18 Park Road with a tall chimney on its east side, was enlarged between 1930-324. A workshop with a north-light roof was built behind what were then three pairs of semi-detached houses at 14-24 Borough Road in 1933.5

3.4 Plans for the replacement the pair of houses at 18-20 Borough Road and their gardens were submitted to the Council in September 1939- almost

---

2 Kingston upon Thames Building Control application ref. 1941: 11367
3 Kelly's Directory Kingston Upon Thames, 1920, 1922
4 Kingston upon Thames Building Control application ref. 1930-32: 8551
5 Kingston upon Thames Building Control application ref. 1932: 8997
immediately after the outbreak of war⁶ (Fig. 2). The new building included the present 18-20 Borough Road and four largely windowless areas marked "Refuge". Refuge no. 1 was on the ground floor of the block to at 18-20 Borough Road, Nos. 2 and 3 flanked the store behind that and No. 4 was a detached building in the rear yard. The watchers' post was added to the roof of 18-20 Borough Road in early 1941⁷ (Fig. 3).

3.5 All of these 1930s buildings are constructed in utilitarian, hard orange-red brick, with a concrete floor slabs and steel-framed "Crittal" windows, typical of their date. The circular window to the ground floor west elevation of no. 18-20 is an unusual feature in this industrial context. 18-20 Borough Road has a flat roof and banded decoration to the first floor balcony doorway characteristic of the 1930s Moderne style.

3.6 HD Symonds & Co. Ltd. made specialist glass fibre fabrics for aircraft insulation⁸. The products were significant to the war effort, as it is understood that the insulating materials were used in the manufacture of aircraft, a key industry in the area, the best known local company being Hawker Siddeley. Symonds is listed in Emergency Control File Controllers File 5 ("list of factories where any damage caused by enemy action was reported to the government")⁹. Factories such as this, making products that were important to the war effort, were expected to maintain production even during air raids and only when there was immediate danger would staff shelter. For this reason, air-raid watching posts were built, to be used in association with the air raid shelters, to ensure that production was halted only when there was imminent danger in the immediate locality and the gap between the air-raid warning and all-clear was as short as possible¹⁰. Here the shelters or refuges occupy much of the ground floor and were evidently designed to be as close to the production areas as possible, rather than underground, and as a result they can have offered only limited protection.

3.7 The detached shelter in the rear yard was converted to use as a workshop in 1946¹¹. The present building at 14-16 Borough Road was built between 1946 and 1955. Although 14-16 Borough Road is of a very similar design to 18-20, it is of later date and without the air-raid watcher's post it is not of architectural or historic interest. The present 22-24 Borough Road is first shown on the 1969-71 Ordnance Survey map. The 1955 Ordnance Survey identifies the works as producing "Electrical Insulation". Symonds continued to occupy the site until 1971.

---

⁶ Kingston upon Thames Building Control application ref. 1935: 11325
⁷ Kingston upon Thames Building Control application ref. 1939: 11367
⁸ Butters S., That Famous Place, Kingston University Press, 2013 p.363
⁹ Kingston upon Thames local history archives ref. KT33/1/1
¹¹ Kingston upon Thames Building Control application ref. 1946: 11572
4 **ASSESSMENT**

4.1 The criteria that apply to 18-20 Borough Road are 2(b); 2(c); 2 (d); 2(e) 2(f) and 3. The building was not included on the old grade III list, which was extremely selective with regard to 20th century industrial architecture. Neither the factory itself nor its war-time additions would have been considered for listing prior to 1970.

4.2 Criterion 2(b)
The block at 18-20 Borough Road appears to be substantially unaltered externally. The watching post appears to be intact. The building retains its steel-framed windows.

4.3 Criterion 2(c)
18-20 Borough Road has group value with the rest of the street, despite its industrial and civil defence functions. The building occupies the site of a pair of mid-Victorian houses. Its scale and materials conform broadly to the scale and height of the surrounding proposed Local Area of Special Character that encompasses Princes, Borough and Arthur Roads. It forms part of a group with the rest of the factory.

4.4 Criterion 2(d)
As a World War Two civil defence structure that served a factory contributing to the war effort, 18-20 Borough Road is associated with both a great national event that is still deeply resonant today, and with the local community's part in the war. The aircraft industry is particularly significant locally and to the national struggle. The building sheds light on the way in which the war effort was inseparable from the Home Front. The factory brought the danger of the front line to a quiet residential backwater, and the watching post is a visible monument to those times and helps tell the story of this community.

4.5 Criterion 2(e)
There has not been a comprehensive national survey of factory watching posts or similar buildings\(^\text{12}\), so its rarity in the national context is difficult to judge. Its design is fairly standard, albeit as an unusual building type. Wartime design and construction aimed at utility and strength-decoration was superfluous- and these are expressed in this example. However, such buildings are certainly uncommon today, and no other examples are known to survive locally.

4.6 Criterion 2(f)
The building is an unusual building type. It is a prominent landmark and can be seen from both ends of the street. As noted, its scale is sympathetic to

---

\(^{12}\) *Listing Selection Guide, English Heritage, 2011*
the residential neighbourhood of which it is a part. As such it adds historic interest and resonance to the area.

4.7 Criterion 3
Although 18-20 Borough Road is a relatively recent structure, the survival of the watching post and its association with the local community's experience of the Second World War gives it much greater interest than other buildings of this date such as the rest of the factory complex.

5 CONCLUSION

5.1 18-20 Borough Road meets most of the Council's designation criteria for Buildings of Townscape merit. It has considerable local historic interest as a relatively rare survival of a building type that directly connected with the role of the area in World War Two and the history of the aeronautical industry. It has a distinctive appearance in the streetscape, marking the location of the former factory in this otherwise residential neighbourhood and adding variety and interest to the street scene. For the reasons, the block at 18-20 Borough Road as far back as the line of the northern entrance to the covered way, merits consideration for inclusion on the local list of Buildings of Townscape Merit.

5.2 It should also be noted that the research undertaken for this report, which assessed the building in the context of the Council's own criteria for local listing, has revealed that the buildings associated with World War Two, particularly if their interiors survive substantially intact, may have special architectural and historic interest in the national context, possibly sufficient to lead to statutory listing. Statutory listing could cover a rather greater proportion of the site than would be appropriate for a Building of Townscape Merit, since BTM's are listed principally for their contribution to their appearance in the townscape rather than their interiors or their interest as industrial archaeology. It is understood that a listing request has been made to Historic England and therefore it is recommended that any planning application should be deferred until the outcome of that application is known.
Figure 1: Location plan
Figure 2: Plan of Park Works factory extension, 1939, RBKC Building Control ref. 11325
Figure 3: Plan of watchers' post, 1941, RBKC Building Control ref. 11367
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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This report supplements the report entitled Borough Road, Arthur Road and Princes Road, Kingston Upon Thames: Assessment Of Potential For Heritage Designation, by Drury McPherson Partnership for the Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames, 2015. It has been produced by Michael Copeman. In addition to the sources cited in the initial report, it draws on and to the Council's historic planning and building control plans, leases and other material in the Borough archives and published sources.

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 The former Borough Arms Public House (now the Pottery Tapas Bar), was identified as a building potentially meriting inclusion on the local list of Buildings of Townscape Merit during the process of evaluating the area around Princes, Borough and Arthur Roads for possible designation as a Local Area of Special Character.

2.2 Buildings of Townscape Merit (or locally listed buildings) are those, which although not of the special architectural or historic interest quality that would justify their inclusion on the statutory list, nonetheless add to the richness of the local built environment and contribute to local distinctiveness. The Council has formulated policies for their protection (CS8 and DM12) and a guidance document Procedure for Designating Buildings of Townscape Merit (BTM), June 2014, which supports the implementation of the Core Strategy policies.

2.3 This report assesses the eligibility of the former Borough Arms against the designation criteria contained in the document, and recommends that the building should be added to the local list as a Building of Townscape Merit.

2.4 Buildings of Townscape Merit in Kingston are designated according to the following criteria:

1. Any building, not statutorily listed, which can be proved to date from before 1840.
2. Selected buildings, not statutorily listed, dating from between 1840-1939 of definite quality and character. These are assessed by whether a building comes under one or more of the following categories:
   (a) was included as Grade III1 on the former statutory list;
   (b) retains a substantial portion of original features;
   (c) has group value;
   (d) has association with well known characters or events;
   (e) displays special value within a certain type or illustrates social, economic or industrial history (e.g. railway stations, schools, almshouses, etc);
   (f) by reason of its appropriateness to the site and inter-relationship with

---

1 The non-statutory listing category abolished in 1970.
other buildings makes a unique contribution to the townscape.

2.5 Post 1939 buildings, not statutorily listed, which are exceptionally good examples of the architectural output of the period and/or are the work of principal architects.

3 HISTORY AND DESCRIPTION

3.1 The former pub was built between 1840, the date of the Tithe Map, (from which it is absent) and 1865, when it is shown on the first edition Ordnance Survey map. The style of the building suggests that it dates from 1850-65, but its location on the corner of a street that was only just being laid out at the date of the Ordnance Survey, makes a date of c1865 most likely. It is listed in the Phillipson's Directory for 1870, as the Borough Arms. The building as shown in 1865 has a rectangular plan with a small projecting bay to the principal (west) Park Road elevation. The core of the building, on this plan is clearly visible today. The building is of brick, with a slate roof, deep eaves and small-paned timber sash windows. It would originally probably have been quite plain, with similar windows to the ground floor. It is not known for certain whether it was purpose-built as a pub, but its prominent position as a substantial detached building on the corner of the road, its plan which is quite distinct from the terraced and semi-detached houses that were the usual form of development here and the fact that it has a large outbuilding- possibly a stable or coach house adjacent to the main block across a rear courtyard, strongly suggest that it was built as a commercial building and probably, given its history, as a pub.

3.2 The 1897 Ordnance Survey map shows that the building had been extended slightly on its west, south and east sides. This alteration is consistent with the addition of the decorative glazed "pub" frontage that survives today, and the WCs to the rear south-east corner. The frontage has classically derived elements such as the cornice, and fluted pilasters with unconventional almost distorted brackets instead of capitals and glazing bars in a Venetian pattern (i.e. of three lights with a central arch, as well as fine red-glazed tiling below the cill level. This eclectic use of classical detail is typical of its date and in grander public buildings is sometimes called the "Northern Renaissance" style, but here it is very much \textit{su generis}: late-Victorian "pub architecture", which reached its exuberant architectural height at the end of the 19th century. An application for permission for works under the buildings regulations was submitted to Kingston Borough Council in 1887\textsuperscript{2}. The pub window frontage also reinforces the landmark value of the building on its corner site by creating two highly visible "front" elevations, to the east and south, in place of the original (west) front and (south) side.

\footnote{\textsuperscript{2} RB Kingston upon Thames Local History Collection Deposited Building Plans no. 40707}
3.3 The 1913 Ordnance Survey suggest that minor additions had been made to the outbuilding, but the structure of the main building appears to have been little altered during the 20th century. At some point the brickwork of the pub has been painted. It is currently an "avocado" shade of green. This has had an unfortunate effect on the appearance of the building, but the underlying fabric remains largely intact. The building now operates as a restaurant rather than a traditional public house, but its architectural or historic value remain largely intact and it could easily be returned to use as a pub.

4 ASSESSMENT

4.1 The criteria that apply to the former Borough Arms are 2(b); 2(c); 2(e) and 2(f). The building was not included on the old grade III list, which was selective with regard to 19th century architecture. It would not have been considered for listing prior to 1970.

4.2 Criterion 2(b)
The building retains most of its original external features and the pub-front windows added c1897 adds to the interest of the original building, emphasising its specific use. Although it could be difficult (but not impossible) to remove the paint from the brick-work, it would be easy to enhance the appearance of the building in the streetscape by repainting it in a quieter and more sympathetic colour.

4.3 Criterion 2(c)
The pub is a key element of the group of residential and commercial buildings that surround it. The much altered shops to its north on Park Road and the residential streets to the east (the proposed Local Area of Special Character (LASC): Princes, Borough and Arthur Roads) date from the same period of c1860-1890 and together they make up a typical outer suburban development of this date. The pub was often a focal point in such developments, for example, occupying a prominent and highly visible location such as a corner site on a main road, as here. Several houses in the immediate area are of similar date and architectural style to the pub and appear on the 1865 Ordnance Survey, but the three pairs of houses to its north (occupied by tradespeople and probably shops in 1870) to its north on Park Road (numbers 22-32) area are so altered as to barely be recognisable as such. The pair at 16 Park Road, also altered and subsumed by Park Works, still has a slate roof with eaves and sash windows, like the pub. However almost the of the LASC was built within 30 or so years of the pub, and shares (or originally shared) the same scale of building, and palette of materials, principally yellow London stock brick and Welsh slate.

3 Phillipson’s Directory of Kingston upon Thames, 1870, RBKT Local History Collection.
4.4 Criterion 2(e)
Whilst it is not exceptional, the building is a good example of its type - a plain mid-century building enhanced by its decorative pub-frontage of 1897, and is of greater interest because it is a relatively unaltered when so many similar pubs have been demolished, or converted into new uses at the expense of the features that distinguish them as serving their particular purpose.

4.5 Criterion 2(f)
The pub occupies a prominent site and marks the social centre of the small sub-neighbourhood of which it is a part. It has been designed to make the most of its corner site. Thus it has considerable visual importance in the streetscape, which reflects its historic role in the community.

5 CONCLUSION

5.1 The former Borough Arms meets most of the Council's designation criteria for Buildings of Townscape merit. It has both visual quality in the streetscape and considerable local historic interest. Pubs are almost by definition, places with strong community associations, and they are also, as a building type, at risk. Many thousands of pubs have shut in the past decade and a substantial number of these have been demolished. The former Borough Arms is a good and relatively early example of the type, and is a prominent feature in the streetscape of Park Road. Its late Victorian pub frontage is of notably high quality, and intact. For the reasons set out above it merits consideration for inclusion on the local list of Buildings of Townscape Merit.
Figure 1: Location plan
Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee
3 June 2015

2014/15 Financial Outturn
Report by Director of Finance

Purpose

To inform the Committee of the 2014/15 outturn position for the neighbourhood and provide reasons for variances. To confirm the 2015/16 budget for the neighbourhood.

Recommendations

To RESOLVE that
1. the 2014/15 outturn position is noted
2. the Policy and Resources Committee is RECOMMENDED to carry forward the underspend for use on neighbourhood priorities in 2015/16
3. the committee considers how to use the 2014/15 underspend that may be carried forward
4. the 2015/16 budget is noted

Key Points

A. Kingston Town neighbourhood has a final outturn underspend of £64,516. This is detailed in Annex 1. The Director of Finance will recommend to the Policy and Resources Committee that this is carried forward for use in 2015/16 on neighbourhood priorities.

B. This underspend is partly due to schemes that were agreed to be funded through discretionary allocations that are not yet complete. If the underspend is approved to be carried forward, the Committee may decide to keep these funds ring-fenced for their originally approved purpose. This would leave £40,816 unallocated for use on new schemes.

C. The 2015/16 budget is in line with the draft budget presented in February. There have been minor amendments to the recharges budget as shown in Annex 2.

Context

1. The detailed outturn for Kingston Town is shown in Annex 1 with service manager comments to explain significant variances from budget. The main areas of underspend are the rangers, library branches, Tudor Hall income, management and operations and the discretionary budgets. These are partially offset by an overspend recorded against the youth centres budget which has been caused by a fall in the level of income received for centre bookings.

2. The table below shows the discretionary allocations made by the committee in 2014/15 and the amount spent against each scheme. Where the scheme is unfinished the remaining funds will be requested to be carried forward as part of the overall underspend.
### Discretionary Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discretionary Allocation</th>
<th>2014/15 Budget (£)</th>
<th>2014/15 Spend (£)</th>
<th>2015/16 C/fwd Request (£)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canbury Gardens</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Scheme finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation Lecturn</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,393</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Scheme finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latchmere rec catering facilities</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Scheme finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward Allocations</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>3 schemes finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elm Rec</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Scheme finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latchmere rec (railings)</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Scheme finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Project</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Scheme finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen’s Promenade</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Scheme finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Activities at Kingsmead</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>4,919</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>1 scheme finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canbury Pavilion</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Scheme finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-compacting litter bins</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL C/FWD**                   | 23,700

3. If the Committee carries forwards the funds above as ring-fenced funds this will leave £40,816 of the total underspend as unallocated and available for new schemes. The committee is asked to consider whether to carry forward the amounts set out in the table above and how to use the remaining unallocated underspend, pending the decision to be taken at Policy & Resources as to whether Neighbourhoods will be able to retain their 2014/15 underspends. This decision will be taken in light of the overall Council outturn position currently being finalised.

4. Policy and Resources Committee will take the decision on Neighbourhood underspends in July. The Kingston Town Neighbourhood Chair will be advised of the decision in July so that any decisions made today regarding use of potential carry forwards can be implemented quickly. A report will also be taken to the next Neighbourhood meeting (in September) to confirm the agreed carry forward and any implications for agreed schemes.

5. At the February neighbourhood meeting a draft 2015/16 budget was presented and approved by this Committee. **Annex 2** confirms the final budget that has been set
for the neighbourhood. There have only been minor changes (budget roundings) to
the draft previously presented. A budget monitoring report will be presented to the
September meeting.

**Background papers – held by the author/other** - Victoria.goddard@kingston.gov.uk
**Author of report – Victoria Goddard**

None other than those referred to in this report
## Annex 1 – 2014/15 Outturn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>Latest Budget 14/15 at M8</th>
<th>Budget Changes</th>
<th>Final Budget 14/15</th>
<th>Outturn 14/15</th>
<th>Outturn Variation 14/15</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Budget change is the KT allocation of additional £1m highways maintenance funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KT - HIGHWAYS MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>226,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>226,800</td>
<td>227,133</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>Ranger Salary Budget set at the top of the pay scale, current employed rangers are not at the top of the scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KT - PLANNED MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>600,818</td>
<td>234,659</td>
<td>835,477</td>
<td>835,024</td>
<td>-453</td>
<td>Budget change is the allocation of additional £1m highways maintenance funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KT - RANGERS</td>
<td>59,300</td>
<td>-300</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>51,352</td>
<td>-7,648</td>
<td>Rangers salary set at the top of the pay scale, current employed rangers are not at the top of the scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KT - TMS</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>14,728</td>
<td>-272</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>901,918</td>
<td>234,359</td>
<td>1,136,277</td>
<td>1,128,237</td>
<td>-8,040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning &amp; Children's Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The main reason for the underspend was staff turnover at both Kingston and Tudor Drive libraries, combined with an overestimation of utility costs, particularly electricity costs which were nearly 50% less than predicted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KT - Library Branches</td>
<td>388,100</td>
<td>-2,900</td>
<td>385,200</td>
<td>370,047</td>
<td>-15,153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFC Commissioning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The main reason for the underspend was staff turnover at both Kingston and Tudor Drive libraries, combined with an overestimation of utility costs, particularly electricity costs which were nearly 50% less than predicted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KT - Youth Services</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Landlord</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We have increased number of regular hirers and one off parties in the hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KT - Advertising Income</td>
<td>-6,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-6,000</td>
<td>-6,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Decrease in income approx -£15,000 for the hire of Searchlight and Barnfield - AFC responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KT - Tudor Hall</td>
<td>-8,500</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-8,600</td>
<td>-23,177</td>
<td>-14,577</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KT - Youth Centres</td>
<td>23,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23,600</td>
<td>30,832</td>
<td>7,232</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,100</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>1,655</td>
<td>-7,345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KT - MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS</td>
<td>108,700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>108,700</td>
<td>94,711</td>
<td>-13,989</td>
<td>Variance due to reduced salary costs and underspends on publicity &amp; promotions and professional fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KT - NEIGHBOURHOOD GRANT</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>8,368</td>
<td>-632</td>
<td>Variance dependent on applications coming forward and Committee decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KT - DISCRETIONARY ALLOCATIONS</td>
<td>158,334</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>158,334</td>
<td>138,977</td>
<td>-19,357</td>
<td>Some projects funded by discretionary monies - Ward monies, Big Belly bins and the Transitions Project - were not completed within the financial year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>276,034</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>276,034</td>
<td>242,056</td>
<td>-33,978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL OVERHEADS (non-controllable)</td>
<td>239,807</td>
<td>-9,655</td>
<td>230,152</td>
<td>230,152</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Total</td>
<td>1,816,359</td>
<td>221,704</td>
<td>2,038,063</td>
<td>1,973,547</td>
<td>-64,516</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ANNEX 2 – 2015/16 BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KT - HIGHWAYS MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>230,700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>230,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KT - PLANNED MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>490,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>490,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KT - TMS</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>736,300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>736,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning &amp; Children’s Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KT - Library Branches</td>
<td>388,752</td>
<td>-62</td>
<td>388,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corporate Landlord</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KT - Advertising Income</td>
<td>-6,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KT - Tudor Hall</td>
<td>-8,600</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-8,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KT - Youth Centres</td>
<td>23,600</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>9,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Business</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KT - MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS</td>
<td>109,709</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>109,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KT - NEIGHBOURHOOD GRANT</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KT - DISCRETIONARY ALLOCATIONS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KT - RANGERS</td>
<td>59,578</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>59,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>178,287</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>178,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OVERHEADS (non-controllable)</strong></td>
<td>263,047</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>263,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Fund Total</strong></td>
<td>1,575,386</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1,575,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following factors should be taken into account:

i) Safer Routes to School work and other engineering work that has happened on or near the crossing point since the most recent review

ii) Any additional comment made by the Neighbourhood Engineers and Head Teachers

iii) A pedestrian count taken in the morning and the afternoon for each school crossing site which would:
   - take account of all pedestrians crossing within 50 metres of the crossing point where appropriate
   - include the number of pedestrians in the busiest consecutive period of 6 x5 minute slots making ½ hour
   - represent all pedestrians
iv) A review of accident data since 2009 (5 years prior)

v) Consideration of a number of other relevant factors: carriageway/footpath width, restricted visibility/sight lines, proximity to road junctions, reports of problems with speeding, reports of red light jumping, street lighting, complicated road markings, weight of traffic, age profile of pedestrians

vi) The length of time that a site has been vacant

vii) Most roads in Kingston have sufficiently heavy traffic levels to make traffic counts unnecessary when reviewing a school crossing patrol site. However, if traffic flow levels appear to be light a traffic count will be undertaken

viii) Sites at crossings with pelican/puffin crossing or a traffic light ‘all red’ pedestrian facility to be scrutinised to consider whether a School Crossing Patrol is needed as well as a pelican/puffin crossing or a light controlled crossing.

*Note: As a matter of policy some boroughs do not employ School Crossing Patrols at sites where there are light controlled crossings or pelican/puffin crossings and some only do so where there are special factors such as reports of red light jumping.*

The Review Process

2. The data has been collected on the basis described above. School Crossing Patrols in post were informed that a review would take place and their opinions and views were sought.

3. All Head Teachers were *not* consulted on their views on specific SCP sites both in operation and vacant for this biennial review. This decision was based on the assumption most would support a school crossing facility nearby their schools, as per previous years.

4. Neighbourhood Committees are now being invited to comment on the proposed changes to the existing establishment. Officers will then proceed to implement the changes using delegated authority.

Establishment of new Sites

5. It was also agreed that the above criteria be used when considering establishing new sites with the inclusion of an additional factor, namely, the difficulty experienced in recruiting School Crossing Patrol.

The results of the review

6. A summary of the outcomes of the review is presented in the table below and fuller details are set out in Annex 1. A map showing the locations of the sites in this Neighbourhood is at Annex 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Ref</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>School Served</th>
<th>SCP operational or vacant</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kingston Town Neighbourhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Park Rd/Princes Rd, Kingston</td>
<td>St Paul’s CE Junior School, Alexandra Infants’ School, Park Hill School</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Keep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Queens Rd, Kingston</td>
<td>St Paul’s CE Junior School, Alexandra Infants’ School, Park Hill School</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Keep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Portland Rd, Kingston</td>
<td>St John’s CE Primary School</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Keep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dickerage Lane, New Malden</td>
<td>The Mount Primary School</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Keep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Villiers Rd, Kingston</td>
<td>King Athelstan Primary School</td>
<td>In operation</td>
<td>Keep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kings Rd, Kingston</td>
<td>St Agatha’s Catholic Primary School, Latchmere Primary School</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Keep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Timescale**

7. Not applicable

**Resource Implications**

The current budget for School Crossing Patrols does not cover all vacant posts. Although the current budget allows for ten staff posts this would be addressed in the event of an increase in staff recruitment. The annual cost of employing a SCP is approximately £4000. There are currently seven staff in post and if all the recommendations resulting from this review are agreed there would be a total of seventeen posts.

**Legal Implications**

8. None. This is a statutory service, thus the service is governed in accordance with best practice guidelines as administered and reviewed periodically by Road Safety GB. General Health & Safety and Employment legislation is adhered to as per standard Council protocol and procedure.

**Environmental Implications**

9. nil

**Background papers – held by the author** Alex Jones (Sustainable Transport, Traffic Management & Design) 020 8547 6866

None other than those referred to in this report
Annex 1

Neighbourhood: Kingston Town

Park Road: map reference 1
Schools served: Alexandra Infants’ School, St Paul’s C of E Junior School, Park Hill School

Pedestrian count for busiest half hour periods (am+pm), figures in brackets are 2010 pedestrian counts (under 11 data not available)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total pedestrians</th>
<th>Total Children:</th>
<th>Total children under 11 years:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>758(759)</td>
<td>455(417)</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other factors:

- SCP post vacant pre 2000.
- Raised zebra crossing (with another zebra crossing approximately 100m towards Kings. Road) with a 20mph speed limit segment for approx. 100 metres.
- Busy road.
- High pedestrian numbers and high children under 11 numbers.
- No relevant accidents since 2009.

Recommendation: KEEP and high priority to fill post

Queens Road: map reference 2
Schools served: Alexandra Infants’ School, St Paul’s C of E Junior School, Park Hill School

Pedestrian count for busiest half hour periods (am+pm)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total pedestrians</th>
<th>Total Children:</th>
<th>Total children under 11:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>440(530)</td>
<td>234 (244)</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other factors:

- SCP post vacant pre 2000.
- Raised zebra crossing close to awkward junction with Crescent Road and Alexandra Road.
- Moderate pedestrian numbers and moderate children under 11 numbers.
- No relevant accidents since 2009.

Recommendation: KEEP but moderate priority to fill post
Portland Road: map reference 3  
School served: St John’s C of E Primary School

Pedestrian count for busiest half hour periods (am+pm)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total pedestrians</th>
<th>Total Children</th>
<th>Total children under 11years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>314(305)</td>
<td>90(53)</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other factors:

- SCP site vacant since August 2011
- Narrowed road and 20mph zone.
- Close to mini-roundabout with 3 roads entering.
- The road is very narrow with single alternate traffic. This may make crossing more difficult as gaps reduced.
- Moderate pedestrian numbers and low children under 11 numbers.
- No relevant accidents since 2009.

Recommendation: KEEP but low priority to fill post

Dickerage Lane, near The Mount School: map reference 4
School served: The Mount Primary School

Pedestrian count for busiest half hour periods (am+pm)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total pedestrians</th>
<th>Total Children</th>
<th>Total children under 11years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>238(174)</td>
<td>102(74)</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- SCP post vacant pre 2000.
- Zebra crossing on raised table outside school.
- Road layout made more complicated by the proximity on Dickerage Lane of the railway bridge that has traffic light controls.
- Moderately low pedestrian numbers and moderately low children under 11 numbers.
- No relevant accidents since 2009.

Recommendation: KEEP but low priority to fill post
Villiers Road: map reference 5
School served: King Athelstan Primary School

Pedestrian count for busiest half hour periods (am+pm)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total pedestrians</th>
<th>Total Children</th>
<th>Total children under 11 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>338(*544)</td>
<td>185(*284)</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Unusual high pedestrian count due to a run event.

Other factors:

- Mr Garside has operated this SCP site since October 2013.
- Busy road with heavy lorries going to the Civic Amenity Site.
- Frequent occasions when one carriageway is stationary but the other free-flowing.
- Moderate pedestrian numbers and moderately low children under 11 numbers.
- 3 Relevant accidents since 2009: Oncoming traffic stopped to allow car to turn right, which hit a cyclist travelling on inside of stationary vehicles 08:10 on 26/11/2009; Car turned left across Path of cyclist causing collision 08:45 on 27/06/2013; Pedestrian ran out into nearside of bus as it was crossing zebra crossing 08:45 on 07/07/2014.
- 1 accident involving pedestrian child under 11 years.
- All 3 accidents occurred between 08:10am-08:45am.

Recommendation: KEEP

Kings Road: map reference 6
Schools served: Latchmere Primary School, St Agatha’s Catholic Primary School

Pedestrian count for busiest half hour periods (am+pm)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total pedestrians</th>
<th>Total Children</th>
<th>Total children under 11 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>411(466)</td>
<td>244(263)</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other factors

- SCP site vacant since.
- Raised zebra crossing and 20mph zone.
- Moderate pedestrian numbers and moderate children under 11 numbers.
- No relevant accidents since 2009.

Recommendation: KEEP but low priority to fill post
Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee
3 June 2015
Neighbourhood Grants to Voluntary Organisations

Report by Capability Lead for Communities

Purpose
To consider applications for Neighbourhood Grants

Recommendations
To RESOLVE the allocation of grants as follows:

1. Kingston Arts (formerly Kingston Arts Council) £750
2. Kingston Environment Centre £750
3. North Kingston Choir £750

Key Points

A. The total budget allocated for grant making to Neighbourhood Committees in 2015/16 is £29,500.

B. The Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee has a grants budget of £9,000 for 2015/16.

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

Context

1. Subject to the criteria listed below, 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, particularly where it meets priorities set out in the Neighbourhood Community Plan.

2. The criteria for Neighbourhood grants are as follows:

   - Kingston Town Neighbourhood encourages applications that contribute towards the priorities identified by the Neighbourhood or in its future Neighbourhood Community Plan.

   - The Committee is keen to prioritise applications for new activities, but will consider repeat applications where the organisation can demonstrate that their
Organisations should provide evidence of their fundraising/match funding plans as part of their application to ensure the best value for money possible for any Neighbourhood Grant contribution.

Organisations that are linked to larger, national organisations should indicate, as part of their application, the annual accounts of the national organisation and explain why these cannot be used to fund local projects.

Organisations should normally identify their exit strategy as part of any application to demonstrate their sustainability and not rely on continued grant funding from the Council.

Where the event or other activity takes place in Kingston Town Centre, including the Rose Theatre, or Kingston Town Neighbourhood but is substantially for residents throughout the Borough and visitors, the grant application may also be submitted to the other Neighbourhood Committees for shared or proportionate funding.

Where an organisation has applied for, or is in receipt of an RBK Corporate Grant they would be unlikely to be given a high priority for a Neighbourhood Grant.

Cross-Neighbourhood applications will be considered, but only where a significant proportion of beneficiaries are resident in the Kingston Town Neighbourhood. Other Neighbourhoods may be approached to support their residents benefiting from the same project.

The Neighbourhood Committee decision on all grant applications is final.

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

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

1) **Kingston Arts (formerly Kingston Arts Council)**  

Grant request: £750

3. Kingston Arts is a registered charity formed in 1967 to promote, support and nurture local talent and deliver all arts for all ages across the Borough. It is not affiliated to a larger organisation but works alongside Kingston Council and with other local groups such as Surbiton Arts Group, Surbiton Camera Club and Surbiton and District Caledonian Society and with individuals to develop their artistic projects and initiatives, represent, publicise and enhance the activities of the voluntary and professional arts sector in the Borough and, with partners, present high-profile arts activities. Kingston Arts also runs networking events for affiliates and the local arts community.

4. Kingston Arts has approximately 1,000 members/users, individuals and groups, with membership spread across the Borough.
5. Kingston Arts has no paid staff, approximately 20 volunteers, 12 committee members, an Honorary Vice President and Councillor Ken Smith is their President. The Management Committee meets a minimum of six times per year.

6. The grant request is for £750 to assist in the payment of the ongoing administrative and staffing costs at Kingston Arts administrative premises in Surrey House, Eden Street. These being a fixed monthly cost of £35 towards the general office space upkeep and cleaning (£420 annually). The remaining £330 would be used to pay for stationery and consumables and, according to the demands of the events calendar, a receptionist for the 3rd floor lobby reception (for health and safety reasons) when Surrey House is used for hosting of specific events (Arts Salons, Galas, Festival of the Voice activities). The office space at Surrey House supports Kingston Arts work across the Borough.

7. Accounts for the year ended 31 March 2014 show an income of £8,818.04 against expenditure of £14,684.12, leaving a deficit of £5,866.08 and a year end balance of £4,317.23. Income consisted of an £8,500 grant from Kingston Council, £310.42 membership subscriptions and £7.62 bank interest. Expenditure consisted mainly of £10,100 for Festival of the Voice, £1,406.41 general expenses, £1,219.77 fixed asset PA provision for events and £635.10 website design and administration. The organisation has approximately £2,500 in reserves which is held for Festival of the Voice 2015.

8. The projected budget for this activity shows expenditure of £750 on premises hire/rent (£420), equipment purchase/hire (£230) and volunteer expenses (£100). No income is projected outside of this grant application.

9. Kingston Arts is in receipt of a 3 year RBK Community Investment Grant of £8,500 per year covering 2013/14 to 2015/16 towards running Arts Salons and events, staff costs and publicity. The group have also received a 2014/15 £750 Neighbourhood grant from Surbiton Neighbourhood towards the cost of ‘meet the artists’ events at the Court Farm cafe.

**Officer’s Report**

10. Kingston Arts, together with its diverse list of affiliates, offers a wide range of local arts and cultural activities in a variety of venues across the Borough which fits in with the Community Plan for community facilities, activities and developing community spirit.

11. Kingston Arts have been using the space at Surrey House as an administrative base and also for public events. A minimum of 11 Kingston Arts member groups and/or individuals are using the space on a daily basis in addition to ad-hoc use by drama, dance and arts groups and lunchtime activities open to all. RBK’s Arts Officer is supportive of this application, as the establishment of a permanent office base in the town centre has enabled the group to massively expand their programme of activities to support local artists and arts organisations.

12. As the requested funding will ensure the sustainability of Kingston Art’s base in the town centre and its provision of open activities for residents of Kingston Town neighbourhood, a grant of £750 is recommended towards the running costs of the office space at Surrey house. It is also recommended that Kingston Arts collect
data on attendance at events taking place at the venue to assist them with future funding applications.

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

RECOMMENDATION: A grant of £750

2) Kingston Environment Centre

Grant request: £750

14. Kingston Environment Centre (KEC), formed in 2012, is a not-for-profit company limited by guarantee. It is in the process of applying for registered charity status. Currently run on a voluntary basis from Kingston Environment Centre (previously Fountain Youth Centre) in New Malden, the broad aims of Kingston Environment Centre are to support the development of a sustainable Kingston. Kingston Environment Centre has 52 registered members and approximately 1,000 users per annum. Kingston Environment Centre has 2 part-time members of staff, 7 committee members who meet monthly, and between 15 and 30 regular direct supporters. If you include other projects at the Centre this increases to approximately 300 other volunteers.

15. The grant request is for £750 towards the cost of a polytunnel (£500) and work benches (£250) for the Hogsmill Community Garden. The projected budget for this activity shows income of £200 against expenditure of £2,500. Income is expected mainly from in-kind donations (£100), member’s fees (£50) and donations (£50). Expenditure is expected mainly on equipment (£2,000), volunteer’s expenses (£250) and publicity (£100).

16. Accounts for the year ended 31 March 2014 show an income of £16,376 against expenditure of £16,520 resulting in a deficit of £144 and a balance of £8,098 (£949 of which are restricted funds for Fruitful Kingston and £7,149 unrestricted funds held to enable Kingston Environment Centre to react to unexpected eventualities). Main income consisted of grant money from RBK (£15,000), membership fees (£550) and The Challenge (£550) whilst main expenditure items were rent and rates (£4,351), funding for Kingston Green Radio (£1,661), welfare (1,646), accountancy (£1,325) and equipment/repairs (£1,226).

17. The group have applied for a 2015-16 Emerging Needs and New Initiatives Grant for £3,000 towards the Hogsmill Community Garden, and also a further Emerging Needs and New Initiatives grant application for £1,800 towards the installation of a security gate at Tolworth Medieval Manor. They have not previously been awarded a Neighbourhood grant.

Officers’ Report

18. The Hogsmill Community Garden is located on the banks of the Hogsmill River next to Kingston University’s Knights Park campus. Under the umbrella of Kingston Environment Centre, a five year renewable lease has been granted by the Environment Agency for this plot of waste ground in Kingston. The land had been unused for many years and had become a fly tip. KEC’s vision for the derelict site
is to create a garden for the whole community where all ages can be inspired to reconnect with nature.

19. The funding will allow KEC to purchase a poly tunnel and set up an indoor propagation area where they intend to grow a wide range of plants and wildflowers to attract pollinating insects. The tunnel will have a multi-purpose function; as a shelter and to run workshops in propagation and structures for the garden along with enabling the growing season to be extended.

20. Although KEC are struggling to recruit volunteers for the Hogsmill Community Garden, the requested funding will enable some progress on the site to be made with the current volunteer force. Therefore, a grant of £750 is recommended towards the material costs with the additional recommendation that KEC forge links with other local groups, particularly the University, to recruit volunteers to work on the site.

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

**RECOMMENDATION: A grant of £750**

3) North Kingston Choir

22. North Kingston Choir is a not for profit constituted member’s organisation formed in 2013. They are an informal and relaxed adult community choir with an emphasis on fun music-making singing mainly modern and uplifting music. The choir rehearse on Mondays during term-time from 8 - 9.30pm at Tiffin Girls’ School. Since its inception, the choir has fundraised for a number of local and national charities / organisations (DEC Philippines Appeal, Kingston Hospital, Momentum, Down’s Syndrome Association, Marie Curie and Love Kingston). The choir is run by a management committee of 8 which meets every 6 weeks. They have no paid staff or volunteers and 39 members aged 25-65. The choir is supported by fees of £30 per term. They do not have a concessions rate although our Constitution does provide for prospective or current members who face financial hardship to apply for a reduction in fees, which is considered on a case-by-case basis by the Committee. All but 12 of the members are from Kingston Town neighbourhood.

23. A grant of £750 is requested towards the cost of one-off equipment items to assist the choir with its future charity fundraising concerts. The equipment which application relates to will allow the choir to perform with their live band at outside events, without the need for electricity or compromising on sound quality. We have fully researched the equipment options available, and consider that those listed below will best suit the performance requirements. The full equipment list applied for is:

- Battery powered stereo amplifier £398
- Amplifier carrying case / protector £49
- 12 pack rechargeable batteries £22.99
- Battery charger £16.99
24. Accounts for the year ending 31 December 2014 show income of £2,615 against expenditure of £2,512 leaving a surplus of £103. Income came entirely from membership fees and expenditure related mainly to rehearsal / concert room hire (£1,548), backing musicians fees (£375), sheet music (£210), website and logo (£136), concert expenses (£61) and temporary music director (£60). The balance sheet shows a total balance of £185 at year end.

25. The projected budget for 2015 shows an income of £3,600 against expenditure of £3,549. Income is expected exclusively from membership fees and expenditure is expected mainly on room hire for rehearsals (£1,151), room hire for concerts (£675), purchase of music (£680), concert musicians (£420), workshops (£290) and admin materials (£120).

26. North Kingston Choir have not previously applied to RBK for funding.

Officers’ Report

27. This fully costed request for equipment will enable the choir to perform at outdoor venues at future events. In its first year, the choir’s concerts raised over £1,100 for national and local charities (through ticket sale proceeds, refreshments and donations at concerts), and they have also performed at many other local events. In March 2015 the choir was selected by Kingston’s Mayor and the Love Kingston team to win an award for the most public awareness raised for Love Kingston day on 14 February.

28. Due the choir’s fundraising activity and provision of community-based musical activity, a grant of £750 is recommended towards the cost of sound equipment and banner.

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

RECOMMENDATION: A grant of £750

Statutory powers for grant making

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 Strategic Director. Therefore, any grants deemed to be in this category will be considered by the Neighbourhood Committee and passed to the Director of Adult Social Care Services so that the Strategic Director’s delegated powers can be exercised.
30. Applications 1 and 2 may be authorised under Section 137 of the Local Government Act 1972, which gives local authorities the power to incur expenditure in the interests of their area which is not otherwise authorised, including contributing to the funds of charitable bodies in furtherance of their work in the UK, or to bodies providing any public service in the UK other than for the purposes of gain. Application 3 may be authorised under Section 145 of the Local Government Act 1972, relating to the provision of entertainment, which gives local authorities the power to contribute towards the expenses of anything necessary or expedient for the provision of entertainment of any nature, and for the development and improvement of the Council’s understanding and practice of the arts.

Financial implications

31. There is currently £9,000 in the Committee’s Neighbourhood Grants budget. If the recommendations in this report are supported then there will be £6,750 remaining for 15/16.

Environmental implications

32. There are no significant environmental implications arising from Application 1 or 3. Application 2 is expected to make a positive contribution to biodiversity.

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.
Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee

3 June 2015

Item for Information - Restriction on the tabling of new information by members of the public at Planning meetings

1. Provisions for allowing registered members of the public to speak during the consideration of planning applications at Committee are set out in the Council’s Scheme for Public Participation on Planning Applications. The Executive agreed in October 2006 that any amendments to that Scheme should be submitted to Development Control Committee, following consultation with Neighbourhood Committees. Neighbourhood Committees were consulted at the January /February cycle of Committee meetings on a proposed change to the Scheme arising from the most recent guidance from the LGA (“Probity in Planning” ) in relation to members of the public tabling new information at planning meetings.

2. The LGA guidance indicates that: “New documents should not be circulated to the committee; councillors may be unable to give proper consideration to the new information and officers may not be able to check for accuracy or provide considered advice on any material considerations arising. This should be made clear to those who intend to speak.” (Previous LGA guidance had not been as explicitly prohibitive on this matter and it had been past practice across the Neighbourhood Committees that registered speakers were permitted to table documents in order to support the points being made in their representation.)

3. The four Neighbourhood Committees had differing responses to a proposed change to the Scheme to reflect this more restrictive approach; these differing views were reported to the Development Control Committee meeting on 19 March (report at Appendix B of that agenda)

4. Having considered these views, the Development Control Committee resolved that the Scheme for Public Participation on Planning Applications is amended so that it includes a straightforward restriction on any new document, including photographs, being tabled at planning meetings by members of the public or by the applicants.

5. The Development Control Committee also considered other recommendations from Neighbourhood Committees on proposed changes to the Scheme and, in response to a recommendation from South of the Borough Neighbourhood Committee, resolved that any documents that the public or applicants wish a Planning Committee to consider need to be submitted at least two working days prior to the date of the meeting in order that ‘late material’ can be sent to the Committee in sufficient time for Members to consider it before the meeting.

6. Those who have registered to speak will be clearly informed of these changes in the letter which is sent to interested parties to explain the arrangements for speaking on planning.

Background papers – held by the author of the report- Jean Cousens, Snr Democratic Support Officer, tel 020 8547 5023 email: jean.cousens@kingston.gov.uk:
Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee
3 June 2015

Work Programme

2 September 2015

Neighbourhood Budget

Neighbourhood Grants

Application to designate Area of Special Local Character (Borough Road, Princes Road and Arthur Road)

Memorial Square

Park Road Traffic Management Measures – results of consultation

London Road/Coombe Road Junction Improvements

Acre Road – New Zebra Crossing

Local Improvement Plan 2016/17

10 November 2015

Neighbourhood Budget

Neighbourhood Grants

Library Fees and Charges

Eden Street Taxi Rank

Ancient Market Place – review mechanism for controlling area

3 February 2016

Neighbourhood Budget

Neighbourhood Grants

13 April 2016

Neighbourhood Budget

Neighbourhood Grants