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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. However this is with the exception of any planning applications, enforcement or TPOs. Please see guidance notes on speaking on these items at the end of the agenda.

1. **Appointment of Chair and Vice Chair for the 2017/18 Municipal Year**

   To appoint the Chair and Vice Chair of this Committee for 2017/18

2. **Questions**

   To consider questions from the gallery on items not on the agenda

3. **Apologies for absence and attendance of substitute members**

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 9 March 2017

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.

8. **Planning Applications**

   To determine three planning applications

9. **Enforcement - 10 Borough Road KT2 6BD**

   To determine whether or not enforcement action should proceed
10. **Roads East of Richmond Road - results of consultation**
   Appendix C

   To consider the results of the local public consultation on the proposal for Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in roads east of Richmond Road, and agree the way forward.

11. **Kings Road - introduction of traffic management measures**
    Appendix D

   To consider the request from petitioners to urgently calm and limit traffic using the upper part (eastern section) of Kings Road, between Park Road and Queens Road.

12. **Park Road review of traffic management system**
    Appendix E

   To consider the results of the local public consultation on the introduction of traffic management measures in Park Road, and agree their implementation.

13. **Mill Street objections to double yellow lines**
    Appendix F

   To consider representations raised to a Traffic Management Order (TMO P-248), which proposes the implementation of No Waiting “At Any Time” restrictions (double yellow lines) on the east side of Mill Street.

14. **SO32 - Enforcement action - 1 Nightingale Mews, South Lane, KT1 2NS**
    Appendix G

   To report urgent action taken under the Standing Order 32 procedure.

15. **Work Programme**

   **Tuesday 5 September 2017**

   Union Street – review of existing banned left turn Planning applications

16. **URGENT ITEMS AUTHORISED BY THE CHAIR**

17. **Exclusion of press and public**

   The following resolution is included as a standard item which will only be relevant if any exempt matter is to be considered at the meeting for which the Committee wish to resolve to exclude the press and public:

   To exclude the public from the meeting under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that it is likely that exempt information, as defined in paragraph *....of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Act, would be disclosed and the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

   (*relevant regulatory paragraph to be indicated)
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. A Decision Notice will be published on the Council’s website soon after the meeting with details of the decisions and the call in period expires 10 working days after the meeting. 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.

**Speaking on Planning Applications, Enforcement, or TPOs**
There is a registration scheme for residents wishing to speak on Planning Applications, Tree Preservation Orders or Enforcement cases to be determined by the Committee.

(For other items on the agenda, including planning applications on which the Neighbourhood is being consulted before the application is considered by the Development Control Committee, residents may ask questions and give their views at the discretion of the Chair.)

The arrangements for speaking on applications are based on both sides having equal time to make their points to Councillors. To make sure that the meeting runs in a way which is fair to everyone, these arrangements will be followed without any exceptions being made. The full scheme is on the Council website at the ‘Council and Decision making’ webpages.

Everyone wishing to speak on an Application, Enforcement Action or Tree Preservation Order must have registered THREE days before the meeting. **Objectors must have responded to the consultation on an application.** To register please contact: Marian Morrison 020 8547 4623, email: marian.morrison@kingston.gov.uk

**Registration deadline:** Tuesday 4 July 2017 at 10.00am

**Time for speaking - FIVE minutes is allowed for each side on each application.** This time has to be shared by however many there are on each side. If there is a large number of speakers, people must decide amongst themselves on a spokesperson or some other arrangement. **The Chair of the meeting has no discretion to extend the time limit.**

Speakers may find it helpful to have made some notes on what they want to say, so that they make the most of the speaking time. The notes attached to the original consultation letter from the Planning Officer will have explained the things that the Committee can't take account of - loss of view, property values etc.

**The order of speaking is:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning applications</th>
<th>Enforcement/Tree Preservation Orders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong></td>
<td>Planning Officer to present item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong></td>
<td>Objector(s) (5 minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong></td>
<td>Applicant (5 minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questions from Committee to Objector(s) and Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.</strong></td>
<td>Objector(s) (5 minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant (5 minutes)</td>
<td>The Council as applicant and/or supporters of the action proposed (5 minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.</strong></td>
<td>Sweep up by Planning Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.</strong></td>
<td>Questions from Committee to Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.</strong></td>
<td>Debate and decision by Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM NO</td>
<td>REGISTER NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>16/13215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>16/13258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>17/12102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All recommendations for planning permission in this section are automatically subject to the condition limiting the duration of the permission required by Sections 91 and 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act (as amended) 1990 unless permission is to be granted for a limited period or unless there is a specific recommendation that the period for such duration be other than the period referred to in the standard condition. All background papers are incorporated into Planning Application Reports.

The policies listed are those from the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames the Local Development Framework Core Strategy, Adopted April 2012.
A1 Register No: 16/13215/FUL

Address: 178 (THE FORMER RICHMOND PARK TAVERN)
KINGS ROAD, KINGSTON UPON THAMES, KT2 5HU

(c) Crown Copyright. All right reserved. Royal Borough of Kingston 2007. Licence number 100019285.

[Please note that this plan is intended to assist in locating the development it is not the site plan of the proposed development which may have different boundaries. Please refer to the application documents for the proposed site boundaries.]
Ward: Canbury
Description of Proposal: Erection of a part ground and first floor, part first floor and mansard roof extensions to existing building to facilitate 8 self-contained units comprising 1 x 1 bed and 7 x 2 bed units and the erection of a two storey building comprising 2 x 3 bed pair of semi-detached dwellinghouses and associated landscaping, cycle and refuse storage.

Plan Type: Full Application
Expiry Date: 13/02/2017

Applicant's Plan Nos:

006-100 Rev A Visuals Received 14/12/2016
006-101 Rev A Proposed Plans Received 14/12/2016
006-102 Proposed elevations Received 02/12/2016
006-103 House Elevations Received 02/12/2016
006-104 Existing Elevations Received 02/12/2016
006-106 Existing Plans Received 02/12/2016
006-107 Rev C Ground floor plan Received 27/02/2017
8125-02 Tree Protection Plan Received 02/12/2016
LS/8125 Rev A Survey of Trees Received 02/12/2016
Site Location Plan Received 02/12/2016

BASIC INFORMATION

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012

Development Plan: Mayor for London
London Plan March 2016 (consolidated with alterations since 2011)
LDF Core Strategy Adopted April 2012
Kingston Town Centre AAP 2008

Policies

LDF CORE STRATEGY CORE POLICIES
CS 01 Climate Change Mitigation
CS 08 Character, Heritage and Design
CS 10 Housing Delivery

LDF CORE STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT
DM01 Sustainable Design and Construction Stan
DM10 Design Requirements for New Developments
Development in Conservation Areas and Affecting Heritage Assets

Housing Quality and Mix

Previous Relevant History

14/13212/FUL Erection of single storey rear extension, new accessible access ramp, infilling of one main entrance door, infilling of minor ground floor windows and erection of new access gate and retention of closeboard fence. Permit with conditions 03/02/2015

15/12414/FUL Installation of refrigeration and air conditioning plant within an external compound Permit with conditions 14/12/2015

16/12583/ADV Display of 1 x internally illuminated Co-op hanging sign, 1 x internally illuminated projecting sign, 2 x internally illuminated fascia sign and 1 non-illuminated wall mounted panel Grant 5 Year 04/10/2016

Consultations

1. Neighbour notifications: 128 addresses have been consulted. 5 letters of objection received. The objections can be summarised as follows:
   -over development
   -Harmful to and not in keeping with the character of the area
   -increased parking pressure
   -traffic congestion
   -noise to residents from use at ground floor

Site and Surroundings

2. The application site is located on the south side of Kings Road on the junction with Acre Road. The site is occupied by a two storey building that was formerly the Richmond Park Tavern Public House. The ground floor has been converted to an A1 retail unit and the first floor is vacant.

3. The site is in a predominantly residential area in character and appearance. The site is not located in a conservation area but is opposite the statutorily listed St Agatha RC Church and The Keep building and boundary wall.
Proposal

4. Planning permission is sought for the erection of a part ground and first floor, part first floor and mansard roof extensions to existing building to facilitate 8 self-contained units comprising 1 x 1 bed and 7 x 2 bed units and the erection of a two storey building comprising 2 x 3 bed pair of semi-detached dwellinghouses and associated landscaping, cycle and refuse storage.

Assessment

The main considerations material to the determination of this application are:

- Principle of Proposed Development
- Impact on Character of Area
- Impact on Neighbour’s Residential Amenity
- Highways and Parking
- Trees
- Legal Agreements
- Sustainability
- Other Material Considerations

Principle of Proposed Development

5. The proposed development seeks to redevelop the existing site to provide 10 residential units in the shape of 8 self contained flats through extending the existing building to provide 7 x 2 bed units and 1 x 1 bed unit creating a mixed use building with the commercial A1 retail unit remaining at ground floor. Adjacent to the existing building and fronting Kings Road it is proposed to build a pair of semi-detached 2 x 3 bed dwellinghouses. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character and appearance and the policies of the current development plan and the National Planning Policy Framework do not preclude such types of development and indeed seek to promote residential and mixed use developments. Paragraph 17 of the NPPF states that Planning should encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land). It is considered that the proposed use would be compatible with and be in keeping with its surroundings and the principle of the development acceptable subject to compliance with the relevant policies of the Development Plan and National Planning Policy Framework.

Quality of accommodation

6. Paragraph 17 of the NPPF states that planning should always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. The proposed development would provide 10 units of residential accommodation. The units would
be meet the minimum internal space standards set by table 3.3 of Policy 3.5 of the London Plan, have a practical layout and adequate provision of amenity space for an outside seating and drying area. The units would have an adequate provision of daylight/sunlight provision for future occupants. It is noted that some of the units are in excess of the minimum internal floor areas required. This is considered necessary in this instance to allow the units in the development to achieve a good standard of accommodation in this instance due to the constraints of the shape of the site and the need for dual aspect units due to the orientation of the site. The site would provide 2 x 3 bed units which is 20% of the total units in the proposed development. This is less than the 30% sought by policy DM13 of the Council’s adopted LDF Core Strategy. However the 2 units of 3 bed accommodation would be of high standard and provide a good standard of family accommodation. To achieve the required 30% of units on site as family units would, due to the constraints of the site be likely to compromise the quality of the resulting accommodation and the overall quality of the proposed development. In addition, the proposed development would provide a good range of accommodation types with a mixture of 1, 2 and 3 bed units. The proposed development would have adequate cycle and refuse storage and the 3 bed units would be eligible to apply for on-street parking permits with the 8 flatted units being the subject of a legal agreement preventing future occupants and their visitors from applying for residents or visitors parking permits.

7. It is considered that the quality and mix of accommodation would be acceptable and the proposal would comply with policies CS10 and DM13 of the Council’s adopted LDF Core Strategy April 2012.

Impact on Character of Area

8. The proposed extensions to the existing building and the new two storey building would be well proportioned and of a mass and bulk, height and scale proportionate to the existing plot size and the surrounding area and be of an architectural style sympathetic to the host property and the surrounding area. The proposal would provide an enhancement to the character and appearance of the site and that of the surrounding area and would be in keeping with the general pattern and form of development.

9. It is considered that the proposal would not cause any harm to the setting of the statutorily listed St Agatha RC Church and The Keep building and boundary wall opposite.

Impact on Neighbours' Residential Amenity

11. It is considered the proposed development would by virtue of its nature and size, siting and design in relation to the neighbouring properties and uses would not cause any significant harm to the outlook, daylight/sunlight provision, or privacy of the neighbouring residential occupants or by its presence prejudice the future operations of the commercial A1 retail unit at ground floor level.

12. It is therefore considered that the proposal would comply with paragraph 123 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy DM10 of the Council’s adopted LDF Core Strategy April 2012.

Highways & Parking

13. The applicant would be required to enter into a legal agreement preventing the future occupants and their visitors of the proposed flatted units (1 x 1 and 7 x 2 bed units) from obtaining residents and visitors parking permits. The future occupants and visitors of the proposed pair of semi-detached dwellinghouses (2 x 3 bed units) would be eligible to apply for residents and visitors on-street parking permits. The applicant has carried out a parking beat survey that shows that there is on-street parking capacity.

14. It is considered that the parking controls in place on-street and the fact that there is evidence of on-street parking capacity within the areas of parking control would mitigate the parking demand on-street created by the proposed 2 x 3 bed units. As such it is considered that the proposed development would not result in congestion in the area and that the proposed development would not prejudice highway safety. Therefore the proposed development would comply with policy DM10 of the Council’s adopted LDF Core Strategy April 2012.

Trees

15. The proposed development does not affect any trees subject of a Tree Preservation Order.

Legal Agreements

16. The applicant would be required to enter into a legal agreement to prevent the future occupants and their visitors from obtaining residents or visitors car parking permits, and to provide a financial contribution as a carbon off-set payment in order for the development to comply with zero carbon policies set out in the London Plan. It is recommended that a resolution to grant be subject to completion of the said legal agreement.
The development would be both Mayoral and Kingston Community Infrastructure Levy (MCIL & KCIL) liable. The MCIL would be chargeable at £35/sqm. The KCIL would be chargeable at £210/sqm (charging zone 1) total £199,647.00.

Sustainability

The proposal is a residential development. Policy 5.2 of the London Plan requires that residential development achieve a zero carbon emissions rating. The applicant has provided an energy statement that demonstrates that a reduction in CO2 emissions of 42% would be achieved. As in line with London Plan Policy a financial contribution is to be made of £13,887.00 an off-set payment up to 100% CO2 emissions reduction.

A condition is recommended that ensures the development achieves internal water usage rates of 105l/p/day.

Recommendation:

Approve subject to the applicant entering into a legal agreement and subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be commenced within 3 years from the date of this decision.
   
   Reason: In order to comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990. (As amended)

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

   006-104 Existing Elevations  02/12/2016
   006-106 Existing Plans  02/12/2016
   006-103 House Elevations  02/12/2016
   006-102 Proposed elevations  02/12/2016
   Site Location Plan  02/12/2016
   8125-02 Tree Protection Plan  02/12/2016
   LS/8125 Rev A Survey of Trees  02/12/2016
   006-100 Rev A Visuals  14/12/2016
   006-101 Rev A Proposed Plans  14/12/2016
   006-107 Rev C Ground floor plan  27/02/2017
Reason: For avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3 The facing materials to be used in the construction of the buildings and extensions shall be those specified on the application form and approved drawings or such other materials as have been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development is commenced and shall thereafter be retained as such.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance on completion of the development in accordance with Policy DM10 (Design Requirements for New Developments including House Extensions) of the LDF Core Strategy Adopted April 2012.

4 Within 3 months of first occupation, evidence must be submitted to the council confirming that the development hereby approved has achieved internal water usage rates of 105l/p/day must be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, unless otherwise agreed in writing.

Reason: In the interests of sustainability and energy conservation in accordance with Policy 5.3 (Sustainable Design & Construction) of the London Plan (July 2016) and Policy DM1 (Sustainable Design and Construction Standards) of the LDF Core Strategy Adopted April 2012.

5 Prior to the occupation of the development hereby permitted the secure cycle parking facilities for the occupants of, and visitors to, the development and shown on the approved plans shall be fully implemented and made available for use and shall thereafter be retained for use at all times.

Reason: To ensure the provision of satisfactory cycle storage facilities and in the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy DM8 (Sustainable Transport for New Developments) of the LDF Core Strategy Adopted April 2012.

6 Prior to the occupation of the development hereby permitted the refuse storage facilities and recycling facilities shown on the approved plans shall be provided and such facilities to be permanently retained at the site.

Reason: To ensure the provision of refuse facilities to the satisfaction of the Council in accordance with Policy DM10 (Design Requirements for New Developments including House Extensions) of the LDF Core Strategy Adopted April 2012.

7 All works on site shall take place in accordance with the following details which shall have previously been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of work:
(a) Provision for loading/unloading materials.
(b) Storage of plant, materials and operatives vehicles.
(c) Temporary site access.
(d) Signing system for works traffic.
(e) Measures for the laying of dust, suppression of noise and abatement of other nuisance arising from development works.
(f) Location of all ancillary site buildings.
(g) Measures to protect any tree, shrubbery and other landscape features to be retained on the site during the course of development.
(h) Means of enclosure of the site.
(i) Wheel washing equipment.
(j) The parking of vehicles of the site operatives and visitors
(k) The erection and maintenance of security hoarding.

Reason: In order to safeguard the amenities of the surrounding residential occupiers and to safeguard highway safety and the free flow of traffic in accordance with Policy DM10 (Design Requirements for New Developments including House Extensions) of the LDF Core Strategy Adopted April 2012.

8 Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted (excluding demolition) and notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans stated in condition 2 of this permission, the following details shall have been submitted in writing (on plans at a scale of no less than 1:10) and approved by the Local Planning Authority.
- Window reveals, door reveals, overhangs, rainwater goods.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: It is necessary to provide these details prior to commencement as it is integral to the design and appearance of the building and therefore agreement of these details prior to commencement would ensure a satisfactory appearance on completion of the development in accordance with Policy DM10 (Design Requirements for New Developments including House Extensions) of the LDF Core Strategy Adopted April 2012.

Informative(s)

1 Your attention is drawn to the need to comply with the relevant provisions of the Building Regulations, the Building Acts and other related legislation. These cover such works as - the demolition of existing buildings, the erection of a new building or structure, the extension or alteration to a building, change of use of buildings, installation of services, underpinning works, and fire safety/means of escape works. Notice of intention to demolish existing buildings must be given to the Council’s Building Control
Service at least 6 weeks before work starts. A completed application form together with detailed plans must be submitted for approval before any building work is commenced.

2 When undertaking demolition and/or building work, please be considerate to your neighbours and do not undertake work before 8am or after 6pm Monday to Friday, before 8am or after 1pm on a Saturday or at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays. Furthermore, please ensure that all vehicles associated with the construction of the development hereby approved are properly washed and cleaned to prevent the passage of mud and dirt onto the adjoining highway. You are advised that the Council does have formal powers to control noise and nuisance under The Control of Pollution Act 1974, the Clean Air Acts and other relevant legislation. For further information and advice, please contact - Environmental Health Department Pollution Section.

3 The Party Wall Act 1996 requires a building owner to notify, and obtain formal agreement from, any adjoining owner, where the building owner proposes to:
   • carry out work to an existing party wall;
   • build on the boundary with a neighbouring property;
   • in some circumstances, carry out groundwork’s within 6 metres of an adjoining building.
Notification and agreements under this Act are the responsibility of the building owner and are quite separate from Building Regulations, or Planning Controls. The Building Control Service will assume that an applicant has obtained any necessary agreements with the adjoining owner, and nothing said or implied by the Council should be taken as removing the necessity for the building owner to comply fully with the Party Wall Act. Further information and advice is to be found in “The Party Walls etc. Act 1996 - Explanatory Booklet”.

4 Kingston Council has a statutory duty to officially name streets and number properties within streets. As your planning application is likely to require address changes, you are obliged to contact the Street naming and numbering team to request official registration in accordance with Part II of the London Buildings Act 1939. Failure to do this could result in delays/omissions by the post office, emergency services and other service providers. You can submit your application online via our website www.kingston.gov.uk <http://www.kingston.gov.uk/> or via email to snn@kingston.gov.uk <mailto:snn@kingston.gov.uk>. Alternatively, if you do not have internet access please call 020 8547 4606.

5 In dealing with the application the Council has implemented the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive way. We have made available detailed advice in the form of our statutory policies in the Core Strategy, Supplementary Planning Documents, Planning Briefs and other informal written guidance, as well as offering a full pre-application advice service, in order to ensure that the applicant has been given every opportunity to submit an application which is likely to be considered favourably.
The development approved by this planning permission will be liable to pay the Mayor of London’s Community Infrastructure Levy (MCIL) and Kingston Community Infrastructure Levy (KCIL). The amount of KCIL liability to be £199,647.00.

Payment will be due once the owner/developer serves a development Commencement Notice on the Council, and a payment Demand Notice has been received by the owner. Failure to submit a Commencement Notice will incur a surcharge of 20% of the chargeable amount or £2,500, whichever is the lower amount.

When you have received approval of all reserve matters / discharged all pre-commencement conditions the Council will issue a Liability Notice to the owner setting out the MCIL and CIL calculation. Accompanying the Liability Notice will be a blank Commencement Notice and if necessary a blank Assumption of Liability form, both of which need to be completed and returned to the Council prior to development commencing. A failure to do so will incur a surcharge.

Should you have any questions in respect of the contents of this letter or the MCIL more generally, please contact the Council’s Contact Centre 0208 547 5002.
Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee

Date of Meeting: 6 July 2017

A2 Register No: 16/13258/FUL

Address: LAND TO THE REAR OF AND INCLUDING 18 GENEVA ROAD, KINGSTON, KT1 2TW

(c) Crown Copyright. All right reserved. Royal Borough of Kingston 2007. Licence number 100019285.

[Please note that this plan is intended to assist in locating the development it is not the site plan of the proposed development which may have different boundaries. Please refer to the application documents for the proposed site boundaries.]
Ward: Grove
Description of Proposal: Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 3 No. two storey houses. Minor alterations to the existing house.
Plan Type: Full Application
Expiry Date: 31/05/2017

Applicant's Plan Nos:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Received Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>461-P1.001-C</td>
<td>Ground Floor Plan - Existing</td>
<td>05/04/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461-P1.002-C</td>
<td>First Floor Plan - Existing</td>
<td>05/04/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461-P1.005-C</td>
<td>Elevation AA - Existing</td>
<td>05/04/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461-P1.101-C</td>
<td>Ground Floor Plan - Proposed</td>
<td>05/04/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461-P1.102-C</td>
<td>First Floor Plan - Existing</td>
<td>05/04/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461-P1.105-C</td>
<td>Elevation AA - Proposed</td>
<td>05/04/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461-P1.106-C</td>
<td>Elevation BB - Proposed</td>
<td>05/04/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461-P3.101-B</td>
<td>Detail 3 - Sash Window Reveal</td>
<td>05/04/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461-P3.102-B</td>
<td>Detail 3 - Sash Window Head</td>
<td>05/04/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461-P3.103-C</td>
<td>Detail 3 - Sash Window Cill</td>
<td>05/04/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>751_18GR_P101</td>
<td>Proposed Site Plan</td>
<td>05/04/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>751_18GR_P102</td>
<td>Proposed Ground Floor Plan &amp; Garden Space</td>
<td>05/04/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>751_18GR_P102</td>
<td>Proposed Rear Elevation</td>
<td>05/04/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>751_18GR_P102.1</td>
<td>Ground Floor Plan - Parking Area</td>
<td>05/04/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>751_18GR_P103</td>
<td>Proposed Unit 1 Ground Floor Plan</td>
<td>05/04/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>751_18GR_P104</td>
<td>Proposed First Floor Plan</td>
<td>05/04/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>751_18GR_P105</td>
<td>Proposed Unit 1 First Floor Plan</td>
<td>05/04/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>751_18GR_P106</td>
<td>Proposed Loft Plan</td>
<td>05/04/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>751_18GR_P107</td>
<td>Proposed Unit 1 Loft Plan</td>
<td>05/04/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>751_18GR_P108</td>
<td>Proposed Roof Plan</td>
<td>05/04/2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
751_18GR_P109 Proposed Unit 1 Roof Plan  Received 05/04/2017
751_18GR_P110 Proposed Section A-A Received 05/04/2017
751_18GR_P111 Proposed Front Elevation Received 05/04/2017
751_18GR_P113 Proposed Right Side Elevation Received 05/04/2017
751_18GR_P114 Proposed Left Side Elevation Received 05/04/2017
751_18GR_P115 Site Plan Proposed Received 05/04/2017
751_18GR_X000 Block & Location Plan Received 05/04/2017
751_18GR_X000.1 Proposed Block and Location Plan Received 05/04/2017
751_18GR_X001 Existing Site Plan Received 05/04/2017
751_18GR_X002 Existing Site Plan Received 05/04/2017
751_18GR_X003 Existing Site Plan Received 05/04/2017
Daylight & Sunlight Study Received 05/04/2017
Housing Standards Policy Statement Received 13/01/2017
Planning Statement Received 05/04/2017

BASIC INFORMATION

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) – web based resource

Development Plan: Mayor for London
London Plan March 2016 (consolidated with alterations since 2011)
LDF Core Strategy Adopted April 2012
Kingston Town Centre AAP 2008

Policies

LONDON PLAN MARCH 2016
(consolidated with alterations since 2011)
LP 3.3 Increasing housing supply
LP 3.4 Optimising housing potential
LP 3.5 Quality and design of housing development
LP 5.1 Climate change mitigation
LP 5.12 Flood risk management
LP 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
LP 7.4 Local character
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LP 7.6</th>
<th>Architecture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS 01</td>
<td>Climate Change Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 02</td>
<td>Climate Change Adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 07</td>
<td>Managing Vehicle Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 08</td>
<td>Character, Heritage and Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 10</td>
<td>Housing Delivery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| LDF CORE STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT |
| DM01  | Sustainable Design and Construction Stan |
| DM03  | Designing for Changing Climate |
| DM04  | Water Management and Flood Risk |
| DM08  | Sustainable Transport for New Development |
| DM09  | Managing Vehicle Use for New Development |
| DM10  | Design Requirements for New Developments |
| DM11  | Design Approach |
| DM13  | Housing Quality and Mix |
| DM14  | Loss of Housing |
| DM15  | Affordable Housing |

**Previous Relevant History**

N/A

**Consultations**

1. 45 surrounding owner/occupiers were consulted. 18 responses from separate addresses were received all of which were objections. The material objections are summarised as follows:
   - overbearing/increased sense of enclosure;
   - overdevelopment/overly high density
   - excessive bulk, height and massing;
   - overlooking/loss of privacy
   - noise and disturbance
   - contrary to LDF Core Strategies CS8 and DM10
   - substandard outdoor amenity space
   - poor separation distance
   - overshadowing/loss of daylight/sunlight
   - concern about poor boundary treatment
   - loss of garden land and trees
   - design and materials being out of character/not in-keeping with the surrounding area;
   - out of character with surrounding area; and,
   - increase in traffic congestion and on-street parking pressure.

**Thames Water**

2. No objection.

**Highways and Transportation**
3. No objection subject to the imposition of planning conditions regarding; parking, cycle parking, pedestrian inter-visibility splays, a working scheme, and a Construction Management Plan, and subject to the applicant entering a legal agreement car capping the development and precluding future occupants from applying for on-street car parking permits.

Kingston upon Thames Society

4. Support the application subject to the number of houses being reduced to 2.

Site and Surroundings

5. The application site is located to the rear of 18 Geneva Road but is in closer proximity to the eastern side of Beaufort Road. It measures approximately 613sqm in area and comprises a vacant "granny annex" previously associated with No. 18 Geneva Road and a single storey garage. Part of the site is under the ownership of Thames Water.

6. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character. However, the site is opposite the Hotel Antoinette (Use Class C1). It should be noted that redevelopment of the Hotel Antoinette for residential use has been recently granted on appeal (15/12107/FUL). The buildings on the site are not listed or locally listed and the site does not fall within a Conservation Area. However, it does fall within the Grove Crescent Local Area of Special Character (LASC) and is within 31m of the Grove Crescent Conservation Area. It does not fall within a Flood Risk Zone and is not covered by any Tree Preservation Orders (TPOS).

Proposal

7. The proposal relates to the demolition of the existing buildings and the erection of 3 No. two storey (4 bedroom) townhouses and minor alterations to the existing house comprising replacement windows, a replacement front boundary wall and new hardstanding treatment.

Assessment

The main considerations material to the determination of this application are:

- Principle of Proposed Development
- Impact on Character of Area
- Impact on Neighbour’s Residential Amenity
- Highways and Parking
- Trees
- Legal Agreements
- Sustainability
Other Material Considerations

Principle of Proposed Development

8. Paragraph 17 of the NPPF, 2012 directs that planning should proactively drive and support economic development to deliver the homes that the country needs and that every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing needs of an area. Paragraph 47 goes on to say that local authorities should "boost significantly" the supply of housing and Paragraph 49 makes it clear that "Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development."

9. Regional policy supports this stance and policies 3.3 and 3.4 of the London Plan March 2016 (consolidated with alterations since 2011) emphasise that the Mayor recognises the pressing need for more homes in London and will work with relevant partners to ensure that housing need is met.

10. At the local level LDF Policy CS10 of the Council's LDF Core Strategy, 2012 sets out the Borough's housing targets as defined by the London Plan, 2011. These have increased since the adoption of the Core Strategy and Kingston currently has a target of 643 new residential dwellings per year London Plan March 2016 (consolidated with alterations since 2011). This application proposes three net additional residential units.

11. The principle of creating additional residential units and making minor alterations to an existing residential property within a predominantly residential area is acceptable subject to compliance with Development Plan policies.

Housing Quality and Mix

12. Policy DM13 of the Council's LDF Core Strategy, 2012 states that the Council will ensure that the housing delivered in the Borough is of high quality and the most appropriate type. To this end and in the spirit of the Policy the proposal provides 100% family dwellings which exceeds the Council's requirements.

13. With regards to internal space standards Policy 3.5 of the London Plan, 2016 states that for 4 bed, 7 person dwellings, the minimum internal floor area required is 115sqm. All proposed units would exceed these minimum standards with each unit providing approximately 125.

14. As to internal floor to ceiling heights each of the storeys measures 2.5m throughout. As such, the proposals would be in compliance with Table 3.3 of the London Plan, 2016 which requires that new units achieve a minimum floor to ceiling height of 2.3m for at least 75% of
the Gross Internal Area.

15. Overall, the residential accommodation proposed would provide a good standard of accommodation for future occupants of the proposed development.

Impact on Character of Area

16. Together the NPPF, 2012 and the London Plan, 2016 operate to secure development of a high quality and where applicable replace poor design with better design.

17. At the regional policy level Policy 3.5 of the London Plan, 2016 states that housing developments should be the highest quality internally, externally, and in relation to their context and to the wider environment. The design of all new housing should enhance the quality of local places, taking into account physical context and local character.

18. Local policies CS8 and DM10 of the LDF Core Strategy, 2012 support the regional position and require that proposals relate well to their surroundings, recognise distinctive local features and be of a high standard to achieve a more attractive, sustainable and accessible environment.

19. The proposal involves two aspects, the first relates to the construction of 3 No. 2-storey, 4 bedroom terraced houses with accommodation in the roofspace. In terms of design the new dwellings would be contemporary but incorporate traditional features such as gables and porthole windows in the front elevations. They would measure 8.95m in height and have staggered/stepped front and rear building lines. The roofs would be pitched and include one rooflight in each of the front roof pitches and two in each of the rear roof pitches. In terms of fenestration each property would have 2 sash windows at ground level and 2 sash windows and a square single paned window in the front elevation and 2 sash windows and a three-paned patio door in the rear elevation. The property forming the southern end of the terrace would have a sash window at ground floor level and a sash window at roof level in the southern elevation and the property forming the northern end of the terrace would have a sash window at ground floor level and a sash window at first floor level in the northern elevation.

20. With regards to materials for the new dwellings limited information has been submitted by applicant, however, the proposed walls would be finished in London Stock brick or similar, the roof would be finished in slate or similar and the windows would be of a sash style and white in colour. These are considered to be in keeping with the surrounding context and are acceptable. Although, detailed materials information will be required via condition so that they are of a suitable quality and specification to ensure a satisfactory appearance. In addition, a landscaping scheme including details of the boundary treatment,
planting species and planting schedule will also be required via condition to ensure that the finished appearance of the dwellings is sympathetic to both the new dwellings as well as the neighbouring properties and surrounding context.

21. The second aspect of the proposal relates to alterations to the front elevation of the existing dwelling on Geneva Road and includes the replacement of the aluminium sash windows at first floor level, the re-rendering of the existing expanse of render at first floor level, the demolition of the existing low rise front boundary wall and the erection of a new boundary wall and associated gates and railings. The style of the new sash windows would replicate those existing at ground floor level in terms of appearance and materials. The new brick wall would measure 1.6m in height (to the top of the pillars) and incorporate pillars with metal railings and gates between measuring 1.3m in height. The existing crossover and hardstanding, sufficient to accommodate 1 car would be retained.

22. Overall, the proposed design of the new dwellings is considered to be in keeping with the surrounding residential context which includes a mixture of detached and terraced houses varying in architectural style, character and age. Whilst it is acknowledged that the new houses would be built to the rear of No. 18 Geneva Road, Officers also recognise that the new development would replace a partially developed piece of land which features existing structures, including ancillary residential accommodation, a double garage and a large expanse of hardstanding. It is also considered that as the new dwellings would face Beaufort Road, as opposed to Geneva Road, they would have a positive effect on the Beaufort Road streetscene by filling a substantial and uncharacteristic gap between properties. The proposed height of the development is also considered to be in keeping with neighbouring dwellings and would only be marginally higher than No. 9 Beaufort Road which is in closest proximity. It should also be noted that a number of properties on both Beaufort Road and Geneva Road were originally built as two storey dwellings but now have accommodation in the roofspace, or were purpose built as 3 storey developments, as was the case with No. 23 Beaufort Road.

23. In terms of density, the proposed new dwellings are considered to be in conformity with the ranges appropriate to suburban development as set out in Table 3.2 of the London Plan, 2016.

24. As to the proposed alterations to the front elevation and front boundary of 18 Geneva Road, they are considered to be in keeping with the character of the host dwelling and the prevailing character of the street. Officers consider that the replacement windows would better match those existing at ground floor level and the proposed boundary wall, gates and railings would be similar to those present on other properties in the street. Timber for the proposed windows is considered acceptable, although, along with the proposed new dwellings detailed materials information will be required via condition so that all aspects of
the proposal are of a suitable quality and specification to ensure a satisfactory appearance.

25. As such, the proposed development is considered to comply with LDF Core Strategy policies CS8 and DM10.

Impact on Neighbours’ Residential Amenity


27. More specifically, Policy DM10 of the LDF Core Strategy, 2012 seeks to safeguard residential amenity with regards to privacy, outlook, sunlight/daylight, avoidance of visual intrusion and noise and disturbance.

28. The alterations to the existing dwelling at 18 Geneva Road are considered not to have any adverse impact upon neighbouring residential amenity. With regards to the proposed new dwellings Nos. 7 and 9 Beaufort Road and No. 16 Geneva Road are the principal properties to be considered.

29. Despite an increase in the built form across the site it is considered that there would be only a limited adverse impact upon the amenity of the aforementioned properties.

30. In terms of separation distances Policy Guidance 31 of the Residential Design SPD, 2013 advises that a distance of at least 21m should be maintained between the facing habitable room windows of residential properties and 15m between the primary elevation of an existing house and flank walls. This is to ensure that new development does not cause unacceptable adverse harm to neighbouring amenity, particularly in terms of overlooking and loss of privacy. The distances between the application site and No. 16 Geneva Road have been calculated to measure approximately 21m, thereby meeting the Council's guidance. Similarly, No. 7 Beaufort Road would be separated from the nearest of the new dwellings by approximately 18m which would also meet the Council's guidance. Due to these separation distances it is not considered that the properties would experience an unacceptable sense of enclosure in association with the proposed bulk and mass of the development.

31. As to loss of daylight/sunlight, the only aforementioned property considered to experience an adverse impact as a result of the proposals would be No. 9 Beaufort Road. The bedroom which has a principal window in the northern flank wall at first floor level would fall foul of the 25 degree rule set out in Policy Guidance 18 of the Residential Design SPD, 2013, as would the kitchen windows in the northern flank wall at ground floor level. Both the bedroom and kitchen are classed as
habitable rooms. Ordinarily, the loss of daylight to habitable rooms would be considered unacceptable. However, in this case, due to the substantial nature of No. 9 Beaufort Road which includes a large kitchen, separate dining room and a total of 6 bedrooms, it is considered that the occupants would have the option of using a number of alternative rooms within the dwelling for both dining and sleeping accommodation. With regards to potential loss of privacy and overlooking in terms of No. 9, it is not considered that there would be a significant adverse impact as the proposed window at ground floor level in the southern flank wall of the nearest dwelling would relate to a hallway window and the proposed window in the same flank wall at first floor level would relate to the stairwell. In addition the stairwell window is proposed to be finished in obscured glass.

32. Whilst Officers acknowledge that the proposed gardens would allow views into adjoining existing gardens to some extent, the proposal is not considered to result in an unacceptable loss of privacy and would not afford direct overlooking into neighbouring habitable rooms.

33. With regards to noise and disturbance the proposed development would not cause harm to the amenity of neighbouring properties above and beyond what is commonly associated with suburban patterns of development. It should be emphasised that the proposal would be for a residential use in a predominantly residential area which is considered entirely appropriate.

34. In terms of private amenity space for future occupants, the proposal would provide gardens with areas of between 50 sqm and 55.5 sqm predominantly to the rear of the site. Part (h) of Policy DM10 of the LDF Core Strategy, 2012 states that development proposals should ensure adequate private and/or communal amenity space. In support of this stance Policy Guidance 13 of the Residential Design SPD, 2013 requires that new houses provide at least 50sqm of private amenity space per dwelling, plus 5 sqm of extra floorspace per additional bedroom over a total of three bedrooms. Therefore, the total requirement for the development would be 150sqm. This has been exceeded. As to the quality of the proposed amenity space, it is acknowledged that the gardens would be irregular in shape, nevertheless, this factor is not considered to render them unusable.

35. Overall, and for the reasons set out above the proposal is considered to comply with Policy DM10 of the LDF Core Strategy, 2012.

Highways & Parking

36. Policies DM9 and DM10 of the LDF Core Strategy seek to ensure that new development has regard to local traffic conditions and does not contribute to congestion or compromise highway safety.

37. The site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level of 2 (Poor) and falls
within the Grove Area G1 Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ).

38. As the site falls within a CPZ the 3 proposed car parking spaces (1 for each new dwelling) would be considered acceptable and in accordance with policies DM9 and DM10 of the LDF Core Strategy, 2012 subject to the signing of a legal agreement. The legal agreement would cap the development, preclude future occupants from obtaining on-street car parking permits and stipulate a requirement to inform potential buyers/tenants of the above exclusion, as well as publicise the lack of parking provision in sales brochures.

39. It should be noted that the applicant has agreed to enter into such an agreement should the Committee resolve to grant planning permission.

40. The information provided in the application states that 7 cycle parking spaces are proposed. According to the standards set out in Table 6.3 of the London Plan, 2016 6 cycle parking spaces are required. Therefore, the proposal meets and exceeds the requirements. Although, to ensure that the proposals fully comply with Policies DM9 and DM10 of the LDF Core Strategy and the Sustainable Transport SPD, 2013 further information will be sought via condition with regards to the style and siting of cycle storage.

41. With regards to the proposed new boundary on Geneva Road, the proposed height and visual permeability of the gates and railings are not considered to create an adverse impact in terms of safety for wither vehicles or pedestrians. Whilst it is acknowledged that the depth of the front hardstanding falls short of the recommended depth set out in the Council’s Sustainable Transport SPD, 2013, Officers recognise that the hardstanding area is already used for car parking and cannot be increased further. A such, the proposal is considered to comply with Policy DM10 of the LDF Core Strategy.

Trees

42. The proposal involves the removal of a soft landscaped area including trees and shrubs. This loss can be mitigated by replacement planting and secured by way of a planning condition.

Legal Agreements

43. The applicant has agreed to enter into a legal agreement to car cap the development, preclude future occupants from obtaining on-street car parking permits and inform potential buyers/tenants of the above exclusion and to publicise the lack of parking provision in sales brochures should the Committee resolve to grant planning permission.

44. The legal agreement will also stipulate that no development can commence until the options rights on Thames Water Land have been exercised and no occupation of the proposed units can occur until car
parking spaces have been identified and laid out.

45. Subject to the signing of this legal agreement the proposal is considered to comply with policies DM9 and DM10 of the LDF Core Strategy, 2012.

Sustainability

46. Policies 5.1 and 5.2 of the London Plan, 2016 (consolidated with alterations since 2011) seek to achieve an overall reduction in London's carbon dioxide emissions through a range of measures including using less energy, supplying energy efficiently and using renewable energy, improving on Building Regulations targets by 25% in the period 2010-2013.

47. In addition, Policy CS1 of the LDF Core Strategy, 2012 states that the Council will ensure that all development (including extensions, refurbishments and conversions) is designed and built to make the most efficient use of resources, reduce its lifecycle impact on the environment and contribute to climate change mitigation and adaptation. It should be noted that despite Policy DM1’s requirements which encourage residential developments to achieve Code for Sustainable Homes (CfSH) Level 6 from 2016, the Code was revoked as part of the Housing Standards Review in 2015 and no longer applies. However, elements of the code were incorporated in the building regulations.

48. In this case the applicant has not provided sufficient information to demonstrate compliance with current sustainability requirements. As such, a detailed condition will be required to ensure current standards are met.

49. On the basis that these sustainability standards are secured by condition, the proposal is considered to comply with Policies DM1 of the Council's LDF Core Strategy, 2012.

Conclusion/Planning Balance

50. In conclusion, Officers consider that the disbenefits associated with the adverse impact on the amenity of No. 9 Beaufort Road (in terms of loss of light to one bedroom and two kitchen windows) do not demonstrably outweigh the benefit of providing 3 additional market family dwellings. As such the proposals are considered to comply with the London Plan, 2016 the LDF Core Strategy, 2012 and the Council's Residential Design Guide, 2013.

Other Material Considerations

51. Officers note that a neighbouring property raised concern as to the loss of an existing wildlife corridor. However, the site is not designated under any of the open space types listed in Policy CS3 and following investigation Officers have not found any Council held data to suggest
the site may be inhabited or used by any protected species. As such, the proposal is considered to comply with LDF Core Strategy Policies CS3 and DM6.

52. Notwithstanding the above findings, an Informative will be attached to this report stating that should evidence of protected species on site be found as a result of future development, the applicant must fulfil his/her duties under the Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981 (as amended) and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations, 2010.

Recommendation:

Approve subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be commenced within 3 years from the date of this decision.

   Reason: In order to comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990. (As amended)

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

   Housing Standards Policy Statement 13/01/2017
   Planning Statement 05/04/2017
   Daylight & Sunlight Study 05/04/2017
   461-P3.103-C Detail 3 - Sash Window Cill 05/04/2017
   461-P3.102-B Detail 3 - Sash Window Head 05/04/2017
   461-P3.101-B Detail 3 - Sash Window Reveal 05/04/2017
   461-P1.106-C Elevation BB - Proposed 05/04/2017
   461-P1.105-C Elevation AA - Proposed 05/04/2017
   461-P1.102-C First Floor Plan - Existing 05/04/2017
   461-P1.101-C Ground Floor Plan - Proposed 05/04/2017
   461-P1.005-C Elevation AA - Existing 05/04/2017
   461-P1.002-C First Floor Plan - Existing 05/04/2017
   461-P1.001-C Ground Floor Plan - Existing 05/04/2017
   751_18GR_X000.1 Proposed Block and Location Plan 05/04/2017
   751_18GR_X001 Existing Site Plan 05/04/2017
   751_18GR_X002 Existing Site Plan 05/04/2017
   751_18GR_X003 Existing Site Plan 05/04/2017
Reason: For avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3 The car parking identified upon the approved drawings shall be reserved for car parking by occupiers of the dwellings hereby permitted and their visitors and for no other purpose.

Reason: In order to reserve car parking spaces for the use of residents in accordance with Policies DM9 (Managing Vehicle Use for New Development) and Policy DM10 (Design Requirements for New Developments including House Extensions) of the LDF Core Strategy Adopted April 2012.

4 The development shall be completed in accordance with the following details which shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, before building operations commence.

(a) materials for all external finishes (including their colour and texture).
(b) boundary treatment, (including walls, fences, gates, access and egress pathway along with levels (thereof) and materials).
(c) refuse storage facilities (in accordance with the requirements of the
Residential Design SPD, 2013.

(d) sewer and drainage runs.

Reason: These details are required prior to commencement of development because the details would affect subsequent design of other elements of the scheme and must be agreed at the outset and to ensure a satisfactory appearance on completion of the development in accordance with Policy DM10 (Design Requirements for New Developments including House Extensions) of the LDF Core Strategy Adopted April 2012.

5 No development shall commence until a landscaping scheme including the management and maintenance of the living roof shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented within the first planting season following completion of the development and the tree planting and landscaping shall thereafter be maintained for five years to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. Any trees or shrubs which die during this period shall be replaced in the first available planting season, and the area shown to be landscaped shall be permanently retained for that purpose only.

Reason: These details are required prior to commencement of development because the details would affect the subsequent design of other elements of the scheme and must be agreed at the outset and in the interests of visual amenity and also that the Local Planning Authority shall be satisfied as to the details of the development in accordance with Policy DM10 (Design Requirements for New Developments including House Extensions) of the LDF Core Strategy Adopted April 2012.

6 All works on site shall take place in accordance with the following details which shall have previously been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of work:

(a) Provision for loading/unloading materials.
(b) Temporary site access.
(c) Signing system for works traffic.
(d) Measures for the laying of dust, suppression of noise and abatement of other nuisance arising from development works.
(e) Means of enclosure of the site.
(f) Wheel washing equipment.
(g) The parking of vehicles of the site operatives and visitors
(h) The erection and maintenance of security hoarding.

Reason: These details are required prior to commencement of development because the relevant works would take place at the beginning of the construction phase and in order to safeguard the
amenities of the surrounding residential occupiers and to safeguard highway safety and the free flow of traffic in accordance with Policy DM10 (Design Requirements for New Developments including House Extensions) of the LDF Core Strategy Adopted April 2012.

7 The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until details of secure cycle parking facilities (for 7 bicycles) for the occupants of, and visitors to, the development hereby approved have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These facilities shall be fully implemented and made available for use prior to the occupation of the development hereby permitted and shall thereafter be retained for use at all times.

Reason: These details are required prior to commencement of development because the details would affect subsequent design of other elements of the scheme and must be agreed at the outset and to ensure the provision of satisfactory cycle storage facilities and in the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy DM8 (Sustainable Transport for New Developments) of the LDF Core Strategy Adopted April 2012.

8 Within 3 months of first occupation, evidence must be submitted to the Council confirming that the development hereby permitted has achieved no less than the C02 reductions (ENE1), internal water usage (WAT1) standards equivalent to Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4. Evidence requirements are detailed in the "Schedule of Evidence Required for Post Construction Stage from ENE1 and WAT1 of the Code for Sustainable Homes Guide. Evidence to demonstrate a 19% reduction compared to 2013 Part L regulations and internal water usage rates of 105L/day must be submitted to the Local Planning Authority, unless otherwise agreed in writing.

Reason: In order to ensure that all development is designed and built to make the most efficient use of resources, reduce its lifecycle impact on the environment and contributes to climate change mitigation and adaptation in accordance with Policy CS1 (Climate Change Mitigation) of the LDF Core Strategy Adopted April 2012.

9 No development shall take place until details of the implementation, adoption, maintenance and management of a sustainable drainage system have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The system shall be implemented and thereafter managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details. Those details shall include a timetable for its implementation, and a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public body or statutory undertaker, or any other arrangements to secure the effective operation of the sustainable drainage system throughout its lifetime.

Reason: These details are required prior to commencement of development because the relevant works would take place at the
beginning of the construction phase and to prevent the increased risk of flooding in accordance with Policy CS1 (Climate Change Mitigation) of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy Adopted April 2012.

10 The garage or car parking accommodation shown upon the approved drawings shall be provided with a hard bound dust free surface, adequately drained before the development to which it relates is occupied and thereafter it shall be kept free from obstruction at all times for use by the occupier of the development and shall not thereafter be used for any purposes other than the parking of vehicles for the occupiers of the development and visitors to it.

Reason: To ensure the provision of adequate off-street parking accommodation and to avoid the congestion of surrounding roads by parked vehicles in accordance with Policy DM10 (Design Requirements for New Developments including House Extensions) of the LDF Core Strategy Adopted April 2012.

11 By the time the development hereby permitted is substantially complete, pedestrian/vehicular intervisibility splays of 2.8m x 3.3m shall have been provided in each direction on both Beaufort Road and Geneva Road where the access meets the back edge of footway, and shall be permanently retained free from any obstruction to visibility.

Reason: To maintain pedestrian/vehicular intervisibility in the interest of highway safety in accordance with Policy DM10 (Design Requirements for New Developments including House Extensions) of the LDF Core Strategy Adopted April 2012.

12 Prior to commencement of any development on site, a Construction Management Plan shall be submitted to the planning authority for written agreement. The development shall only be implemented in accordance with the details and measures approved as part of the construction management plan, which shall be maintained throughout the entire construction period.

Reason: These details are required prior to commencement of development because the details would affect subsequent design of other elements of the scheme and must be agreed at the outset and to safeguard the amenities of the surrounding residential occupiers and to safeguard highway safety and the free flow of traffic in accordance with Policy DM10 (Design Requirements for New Developments including House Extensions) of the LDF Core Strategy Adopted April 2012.

13 No piling shall take place until a piling method statement (detailing the depth and type of piling to be undertaken and the methodology by which such piling will be carried out, including measures to prevent and minimise the potential for damage to subsurface water infrastructure, and the programme for the works) has been submitted to and approved in writing
by the local planning authority in consultation with Thames Water. Any piling must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved piling method statement.

Reason: These details are required prior to commencement of development because the details would affect the subsequent design of other elements of the scheme and must be agreed at the outset. The proposed works will be in close proximity to underground water utility infrastructure. Piling has the potential to impact on local underground water utility infrastructure. The applicant is advised to contact Thames Water Developer Services on 0800 009 3921 to discuss the details of the piling method statement.

Informative(s)

1. Your attention is drawn to the need to comply with the relevant provisions of the Building Regulations, the Building Acts and other related legislation. These cover such works as - the demolition of existing buildings, the erection of a new building or structure, the extension or alteration to a building, change of use of buildings, installation of services, underpinning works, and fire safety/means of escape works. Notice of intention to demolish existing buildings must be given to the Council’s Building Control Service at least 6 weeks before work starts. A completed application form together with detailed plans must be submitted for approval before any building work is commenced.

2. You have been granted planning permission to build a residential extension. When undertaking demolition and/or building work, please be considerate to your neighbours and do not undertake work before 8am or after 6pm Monday to Friday, before 8am or after 1pm on a Saturday or at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays. Furthermore, please ensure that all vehicles associated with the construction of the development hereby approved are properly washed and cleaned to prevent the passage of mud and dirt onto the adjoining highway. You are advised that the Council does have formal powers to control noise and nuisance under The Control of Pollution Act 1974, the Clean Air Acts and other relevant legislation. For further information and advice, please contact - Environmental Health Department Pollution Section.

3. The Party Wall Act 1996 requires a building owner to notify, and obtain formal agreement from, any adjoining owner, where the building owner proposes to:
   - carry out work to an existing party wall;
   - build on the boundary with a neighbouring property;
   - in some circumstances, carry out groundwork’s within 6 metres of an adjoining building.

Notification and agreements under this Act are the responsibility of the building owner and are quite separate from Building Regulations, or Planning Controls. The Building Control Service will assume that an applicant has obtained any necessary agreements with the adjoining
owner, and nothing said or implied by the Council should be taken as removing the necessity for the building owner to comply fully with the Party Wall Act. Further information and advice is to be found in “The Party Walls etc. Act 1996 - Explanatory Booklet”.

4 Your attention is drawn to the fact that planning permission does not override property rights and any ancient rights of light that may exist. This permission does not empower you to enter onto land not in your ownership without the specific consent of the owner. If you require further information or advice, you should consult a solicitor.

5 Unless clearly specified otherwise, the base of the development shown on the approved plans is taken to be external ground level, and not a Damp Proof Course or Internal Finished Floor Level. The external ground level is expected to remain consistent before and after construction of the approved development unless specified otherwise on the approved plans.

6 With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of groundwater. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. The contact number is 0800 009 3921. Reason to ensure that the surface water discharge from the site shall not be detrimental to the existing sewerage system.

7 The developer is recommended to continue to work with Thames Water to obtain a formal Letter of No Further Comment prior to and during development and construction so as to protect the nearby mains.
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BASIC INFORMATION

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012

Development Plan: Mayor for London
- London Plan March 2016 (consolidated with alterations since 2011)
- LDF Core Strategy Adopted April 2012
- Kingston Town Centre AAP 2008

Policies

LDF CORE STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

- DM09 Managing Vehicle Use for New Development
- DM10 Design Requirements for New Developments
- DM12 Development in Conservation Areas and Affecting Heritage Assets

Previous Relevant History

- 16/12615/HOU Erection of single storey rear extension. Demolition of car port and erection of single storey (replacement) outbuilding. Installation of new Permit with conditions 18/08/2016
cast iron gates to driveway.

Consultations

1. **Neighbour notification:** 19 local addresses have been notified. Written objections from 1 address have been received. These raise the following (summarised) planning related concerns:

   - The proposed development, due to its height, siting, bulk and design, would harm the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area.
   
   - The proposed development would harm the amenities of neighbouring occupiers in terms of noise and disturbance.

2. Other non-planning related concerns were raised, including the need for the development, party wall considerations, loss of property value, harm to foundations/structural integrity, Property rights infringement, potential future residential use etc.

3. **Neighbourhood Traffic Engineer:** No objections

4. **Kingston Town CAAC:** Neutral

5. **RBK Environmental Protection Officer:** No objections subject to suggested conditions.

Site and Surroundings

6. The application concerns a two storey semi-detached residential property situated on a corner plot between Orchard Road and Grange Road. The surrounding area is mainly residential in character with two storey semi-detached and detached properties. The site is located within the Fairfield/Knights Park Conservation Area and within an area of Archaeological Significance.

Proposal

7. The application proposes the erection of a single storey outbuilding and the change of use of part of the curtilage of land to private garage and workshop separate to number 20 Orchard Road.

Background

8. This application follows two previous applications for similar developments upon this site. The most recent application, reference 16/12615/HOU, granted planning permission for the demolition of the existing car port and the erection of a single storey (replacement) outbuilding. Additionally, permission was granted for the erection of a
single storey side/rear extension and the installation of new cast iron gates to the driveway.

9. In this application, the proposed outbuilding is identical (in terms of design, footprint, dimensions, siting etc.) to the outbuilding permitted in application 16/12615/HOU. This application differs in that the applicant proposes the separation of the rear part of the land from the existing dwelling at 20 Orchard Road and the use of this building as a private garage/workshop.

10. This is application is to be determined at Committee at the request of the three ward Councillors.

Assessment
The main considerations material to the determination of this application are:

- Principle of Proposed Development
- Impact on Character of Area
- Impact on Neighbour’s Residential Amenity
- Highways and Parking
- Trees

Principle of Proposed Development

11. The principle of the separation of the rear part of the site from number 20 Orchard Road and the erection of a detached building to create a private garage/workshop does not conflict with any adopted planning policies and is therefore acceptable, subject to the detailed planning assessment set out below.

Impact on Character of Area

12. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that: In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any functions under or by virtue of any of the provisions mentioned in subsection (2), special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

13. Policy DM12 of the Core Strategy states that the Council will:

- Preserve or enhance the existing heritage assets of the Borough through the promotion of high quality design and a focus on heritage led regeneration.
- Allow alterations which preserve or enhance the established character and architectural interest of a heritage asset, its fabric or its setting.
- Ensure that development proposals affecting historic assets will use high quality materials and design features which incorporate or complement
those of the host building or the immediate area.

- Respect features of local importance and special interest through the consideration of form, scale, layout and detailed designs of a site, area or streetscape

14. Policy Guidance 41 of the SPD for residential design states that outbuildings should:

- be positioned as far away as possible from any shared boundaries to stop overshadowing of neighbouring houses;
- not be built forward of the established building line, i.e. in front of the existing house;
- relate well to the design of the existing house;
- generally be built of similar materials to the existing house; and,
- Not affect the existing parking provision of the development and any parking lost as a result of the outbuilding should be replaced on site.

15. The site benefits from two vehicular accesses (crossovers). The primary vehicular access/crossover lies at the very end of Grange road. The secondary access consists of a wide crossover which provides access to the rear of number 20 (in addition to the driveway serving the adjacent property at number 1 Grange Road).

16. Whilst the proposed outbuilding would be notable in height, it would be set off the boundary with Grange Road by 5.3m and would not protrude beyond the front of number 1 Grange road (or the established building line), thereby complying with Policy Guidance 23 of the SPD for residential design. Its ridge height of 4.75m would sit notably below the eaves height of the adjoining property at 1 Grange Road and, as such, it would not appear prominent of visually intrusive within the street scene. It is proposed to be constructed in stock brickwork to match the main dwelling, with a high quality (welsh) slate roof. As such, it would respect the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding Conservation Area.

17. The proposed development would result in the loss of a rear part of the site which currently serves number 20 Orchard Road. However, an area of around 115m2 of amenity space would be retained for the existing dwelling, which is notably greater than the 50m2 recommended/set out in Policy Guidance 13 of the Council's SPD for Residential Design (2013). This separation would not therefore result in unsatisfactory level/amount of amenity space for the existing dwelling house at number 20.

18. Additionally, it is noted that current planning guidance, stemming from the Government’s Written Ministerial in 2015, encourages the renting out of residential and non-residential car parking spaces near town centres.
Impact on Neighbours' Residential Amenity

19. Policy DM10(k) of the states that development proposals should have regard to the amenities of occupants and neighbours, including in terms of privacy, outlook, sunlight/daylight, avoidance of visual intrusion and noise and disturbance.

20. The proposed outbuilding would not extend beyond the front on number 1 Grange Road, and the flank wall of this dwelling does not contain any windows, and so the proposed outbuilding would not have any impacts on the amenities of this occupier in terms of dominance, loss of light or outlook. In terms of the impact on number 22, the proposed outbuilding would be sited 5m away from the rear facing ground floor habitable room window serving this property.

21. In terms of privacy, the proposed outbuilding roof lights would be set at an angle and at a height notably above finished floor level, and so would not provide any direct overlooking opportunities into any neighbouring habitable room windows.

22. Concern has been raised about potential noise generating activities occurring within the proposed building. The proposed use, as a garage for vehicular storage with associated workshop facilities, is a function which would be expected within a residential garage within a residential area. Notwithstanding, a condition is attached to ensure that the use of the building and land remains within these functions, and that it is not used for any commercial premises which could result in a material increase in activities (and therefore likely disturbance) to neighbouring occupiers. Additionally, a further condition requiring details of sound insulation of the building is also recommended given its close proximity to the boundaries of 22 Orchard Road and 1 Grange Road. Subject to this, the application would have sufficient regard to neighbouring amenities and would therefore comply with Policy DM10 (k) of the Core Strategy.

Highways & Parking

23. The proposed development private garage would be accessed via the existing ‘secondary’ crossover which currently provides access to the existing carport. The proposal would result in the loss of this existing carport, and therefore some potential loss of off street parking for the main 3 bedroom dwelling at number 20 (although this does not appear to be being used for this purpose at present).

24. However, notwithstanding this, it is noted that space would still remain to the side/front of the dwelling for up to 2 vehicles as currently exists. Policy 6.13 of the 2016 London Plan indicates that for 3 bedroom dwellings a maximum of 1.5 spaces should be provided. The proposal would therefore comply with this, and it is noted that RBK's Neighbourhood Traffic Engineer did not raise any objections. As such,
no conflicts with policy DM9 of the Core Strategy or 6.13 of the London Plan are identified.

Trees

25. As the site lies within a Conservation Area, the site is subject to a blanket Tree Preservation Order (TPO). Policy DM10 states that trees that are important to the character of the area or are covered by Tree Preservation Orders should not be adversely affected by developments. No trees would be affected by the proposed development and so no conflict with Policy DM10 arises.

Recommendation:

Approve subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be commenced within 3 years from the date of this decision.
   Reason: In order to comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990. (As amended)

2. The garage (and associated change of use of the land) hereby permitted shall be used for the parking/storage of vehicles only and any activities ancillary to this permitted function. The permitted garage building, and surrounding land, shall not be used for any commercial purposes, nor as a separate residential unit.
   Reason: To prevent commercial use of the site or the creation of a separate residential unit which could potentially harm the amenities of the occupants of the adjoining residential properties in accordance with Policy DM10 (Design Requirements for New Developments including House Extensions) of the LDF Core Strategy Adopted April 2012.

3. Prior to commencement of the development the applicant shall provide a scheme to the Local Planning Authority for its written approval detailing sound transmission reduction measures to be installed within the separating wall between the garage and 1 Grange Road, Kingston upon Thames. The scheme shall be designed to provide at least DNTw+Ctr 60dB. Once agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority the approved details shall be installed prior to the development being occupied and retained thereafter.
   Reason: To protect the amenities and privacy of the occupiers of the adjoining residential properties in accordance with Policy DM10 (Design Requirements for New Developments including House Extensions) of the LDF Core Strategy Adopted April 2012.
4 A minimum of one car parking space measuring 2.4m by 4.8m, shall be provided within the curtilage of the site outlined in blue on the application site for the lifetime of the approved development. This/These shall be kept free from obstruction at all times for use by the occupiers of the dwelling house at number 20 Orchard Road and shall not thereafter be used for any purposes other than the parking of vehicles for the occupiers of the dwelling house and visitors to it.

Reason: To ensure the provision of adequate off-street parking accommodation for the remaining dwelling at number 20 Orchard Road, and to avoid the congestion of surrounding roads by parked vehicles in accordance with Policy DM10 (Design Requirements for New Developments including House Extensions) of the LDF Core Strategy Adopted April 2012.

Informative(s)

1 For the avoidance of doubt, this planning consent solely relates to the erection of a garage and the change of use of the land outlined in red on the submitted 'Proposed Plan' and does not include/permit any extensions or alterations to the main dwelling at number 20 Orchard Road.
Summary

This report concerns the unauthorised conversion of a single dwellinghouse into three self contained flats without planning permission.

To resolve that the Head of Planning and Regeneration and the London Borough of Merton (for Shared Legal Service) are authorised to:

1. Issue an Enforcement Notice (s) under S. 172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), subject to any necessary legal amendments being made for which authority is delegated to the Head of Planning and Regeneration in consultation with officers from the London Borough of Merton (for Shared Legal Service SLLP);
2. withdraw and to vary such notice (s) under S. 173A, and
3. in the event of non-compliance, take action (s) by way of prosecution under S. 179, S.187A and/or direct action under S. 178 of the Act in respect of the breach of planning control/or for injunctive relief under S.187B.

To resolve that the enforcement notice require -

1. the cessation of the use of the property as flats;
2. the permanent removal of all but one kitchen and kitchen related facilities from the property (i.e. including kitchen wall and base units, kitchen sink, kitchen worktop surfaces, cooking facilities and cooker hood; and
3. the removal of all resultant debris from the land.

Site and surroundings

1. The subject site comprises a two storey mid terraced dwellinghouse located on the south-eastern side of Borough Road, Kingston. The site is not located in a conservation area and the subject building does not comprise a listed building.
2. The dwelling benefits from an original two storey part width rear projection and has been extended by way of a first floor rear extension and a dormer
roof extension to the rear. A small extension has also been added to the rear of the property at ground floor level, which is used as a boiler room.

**Relevant planning history**

3. In 2013 a certificate of lawful development was granted for the erection of a dormer roof extension to the rear roof slope (ref: 13/12454/LDP). The application form and drawings showed that the property was at that time a single dwellinghouse.

4. A further planning application was submitted in 2013 for the erection of a part single/part two storey rear extension (ref: 13/12789/HOU), which was granted subject to conditions. Again the property was shown as a single dwellinghouse.

5. In 2016 a complaint was received regarding breaches of planning control at the property.

6. On inspection it was found that there were four self-contained flats within the property, two residential units on the ground floor (one within the main body of the house and the other within the rear projection), a residential unit at first floor level to the rear and a further residential unit spread across the first floor front of the house and the loft space. Each unit had its own kitchen and bathroom facilities.

7. The owner subsequently removed kitchens from two of the residential units, the larger residential unit at ground floor level and the unit at the rear on the first floor. The number of residential units being reduced to 3, two on the ground floor and one on the first and second floors.

8. A planning application (17/12099/FUL) was then submitted for the conversion of the property into 1 x 2 bed unit and 1 x 3 bed unit. The two bed unit occupied the entire ground floor, whilst the 3 bed unit was on the first floor and within the roof space. This application was refused on 7th April 2017 for the following reason:

*The proposed development, due to the proposed unit sizes and insufficient amenity space, would not provide satisfactory standards of accommodation for its occupants. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policies DM10 and DM13 of the 2012 Local Development Framework Core Strategy, Policy 3.5 of the 2015 London Plan and the Council’s Supplementary Planning Document titled Residential Design (2013).*
9. There has been no appeal submitted against this refusal of planning permission and the property remains as three self-contained residential units.

Planning considerations

10. The unauthorised conversion into flats is assessed against the polices of the current development plan which consists of the London Plan and the Council’s adopted LDF Core Strategy April 2012. The Council’s Residential Design SPD July 2013 is also a material consideration. The main considerations with this development are considered to be the quality and type of accommodation provided, the impact on the character and appearance of the area, and impact on the residential amenities of the neighbouring occupiers.

11. The relevant policies are considered to be:

**LDF Core Strategy**

CS7 – Managing Vehicle Use
CS8 – Character, Design and Heritage
CS10 – Housing Delivery
DM9 – Managing Vehicle Use for New Development
DM10 – Design Requirements for New Developments (including House Extensions)
DM13 – Housing Quality and Mix
DM14 – Loss of Housing

**Supplementary Planning Document** - Residential Design

**London Plan** - 3.5 – Quality and Design of Housing Developments

**Quality and type of accommodation provided**

12. Policy 3.5 of the London Plan requires that housing developments to be of the highest quality internally, externally and in relation to their context and to the wider environment, taking into account strategic policies of the London Plan to protect and enhance London’s residential environment and attractiveness as a place to live. The design of all new housing developments should enhance the quality of local places, taking into account physical context; local character;
density; tenure and land use mix; and relationships with, and provision of, public, communal and open spaces, taking particular account of the needs of children and older people. There are minimum space standards for residential units and a table showing the current and required standard are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Current layout in sq.m</th>
<th>Required Standard sq.m</th>
<th>Standard Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studio ground floor rear 1 person flat</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bed unit ground floor - 1 bed, 2 person flat</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bed unit on 1st &amp; 2nd floor - 2 bed 4 person</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. As can be seen from the table above, the two residential units on the ground floor are clearly below the minimum standard required and the other flat on the upper floors is just below the minimum at its current layout.

14. Policy DM13 of the Core Strategy states that the Council will expect proposals for new development to:

   a) Accord with the principles of good design, as set out in policies CS8 & DM11 and the Residential Design SPD, including the provision of appropriate amenity space and play space provision.

   b) Incorporate a mix of unit sizes and types and provide a minimum of 30% of dwellings as 3 or more bedroom units, unless it can be robustly demonstrated that this would be unsuitable or unviable.
c) In accordance with London Plan policies, demonstrate that the scheme has been designed to provide adequate internal space appropriate to the intended number of occupants.

15. The Strategic Housing market Assessment (2016) identifies that there is a lower requirement for 1 bedroom units and an increased requirement for units of greater bedrooms. The conversion into three flats results in the loss of a family unit and therefore is contrary to policy DM13.

16. Policy DM14 of the LDF Core Strategy states that the Council will resist the loss of existing accommodation (of all types) and, in particular, dwellings which are suitable for family accommodation. To protect existing family units that meet an identified need, the Council will, where necessary, limit the conversion of family units into houses in multiple occupation. The conversion into flats is therefore contrary to this policy.

17. Policy guidance 13 of the Residential Design SPD states that new houses (including conversions) should provide 50 sq m of private garden per family house (+5sq m per extra bedroom over three) where the prevailing character of the area allows. For flats, the guidance states that 10 sq m of private amenity space should be provided per dwelling and 1 sq m per additional occupant.

18. In terms of communal amenity space, policy guidance 14 of the Residential Design SPD sets out the following standards in addition to the private amenity space standards:

   50 sq m per development plus where less than 10 sq m private amenity space is provided per flat, the shortfall in provision should be added to communal amenity space.

19. The rear garden of the property is approximately 50 square metres in area but is only accessible from the studio flat within the ground floor of the rear projection, as there are no other doors opening on to this space. As such the size and access arrangements to the private amenity space at the rear of this property is considered to be sub-standard and contrary to policy DM10 of the LDF Core Strategy and policy guidance 13 and 14 of the Residential Design SPD.

Highways and Parking

20. The property has no off street parking spaces are available, as the front garden is too small to accommodate a vehicle and the rear garden is not accessible by car. The site is within walking distance of a number of buses and
has a moderate PTAL rating of 3. There are parking restrictions both along Borough Road and the adjoining streets and due to the number of residential units and the potential number of tenants it is considered that there would be potential for extra pressure for on-street parking within the area, contrary to policy DM9 of the LDF Core Strategy.

**Recommendation**

21. Given the assessment above, it is recommended that enforcement action is taken to require the cessation of the unauthorised use of the property as flats.

**SUGGESTED REQUIREMENTS OF THE ENFORCEMENT NOTICE**

- Cease the use of the property as flats
- Permanently remove all but one of the kitchens and kitchen related facilities from the property (i.e. including kitchen wall and base units, kitchen sink, kitchen worktop surfaces, cooking facilities and cooker hood
- Removal from the site all debris resulting from compliance with the above steps

**Timescale for compliance**

22. Section 173(9) of the 1990 Town and Country Planning Act (as amended) requires that an enforcement notice shall specify the period at the end of which any steps are required to have been taken or any activities are required to have ceased. Ground (g), as set out in section 174(2) of the aforementioned Act, provides that an appeal may be made if it is considered that any period specified “falls short of what should reasonably be allowed”.

23. In determining a suitable compliance period, consideration must therefore be given to all factors such as the owners circumstances, the time it would take to secure the services of the builder whilst weighing this up against the ongoing impact of the development on the host dwelling, the overall terrace and surrounding area.

24. A compliance period of 6 months is recommended.

**Reasons for issuing the notice**

25. The material change of use results in the loss of a family dwellinghouse for which there is an identified need within the Borough and as such is contrary to policies CS10, DM13 and DM14 of the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames LDF Core Strategy (Adopted April 2012) and the Residential Design SPD (adopted July 2013).
26. The material change of use of the property from a single dwellinghouse into self-contained residential units, results in residential units that are of a substandard floor area, leading to a cramped and detrimental form of accommodation for the occupants of these units, with insufficient private amenity space for the occupants. As such the change of use conflicts with policies CS10 and DM13 of the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames LDF Core Strategy (adopted April 2012), the Council’s Supplementary Planning Document Residential Design (adopted July 2013) and policy 3.5 of the London Plan 2015.

27. The use of the property as flats would lead to an increase in the pressure for on-street parking within the area, as there are no facilities to park vehicles off-street at the site. As such this would be contrary to Policy DM9 of the Kingston upon Thames LDF Core Strategy (adopted April 2012) and Policy 6.13 of the London Plan (2015).

Background papers held by David Lockie

Author of report - David Lockie - Planning Enforcement Officer, david.lockie@kingston.gov.uk, 020 857 5280
Purpose
To consider the results of the local public consultation on the proposal for a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in roads east of Richmond Road, and agree the way forward.

Recommendation
To resolve to:
1. Note the results of the parking beat survey in both Latchmere Lane (between Latchmere Road and Tudor Drive) and Latchmere Road (between Latchmere Lane and Park Road);
2. Note the results of the consultation and the level of support and opposition, as set out in paragraphs 17 and 18 and Annex 2; and
3. Approve one of the below options:
   ● Option 1: Introduce a Parking Permit Area (PPA) where parking bays are not marked
   ● Option 2: Introduce a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) as consulted on, granting residents the option to include the space in front of their crossovers within the parking bays if they wish to
   ● Option 3: Do nothing

Key Points
A. The November 2016 Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee meeting approved a public consultation on the introduction of a CPZ in Durlston Road, St Albans Road, Studland Road, Latchmere Road and Fernhill Gardens, with the results being reported back to a future meeting of this Committee. This is in response to receiving several petitions, as listed in paragraphs 2 to 8.

B. The consultation area is shown in Annex 1, and the results of the consultation are shown in Annexes 2 and 3. The results of parking beat surveys in Latchmere Road and Latchmere Lane are shown in Annex 4.

Context
1. In 2014 residents of Lower Ham Road, Bank Lane, Albany Mews and Albany Park Road (River Roads) were consulted on the introduction of a CPZ in their
area. In June 2014 the introduction of the CPZ, as an extension to the existing Canbury Gardens zone, was approved. It was also agreed that residents of roads to the east of the approved CPZ area were informed of the Committee decision and their views sought about whether they wish to be considered for a CPZ and the outcome is reported to a future meeting.

2. In March 2014 residents of Durlston Road and St Albans Road raised a petition in favour of introducing a CPZ in their area. They requested a public consultation to seek views of all residents of Durlston Road, St Albans Road, Latchmere Road and Studland Road be carried out in case a CPZ should be implemented in the River Roads, as they believed that would result in a problematic parking issue in their roads. 16 properties signed the petition.

3. As a response to the March 2014 petition, a consultation was carried out to see if residents would support a CPZ in their roads, following the approval of the Canbury Gardens CPZ, as set out above. The consultation took place before the Canbury Gardens CPZ was introduced, and there was no support from the residents at that time, and as such Committee took no further action.

4. Canbury Gardens CPZ in the River Roads was implemented in March 2016. Following this residents who live in roads east of Richmond Road, such as Durlston Road, St Albans Road and Fernhill Gardens, reported an increase in on-street parking in those roads. This appears to mainly relate to commuter parking.

5. In May 2016 residents of Durlston Road, St Albans Road, Studland and Latchmere Road raised a petition supporting the implementation of a CPZ in their roads. There was a total of 158 signatures.

6. In September 2016 residents of Fernhill Gardens raised a petition in favour of a CPZ and requested that Fernhill Gardens be included. There was a total of 25 signatures.

7. A Ward Councillors Surgery meeting was held on 11 February 2017 to discuss with residents their concerns relating to the proposed introduction of CPZ in their area, and the consultation area. It was agreed at the meeting that additional information would be provided, with details that demonstrated what the on-street parking impacts of introducing a CPZ would be. The information was included in the April 2017 consultation (discussed below).

8. In March 2017 a petition was raised by residents of Latchmere Lane (between Latchmere Road and Tudor Drive) and Latchmere Road (between Latchmere Lane and Park Road) in favour of including both roads in the proposed CPZ. There was a total of 58 signatures.

9. The initial public consultation, which had commenced in March 2017 was therefore cancelled, to allow the extent of the consultation area to be adjusted to include all interested parties. It was considered that the in light of the
release of additional information and a further petition from residents in Durlston Road that the a new consultation exercise was to be undertaken and this report considers the results of that consultation.

Proposal and Options

10. Following the Committee’s resolution in November 2016, a public consultation was undertaken in April 2017 on a proposal to introduce a CPZ in Durlston Road, St Albans Road, Studland Road, Latchmere Road (between Latchmere Lane and Richmond Road) and Fernhill Gardens. The suggested CPZ operational hours were Mon - Sat, 11am to 2pm, which was the preferred option, based on previous community engagement.

11. A parking beat survey was carried out on Thursday 27 April 2017 to assess the on street parking in both Latchmere Lane (between Latchmere Road and Tudor Drive) and Latchmere Road (between Latchmere Lane and Park Road). Results of the parking beat survey are shown in Annex 4.

12. In May 2017 residents of Durlston Road raised a petition against the introduction of a CPZ in response to the April consultation. 16 properties signed the petition, of which 13 responded to the consultation questionnaire and are included in the total results shown in Annex 2.

Consultations

13. Questionnaires seeking views on the proposed CPZ were delivered to 410 addresses, covering all residents of Durlston Road, St Albans Road, Studland Road, Latchmere Road (between Latchmere Lane and Richmond Road) and Fernhill Gardens.

14. The Metropolitan Police, Fire Brigade and Ambulance service were also consulted on the scheme. A response was received from the Metropolitan Police, raising no objections.

Results

15. A total of 267 (65%) addresses responded to the consultation, and the responses to each question are as follow:
   * Question 1: Do you think there are parking issues in your street? - 204 (76%) agree that there is a parking issue in their road, and 58 (22%) disagreed;
   * Question 2: Do you support the proposal to introduce a Controlled Parking zone (CPZ), in your road? - 142 (54%) support the introduction of CPZ, while 123 (46%) are against.
   * Question 3: Do you support the proposals to introduce a CPZ, operating 11am to 2pm Monday to Saturday? - 127 (48%) agreed on the proposed operating hours of the CPZ, while 137 (51%) disagreed.

16. The full consultation results are shown in Annex 2 and a number of key points have been set out below.
a. Durlston Road
This was the largest street to be consulted with 65% of the residents responding. It received the lowest support of all the other roads of 51% supporting and 49% opposing a CPZ, while 78% agreed that there is a parking issue in their road.

b. St Albans Road
This street had a high response rate of 78%, with 52% supporting and 48% opposing a CPZ, while 81% agreed that there is a parking issue in their road.

c. Latchmere Road
This street also had a high response rate of 71% and also similar results to St Albans Road, with 52% supporting and 48% opposing a CPZ, while 75% agreed that there is a parking issue in their road.

d. Earle Gardens
This street had the lowest response rate of 37% but it had the highest support with 68% supporting and 32% opposing the proposed CPZ, while 59% agreed that there is a parking issue in the cul-de-sac. It also showed the highest support of 68% for the proposed CPZ operating hours. Respondents also mentioned that the entrance to Earle Gardens should be protected with double yellow lines to help ensure adequate visibility.

e. Fernhill Gardens
This street had a response rate of 53% with 56% of respondents supporting and 44% opposing the proposed CPZ, while 69% agreed that there is a parking issue in their road. However, 56% disagree with the proposed operating hours.

f. Studland Road
Few properties front this street which was the smallest consulted but had a 100% response rate. It received the second highest support for the proposed CPZ with 63% in favour, and 63% agreeing with the proposed operating hours. 88% of respondents indicated there are issues caused by commuter parking.

g. Parking beat survey for Latchmere Lane, Latchmere Road (between Latchmere Lane and Park Road) and Cranleigh Gardens
The summary findings of the parking beat survey are shown in Annex 4. The results show that the most parking occurred at 12 noon, with approximately 86% of available parking spaces in the three roads being occupied, leaving 14% reserve capacity which does not support a need to introduce a CPZ. However, if the proposed CPZ is approved by the Committee parking activity would be expected to increase in these roads.
Comments Received

17. All comments received are shown in Annex 3. The most commonly made comments were as follows:-

- We do strongly support a CPZ for the roads you propose. However, the operational hours are not enough, they should be 8:30am to 6:30pm to prevent school and shopper use. (29)

- This proposal will significantly increase parking issues not reduce them. (22)

- Please put double yellow lines on the corners of the roads and junctions to allow emergency vehicles easier access. Corners of Latchmere Road and Studland Road, St Albans, Fernhill Gardens, Durlston Road and bends in Earle Gardens. (20)

- I support the CPZ even though there might be a small reduction in parking spaces. Parking spaces are currently used by commuters, Kingston Academy and motor traders. It will free up parking spaces for residents. (19)

- Parking problems increased after the implementation of a CPZ in Albany Park Road area. Remove parking restrictions from Albany Park Road, Lower Ham Road and Canbury Gardens where few residents park on the road anyway. (15)

- We agree with time restrictions suggested but the loss of so many parking spaces in the proposed scheme is unacceptable. We suggest that parking bays be extended along the length of the road, including across driveways, or leave crossovers unmarked for house owners to use. (14)

- We do not support loss of parking spaces. (14)

- It does not make sense not being able to park outside your own drive. It reduces parking spaces. It is useful to be able to park in front of our own drive. These are family homes with young children, not being able to park across our own driveway causes great difficulties. (10)

- The proposed CPZ will push the problem further down the Richmond Road and surrounding roads. (8)

- We have no issue with people parking to go to work. The proposal is unnecessary. (7)

- Restrictions on Saturdays is not necessary. (6)

- Our main concern is non-residents in this area, parking and leaving their cars here for days and sometimes weeks at a time, without
moving them at all. (6)

- We would like our guests to remain able to park anytime for free when visiting. (5)

- The proposed CPZ will result in street clutter and a less attractive streetscape. (6)

- I need my van for work, I always park outside my own property, with your (no permit policy for height restricted vans), it would be impossible to run my work. (4)

- The proposed 1 hour free parking next to the doctor’s surgery will be misused. (2)

**Officer’s comments**

18. Comments were made by residents about the impact of the existing CPZ in Albany Park Road, and its effect on roads east of Richmond Road. Further investigations and site observations were carried out in Albany Park Road, and concluded that:

- Out of the total 138 properties in the street, only 24 CPZ permits had been bought by 22 residents, equating to only 16% of all properties (as of 1 June 2017).
- There is at least 75% reserve capacity for on-street parking in Albany Park Road on a typical weekday.

19. With the results being 54% supporting and 46% opposing the proposed CPZ; and 51% disagreeing with the proposed CPZ operating hours (48% agree), there is no strong support for the introduction of a CPZ in these roads as consulted on. Therefore the following options are proposed for consideration:

- Option 1: Introduce a PPA where parking bays are not marked;
- Option 2: Introduce a CPZ as consulted on, granting the residents the option to include the space in front of their crossovers within the parking bays if they wish to.

(options 1 and 2 will address the loss of on street parking outside driveways during the hours of restrictions)

- Option 3: Do nothing.

**Timescale**

20. Timescales for options 1 and 2, if agreed, would need to be determined and approved in liaison with the Chair, Vice Chair and Ward Councillors after the Committee’s decision.
Resource Implications
21. The cost for the local consultation has been met from the Kingston Town Traffic Management Revenue budget.

22. If Committee support the proposals a funding source will need to be identified, with the most appropriate budget being the On-street Parking revenue account. Any bid for funding would need to cover expenditure for the installation of pay and display machines, signs, lines.

23. The ongoing costs of the scheme once implemented are cost neutral, with the permit fee income used to offset enforcement officers fees and ongoing maintenance of the scheme.

Legal Implications
24. There are no specific legal implications at this stage, however should the scheme proceed to Traffic Management Order (TMO) stage, any legal issues arising at that time would be the subject of a further report to this Committee.

Risk Assessment
25. The risks associated with the project at this stage relate to the consultation, and the associated outcomes, which will determine whether the scheme proceeds or not. If there is support for the scheme, then further risk assessments will need to consider budget provision and project delivery.

Equalities Impact Assessment
26. Schemes of this nature are covered by an overarching EQIA, and as such smaller projects do not need a specific assessment.

Environmental Implications
27. It is considered that the implementation of a CPZ scheme will result in an improved local environment, as it is anticipated that there would be significantly less traffic on the road trying to find and secure on-street parking spaces. This traffic is usually stop/start as drivers wait for spaces.

Network Implications
28. If the Committee approves a scheme, this would shift on street parking pressure to other roads, which do not have parking controls, and it is likely that the traffic would spread over a wider area. It would, however reduce the amount of local traffic that uses the roads in the controlled area, whilst trying to find a space to park.

Background papers
- Consultation letter
- Returned questionnaires
- Consultation plans.
- Speed survey results
- Results of the parking beat surveys
- Copy of petitions
held by - Younes Hamade, Senior Professional Traffic Engineer, tel 020 8547 5922
email: younes.hamade@kingston.gov.uk
Author of report - Nancy Mikhael, Engineer, Highways and Transport.

ANNEX 1: CPZ Plans
## ANNEX 2

### Latchmere Rd (between Richmond Rd & Latchmere Lane), Durlston Rd, Studland Rd, ST Albans Rd, Fernhill Gdns & Earl Gdns - Proposed Controlled Parking zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. Delivered</th>
<th>No. Returned</th>
<th>Question 1: Parking issues?</th>
<th>Question 2: Support Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) operating 11am to 2pm Mon - Sat?</th>
<th>Question 3:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latchmere Rd</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durlston Rd</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST Albans Rd</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studland Road</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernhill Gdns</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earle Gdns</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>410</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 1:** Do you think that there are parking issues in your street?

**Question 2:** Do you support the proposal to introduce a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ), in your road?

**Question 3:** Do you support the proposals to introduce a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ), operating 11am to 2pm Monday to Saturday, as shown on the attached plan?
# KINGSTON TOWN CENTRE NEIGHBOURHOOD

## RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE ON PROPOSED CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE
IN LATCHMERE RD (BETWEEN RICHMOND RD & LATCHMERE LANE), DURLSTON RD,
STUDLAND RD, ST ALBANS RD, FERNHILL GDNS & EARLE GDNS, KINGSTON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key:</th>
<th>LR - Latchmere Rd</th>
<th>DR – Durlston Rd</th>
<th>SA R - St Albans Rd</th>
<th>SR – Studland Road</th>
<th>FG – Fernhill Gdns</th>
<th>EG – Earle Gdns</th>
<th>UN - Anonymos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Q4 Any other comments?

**LR1** I support the CPZ even though these might be a small reduction in parking spaces. Parking spaces currently used by commuters, John Lewis and Bentalls staff. It will free up parking spaces for residents.

**LR2** Our main concern is non-residents in this area, parking and leaving their cars here for days and sometimes weeks at a time, without moving them at all.

**LR7** We agree with time restrictions suggested but:
- The loss of so many parking spaces in the proposed scheme is unacceptable.
- We suggest either:
  - A) a similar scheme to that adjacent to Kew Gardens where parking bays extend along the length of the road including and across driveways; or
  - B) Extend the existing non-chargeable scheme – as the eastern end of Latchmere Rd.

**LR10** The existing free for all parking arrangement on Latchmere Rd area are abused and used to the benefit of motor traders/ visitors at the expenses of Council and tax paying residents. Change them.

**LR11** Parking on the street is impossible in Latchmere Rd, because of its proximity to Kingston station and the town, many people park for the day here. A CPZ is essential.

**LR14** We would like our guests to remain able to park anytime for free when visiting. We have no issue with people parking to go to work. Our childminder is in Fernhill Gdns and we would have to pay to leave our car there too.

**LR17** Cars are parked for months without being driven, not local cars, broken cars, cars from Ireland or Jersey. Will residents need a paid permit?

**LR19** 11am -2pm restrictions is a good idea. But loss of more than half the existing spaces is too much. Leaving cross overs unmarked to house owners would help.

**LR20** I live at Latchmere Road by Latchmere Lane end. I don’t see how you can put a parking bay outside no 75, at on the roundabout.

**LR21** This proposal will remove 54% of the parking spaces in Latchmere Rd and 62.5 of the parking spaces in Earle Gdns, this will significantly increase parking issues not reduce them.

**LR22** We would agree if the crossovers did not have a yellow line stopping people parking across their own driveways is odd.

**LR23**
- Loss of too many spaces
- Loss of freedom/ flexibility
- Unsightly road painting and posts, especially in conservation area.
- Cost of implementation
- Cost of permits

**LR26** We have four adults in our house and three cars, we would have to pay for three permits, it’s too much.

**LR27** Definitely do not support loss of parking spaces on Latchmere Rd, more than officers and commuters parking here.
Thank you sending us the consultation document on the above proposals.
Now that we have the additional information confirming the significant loss of roadside parking for residents and visitors in the new proposal – over 50% reductions in spaces, I believe the proposed remedy does far more damage than the occasional pressure on parking from shoppers, local workers, and students from the recently opened Kingston College.
I am therefore registering my opposition to the plan.
Could I make an additional point. The proposals for St Albans Rd state that the existing two disabled bays outside the St Albans Medical practice will be replaced by 1 hour free parking bays. The loss of the disabled bays would be disastrous for my wife and I and many other patients. The bays are intensively used for short terms visits by between 10 and 20 blue badge holders daily. Free bays, by being open to all, will introduce a huge competition for those spaces. As I know from our own experience, the disabled bays allow severely mobility-restricted patients (with assistance) to be helped directly into surgery. If they are not there I simply do not know how we could get to see our doctor.

How on earth can you improve parking in any of these roads by reducing the spaces by 36%!

We are strongly against CPZ in Latchmere Rd – it is unnecessary and unfriendly.

If the CPZ is rejected in Latchmere Rd, would it be possible to put double yellow lines on the 2 corners of Latchmere Rd and Studland Rd given the recent road traffic accident at that junction?

Please do not change my opposition to the proposed CPZ.

Please see enclosed as it sums up the points for Latchmere Rd as well. It will push the problem further down the Richmond Rd

The map incorrectly refers to Park Farm Rd which should read Staunton Rd.

I am not clear, if the CPZ is introduced how can park outside our own houses? Do we have to pay and display??

The humps along the length of the road are noisy.

Build adequate parking facilities for school staff!!
Remove parking restrictions from Albany Park Rd, Lower Ham Rd, Canbury Gardens where few residents park on the road any way.

- CPZ results in a 53% reduction in available parking on Latchmere Rd. There will not be enough parking for Latchmere residents which will push us onto adjacent roads.
- These are family homes with young children, not being able to park across own driveway causes great difficulties.
- As Latchmere is the closest road to Kingston in this latest review, all available pay & display parking will always be busy thus further reducing parking for residents.
- This would force people to pave over their entire gardens thus reducing street parking still further and also resulting in a massive reduction in green planting. Our gardens and parks are the lungs of London. The decrease in gardens increases the potential of respiratory disease. It is detrimental to our health.
- Aside from all of this, the aesthetics of this Victorian Edwardian street will be greatly spoiled. These homes were designed to have front gardens not parking for two cars. This is supposed to be a conservation area but increasingly it seems not to be considered. Unsightly CPZ road markings are detrimental to appearance.

Area is really busy at school pick up and drop off times. Restrictions will make it worse. Maybe stop zone at Staunton Rd. Areas of Wimbledon have 11-11:30 much better than 3 hours slot.

The reduced parking will make matters worse – it is intolerable not to be able to park in front of your own drive. The reduced parking is so substantial it will affect the whole area, environmentally the lines and meters are not pleasant in the road with narrow pavements.
- Paying will enable people from outside the area to use our roads more.
- It will affect all the rest of the Kingston town area in a detrimental way too due to the
loss of parking spaces. It will mean a congested area which is unpleasant, and people would not want to live in, due to this and the general inconvenience.

- It does not make sense not being able to park outside your own drive. It reduces parking spaces. It is useful to be able to park in front of own drive
- This I feel has only one advantage in that it is a money generator for the Council. Our Council tax is quite high enough without having to pay for parking outside our houses.

**LR56**
CPZ will not alleviate the parking problem (if there was any!)
It will add to it immensely with 74 parking spaces lost!

**LR59**
In principle we do strongly support a CPZ for the roads you propose, with the following comments:

- If this is turned down again, then the Council will get many more applications for dropped kerbs, which will both reduce available parking on the road and will increase the concreting of front gardens
- We do not believe that the whole zone should be dual purpose, i.e. residents parking and pay and display. There are no shops etc. in the proposed zone, so we don not see a need. If the zone hours were for the full day, we would be less concerned by the mixed zone proposal.
- The zone hours should be 8:30am to 6:30pm to prevent folk parking early and loading the meter until 1pm or parking 12pm and then parking for the rest of the day.
- We regularly watch people walk from the other side of Richmond Rd up to their car parked in Latchmere Rd and then drive off – this is why we need the full 8:30am - 6:30pm zone.
- We believe that the reduction in total number of bays (because some residents park across their own driveways) will not adversely affect residents, especially if the zone hours extended to 6:30pm.

There has been an empirical evidence over the last couple of months that residents regularly park across their drives.

**LR60**
If this goes ahead we be paying to lose our amenity. One example, currently tradesman, deliveries and friends can park across our drive. Adding yellow lines across crossovers reduces parking flexibility. We are against CPZ.
Find ways to encourage residents to own one car

**LR61**
I have yet to see a CPZ which best use of available space. Looks like this one will leave lots of space unusable. Those having two cars should pay for second car. Need other ways of reducing car use

**LR63**
Cars from other areas park here for long periods so I support this CPZ plan. Also controls over parking over access ways.

**LR64**
The impact of CPZ on roads near to Latchmere Road, (Bank lane and Albany Park Rd) meant that there is far too many vehicles wanting to park on Latchmere Rd. Putting CPZ would not solve it but increase vehicles wanting to park in other places. Not having CPZ on neighbouring roads would ease congestion.

**SAR1**
Our only concern is that 1 hr free parking next to doctor’s surgery will be misused. We suggest:
- Make 1 hr free parking only for patients Mon- Fri and controlled parking on Sat.

**SAR2**
Perhaps a longer operating period would be better because of school and shopper use.

**SAR3**
Something needs to be done urgently. More and more residents are now placing bins etc outside to reserve parking spaces.

**SAR4**
I have to put bins out and stop car parking, I have a disability badge and use a walking stick.

**SAR6**
CPZ needed to address:
- Dangerous parking, particularly around street corners.
- Dumping of vehicles – several vehicles have been parked for months without moving
| SAR7 | Drop kerbs are wide enough without adding 1 metre either side of the dropped kerb. People should be able to park in front of drives with permit. |
| SAR9 | The current uncontrolled parking is dangerous as there is a lot people parking on corners/junctions. In addition as there are no gaps, it makes it difficult for 2 cars to travel up the road in opposite directions. |
| SAR11 | Double yellow lines on all corners at the moment, it is a nightmare. |
| SAR13 | The quicker the better |
| SAR14 | Why can't we have white lines across drives instead of yellow? I have off street parking but because of drive, guests will have to park across our neighbour's drives. |
| SAR15 | The offset crossing of St Albans Rd and Studland Rd needs yellow lines operational from 7 am to 7 pm as at Richmond Rd end of St Albans. 11 am to 2 pm is not enough. |
| SAR16 | Proposed parking zone times will not address the issues in the area. We would ask that full day parking restrictions are put in place as seen in the other streets in the borough. |
| SAR17 | We would support a CPZ which operates all day and which only allowed residents and their visitors with a permit to park i.e. no metered parking, as in place in Staunton Rd nearby. |
| SAR22 | We don't see why we should have to pay to park in our street. If you are giving us free parking permits we would consider. |
| SAR23 | Brining in a CPZ would simply result in a loss of parking spaces in these streets, would cost residents money and would result in a less attractive street scape. |
| SAR26 | • Loss of parking spaces  
• Problem with residents owing more than one car  
• No arrangements for motorbikes  
• Pay machines insufficient  
• Appears to be hidden RBK income earn. |
| SAR27 | All that is needed is yellow lines at all junctions, all your proposal will do is push the parking on to Hollybush etc. 
Also, I need my van for work, I always park outside my own property, with your (no permit policy for height restricted vans) I will be forced to find free parking in neighbouring streets which will disappointing living there, or dig up my lovely front garden to park it, or pack up work and claim benefits. So any ideas? |
| SAR31 | Councils should encourage residents to use front driveway space as parking. It is ridiculous to have a policy which prevent dropped kerbs being granted. |
| SAR33 | Reason for saying NO is due to not being able to park across our own driveway. Unhelpful proposal. |
| SAR34 | Loss of parking spaces will worsen the parking issues, why can't we have white lines over crossovers! 
Your proposal does not address the problem which is – residents with 4+ cars and commercial vehicles being parked overnight! |
| SAR35 | Restrictions on Saturday not necessary. 
Too many parking spaces will be lost meaning residents will have difficulty finding a space, particularly on Saturdays. |
<p>| SAR36 | Parking in St Albans Rd, has become intolerable, as indeed have the other roads mentioned in your letter. It has become much worse since Albany Park Rd, became a CPZ. |
| SAR37 | It is impossible to park on our street Mon-Fri due to people parking all day to go to work/station. We would like to be able to park outside our home! |
| SAR39 | The Council should keep some reasonably sized small spaces between crossovers, which are safely and routinely used at present. We have for example, a small (SMART) car which we park between 14&amp;16 St Albans Rd without impeding into either of crossovers. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAR40</td>
<td>Please could signage, machines, etc be kept to a minimum so conservation areas are not altered significantly?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAR41</td>
<td>We are on the corner of Studland Rd/ St Albans Rd and have large vehicles parking outside for 10 months at a time (caravan).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| SAR43     | - The loss of spaces  
            - The lack of parking metre machines  
            - Use of Albany Park Rd for permit holders/ area as a whole  
            - Spaces for elderly (who do not have blue badge) going to dentist. |
| SAR44     | The figures you have produced make it obvious that this plan will make parking for residents worse not better. |
| SAR45     | Thank you for your effort in the consultation process.                                               |
| SAR47     | If this comes into operation we will be yet another house that will our green front garden into off street parking. |
| SAR49     | We are prisoners in our own homes. The aggressive insufficient parking is creating an unsafe environment. The selfish attitude of residents with their own drives must not determine the outcome of this essential action. |
| SAR51     | There are problems with people parking over the ends of dropped kerbs and making drive access difficult. This will probably still happen outside of CPZ hours with single yellow lines used at crossovers. |
| SAR53     | Loss of 36 of on-street parking is too high price to pay for the benefits – and largely could have been avoided if you did not propose yellow lines across crossovers. |
| SAR54     | I object to vehicle restrictions – I have a large van which I use for work. I also object strongly to the loss of spaces caused by the CPZ. |
| SAR55     | Something does need to be done to stop commuters and residents from nearby High Rise apartment parking all day in the street but we do not approve of the CPZ or line markings on the road. |
| SAR57     | I think it should not just be limited to 11am – 2pm, but extend for the whole day. The current zone on Staunton Rd should be extended. |
| SAR59     | Why only three hours restrictions and not all day?                                                    |
| SAR60     | Should be longer 8am – 3pm, why is it necessary to lose so many spaces?                              |
| SAR62     | Double yellow lines needed on corners to allow emergency vehicles eg. fire engines easier access.    |
|           | If the CPZ is introduced I (a 73 years old pensioner) will have to pay for the privilege of parking my small car anywhere I can find a place instead of parking outside my house, as my car is small, it comfortably fits in the area between two driveways. I use a proportion of the extremely wide pavement overlaps, but this does not affect my neighbour nor my daughter when they exit their driveway parking. Please give consideration to residents. I lived in St Albans Rd for 43 years, first in no. 39 and then in no. 40, witnessing many changes in Kingston, but please do not transform our quiet road into a deterred monstrosity. Thanks for considering my comments and ensure that elderly folks can park outside their own properties, without imposing yet another cost. |
| SAR63     | - Proposed CPZ will make parking situation worse not better.  
            - A CPZ will unfairly penalise those residents without off street parking, while allowing those with dropped kerbs (paved front gardens) to buy additional permits to ‘road block’ those who haven’t. |
| SAR64     | - Allow residents to park across the yellow lines on driveways.  
            - Or remove the Albany Park Road CPZ. Having attended the challenge you have is how do you alleviate the parking issues in the area. Given that other areas already have a CPZ means we have to also. If you could rescind the other areas – Albany Park Road etc.. then it would probably be ok not to have one. Given I think its unlikely that you can then we have to go down the route of a CPZ in
the area. However, the scheme takes out too many spaces and not allowing people to park over their crossover simply exacerbates the solution.

My suggestion is to implement but all residents to park wherever they like e.g. over a crossover. We have had this like it is now for 20 years and no one to my knowledge has caused an issue so why not make this exemption it is eminently enforceable by the traffic officers simply by including the residents rule.

Unfortunately the need for a CPZ is not our decision it is the decision to allow multiple CPZ to creep up from the town which has created the need. Therefore I think it deserves some creativity from the council otherwise the problem will persist and only get worse.

Thanks for your attention and happy to be consulted further.

<p>| SAR65 | We fully support the proposal, as much to alleviate the influx of all day parking as to, hopefully eradicate the unsafe parking which is frequently occurring. Please see attached scanned comments SAR65 |
| SAR66 | We understand teachers for Latchmere and St Agatha’s, drive to the area and there should be a provision made for these teachers and staff. |
| SAR67 | The proposed CPZ is not in the interest of residents based on the number of spaces lost and the loss of parking over crossovers which is now common practice. Yellow lines are needed on corners to allow access of large vehicles such as lorries and emergency services. Corners can become hard for small vehicles to negotiate when people park up to the end of the junction, particularly at the Studland Road/ St Albans road junction and at the point where there is a sharp turn in St Albans Rd. Also at the St Albans /Durlston Rd junction. |
| SAR68 | The only way the CPZ will work is if you allow people to continue to park over driveways. If you introduce CPZ, we still have to pay the full amount, we should be protected until 6:30pm like zone B, and allow to park over driveways. |
| SAR69 | Cars often parked at corners, annoying. I usually find somewhere to park in my road either in front of my house or round the corner, so not a problem. |
| SAR70 | An abandoned vehicles without permits must be swiftly removed by the Council. No permits to the specified large vehicles must be granted to residents who own such vans or caravans. |
| SAR71 | The space proposed outside no. 20 St Albans is too small and parked cars often prevent the use of our drive, now this issue will only get worse. Please remove the space from the plan. |
| SAR72 | The loss of so many spaces means that downside of the proposal outweighs the benefits. Residents and their guests should be able to park over their own driveways. |
| SAR75 | Consideration must be given to all the people who have to visit the surgery in St Albans Road, specially the elder and disabled. They use the surgery for less than an hour and need/ should be able to park, they are also tax payers. |
| DR1 | The situation is getting worse, rather than improving. Parking by non residents even takes place outside the garages in Studland Rd. |
| DR2 | Parking here is currently really getting difficult with lots of people parking for the day and going to Kingston. |
| DR3 | I think we need this zone to deter commuters from parking here all day so there is no space for residents to park. |
| DR5 | The parking will get worse as of Kingston Academy continues to grow so this need addressing now. |
| DR6 | I would go further and extend the operating hours from 11am to 2pm, but am happy with current proposal. |
| DR10 | You ruined our road when you granted CPZ to the ‘river roads’, especially Albany Park |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DR12</td>
<td>But we need CPZ all day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR13</td>
<td>Please ensure that the yellow lines covers our dropped kerb at no. 91 as the map you enclosed not seen to show it, thanks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR15</td>
<td>The current parking arrangement is not working. Cars left all day in an already saturated area for cars. It has worked on Albany Park Rd and hopefully further.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR16</td>
<td>The local schools also cause parking issues especially in the morning, start time should be 8:30am.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR17</td>
<td>The roads are most congested late at night, when residents’ cars are parked here. The problem is caused by too many residents’ cars, so CPZ will make matter worse by reducing spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR18</td>
<td>We do not want a CPZ, which will reduce the number of space available. It is not reasonable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR20</td>
<td>We will lose too many spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR21</td>
<td>The number of parking spaces that will be lost through this proposal would make the parking situation for worse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR22</td>
<td>Would prefer to extend to 8am to 6pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR23</td>
<td>Parking has deteriorated in Durlston Rd considerably in the last few years. It is likely to get worse as the Kingston Academy expands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR26</td>
<td>The main parking issues are first thing in the morning from 8am to 10am and then in the afternoon from 3pm until 5pm. People visiting the doctors or dentist or schools cause the problems plus your parking bays are often too small and reduce too many spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR27</td>
<td>The parking should be from 9am to 4:30pm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| DR28 |  - Time 10am -12:00 or 9:30am to 11:30, not on Sat or Sundays, no problems on Saturday.  
   - Up to home owners if single yellow line outside the driveway. |
<p>| DR29 | We would request a box outside our house rather than a yellow line. |
| DR31 | 11am-2pm does not help us with parking our cars – the cost of tickets are ridiculous especially if we are losing so many spaces. |
| DR33 | As I have previously stated, we would support CPZ if it was from Mon – Fri 11am to 2pm. There is no need for Saturdays. |
| DR35 | Regardless of this outcome, please can we have double yellow lines on every corner. Dangerous parking (even across blind crossings) causes problems for large lorries and cyclists |
| DR37 | Yes to CPZ although, many families have more than one car and those with driveways often park on in their dive and one outside it. Your proposal would make this impossible, thus increasing parking pressure in the street, can this be avoided anyhow? |
| DR38 | There are too many cars for household, eg some households have two or more cars. |
| DR39 | Too many parking spaces will be lost. Driveways are already an issue on the road leading to a loss of flexibility; this proposal will only make matter worse. |
| DR40 | It would not solve the problems, it would actually add new problems. At the meeting of 11 Feb 17, I pointed out that the map needs correcting. No 60 Durlston Rd does not have one parking space off road, please correct the map. |
| DR41 | Why has the Council introduced a CPZ in Albany Park Rd when the majority of the residents in that road have off street parking? Has it been done to encourage more CPZ in Kingston road? |
| DR43 | Again regarding vehicles’ length, please can you make an amendment to ‘leisure vehicles’ – how do we pack for trips away? When living in Lambeth no such restrictions erected or issues. The parking problem only sees to effect those on St Albany and Durlston Rd, can |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>C18</strong></th>
<th><strong>ANNEX 3</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latchmere not be considered separately as this one size fits all does not seem to suit all needs. Can you not trial parking bay or crossovers, instead of yellow lines? This will alleviate restriction of available parking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DR44</strong></td>
<td>We urge the Council to remove the CPZ in Albany Park Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DR45</strong></td>
<td>A CPZ would make it almost impossible to park my small car anywhere near my house. The best solution would even be to remove unnecessary CPZ in Albany Park Rd. (All residents have their own parking spaces anyway).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **DR47** | 'Yes' reasons for meter & CPZ:  
- White car parked outside 36 for 1 month  
- Red car parked outside 36 for a month then neighbour's van for a month  
- Garage at Ham uses Durlston Rd to park and dump cars  
- Cannot park my own car anywhere near my house, I am 77 years old with recent knee replacement. |
<p>| <strong>DR49</strong> | Yellow line at the crossovers and corners of the road, difficult to see cars and vans, re-think Albany Park Rd scheme. |
| <strong>DR51</strong> | As my wife is disabled and has frequent car workers visiting, I would have to pay extra for a car permit. This is unfair and is an indirect discrimination against disability. |
| <strong>DR52</strong> | The parking issues on Durlston Rd are a direct result of bringing in CPZ to Albany Park Rd. It is evident that CPZ on Albany Park Rd is not necessary and therefore should be removed. There are never any cars parked down there!! Introducing CPZ to our roads will mean fewer places to park thus making the matter worse. |
| <strong>DR53</strong> | There have only been parking issues in our roads since the CPZ was introduced in Albany Park Rd and area around. This proposed CPZ will cause similar issues in Latchmere Lane and Tudor Estate. |
| <strong>DR55</strong> | This is definitely not needed on Durlston Rd and will only lead to roads outside the CPZ being clogged. |
| <strong>DR56</strong> | Since the car park for the Kingston Academy school has been completed there are no more parking issues on our road. |
| <strong>DR57</strong> | No yellow lines across drives – that creates/does not take away parking. |
| <strong>DR58</strong> | We do believe no yellow lines should be put in front of the driveways. |
| <strong>DR59</strong> | I believe this situation would be much worse given the loss of spaces eg. across lowered kerbs in front of where we can now park. |
| <strong>DR60</strong> | CPZ should operate all day. Red lines corner of Durlston &amp; Richmond Rd. |
| <strong>DR61</strong> | Please could the yellow lines on the junction Durlston Rd and Richmond Rd be policed at school drop off and pick up times? It's a very dangerous junction with all the children crossing. |
| <strong>DR62</strong> | I would strongly object to 'Parking Pay machine' placed outside my house, intrusion of privacy! If vote goes against CPZ, then Albany Park Rd CPZ needs to be removed to solve this very stressful problem, thanks. |
| <strong>DR63</strong> | It would prefer to 'trial' this for 3 months to see if it improves the parking because there is concern that a big number of spaces will be lost and parking will be worse as a result. |
| <strong>DR64</strong> | Please see attached scanned comments |
| <strong>DR65</strong> | CPZ not supported in current proposal, as there are too many lost parking spaces which will make parking worse not better. |
| <strong>DR66</strong> | We do not feel that CPZ is necessary on a Saturday as parking is fine at the weekend, Mon to Fri only, please. |
| <strong>DR67</strong> | Only if CPZ is voted for, then I prefer: 11am to 2pm Mon – Saturday. |
| <strong>DR68</strong> | After the introduction of CPZ, we will have lost 250 places to park in the neighbourhood, it cannot be a good solution given the parking problem as it is today. The main problem for me as I am asthmatic is too much traffic in Richmond Rd! |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DR69</td>
<td>There are too many large vans and minibuses and other work vehicles parked here, but we stand to lose more spaces with CPZ than we currently lose.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| DR70 | • The only time we have any problem parking is in the evening or night so the CPZ will not help.  
      • We are very concerned, we will not find a space if the CPZ is introduced.  
      • We are very anxious, the CPZ meters will make the area ugly, front gardens will be destroyed and there will be long term damage to the beauty and wild life on the area  
      • A disaster for the area. |
| DR71 | It is our understanding from more longstanding residents that the reason for our current parking issues are due to the CPZ introduction on Albany Park Rd.  
      If the Council are refusing to scrap the CPZ on Albany Park Rd, then I believe we have to try a CPZ as there is clearly a major parking issue on our roads. Nonetheless, would greatly appreciate a written explanation on why the CPZ on Albany Park Rd cannot be removed?  
      Almost all of the houses on that street have large amounts of off street parking for several cars such that there should be no problem if non-residents park in the street.  
      Subject to the above, I agree to a CPZ on Durlston Rd, providing that it is within the same zone as Albany Park Rd so that overflow can park there. I also would not agree to the CPZ if it were not subject to trial period involving residents' consultation at the review stage. |
| DR72 | I see people who do not live on our road park their car and then return 8 -10hours later to collect it.  
      I drive along the road everyday and can never park near our home. This problem is getting worse, please introduce a CPZ in Durlston Rd. |
| DR73 | Parking is an issue all day and in the evenings as well.  
      The loss of parking spaces through a CPZ will not solve these issues. If Councillors had now bowed to the pressure of residents of Albany Park Rd to introduce a CPZ, we would not have these problems. Albany Park Rd is empty throughout the day and night. |
| DR75 | A CPZ would result in too many parking spaces being lost down these roads.  
      The introduction of CPZ would be the best option for this area.  
      We do not believe there would be an issue with people parking over driveways as this is never currently an issue. |
| DR76 | I am concerned that 11-2pm will not help. Too many crossovers and too many people parking outside these drives. |
| DR77 | The process for deciding on CPZ is not fit for the purpose because the residents taking a decision to implement a CPZ are not the only residents affected:  
      eg.1 our current problem was caused by a CPZ in Albany Park Rd  
      eg 2 I don’t want a CPZ in my road unless more surrounding roads opt for one. |
<p>| DR79 | I believe a parking system will drastically decrease available space and make our life and that of others more difficult and more aggressive. |
| DR80 | I don’t understand the point in losing so many parking places, and I can’t see why I can’t park outside my house which has a crossover as it will have as a yellow line. |
| FG1  | I would like CPZ but the operation time to be 8am-6pm. Our main problems are at school drop &amp; pick up times, I understand it would not always be parked but it would still help. |
| FG2  | The parking problems come from the schools Tiffin Girls and Fernhill, so between 7:30 and 9 and 2:45 and 4pm parking is awful. The rest of the time in fine. |
| FG3  | CPZ urgently required, parking situation has deteriorated. Ideally operating hours should be extended beyond 11am-2pm to encompass school drop off times, given chaos caused by Tiffin Girls. |
| FG4  | Please extend hours to 8am -2pm to address dangerous parking issues in Fernhill Gds due to drop off by parents at local schools. |
| FG5  | ASAP, please |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FG6</th>
<th>CPZ times: 10am to 2pm?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FG7</td>
<td>Under no circumstances should there be any money paid for any parking. Please provide results of last consultations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG11</td>
<td>Please could consideration be given to the purchase of visitors' permits. Could books of visitors permit be made available at Tudor Library for old and pensioner residents who do not have computers/ electronic access to customer services?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG14</td>
<td>10am to 4:30 is a more suitable deterrent in Fernhill Gdns where we experience constant illegal parking for Tiffin’s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| FG15  | The entrance into Fernhill Gdns from Richmond Rd should be made a double yellow lines at least on one side right up to nos 1 & 2, not just left as it is now, because this particular junction is very dangerous with cars on both sides, leaving insufficient room for 2 more cars to pass in between. This is particularly dangerous when children are being collected from school. The CPZ will not help this, unless it is extended to 4pm. There is still problem about evening and Sunday activities at the school.  
- CPZ should be extended to 4pm, 7days/ week to help the issue.  
- Double yellow lines on one side of road up to nos 1 & 2  
- The parking bays need to be set back, not right up to the ends of the pavement/edge of the slope for no. 2 Fernhill, as it is almost impossible to get two cars to pass each other. |
<p>| EG1   | Please see my comments and suggested changes (attached regarding hours of operations, parking bays on Earle Gdns, waste land on Earle Gdns and extending double yellow lines at the junction of Studland and St Albans Rd. (Comments are scanned in under EG1). |
| EG3   | Would the £90 residents parking permit allow parking on single yellow lines between 11:00 and 2pm? |
| EG4   | With several schools, in the area we have parents parking often whole day as well as other commuters to London they leave rubbish in the streets as well. |
| EG5   | Regarding the map on Earle Gdns, it looks as if a paid parking bay will be outside no. 77 as I have a blue badge it would have to be a small vehicle as space between two houses is small. Does it mean the disabled bays outside the Dr in St Albans Rd would be removed? If so it won’t be possible for disabled drivers to park as free places would be used by others. Also the right hand bends on Earle Gdns are being used for vans etc this makes it very dangerous for the children in the road also for cyclists. Thanks for reading my concerns, it really is a worry. |
| EG7   | As map is so tiny, it would appear some parking bays will restrict residents’ access to own drive. Why include Saturday in Earle Gdn? Not necessary. |
| EG7   | We personally have had a huge problem with double parking and driveway blocking. We had police assistance on a number of occasions – Earle Gdns has become a commuter car park. |
| EG10  | We would like to see double yellow lines round the corner by No. 16 this is important because any parked vehicle there narrows the area so much that it makes extremely difficult if not impossible for any access of emergency vehicles (ambulances, fir engine) – it creates blind spot for any car. |
| EG11  | Am fed up with commuters parking across the access to driveways/off street. They park on the pavement – warden sometimes comes in between 7-8am (useless). |
| EG13  | Some of the people who park here for the day, seem to think it was fine to leave their rubbish behind when they left. Others would park on the pavement. |
| EG14  | Non-residents of Earle Gdns and commuters monopolise a lot of the available parking spaces, including commercial vehicles, sometimes over 3 tonnes. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>If the majority of the other streets accept the proposals, then Earle Gdns should be included in the CPZ as commuters problems will be all permanently shift to Earl Gdns, causing obstructions particularly at the road bends.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **EG16** | - Reduced parking = problems for residents, long term stay visitors/ carers/ workmen may not be able to find a space.  
- Visitors to a house can park outside the house, in some cases across the houses’ driveways, thus taking up little space, this will be illegal. Between 11-2pm is very inconvenient  
- Some firms won’t attend unless you can guarantee parking. |
| **EG17** | You needed to be more specific, my answer to questions 1 & 2 are in relation to the whole plan going in, may be a different answer if all but our road had this plan implemented. |
| **EG19** | I think the layout of the road could be addressed, where the cars park can be an issue. Can we make the parking bays an echelon parking in Earle Gardens to maximise number of bays?  
We need traffic wardens to give out tickets for cars parking on the corners which creates more of an issue as there is no space in the road for two cars to pass! |
| **EG20** | You have misdiagnosed the situation. The parking is tight, but adequate. Reduction of spaces on Saturdays will be a major problem for residents. |
| **EG21** | Earle Gdns has adequate on & off street parking. |
| **EG22** | If there had to be a CPZ in our road, why can’t they be at the beginning of our road and the lay-by at the side? Leave the rest. |
| **SR3** | Have not addressed the problem of the dangerous junction with St Albans. Parked cars prevent school children crossing and vehicles negotiating the corners. You should leave the office and see the problem for yourselves!! |
| **SR4** | 11am to 2Pm is not long enough 10am -3pm would be more appropriate. |
| **SR5** | I can see more problems as a result of this CPZ.  
If CPZ is introduced, it needs to be for a long period of time, say 8:30am to 6:30pm to really stop the parking problem.  
People already park across my drive and a CPZ will encourage them to park across my drive even more outside of the short period of restricted parking hours. |
| **SR6** | Double yellow lines are needed at all junctions to eliminate dangerous parking, which is the major concern. There is also an abandoned car on our road (six months). |
| **SR8** | Please implement ASAP!  
No matter what the result you have to stop people parking right up to the corners of the road – it creates very dangerous blind spots! |
After some consideration, in this household (no.  ), we are against having permits at this stage, so please count our vote as a ‘no’.

That said, please bear in mind that it was a close decision, as we can see how permits may be of benefit in some ways, if not others.

Our main thoughts regarding the issue are as follows:-

**CONS OF HAVING PERMIT**

- We have a driveway for our only car, and so we don’t need on street parking on a regular basis, unless we have guests or contractors who need access to our house or driveway.

- There will be fewer bays if there is a CPZ (especially if some bays given up to hour long parking, pay and display etc) and I fear there will be less bays than cars which belong to residents on the streets. There has always been pressure on parking, even just for the resident’s cars, which got noticeably worse after the Albany Park Road CPZ was introduced. I worry that introducing a CPZ in our streets may lead to a reduction in available parking spaces, and even more pressure on residents’ parking. Even with permits, I think parking will still be very tight.

- At present, I do not tend to have the problem of people actually parking in my crossover. I worry that the introduction of permits and marked bays, yellow lines etc, as well as the increased pressure on finding a parking space because of fewer bays, may encourage more people to use my crossover and block my drive so I cannot park on it myself.

**PROS OF HAVING PERMIT**

- I do find it difficult often to access my drive easily, as cars do tend to overhang the crossover, especially on the left hand side in front of No.  , where there isn’t really space for the two cars that cram into the gap between the crossover at our house (No.  ) and the crossover at house no.  . A marked parking bay for one car only in this space would be much more appropriate for the size of the space, and would allow much easier access to my driveway, as well as give me use of the crossover for guests when needed (outside of any CPZ times at least!). At present, I rarely get to use the crossover for guests to park as the overhanging cars do not leave a big enough space for a guest’s car to fit.

- There is a lot of non-resident parking on the street, especially since the introduction of the Albany Park Road CPZ. For example, the school run parking at both ends of the day is relatively short lived, but can cause congestion. There seem to be also more unfamiliar vehicles, including vans and trade vehicles (some of them quite large in size), parked for longer periods of time, often days on end, without being moved or checked on.

- At the moment, cars park right up to the corners of road junctions, especially Studland Road, which makes it difficult and dangerous to turn into the different roads. Similarly, as there are more and more cars parking, even across the crossovers, there has become very few spaces where you can pull in to let other cars pass. Again, this is proving dangerous and more and more difficult to get up or down a road, especially Durlston, without meeting a car head on with nowhere to pull in!
OTHER POINTS

- 11am-2pm Mon-Sat CPZ times will obviously stop all day parking, but I also have concerns about overnight parking, as well as late afternoon and evenings and Sundays. But that said, I am not sure I would want to have a permit only parking or longer hours as I am still leaning towards having no permits at all if I had the final decision.

- Which zone would we be under? It would be of benefit to me to be able to park closer to town or in the river roads with a permit, but less of a benefit to simply park in the streets currently considering this new CPZ if you were to create a new zone just for this. I personally would prefer to be the same zone as Albany Park Road was granted – Zone C?

- I strongly feel that, had Albany Park Road not become a CPZ, we would not be in the position of needing our own CPZ. Those roads are now largely empty, whereas ours will be full even with the introduction of a CPZ. I do think that it should be considered whether they need the CPZ after all.

- Just as I feel we have been forced to consider permits only because a CPZ was introduced in Albany Park Road, I suspect Wolsey Road, Hollybush Road, Lancaster Gardens, Tudor Drive etc will all follow suit if they suffer the same knock on effect as we have with these displaced vehicles. It seems every road in Kingston will have a CPZ before too long! I’m not clear how much consideration is given to how, or if, these displaced vehicles can be dealt with longer term.

Many thanks,
Since the introduction of the CPZ west of Richmond Road the parking situation in the roads east of Richmond Road has deteriorated significantly. On a daily basis there are cars (and vans) parked too close to junctions obstructing the view and obstructing lowered kerbs (both infringements of the Highway Code) making it especially difficult for those with mobility impairments and young children to safely cross the road. Being close to a number of schools, the junctions of Studland Road with Latchmere Road, St Albans Road and Durlston Road are of particular concern for those walking younger children to the nearby nursery & primary schools and older children walking themselves to the nearby secondary schools. These photographs, taken in recent months at the junction of St Albans Road and Studland Road, show examples of cars obstructing the lowered kerbs and parking so close to one another that vision from and access to the lowered kerb is impaired:

Similarly, we know this parking problem also exists at the junction with St Albans Road and Durlston Road; at that junction we were told by friends (who do not live in the roads affected, but whose children go to the nearby Fernhill School), that their daughter was cycling along Durlston Road and a car trying to turn out of St Albans Road into Durlston Road came close to hitting the child as the driver pulled forward beyond the white give-way lines in order see around parked cars before turning the corner.

The proposed single yellow lines, are fully supported to prevent this type of inconsiderate and dangerous parking.
We have seen the refuse collection vehicles having difficulty negotiating corners, and the roads becoming blocked as there is nowhere for oncoming vehicles to pass; if the refuse vehicles are having difficulty and having to reverse up the roads and/or have their operatives stand in the road to help guide them around corners, then I fear that emergency vehicles may find similar problems in an emergency. The proposed single yellow lines on junctions will, again, address these concerns, and are fully supported.

The level of non-resident parking in our roads has reached such a point that both residents and visitors of non-residents are often unable to park in the same road as their residence, or even around the corner in an adjoining road. We appreciate that the introduction of the proposed single yellow lines will reduce the number of parking spaces. The influx of all day parking from non-residents (and long term parking – some cars appear to have not moved since before Christmas and I would suspect are non-residents cars) would hopefully be addressed by the proposed CPZ, and therefore in our opinion this will be a suitable means to control the parking in the remaining parking spaces and ensure parking availability for residents. The introduction of the proposed CPZ is fully supported.

Typical parking situation on a Sunday, at junction of St Albans Road with Studland Road i.e. without all-day non-resident parking (taken at 1pm on Sunday, 19th February 2017)

Compare with typical weekday parking at the same junction with influx of non-residential all-day parking. (taken 1pm on Thursday, 23rd February 2017).
20 April 2017

Dear neighbours

**CPZ consultation – second phase**

Since we have just received the new consultation form from the council we are keen to emphasise some points before you respond. Please think carefully as this, in our view, is purely an income generation exercise on behalf of the council which will be detrimental to all residents, regardless of whether or not you have off street parking.

**Points to be aware of:**

- There will be far fewer parking spaces due to the parameters of the bays and the loss of parking close to a crossover due to yellow lines, and, moreover, people with two cars no longer being able to park over their own crossover so having to take one of the reduced bays.

- There will be far fewer parking spaces and we will now have to pay for these.

- There will be less parking space at the bottom of St Alban's Road as there will now be reduced space due to patients’ bays.

- Parking meter machines in each road will mean people will still be able to park in our road if they buy a ticket. This will mean even more competition for the reduced space available.

- An overall loss of a total of 250 spaces. Where will the overspill go? Tudor Drive? Cardinal Avenue? There will be a knock on effect which will then mean residents ask for a CPZ in their roads too; thereby generating more income for the council from permits, parking and the fines that will be issued; and even fewer parking spaces as a result.

- Unsightly CPZ road markings and posts that will affect the look of the roads and regular traffic warden patrols.

We suggest the best solution would be to remove the unnecessary CPZ in Albany Park Road which would alleviate the congestion at peak times and urge you not to vote in favour of the CPZ.

Thank you

Two Durlston Road residents
Dear Mr. Hamman,

I am writing to oppose the introduction of a controlled parking zone in Earle Gardens and the surrounding streets, on the basis that there is no need for a CPZ and it would represent an unnecessary expense and nuisance for the residents of these streets.

If a decision is made to go ahead with the CPZ, I would like to suggest the following changes to the proposals set out in your letter:

1. Hours of operation.
   These should avoid lunchtime when residents are more likely to have visitors. I would prefer 8:30-11 am as this would also help to reduce the parking nuisance caused by parents driving children to school. As you know, there are 3 primary and 2 secondary schools in this immediate area. If you don't wish to deal with the problem of school traffic, a restriction of 2 hours in the morning (10-12) would work.
2. Bays in Earle Gardens
There are currently 4 parking
bays at the end of Earle
Gardens, between ns 38 and 32.
Your plan shows only half of
this space (2 bays?) available
for parking. All four bays should
be retained. No allowance should
be made for vehicular access to
the two areas of waste ground
at the end of the street.

3. Waste ground adjacent to ns
38 Earle Gardens.
To my knowledge, this land is not
adopted by the local authority and
there is no vehicular access over
this land to the houses on
Hatchmere Road, neither is it
to be used as a parking space.
It should not be marked in any way
that might indicate that it is
usable by vehicles. Ideally, the
council would install bollards
across the entrance to this piece
of land, as has already been
done at the end of the street.

4. Junction of Studland Road (37/38)
with St Albans Road.
This is a dangerous crossing which
is used daily by children
walking unaccompanied to school.

end...
The double-yellow lines at this junction should be extended to prevent parking close to the junction and to improve visibility and safety for pedestrians and motorists. All the junctions on the plan suffer from this issue to some extent and should be reviewed; however, this junction is the most extreme, is always parked up and should be changed as a matter of urgency to reduce prevent parking so close to the junction.

Yours sincerely,
## Annex 4

### Parking beat Survey - Thursday 27 April 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Existing total parking capacity</th>
<th>No of parking spaces occupied at:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latchmere Lane, (between Latchmere Rd &amp; Tudor Drive)</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>77 (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latchmere Rd, (between Latchmere Lane &amp; Park Rd)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>61 (76%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranleigh Gardens</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24 (92%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Agathas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>224</strong></td>
<td><strong>162 (72%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee
6 July 2016

King's Road review of traffic management system

Report by Head of Environment

Call-in deadline: 5pm on Thursday 20 June 2017 (ten working days after the meeting)

Purpose

To consider the request from petitioners to urgently calm and limit traffic using the upper part (eastern section) of Kings Road, between Park Road and Queens Road.

Recommendations:

To Resolve that:

1. Members note the report;
2. Approve the following options for local consultation:-
   ● Option 1: Introduce one way working on Kings road between Queens Road and Park Road, and on New Road between Park Road and Queens Road (see Annex 1);
   ● Option 2: remove on-street parking on the western side of Kings Road, between Park Road and Queens Road (see Annex 2);
   ● Option 3: Do nothing.
3. the results of the consultation are considered by a future meeting of this Committee.

Key Points

1. An on-line petition with 42 signatures, from residents in the section of Kings Road between Park Road and Queens Road, was undertaken in Spring 2017. This petition requested that the council implement significant traffic reducing measures to urgently calm and limit traffic using the upper part (eastern section) of Kings Road, between Park Road and Queens Road. This report outlines options available and seeks members views on the way forward.

Context

2. A Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) ban was introduced into the North Kingston Area, including Kings Road, in 1985 banning vehicles greater than 7.5 tonnes from entering the area, except for access.

3. In November 2006 the Neighbourhood Committee agreed to include the section of Kings Road, between Park Road and Queens Road, in an area wide 20mph speed limit. This was an extension of the existing Canbury
20mph zone, which already included Kings Road between Richmond Road and Park Road, which was implemented in 2001.

4. A petition was received in March 2010 from residents of Kings Road, located between Park Road and Queens Road. The petition states that traffic is a significant and growing problem, including the increasing volume and speed of vehicles, increasing number of large trucks and lorries using Kings Road as a cut through. This increases congestion, and is accelerating environmental damage to the conservation area.

5. The petition stated that there are 32 children below the age of 15 living in Kings Road between Park Road and Queens Road, and there had been some instances of vehicles narrowly avoiding harming children. The petition called for a reduction in speed and congestion, and stopping larger vehicles from using this section of Kings Road. The residents wanted a one way system introduced in the area, as they felt Kings Road was not wide enough for two way traffic. Residents also wanted two speed cushions replaced with speed humps, and a width restriction installed to prevent large vehicles from turning into Queens Road.

6. The December 2010 Neighbourhood Committee meeting considered a report on the petition issues, and resolved that no changes were to be made to the traffic management arrangements in Kings Road, between Park Road and Queens Road.

7. A new online petition was started in February 2017, with 42 signatures from Kings Road residents living in the section between Park Road and Queens Road, asking the council to implement significant traffic reducing measures to urgently calm and limit traffic using the upper part of Kings Road, between Park Road and Queens Road. The petitioners highlighted the following points:

- The top of Kings Road, where it meets Queens Road and Park Road, has become a major rat run. Drivers use this section of road particularly during rush hour to bypass Park Road / Kingston Hill to reach the A3, or to enter Kingston town itself through back roads, or to drive to Richmond, or to drive to Kingston Gate to commute through Richmond Park.
- The road was not built to handle this volume of traffic. With SatNavs, large vehicles, such as lorries and skip hire vehicles, travel at speed down or up the road. At both entrances to this section, these vehicles have to enter using the other side of the road to 'make the turn'.
- At the east end of Kings Road (refuge island at the Queens Road junction) the central bollard is repeatedly destroyed as a result of these manoeuvres. Lorries have often become stranded on the single traffic bell bollard, put there to stop traffic cutting the corner.
- Kings Road does have some speed cushions, but the majority of vehicles travelling along this stretch merely straddle these traffic calming measures, which are therefore felt to present no deterrent. The central reservation for pedestrians is not respected, with pedestrians squeezing between vehicles to cross the road. This area
has high footfall given its proximity to the park gate and local primary schools.

- We repeatedly see cars speeding through the single track to beat the car at the other end, before it comes through. This is particularly the case during rush hours.
- Given the volume of traffic, witnessing road rage has become the norm in this part of Kings Road. Residents are regularly subjected to hearing honking horns and foul language, as the amount of traffic exceeds the roads capacity, then gridlock develops. Frequently we have drivers getting out of their cars to argue with each other, then when tempers calm a little, they begin directing the traffic so it can move again! I have taken photographs of this farcical behaviour.
- The increased traffic and waiting traffic, has increased pollution at peak times. The fumes can be smelled during peak times. Residents’ homes regularly shake with the Lorries going down the road. The noticeable increase in traffic using Kings Gate, Richmond Park has been noted by the recent traffic survey by the Royal Parks, the results of which were published this January. This has had a knock on effect on the traffic using the surrounding roads, Kings Road being one of them. This section of Kings Road is single track and not built to take this volume of traffic.

Proposal and Options

8. This section of Kings Road between Queens Road and Park Road is a local distributor Road, it’s carriageway width is 7.6m, there is on-street parking on both sides of the road, and it is within the Canbury CPZ, which operates from 8.30am to 6.30pm Monday to Saturday. There are kerb build outs and speed cushions along the road to manage traffic speeds and provide passing places.

9. A traffic survey was carried out in June 2017 to measure traffic flows. The result shows 4,279 vehicles two-way between 7am and 7pm and 531 vehicles per peak hour. This is compared to the previous survey in 2013, where the two-way flow was 3,699 vehicles and 435 vehicles per peak hour.

10. Considering the recent on-line petition three options are proposed as follows:-

- Option 1: make Kings Road between Park Road and Queens one way. This proposal will remove congestion, and vehicular conflicts but will not remove all HGVs. To facilitate this option it would be necessary to cater for the re-distributed westbound traffic (from Kings Road) into New Road, and by virtue of that traffic re-assignment New Road would need to be one way in the opposite direction.
- Option 2: remove some on-street parking. This proposal will address vehicular conflict and reduce congestion, but it will not remove HGVs. It may increase speeding and will impact hugely on residents in an area where there is great demand for on street parking as the majority of these properties do not have driveways.
- Option 3: do nothing.
11. Members should be aware that although options 1 and 2 will address some of the issues raised by residents they may result in other problems, such as an increase in traffic volume and speeds.

12. One of the main disadvantages of introducing one way working, is the displacement of traffic into surrounding roads, particularly on to New Road. The recent traffic survey shows 631 vehicles use Kings Road between 7am - 7pm, and 118 vehicles in a peak hour. Making New Road one way would increase traffic volume considerably, and potentially the vehicle speeds.

Consultations

13. Subject to Committee approval, local residents and stakeholders will be consulted in September on the options set out in this report, and the outcome reported to a future Committee meeting.

Timescale

14. Subject to the Committee approval it anticipated that the scheme will be designed and delivered within this financial year.

Resource Implications

15. The cost for the local consultation will be met from the LIP 2017/2018 Kingston Town Neighbourhood improvements allocation. There is also provision within that budget to allow any approved scheme to be implemented, and the costs of such a scheme will be provided once agreed. However, it is likely that those costs would range between £10,000 and £15,000, as the options involve differing amounts of physical works.

Legal Implications

16. There are no specific legal implications at this stage, however should the scheme proceed to Traffic Management Order (TMO) stage, any legal issues arising would be the subject of a further report to this Committee.

Risk Assessment

17. A full risk assessment would be carried out once any approved scheme is agreed. The key issues that would need to be considered are any displaced traffic (depending on the scheme approved), and the potential for increase speeding. There would also need to be close monitoring for compliance, and this may be a bigger issue during the summer months, when Richmond Park is busier.

Equalities Impact Assessment
18. LIP Schemes are covered by an overarching EQIA, and as such no individual assessment is undertaken.

Network Implications

19. There will be some disruption to the network for a short period during the construction of any approved works. In general terms, the proposed changes will have an impact on the local highway operation, with the displacement of traffic on to quieter roads.

Environmental Implications and Air Quality

20. It is considered that both options 1 and 2 would have a positive impact in reducing traffic congestion and conflict in Kings Road, although similar concerns around speeding traffic will remain.

Background papers -
Petition
Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee meeting
Previous petition.

held by author/other - insert contact details

Author of report - Younes Hamade, Senior Professional Engineer, 0208 547 5922
**OPTION 1**

**KING'S RD WESTBOUND ONE WAY AND NEW RD EASTBOUND ONE WAY SYSTEM**

**EXISTING ISSUES**
- Rat runs through New Road during peak and off peak periods to Queens Road from Park Road.
- Existing New Road narrow width (2.7m average) encourages higher traffic speeds even with the existence of existing parking bays on Northside.
- Existing two way traffic creates makes traffic movement difficult in both directions at peak times.

**PROPOSED SOLUTIONS (NOT DESIRABLE)**
- Eastbound one way from New Road through Queens Road with the proposed one way system towards Park Road through King's Road will increase rat runs rather than reduce it at peak times.
- Reduction in traffic speeds cannot be achieved without additional traffic calming measures with the proposed one way system alone.

**EXISTING REFUGE TO BE REMOVED AND REPLACED WITH NEW BUILDOUT TO NARROW CARRIAGEWAY**

**PROPOSED ONE WAY SIGN ON EXISTING POSTS**

**PROPOSED NO ENTRY SIGNS ON EXISTING POSTS**

**PROPOSED ONE WAY SIGN ON NEW POSTS**

**PROPOSED NO ENTRY SIGNS ON NEW POSTS**

**PROPOSED SPEED CUSHIONS**

**Annex 1**

**KINGSTON AND SUTTON SHARED ENVIRONMENT SERVICE**

**Scheme**
- Proposed Kings Road & New Road one way system
b/w Queens Rd & Park Rd

**Feasibility Design**
- Option 1
OPTION 2

EXISTING ISSUES

- Existing narrow road width of 3.8m prevents free flowing traffic
- Traffic movement difficulty when refuse vehicles access the road for waste for waste collections

PROPOSED SOLUTION (DESIRABLE)

- Proposed road widening through entire removal of south side parking

PROPOSED REMOVAL OF SOUTHSIDE PARKING TO IMPROVE TRAFFIC MOVEMENT

Scheme

Proposed Removal Of on-street Parking on southside of King's Rd

Drawing Title

Feasibility Design Option 2

KINGSTON AND SUTTON SHARED ENVIRONMENT SERVICE

KING'S RD SOUTHSIDE PK BAYS REMOVAL

ANNEX 2
OPTION 2

EXISTING ISSUES

- HGVs and large buses entering the road at various times preventing free flow of traffic at various times.
- Existing two way traffic also makes traffic movement difficult in both directions at peak times.

PROPOSED SOLUTION (DESIRABLE)

- Proposed 7ft width restriction would improve traffic movement and prevent large vehicles from accessing the road at anytime.

PROPOSED SOLUTION

7 FT WIDTH RESTRICTIONS TO BE INSTALLED ON WIDTH BOTH SIDES OF THE EXISTING CARRIAGEWAY
OPTION 2

EXISTING ISSUES
- Existing narrow road width of 3.8m prevents free flowing traffic
- Traffic movement difficulty when refuse vehicles access the road for waste for waste collections

PROPOSED SOLUTION (DESIRABLE)
- Proposed road widening through entire removal of south side parking

PROPOSED REMOVAL OF SOUTHSIDE PARKING TO IMPROVE TRAFFIC MOVEMENT

KING'S RD  SOUTHSIDE PK BAYS REMOVAL

Annex 4

KINGSTON AND SUTTON SHARED ENVIRONMENT SERVICE
Scheme: Proposed Kings Road & New Road oneway system

Feasibility Design
Option 3
Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee
6 July 2017

Park Road review of traffic management system

Report by Head of Environment

Call-in deadline: 5.00pm Thursday 20 July 2017 (ten working days after the meeting)

Purpose
To consider the results of the local public consultation on the introduction of traffic management measures in Park Road, and agree their implementation.

Recommendations
To resolve that the Committee:-
1. note the consultation results;
2. approve implementation of the proposed 20mph zone in Park Road, between Kingston Hill and Tudor Drive; and
3. Make the existing temporary single yellow line in Park Road, between Bat Gardens and Kelvedon Close permanent.

Key Points
A. Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee passed a resolution on 25 January 2017 to consult on the introduction of a 20mph speed limit in Park Road, between Kingston Hill and Tudor Drive.

B. This report presents the results of the consultation, as shown in Annexes 1 and 2, on the introduction of the 20mph speed limit and making permanent, the temporary single yellow line (operational time is Monday to Friday 8am to 6:30pm) in Park Road, between Bat Gardens and Kelvedon Close.

Context
1. In June 2015 a consultation was undertaken on various traffic management proposals with Park Road residents, between Kings Road and Latchmere Road.

2. The October 2015 Committee considered the results of the consultation, which showed that residents supported the introduction of a raised zebra crossing and retention of temporary yellow lines until nearby building works were complete and those measures were approved. There was a further resolution, which agreed to give further consideration to the introduction of a 20mph speed limit in Park Road at a future meeting. This was subject to the introduction of the above raised zebra crossing, a new speed traffic survey having been carried out, and local consultation.
3. The 25 January 2017 Committee meeting considered feedback on the traffic surveys, and approved a public consultation on a 20mph speed limit along Park Road, between Kingston Hill and Tudor Drive.

4. The average traffic speeds were extracted from the permanent traffic speed counter on Park Road, which is positioned near the junction with Dagmar Road. The survey data indicated that the average speed for Park Road between January to December 2016, is 19.8mph towards Ham and 17.6mph towards Kingston Town. Those speeds fall below the nationally recognised threshold of 24 mph, which mean that a 20mph zone is acceptable.

Proposal and Options

5. The consultation scheme proposal as shown in Annex 3, involved the introduction a 20mph speed limit for Park Road, between Kingston Hill and Tudor Drive. This section of road has previously had speed reducing features implemented, and as such the scheme is primarily providing zone signs and road markings.

6. The consultation also included a question on the proposal to make the existing temporary single yellow line in Park Road between Bat Gardens and Kelvedon Close permanent, retaining the hours of operation.

Consultations

7. A public consultation was undertaken, and letters delivered to 588 addresses, covering all residents of Park Road and adjacent properties on all side roads off Park Road.

8. The consultation posed one question on the introduction of 20mph zone and another one on making permanent the existing temporary single yellow line on Park Road between Bat Gardens and Kelvedon Close.

Results

9. A total of 121 (21%) responses were received, and of those 64 were residents of Park Road. A summary table of the consultation results is provided in Annex 1.

10. In response to question 1, which related to the introduction of the 20mph zone 99 (82%) supported the proposals, and 22 (18%) are against. Those residents from Park Road responded with 51 in support and 13 against this proposal.

11. In response to question 2, which related to making the temporary restriction permanent 87 (73%) supported the proposal, and 26 (22%) are against. Those residents from Park Road responded with 51 in support and 13 against this proposal.

12. It should be noted that some of those who responded back did not answer both questions, so some of the above figures add to less than 100%.
13. A summary of residents’ comments can be found in Annex 2. The main comments and issues are:

- 20mph zone is an appropriate speed. (9)
- Will there be any resources allocated to enforce these measures? At present there is no visible attempt to enforce current speed or weight restrictions. Please enforce 20mph limit. (8)
- I am opposed to the parking restriction because I think it is unnecessary / we all have a difficult time parking at any given time. (6)
- I am opposed to the parking restriction because parked cars slow the traffic down which is a good thing. (2)

14. The Metropolitan Police, Fire Brigade, Ambulance Service and bus companies were consulted on the scheme. A response was received from the Metropolitan Police, and no objections were raised to the proposals.

Timescale

15. If the Committee approves the scheme, it is anticipated that the works will be implemented in October / November 2017.

Resource Implications

16. The scheme is estimated to cost £5,000, and it will be met out of the LIP allocation for Kingston Town Neighbourhood improvements in 2017/18.

Legal Implications

17. If the scheme is approved, Traffic Management Orders (TMO) will be processed for the temporary waiting restriction to be made permanent, and for the implementation of the 20mph zone in Park Road. Any objections to the TMOs would be considered at a later meeting of this Committee.

Risk Assessment

18. A raised zebra crossing has been implemented on this section of road, as a means of helping to reduce traffic speeds. Traffic surveys indicate that average speeds are less than 24 mph, so a 20mph zone is acceptable and should help promote road safety in residential roads. The scheme does not involve any additional physical speed reducing features, but should help reduce the risk and severity of accidents to the benefit of the whole community.

Equalities Impact Assessment

19. There is an overarching EQIA in place that covers local implementation plan (LIP) schemes, and as such individual assessments are not required. This proposal has the potential to benefit both pedestrians and cyclists, as they can both travel in a safer, more low speed environment.
Network Implications

20. There are no significant network implications associated with the proposed 20 mph zone on Park Road.

Environmental Implications and Air Quality

21. It is considered that the proposed scheme will have limited impact on the environment and/or air quality as mean speeds are already at reasonably low levels. Furthermore, it is anticipated that the introduction of a new 20mph zone would help encourage more sustainable modes of transport in the area.

Background papers -
- Consultation letter
- Returned questionnaires
- Consultation plans.
- Speed survey results

held by author/other - Younes Hamade, Senior Professional Traffic Engineer, tel 020 8547 5922 email: younes.hamade@kingston.gov.uk
Author of report - Nancy Mikhael, Engineer, Highways and Transport.
## Annex 1

### Park Rd (between Kingston Hill & Tudor Drive)-Proposed 20mph zone/ parking restrictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. Delivered</th>
<th>No. Returned</th>
<th>Question 1 20mph zone on Park Rd?</th>
<th>Question 2 Existing parking restrictions to be made permanent?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Rd</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandra Rd</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audric Close</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bat Gardens</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bockhampton Rd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough Rd</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunswick Rd</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton Rd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dagmar Rd</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elm Rd</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenville Rd</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelvedon Close</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Rd</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston Hill</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latchmere Rd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Road</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Close</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princes Rd</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortlands Rd</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable Close</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapping Close</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tudor Drive</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tudor Rd</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wingfield Rd</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>588</strong></td>
<td><strong>122</strong></td>
<td><strong>99</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 1
- **Yes:** 21%  **No:** 80%

### Question 2
- **Yes:** 21%  **No:** 80%
## Responses to Questionnaire on 20mph Zone / Parking Restrictions in Park Rd (Between Kingston Hill & Tudor Drive, Kingston)

### Key:
- PR - Park Rd
- AR - Alexandra Rd
- AC - Audric Close
- BG - Bat Gardens
- BckR - Bockhampton Rd
- BR - Borough Rd
- BwR - Brunswick Rd
- CR - Clifton Rd
- DR - Dagmar Rd
- ER - Elm Rd
- GR - Glenville Rd
- KC - Kelvedon Close
- KR – Kings Rd
- KH – Kingston Hill
- LR – Latchmere Rd
- NR – New Road
- PC – Park Close
- PoR – Princes Rd
- SR – Shortlands Rd
- SC – Stable Close
- TC – Tapping Close
- TD – Tudor Drive
- TR – Tudor Rd
- WG – Wingfield Rd
- UN - Anonymos

### Q3  Any other comments?

<p>| PR1 | We need to make the streets safer. Cars drive too fast down Park Road. Please enforce 20mph limit. | We do not need to make it easier for cars to drive quickly, making more of the street open for travelling cars, instead of parked over, has made Park Rd too easy for fast drivers. |
| PR2 | I am opposed to the parking restriction partly because I think it is unnecessary and partly because parked cars slow the traffic down which is a good thing. |
| PR4 | Hopefully this will reduce accidents on junction with Latchmere Rd/ Park Rd |
| PR5 | Will there be any resources allocated to enforce these measures? At present there is no visible attempt to enforce current speed or weight restrictions. |
| PR6 | To support these changes, regular enforcement should be undertaken. To catch at least some of these who speed in this area. |
| PR8 | 20mph is too slow. To go so slowly cars have to be in a low gear which produces more noise and pollution. How about 25mph as a compromise? |
| PR9 | I am saying no to parking restrictions as I believe we all have a difficult time parking at any given time. Some families' homes have more than 2 cars and so all permit holder ‘B’ have to struggle to find somewhere to park even if we have to pay on the machines, not fair. |
| PR10 | I would propose that the yellow line is extended from Kelvedon Close up to Tudor Drive. There is often congestion, and buses and emergency vehicles have difficulty in getting through. |
| PR11 | 20mph zone is an appropriate speed but please, no more speed bumps they damage my car. Please consider cameras other calming measures. |
| PR12 | I contently live on the section of road which is 20mph. This restriction is completely ignored in the night and early morning. As a result I have really been run over multiple times, seen dead cats which have been run over and can’t easily get my car out. The 20mph must be enforced properly. |
| PR15 | I would also suggest a zebra crossing over Wyndham Rd as this is where many children cross the main road (Park Rd) for St Agatha and Latchmere schools. |
| PR21 | The off street parking between Dagmar Rd and Elm Rd either needs the curbs lowered or road raised to stop damaging the cars as the curbs are very high and have to be mounted to park in the spaces. |
| PR22 | I live opposite Alexandra School in Park Rd, and there is a sign outside my flat says 20mph, no one takes any notice of this at all, so how will this be enforced. |
| PR27 | In Park Rd there should be longer parking periods in the free bays, trying to attract trade in the area is difficult enough, we need all the help we can get as small shops. |
| PR28 | We believe this proposal will improve safety and reduce pollution. We look forward to seeing further detail on how the 20mph limit will be enforced as the current speed limit is not always adhered to. |
| PR29 | The 20mph zone, should be from Elton Rd to Kingston Hill. |
| PR32 | 20mph would be wonderful! |
| PR41 | Please sort out uneven road surface on main road opposite Bat Gdns. Heavy buses and lorries going over this spot causes houses to shudder! It has been fixed once but still an issue. |
| PR43 | I think this is a very important measure that will improve safety and encourage a stronger sense of community. |
| PR46 | 20mph: I would support another mini 20mph zone (may be only during school rush hour) but do not feel the full distance would be necessary. Also it would encourage racing at Tudor/Park Rd roundabout. Yellow lines: All building work at Bat Gdns is now finished so there should be less builders parking, so no need to have restrictions. |
| PR48 | Park Rd is such a busy road, with far too much traffic all day. Drivers frequently speed, making it unsafe for pedestrians. The double decker buses also seem far too much for the road to handle too. Anything to cut down speed/traffic/noise will be welcomed! |
| PR51 | I feel that the yellow line should meet up with the lines that comes out of Bockhampton Rd into Park Rd so that both sides of the road can be used by vehicles. At the moment cars and buses move to give way to oncoming traffic. An accident waiting to happen, I would not be against double yellow lines. |
| PR54 | 20mph isn’t enforceable, Council vehicles and buses tend not to obey the limit already in place. It is a main route avoiding Kingston to go to Richmond. A 20mph section from Kings Rd to Kelvedon Close may be an option. |
| PR55 | We live on the corner of Bertram Road so have no parking space outside our home. Any further parking restrictions puts us to more inconvenience. We should like to be in a controlled parking zone to make it fairer for residents. |
| PR57 | We would prefer that no vehicle at any time should park between Bat Gardens and Kelvedon Close (except in an emergency) |
| PR58 | This can only work with speed enforcement measures, NOT speed bumps as they damage adjoining buildings. Need speed cameras to enforce limits, especially near schools. |
| PR59 | 20mph: |
| | • NICE says 20mph speeds protect children and is cost effectively |
| | • NICE reminds local authorities that 20mph offers huge public health gains. |
| | • Park Rd is residential and used by many pedestrians, especially children going to and from primary schools nearby. 20mph zone would help protect safety of pedestrians as well as their health. |
| | • I have a particular concern for current safety of many children waiting at over-crowded Wyndham Rd bus stop, Richmond direction, in the morning with speeding traffic or even traffic at 30mph. |
| | Paid parking zones here push commuters to park on Park Rd. We need more parking spaces for residents. Parking by Bat Gardens and Kelvedon Close also sores to slow down the traffic in the Richmond direction, so I believe the yellow line and parking restriction should be removed. Why would restrictions be to 18:30 when zone ends at 15:00?? |
| PR60 | Could you re-visit extending resident parking to Bertram Rd and Upper Park Rd? Many cars are left in Bertram Rd for long periods of time, leaving no spaces for residents in Park |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rd, Wyndham Rd.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PR61</strong></td>
<td>Please consider double yellow lines between 110-118 Park Rd. The road is very narrow and cars parked outside block the road and cross our driveways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PR63</strong></td>
<td>By reducing the speed limit it would be nice if other traffic calming measures were used than speed bumps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PR64</strong></td>
<td>Double yellow line to stop parking between Latchmere Rd and Tudor drive on Park Rd, especially as large vans and caravans park on this stretch, between Latchmere Rd bus stop and Tudor Drive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KR1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | ♦ 20mph limit and speed humps are not mutually exclusive.  
|   | ♦ 20mph already in force in part of Park Rd??  
|   | ♦ No to speed humps because of increase in nitrogen oxide levels due to deceleration and acceleration.  
|   | ♦ You seen to be behind the curve in engineering research. |
| **SC1** | Also, urgent road resurfacing is required between Tudor Drive and Latchmere Rd outside Stable Close, heavy goods vehicles and buses hit the broken surface and shudder the houses. This is urgent! |
| **WR1** | Due to bottleneck I would extend the yellow line to run from Bockhampton Rd to Kelveden Rd. |
| **TD5** | I have been a frequent user of the road – as a motorist, pedestrian and occasional cyclist – for over 20 years and cannot see what real benefit there would be to any road users or residents in reducing the speed limit from the current 30mph (there is already a 20mph speed limit outside Alexandra School). The current traffic calming measures appear to be perfectly adequate to ensure the requisite level of road safety without further restricting vehicular mobility.  
|   | I understand the proposal has its origins in comments made by residents as part of a consultation on traffic management measures in Park Rd in June 2015. (It appears from the report to Committee on 1/10/15 that 4 residents suggested a 20mph speed limit even though this was not one of the options they were being consulted on. The suggestion presumably related to just that part of Park Road upon which they were being consulted, i.e from Kings Rd to Latchmere Rd.) However, no reasons were put forward to justify such a proposal on road safety, or any other grounds, and the subsequent report to Committee confirmed that a speed survey and collisions data for the last 5 years showed that “there is no evidence to suggest there is either a speeding or accident problem in Park Rd”.  
|   | The updated speed survey annexed to appendix B of the 25/01/17 report shows the current mean speed of (northbound) traffic in Park Rd is only slightly above 20mph and assuming that there is still no evidence of a speed or accident problem in Park Rd I find it difficult to see what other justification there could be for spending the estimated £5000 of public money on the proposal. |
| **TC1** | They do not really apply to us as we live the other end of Park Rd, so I do support the proposals of parking restrictions. |
| **TR 2** | Stop changing things for the sake of change, it all costs money for no improvement. Wasting money on this sort of thing while children in schools don’t have enough text books. |
| **TR3** | I support the new measure but feel the Tudor Drive will suffer a consequence so I would like for these points to be considered: |
- Tudor Drive becomes ‘Pay and Display’ parking zone.
- Tudor Drive also has 20 mph zone – as vans frequently go too fast on this long road.
- New traffic calming such as zebra crossing introduced on junction of Tudor Drive and Park Rd, as too many children exposed to fast cars that do not stop.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TR4</th>
<th>Slowing down traffic will contribute to an increase in pollution in the Tudor Drive and surrounding roads.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PcR1</td>
<td>Speed surfing between 20mp and 30mph are becoming too frequent along Park Rd, this a dangerous problem, where parking is permitted helps to slow speeds. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR3</td>
<td>Yes for 20mph. On the straight stretch of Park Road that goes past Glenville Rd, people accelerate sharply, especially in the evening. I have seen at least two accidents on this stretch, one of which was bad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR1</td>
<td>This road is very dangerous for pedestrians. Some sidewalks are too narrow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BwR3</td>
<td>We are extremely concerned about parking congestion in Brunswick Rd, with lots of vans/cars being parked for a day that do not belong to the street residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR2</td>
<td>Long overdue!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR1</td>
<td>Should have speed humps or make New Rd a one way road, it is the smallest bur busiest cut through road to and from Park Rd and Queens Rd. 2 signs wouldn’t cost much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KH5</td>
<td>Please add Kinston Hill and Manorgate Rd for 20mph speed limit, and add some zebras on them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee
6 July 2017

Mill Street - Representations to Traffic Management Order for No Waiting At Any Time double yellow lines
Report by Head of Environment

Call-in deadline Thursday 27 July 2017 (ten working days after the meeting)

Purpose
To consider representations raised to a Traffic Management Order (TMO P-248), which proposes the implementation of No Waiting “At Any Time” restrictions (double yellow lines) on the east side of Mill Street.

Recommendations:
To resolve that:

1. the representations received in response to the publication of the Traffic Management Order (TMO P-248), as set out in paragraphs 10 to 14 are noted; and

2. the objections are set aside, and the making of the Traffic Management Order (TMO P-248) for the new double yellow lines, as shown in Annex 1, is approved.

Key Points

A. Concerns have been raised by residents regarding restricted accessibility in Mill Street. Single yellow lines (8am - 6.30pm Monday - Saturday) were previously introduced to help improve accessibility and the free flow of traffic in the road.

B. A Traffic Management Order (TMO P-248) to introduce “at any time” (double yellow line) waiting restrictions to replace the existing single yellow lines on both sides of Mill Street was published on the 7 April 2017. The affected area is shown in Annex 1.

C. Officers have investigated the road, and consider that outside of the operational times of the existing single yellow line waiting restrictions in Mill Street (8am to 6.30pm Monday to Saturday), cars can be observed parking on the east side of the street. When combined with the carriageway width (ranging between 4.25 metres - 5 metres), vehicle access and traffic flow are severely affected. It is noted that there is an emergency vehicle access problem which needs to be addressed. Photographs can be seen at Annex 2.

D. Three objections, supported by several residents, and one letter of support were received by the closing date for the responses on 28 April 2017.
Context

1. As demands on the public highway change over time it is important that the Authority reviews and amends the traffic management arrangements, in order to help maintain acceptable levels of road safety and traffic flow.

2. The amendment and / or introduction of waiting restrictions remains an important and effective measure commonly used to retain and / or enhance road safety, emergency vehicle access and the general free flow of traffic.

3. A resident has expressed concern that the existing waiting restrictions in Mill Street do not always provide for the safe access of emergency vehicles, and at times restrict the flow of traffic.

4. Given that the original waiting restrictions are no longer serving their intended purpose officers have developed the proposed scheme, as shown in Annex 1, which will help improve accessibility and lower the safety risks.

Proposals

5. Officers and members visited the site and assessed the issues that had been raised as concerns, and concluded that the most appropriate solution was to convert the existing restrictions into no waiting “At Any Time” (double yellow lines) on the east side of Mill Street, as shown in Annex 1.

6. In arriving at this conclusion a key consideration was that the Emergency Services need to have access at all times.

Consultations

7. The draft TMO was published on 7 April 2017 with a closing date for comments of 28 April 2017, and street notices were placed at appropriate locations along the road.

8. Three objections, representing the views of several residents on the street, were received and there was one letter of support.

Objections Received

9. Three objections were received with residents raising the following concerns;

   Objection 1:

   *Double yellow lines along the proposed stretch will force cars to park further into the street, which is also quite narrow and also into the surrounding streets making parking harder at weekends and evenings.*

   *Possible solutions could be.*

   ● Allow parking on a portion of the pavement, as is seen in other streets within the borough*
● Reducing the proposed length of the double yellow lines just to that around the pinch point.
● There are concerns about the fire access to the street, from the South end. The does seem to be access from the North end, though the restriction. i.e. from Fairfield South to the boundary of number 2 / 2A
● Removal of the overhanging vegetation from number 2A at this critical point.
● Look into whether access from the north end of the street could be set as a viable default route for the fire services.
● We would like the single yellow line restrictions to remain, as this gives us, as residents the flexibility to do the following outside restricted parking hours:

  • To park outside our property on the single yellow, when our resident parking bays are full;
  • To allow visitors to park outside our property, instead of double parking in front of resident bays;
  • To wash and clean our vehicles in front of our properties;
  • To load and board our vehicles outside our property – particularly when we have little children;
  • Instead we would rather the unnecessary paving and shrubs across the road from the first block of Dolphin Court flats, (just beside the school fence) be reduced or removed to allow more room for vehicles to pass – particular larger vehicles like garbage and delivery trucks:

**Officer response**

10. While it is in the residents interest to preserve the limited on-street parking, safety is a priority concern. Investigations have shown that the activities listed above, in conjunction with commuter parking, would restrict emergency vehicle access, as well as impinging on traffic flow. The proposed scheme for the implementation of “at any time” waiting restrictions (double yellow lines), is the minimum intervention needed to ensure that improved and safer access can be provided at all times.

11. With regard to the issue raised by the objector, the Authority will consider this as a separate matter, and will address it at a later date. The purpose of the report is solely to deal with objections to the TMO.
Objection 2:

I am writing to object to the extent of the proposal to replace a length of single yellow lines with doubles in Mill Street. The grounds for my objection are as follows:

1. I consider the length of the line change to be excessive and reach far beyond any requirement to improve access. I accept that the road narrows outside number 2a, however, it widens immediately after this property and Emergency vehicle access can be achieved if parking was to continue to be allowed beyond this point.

2. By extending the doubles beyond what would be necessary for access the impact will be to take away valuable parking spaces in a road where parking is not easy to be had. I use this parking myself for my family members and friends who come to visit, for loading and unloading and for parking overnight after work. My neighbours also use it for similar reasons.

3. Aside from the negative impact on myself, other local people make regular use of this parking for reasons such as visiting the Cocoanut Pub / Restaurant, the Garage in Mill Street, a running club, other users of the Fairfield Park such as the visiting football players. An excessive removal of parking spaces will have a negative on these local people and businesses as well.

4. There is an existing emergency vehicle access route into Mill Street at the southern end of the road. This is in the form of gate outside the Stanley Picker Gallery. It is clearly marked “KEEP CLEAR EMERGENCY VEHICLE ACCESS”. This access allows for unrestricted access to Mill Street coming through the Middle Mill halls of residence car park accessed from Portland Road. The existence of this access could be said to negate any need to make any alterations to the road markings on the road as they stand.

5. Removal of spaces at this end of Mill Street would likely push the problem further down the street where it really does narrow in parts and cause all kinds of obstructions to people’s driveways. In light of my aforementioned points, and as a resident that lives directly opposite the line concerned and someone who would be significantly and unnecessarily impacted by the proposal, I would ask you to review this proposal.

I am not a road designer, however, I am a qualified Engineer and read Civil Engineering at University and from my regular observations of this section road over the 12 years I have lived here I would offer the following alternatives:

1. Double yellow lines from the entrance of the road up to number 2, at a point where measurements show the road is wide enough, would
allow for any emergency vehicle to line up and pass any parked cars. This would also allow number 2a unrestricted access to their driveway at all times.

2. Allow designated on pavement parking for the length of the proposed double yellow lines. The pavement is wide for this section and as there is limited pavement down the length of the road pedestrians on Mill Street rarely use the pavements and prefer to walk down the road.

3. Retain the parking as it stands as there already exists Emergency Vehicle access from the other end of the road.

4. Narrow the pavement width at the pinch point outside number 2a and retain the yellow lines as they stand.

5. Have the deep hanging vine cut away from the wall outside number 2a that currently hangs significantly into the road and increases the perception of narrowing. This will reveal a kerb of approximately 30 cm depth and potentially provide the width needed to get a fire engine through with wheels on the kerb if necessary. I write to object to the proposal to convert the single yellow line restrictions to double yellow lines in Mill Street, Kingston.

Such move would not serve the residents of Mill Street.

This is because: Parking is limited; and many residents do not have garages.

Officer response

12. This objection makes similar points to those in the first objection discussed above, and and such the response provided in paragraph 10 applies here. The proposals are intended to alleviate the current safety risk of restricted emergency vehicle access and traffic flow, which are considered to outweigh the objection.

13. The gate referred to is on private land, and it is highlighting that people should not park in front of the gates. It is also noted that the access into the Kingston university site from Portland Road is blocked by a barrier. It is considered that this would not be the route followed by a fire engine if attending an incident in Mill Street/Fairfield Place.

Objection 3:

- I would like to strongly object to the proposed introduction of double yellow lines for Mill Street. I have been living here since 1962, and never seen a problem. This scheme would obviously impact on the residents of Mill Street, friends and relatives would normally park along the road after 6:30pm Monday to Saturday and all day on a Sunday under the existing single yellow line rules.
why can’t the council flip the existing restrictions, so the fire brigade and other emergency services can use the footway in order to get access to the street if they need to.

Officer Response

14. This objection again makes similar same points as the previous two objections discussed above, and so the responses are the same. The proposals are intended to alleviate the current safety risk of restricted emergency vehicle access and traffic flow, which are considered to outweigh the objection.

15. In response to the second point, the footway has not been designed to take such weight, therefore, is not considered appropriate solution. times, including weekends, when accessibility can be unacceptably limited.

Support Received

16. One letter of support was received where a resident raised the following points:

As a resident of Mill Street since 2002 I would like to offer my support to the extension of the double yellow lines as proposed on your submitted plans.

Over the past 10 years there has been a noticeable increase in casual car parking on the street especially on Sundays at the northern end of the road. The huge volume of cars has had a detrimental effect on our quality of life and on access into what should be a quiet residential street. I have witnessed ambulances being unable to access the properties of the older residents because of the obstruction created by parked cars and it if there was a fire further along the street there would be no way a large fire engine could gain access. All day on Sundays we are subjected to heavy traffic, congestion and all the pollution and noise associated with this traffic. The congestion created has made it particularly dangerous for residents because of the narrowness of the road and because we don’t have footpaths along the edges of the street. My house (number 8) has no footpath outside and my gate opens straight onto the road and on Sundays parked cars.

Arguments from residents (that are not directly affected by the location of the double yellow lines) that suggest this will restrict them or their visitors ability to freely park on a Sunday are simply unfounded. At present there is no possibility of parking with the unrestricted level of non-residents parking that occurs currently. So problematic has the situation now become I am prepared to support extended parking restrictions outside my own house despite me not having alternative off street parking.

I urge you to follow through these proposals and not be swayed into shortening the length of the planned restrictions or into abandoning the idea altogether.
Options and Recommendations

17. With regards to TMO, the options available to the Committee are as follows:-

- To set aside the objections set out above,
- To accept the objections and not make the traffic order,
- To note the objections and modify the final order to reflect the Committee’s decision.

18. Officers consider that the proposals will ensure emergency service access at all times, however it is highlighted that the proposals are only waiting restrictions and would not preclude drivers from stopping to load/unload goods for short periods of time. The recommendation is that the objections are set aside and the TMO implemented at the earliest opportunity.

Timescale

19. If the objections are set aside at this committee, it is anticipated that the works will be carried out by early September 2017.

Resource Implications

20. The scheme is estimated to cost £1,250 and is to be paid from the Kingston Town Neighbourhood Traffic Management Revenue budget.

Legal Implications

21. The legal implications associated with this report are set out in the options section of the report at paragraph 16.

Risk Assessment

22. Officer’s opinion is that the current restrictions present an access concern, in particular for emergency vehicles. Following site visits and assessments, it is therefore recommended that the introduction of “at any time” waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) is approved.

Equalities Impact Assessment

23. There is an overarching EQIA in place that covers LIP Schemes, and as such individual assessments are not required.

Network Implications

24. It is considered that the whilst the proposals will reduce the available on street parking (during unrestricted times), the yellow lines will allow emergency vehicle access and improve traffic flow.
Environmental Implications

25. It is not considered that there will be any environmental implications arising from these proposals.

Background papers

- Draft Traffic Management Order
- Letters to residents regarding draft TMO and Public Notice 7 April 2017
- Emails/letters of objection

held by author of the report - Younes Hamade, Senior Professional Traffic Engineer, tel 020 8547 5922 email: younes.hamade@kingston.gov.uk
Photographs of Mill Street
Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee
6 July 2017
Standing Order 32 urgent action - Enforcement 1 Nightingale Mews, KT1 2NS
Report by Head of Corporate Governance

**Purpose**

To report urgent action taken under the Standing Order 32 procedure concerning the unauthorised change of use of the dwellinghouse into 6 self contained flats without planning permission. Planning permission has been sought and refused for the use and a planning appeal dismissed.

**For information**

1. The Head of Planning and Regeneration in conjunction with the Chair of this Committee, has taken urgent action under Standing Order 32 of the Council’s Constitution. It is a requirement that all urgent authority exercised under Standing Order 32 is reported to the next meeting of the relevant Committee for information.

2. The breaches of planning control consists of the conversion of the property at 1 Nightingale Mews into 6 self contained flats without planning permission. Planning permission has been refused for the use and a planning appeal dismissed.

3. The urgent action was required to take enforcement action and prior to this meeting due to the enforcement timescales involved.

4. The requirements of the enforcement notice(s) served under urgent action were to:
   a) Cease the use the site as flats
   b) Remove all kitchen facilities from all but one room of the overall property
   c) Remove all resultant debris arising from compliance with the above
   d) Require that the enforcement notice is complied within 6 months from the date of serving.

**Background papers** - held by Marian Morrison, (Democratic Services Officer, marian.morrison@kingston.gov.uk tel 202 8547 5021 - Standing Order form