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AGENDA

Questions and public participation

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

1. Questions

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

2. Apologies for absence and attendance of substitute members

3. Declarations of Interest

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

4. Minutes

To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 7 November 2017

5. Petitions

To receive any petitions from residents.

6. Neighbourhood Manager's Report

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

7. Presentation and discussion on Role of Community Rangers

8. Roads East of Richmond Road - Results of Consultation

To consider the results of the consultation and determine the way forward

9. Park Road objection to Traffic Management Order

To consider the objection and determine the way forward
10. Kings Road - introduction of traffic management measures  
Appendix C

To consider the proposals, agree consultation and the formation of a working group with local residents to discuss further options

11. Work Programme  
Appendix D

To note the work programme

12. URGENT ITEMS AUTHORISED BY THE CHAIR

13. 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)

Dates of Future Meetings

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

Wednesday 14 March 2018

Neighbourhood Conversation

Thursday 22 February 2018
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.
Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee  
24 January 2018  
Roads east of Richmond Road - response to petition  
Report by Head of Environment

Call-in deadline 5pm on Wednesday 7 February 2018 (ten working days after the meeting)

Purpose  
To consider the results of the local public consultation on the proposal for a Permit Parking Area (PPA) in roads east of Richmond Road, and agree the way forward.

Recommendations:
To Resolve that -
1. the results of the consultation and the comments received as shown in Annex 1 & Annex 2 are noted;
2. the Committee approves the introduction of PPA (Permit Parking Area) scheme in Latchmere Road between Richmond Road and Latchmere Lane, Durlston Road, St Albans, Studland and Earl Gardens as showing on Annex 3; and
3. residents are informed of the Committee’s decision.

Key Points

A. On 7 November 2017 the Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee approved a consultation on the implementation of a PPA. it is proposed that the PPA would operate between 11 am - 2 pm, from Mondays to Saturdays. It is expected that this would significantly reduce the all day commuter parking. It would be reviewed after twelve months of operation.

B. In November / December local consultation was carried out with the residents as shown in Annex 3. 421 letters were delivered, and a total of 219 (52%) responses were received. The results for each question are as follows:

- **Question 1:** Do you think there are parking issues in your street? 179 (82%) agree that there is a parking issue in their road, and 38 (18%) disagreed;
- **Question 2:** Do you support the proposal to introduce a PPA in your road? 153 (70%) support the introduction of PPA, while 63 (29%) are against.
- **Question 3:** Do you support the proposals to introduce a PPA operating 11am to 2pm Monday to Saturday? 145 (66%) agreed on the proposed operating hours of the PPA, while 72 (33%) disagreed.
This report outlines the result of the local consultation and seeks the Committee’s resolution on the way forward.

**Context**

1. Consideration of the parking issues for Roads east of Richmond Road (RERR) came about following the introduction of the CPZ in Albany Park Road, Albany Mews and Bank Lane in June 2014.

2. In February 2015 the Committee considered the CPZ consultation results for RERR, and took the view that as the response rate was 55%, of which 37% supported the CPZ and 63% were against, no further action was to be taken at that time. This led to two petitions in June and September 2016, an initial officer review and further consultation was agreed in November 2016.

3. The consultation results were reported back to Committee in July 2017, and the report consider responses to the introduction of Permit Parking Area (PPA), CPZ, or a ‘do nothing’ option. The response rate was 64%, and of those 54% supported the introduction of CPZ and 46% were against. The Committee agreed to do nothing and to undertake consultation on the removal of CPZ in Albany Park Road.

4. However this led to two further petitions. These were considered by Committee on 5 September 2017, where it agreed to set up a working group (i.e. public engagement) to explore the implications of PPA, and report back to the November Committee with feedback; and any further action about Albany Park Road.

5. The engagement meeting took place on 1 November attended by 14 residents representing these roads. At the meeting a presentation was given outlining some background information, explaining the different types of parking scheme available to alleviate all day commuters parking problems, and finally pros and cons for CPZ and PPA.

6. On 7 November 2017, Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee considered the outcome of the engagement public meeting, and approved a local consultation on the implementation of a PPA in roads east of Roads as shown on Annex 3. It is proposed that the PPA would operate between 11 am - 2 pm, from Mondays to Saturdays. It is expected that this would significantly reduce the all day commuter parking. It would be reviewed after twelve months of operation.
Consultations

7. Between 24 November and 18 December local consultation was carried out with the residents of roads east of Richmond Road as shown in Annex 2. 421 consultation letters were delivered by hand. A total of 219 responses were received giving a response rate of 52%. The overall result for each question are as follows:

**Question 1**: Do you think there are parking issues in your street? 179 (82%) agree and 38 (18%) disagreed.

**Question 2**: Do you support the proposal to introduce a PPA in your road? 153 (70%) support the introduction of PPA, while 63 (29%) are against.

**Question 3**: Do you support the proposals to introduce a PPA operating 11am to 2pm Monday to Saturday? 145 (66%) agreed on the proposed operating hours of the PPA, while 72 (33%) disagreed.

8. The results received from each road are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>No. Delivered</th>
<th>No. Returned</th>
<th>Q1 Yes</th>
<th>Q1 No</th>
<th>Q2 Yes</th>
<th>Q2 No</th>
<th>Q3 Yes</th>
<th>Q3 No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latchmere Rd (between Richmond Rd &amp; Latchmere Lane),</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durlston Rd</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Albans Rd</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studland Rd</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earle Gdns</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Rd (between 186 -234 even)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No address Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments received**

9. The Consultation included a section for respondents to provide additional comments. Going through the comments received, some of the points raised in the comments were: if PPA is introduced that will address issues such as removing dumped cars, all day parking by outsiders, size of vehicles and hours of restrictions. Regarding the other comments such as “the cost of the permit, concerns over people who does not have access to internet specially who wants to use it for ad hoc parking, not providing enough bays for local businesses”. These comments are always raised when there is a parking scheme been consulted on. In order to be able to maintain a sustainable parking scheme, the scheme needs to be self-funded, otherwise the Council cannot maintain it. The cost of the permit will be used for this purpose and, comparing to other London boroughs the cost is considered to be reasonable.

10. Finally, comments were made regarding blocking driveways. The proposed scheme will not have road markings, however, our experience shows that the parking scheme will remove all day commuters and thereby increase parking capacity in these roads. It is not envisaged that such behaviour would occur.

11. Please see Annex 2 for all the comments received.
Timescale

12. Subject to the Committee's resolution, design details and publication of the Traffic management order could be done by March 2018.

13. Subject to no objection being received on the publication of the traffic management order, the scheme could be implemented in June/July 2018.

Resource Implications

14. The scheme will be funded from RBK capital.

Legal Implications

15. 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

16. 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

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

Network Implications

18. 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.

Environmental Implications and Air Quality

19. 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 -**
Previous committee’s meeting
Result of local consultation
Comments received

**held by author  Younes Hamade**
**Author of report  Younes Hamade, 020 8547 5922,**
younes.hamade@kingston.gov.uk

Petitions received
Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee July 2017 and September 2017, Reports and Minutes
## Annex 1

**Latchmere Rd (between Richmond Rd & Latchmere Lane), Durlston Rd, Studland Rd, ST Albans Rd, Earl Gdns & Richmond Rd (between 186-234 even) - Proposed Permit Parking Area (PPA)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. Delivered</th>
<th>No. Returned</th>
<th>Question 1: Commuter parking issues?</th>
<th>Question 2: Support PPA?</th>
<th>Question 3: (PPA) operating 11am to 2pm Mon - Sat?</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>52</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durlston Rd</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Albans Rd</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studland Rd</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earle Gdns</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Rd</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>421</strong></td>
<td><strong>219</strong></td>
<td><strong>179</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>153</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>52%</strong></td>
<td><strong>82%</strong></td>
<td><strong>70%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 1:** Do you agree there is commuter-parking problem in your road?

**Question 2:** Do you agree with the introduction of Permit Parking Area (PPA) in your road?

**Question 3:** Do you agree with the hours of restrictions for the proposed Permit Parking Area (PPA) in your road to be 11am – 2pm, Monday – Saturday, then to be reviewed after one year?
### Q4: If you agree there is commuter-parking problem in your road and you said No to question 2 or question 3 could you please let us know why?

<p>| LR1 | Many of the commuter cars park right up to corners on all roads making it more hazardous for both pedestrians and cars and cyclists. The area has effectively become a “known commuter car park” |
| LR2 | We have a major commuter parking problem and I very much hope this goes ahead quickly |
| LR3 | I strongly support the implementation of a PPA on the basis set out in the letter from Mr Hamade. Steps to tackle the chronic parking issues in this area are long overdue. I agree with the concept of a limited duration trial followed by a review. |
| LR4 | Commuters and shoppers are problematic. Perhaps extend PPA to Sunday’s too. |
| LR5 | It is not just about commuters, there are quite a few cars just dumped in spaces on these roads which take up valuable spaces. These cars are not currently illegally parked and therefore cannot be moved by police et. PPA is a great idea. |
| LR7 | Parking is a nightmare. I sincerely hope this plan happens very soon! |
| LR8 | Commuter parking is evidenced by my road, having more parking spaces at weekends. During the week, Bona Fide Trades people and visitors cannot find parking because of the commuters and residents with multiple cars hogging the road and not using their drives! |
| LR11 | Not just commuter parking – car dumping, long-term/ holiday parking, commercial vehicles. I think this should be extended into Latchmere Lane, but overall much better proposal than CPZ. Before implementation please yellow line the corner of Latchmere Rd and Studland Rd to stop cars parking over the pedestrian kerb-drop. |
| LR12 | Some kind of parking zone/ PPA is essential to stop commuters and Kingston shoppers parking in our area. |
| LR13 | I think as I have always said, this will just push the problem further down the road. It also means that we will have to pay for friends to park at this time |
| LR14 | The hours of restriction should be changed from 10am till 4pm, not 10am – 2pm. |
| LR15 | I do not want restricted parking at the weekends. Mon – Fri only suffice. |
| LR16 | In general, we believe that a PPA scheme is the ideal solution to the parking issue. However, we would like to see this extended to include Sundays and possibly slightly longer hours (eg 10am -3pm) |
| LR17 | Just too many cars in the area. Parking at weekends is only marginally easier. |
| LR18 | I am fed up with persistent consultations on parking when the majority say no. What a waste of Council money. |
| LR19 | I don’t wish to have a PPA on Latchmere road and propose you evaluate on a road by road basis. Most houses on Latchmere Rd have a driveway, so don’t think this is necessary. |
| LR20 | We occasionally can’t park outside our house and then it will not be more than 50yards away. Only once or twice a year do we have to park in another street. We feel that a |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANNEX 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPA is ‘sledge hammer to crack a nut’ and that it will cause more inconvenience than we have with the current parking situation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR21</td>
<td>I don’t believe there should be bays and please can this be the last of it. Feels like the Council are trying to wear us down! Thanks This is not a significant problem in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR22</td>
<td>Latchmere Rd is packed from 7:30am up until late afternoon. Commuters desperate for free parking, parked inconsiderably overhanging driveways, creating dangerous crossing for the large number of school children in the area, the road cannot be cleaned properly, the pavement hasn’t been replaced, garages and rent a car use the road to keep vehicles for weeks. Deliveries are next to impossible as drivers cannot park and block the road for long leading to rude behaviours from blocked drivers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR23</td>
<td>I see commuter parking around 6:30am and collecting their cars after 7pm, also people from Staunton Road parking cars and walking to their houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR24</td>
<td>The situation on the road is currently intolerable. I am more frequently having access to my own driveway blocked by commuter parking when leave their cars all day and often longer. I am forced to take my children to club via public transport, I so welcome the PPA. It can’t come soon enough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR26</td>
<td>The problem is (or seems) primarily due to commuters or Kingston workers parking all day. Any restricted hours will prevent this. The lack of any control also means there are dumped cars, commercial vehicles and appalling parking contraventions. This has been required for a long time. Too long!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR27</td>
<td>We are mainly concerned with the number of cars which are parked outside our houses and not moved for days or weeks – the drivers do not live in this road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR28</td>
<td>We would also like to ensure that parking for teachers at Latchmere school is given priority and that arrangements are put in place to ensure they are able to park close to the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR29</td>
<td>Parking is intolerable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR30</td>
<td>We strongly agree there is a problem – we have a double driveway which people regularly overhang by as much as 50% of their car, making getting in and off our drive sometimes difficult and sometimes impossible. This can be hazardous for pedestrians too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR31</td>
<td>Both flats always use off street double parking bay, but constant selfish parking makes it very difficult to drive onto driveway as cars park over the dropped kerb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR33</td>
<td>This problem is becoming increasingly urgent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR35</td>
<td>The issue is commuter, residents, parents of Latchmere, Fernhill, TKA and Tiffin Girls school. Given there are to be no painted bays the cost of £90 per car is exceptionally high.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR36</td>
<td>It sounds as though the parking permit, and particularly visitor permits, would be cumbersome to administer and expensive. Students from Kingston College, who make up a good portion of illegal and selfish parkings, would not respects office hours and even harder to dislodge when they obstruct drives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR37</td>
<td>The fact that the permits would not be transferable between vehicles puts us off because of lost – we are a 3 vehicles household and all park of drive at various times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR38</td>
<td>I really don’t want restrictions on the parking. It seems so unfair to have to pay to park outside your own house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR 40</td>
<td>Latchmere Lane has more of a problem due to it being narrower with less spaces for passing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| LR41 | • It would make sense for visitor permits to be sold in fixed unites of one three – low session (i.e. one day)  
• Please ensure that residents can buy visitor permits without having to buy an annual permit first. This would allow some of us to park on our drives free most of the time unless we need to buy a permit. |
**LR44**  |  PPA, not CPZ, better option.
---|---
**LR45**  |  Our section of Latchmere Rd suffers from commuter, holiday and business (white van) parking all day/ all week/ 2 weeks respectively.
---|---
**LR46**  |  This is important: please consider allowing residents to park across their driveways at any time without having to purchase a permit. Our council taxes are high enough, and we should not have to pay extra to park across our driveways.
---|---
**LR48**  |  The main parking problem times are around school drop off and pick up times. Also, commuters’ parking takes up many spaces on weekdays.
---|---
**LR51**  |  We strongly support the introduction of the PPA. The hours of operation are too restricted as non residents, will feel they can get away without paying. 9:30am to 5:30pm would seem more appropriate as this would ensure this be residents only.
---|---
**LR52**  |  Consideration must be taken into account for the local schools – Latchmere and St Agatha’s to allow for teaching staff to park near to the school.

**SAR1**  |  Our children attend Latchmere school, our eldest walks there on his own. Almost every morning cars are parked close to the street corner edges so that looking out for passing cars is very difficult. On many occasions our off street parking plot is parked in by commuters’ cars.
---|---
**SAR2**  |  Double yellow lines are necessary at the end/ corner of each road – too dangerous for young kids. Re question about hours of restrictions – no issue with time being extended. There is also a definite commuter parking issue/ retail shopping worker parking issue.
---|---
**SAR4**  |  Double yellow lines on all corners.
---|---
**SAR6**  |  We support introduction of PPA as outlined. Signage/ marked bays would be minimal and therefore have less adverse impact in conservation areas whilst still addressing the commuter parking issue.
---|---
**SAR7**  |  The hours of restriction should be considered for extension during one year review. Recommend the PPA “typical hours” of 8-18:30” set out in the factsheet. Parking on corners is a problem. Please consider applying double yellow lines at the corners, to discourage/ prevent the dangerous parking. Please put the PPA in place as quickly as possible!
---|---
**SAR8**  |  Yes, it is a problem, not just commuters but now Studland Rd has become a dumping ground for abandoned vehicles (quite a few in the last 2-3 yrs).
---|---
**SAR10**  |  If the majority of residents on St Albans Rd (Richmond Rd end) agree to the PPA, but others such as Latchmere Rd do not(because they have crossovers) – can the PPA be applied to St Albans Rd in isolation – we are desperate for a solution!
---|---
**SAR11**  |  We would like longer operating hours, the standard 8am -6:30pm considered at the 12 month review.
---|---
**SAR12**  |  PPA is much needed. Commuters, shoppers and car dumpers have created an increasingly worse parking nightmare for residents. We think PPA is a perfect solution and hope that it is implemented as soon as possible. We also hope that after 12 months the hours and days of operation are increased.
---|---
**SAR13**  |  It is not only a commuter parking problem – vehicles are sometimes left for days, or even weeks, without being moved.
---|---
**SAR14**  |  Double yellow lines at the end of the roads would help. Parking right up to the end of roads on corners causes a dangerous problem when trying to turn out of the road.
---|---
**SAR15**  |  Would people with their own driveways have to have a permit, also would any visitors. I have to be able to park across my driveway. The lower end of St Albans Rd have 3 enormous vans parked including a large caravan, they never move and take at least 5 parking spaces.
---|---
**SAR16**  |  Can we please move forward with this. It feels like we are going around in circles for a long time.
| SAR17 | There is also a significant problem with cars being dumped on our roads, often with a few months tax remaining. How will these be policed under the PPA, as they will be certainly unpermitted? |
| SAR18 | Please ensure the 'No campaign is aware they can park across their driveways. This seems to be their only substantial objection. We hope the review after 12 months will increase the hours but this would be a fantastic start. Thank you. |
| SAR19 | The PPA should run from 8am to 4pm Monday to Friday. There is no need to review in a year and the PPA should be permanent. |
| SAR20 | Yellow lines at corner St Albans/ Studland Rd still needed as in CPZ proposal. Not clear how visitors’ permits would work? what is the price of permit? What about unexpected visitors? I preferred the original CPZ scheme. |
| SAR21 | We disagree with the introduction of parking restrictions in these roads. We would like to see the parking restrictions in Albany Park Rd removed before anything is introduced in the proposed roads. |
| SAR22 | Leave it as it is. I don’t want restrictions and signs. A small number of residents appear to be obsessed. |
| SAR23 | I really don’t understand why we get asked, because the (few) with influence won’t leave this alone till they get their way, we already voted NO but what the hell that only democracy. |
| SAR25 | We are not online, therefore too many foreseeable problems with activating parking permits etc. Documents providing visitor permits & costs of these. Do not agree with most restrictions documents. |
| SAR26 | No commercial vehicles should be permitted, overnight parking etc. They are a visibility line hazards. Put double yellow lines at all corners. |
| SAR27 | There is a very definite parking problem on our road with some cars being left for weeks. We need a PPA as soon as possible! |
| SAR28 | A PPA would solve issues such as commuter day parking, long term parking and abandoned cars. Parking problem are seriously affecting many residents’ amenity eg unloading groceries, which would be simple, becomes problematic. There are frequently no spaces what so ever during the day (with the exception of Sundays) the elderly and those with babies and pre-schoolers are hit particularly hard. People are parking too close to junctions which poses a danger to road users and pedestrians. Arguments occur, including foul languages, sometime during school run setting for our local children. The current situation is intolerable and at times I feel like I am held hostage in my own home and it affects my daily routines. This was not the situation when we bought our house in 2010. |
| SAR29 | We are in agreement with the proposed PPA however, Saturday parking is not a problem generally. However, it would probably help to reduce cars left in our roads by weekenders, work vans etc so Mon – Sat is probably the best solution. |
| SAR31 | The PPA will also solve the problem of non residents’ cars being left for many weeks illegally and cars clearly dumped although the car tax is valid. There are additional problems to the primary problem of commuter parking. |
| SAR32 | We agree there is a huge commuter parking problem also long term parking by people going on holiday and travelling to airports etc. There is also evidence of cars being dumped. |
| SAR34 | PPA could be from 9am to 3pm. |
| SAR35 | 3 times in last two weeks my parking space has been blocked . Action is urgently needed. |
| SAR36 | I think the hours of restriction should be longer. It is not just commuters that are the problem, the local school, car dealers and the doctors surgery are also huge problems and too many spaces have been lost to illegal dropped kerbs. |
| SAR38 | Please implement asap. Commuting means I can’t re-park once I have left a space. |
| SAR39 | We regularly have commuters parking anytime from 6am and sitting in their cars with the |
engine running, for up to an hour, just so they can get a parking space. The road is packed with cars during the day and if you move your car you cannot then re-park. The road is definitely different after 7pm.

SAR40 There is a problem even as far from Kingston as I am. I had people corner outside my house for 9and half weeks. I regularly have problems parking outside my house, I think this is because the roads near the two schools (Fernhill & Tiffin) and building of new school (Kingston Academy ) and lack of parking of these schools have pushed parents and teachers to park on Durlston, St Albans and Latchmere Rd.

SAR42 Off street parking should be encouraged through policy. Residents should be able to park on their front drives. PPA is irritating, inconvenient and costly.

SAR43 We have managed to cope without parking restrictions for the past 30years!

SAR45 If I leave a bin out to secure my space when I go out (shopping or visiting garage with blue badge) it is put on pavement and then occupied!

SAR49
- Consultation is premature. Disappointed that Council has proceeded with consultation without meaningful engagement with local residents as promised.
- Information as noted in the notes of the working group engagement meeting – presented as late material for the 7 November 2017 Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee has not been provided, eg impact of yellow lining at junctions, number of spaces allocated as pay and display (not available to residents, results of parking beat surveys, spaces to be allocated for local services (doctors and dentists), permits.
- Disagree with need for restriction for Saturdays.
- Agree with the need for review if implemented.

SAR50 More spaces for 2 hrs parking near doctor and dentist, one hour is not really enough. Or one and half hours perhaps. Definitely reviewed if not working properly and treat the areas’ roads as a whole. Eg. no double yellow lines in Albany Park Rd – the same format as above?

SAR52
- Hours of operation are insufficient – recommend to be 8:30am – 18:30pm
- Richmond Rd residents should be offered either Albany CPZ or rear PPA permits
- Our parking issues are not just commuter – school drop off, teachers, GP and dentist surgery, motor trades, commercial vehicles, sports clubs at Tiffin.

SAR53 The cost of a parking permit should not be the same cost of a permit in other zones where the hours of restriction are longer eg, it should be less as the hours are less. Staff working at Latchmere school should be given permits too, so they can come to work and park. Please also conform that we will be able to purchase visitors vouchers even if we don’t purchase a residents parking permit. Thank you.

SAR55 Why cannot the controlled hours be 8am to 6:30pm, which the neighbourhood factsheet says are the hours ‘between which PPA typically operate’. If the control period is only 11am to 2pm, alien cars could park 3pm and stay to 11am next morning.

SAR56 The hours used to be extended to cover those that go shopping in Kingston town Centre, plus all not helped by the car park at the station being filled with many vans from the near by building works

SAR57 If I am paying £90 for a parking permit, I expect to be covered all day. It is the same cost as a zone B permit and they are cover 8;30am – 6:30pm Mon – Sat. There are lots of tutors working from home and we get a constant flow of parents dropping off children from 3:30 – 6:30pm and parking outside and waiting for their children.

SAR59 I don’t think it will make any difference, part parking across my entrance, I have difficulty sometimes getting in and out.

DR1 We absolutely agree that there is a commuters parking problem in the area.

DR2 The PPA should be for a longer period of time. It is intolerable in our road. It is dangerous
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DR4</td>
<td>We agree with PPA trial but think the hours of 11-2pm is too brief to fully resolve the issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR5</td>
<td>I am not quite sure if 11am -2 pm will stop all day parking, needs good surveillance. It will help schools parents drop off etc, will it help me (78yrs old?) to unload my shopping etc, load up my car for the dump! It must be better than it is! I am willing to pay £90 annually, don’t like using my emails for extra tickets etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR7</td>
<td>I strongly believe a PPA is the best solution to the parking problems in our road and the neighbouring roads, which has been getting progressively worse. Something should also be done to prevent drivers from parking close to junctions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR8</td>
<td>I watch commuters park in Durlston Road every morning and set off either for the town centre, or for the 3 schools on Richmond Rd. Those cars are always there the whole day, not leaving till after 5pm. I look after my twin grandson babies and usually have to park 2 roads away!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR10</td>
<td>Agree with restricting size of vehicles as this will stop long term van parking. More than 2 cars at an address should be subject to an increased charge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR11</td>
<td>Yes there is a commuter parking problem in our road. We prefer the PPA option so as not to reduce number of parking bays and to allow owners to park across their drives/ We also feel this will provide a safer road to live on as currently very congested/gridlocked. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR13</td>
<td>We have experienced extremely difficult parking problems on our road and surrounding roads. We have witnessed people parking specifically in this road to commute to the station; we see them every morning and every evening coming back to their cars. For us it is very difficult because we have very young children and we rarely can park near our house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR17</td>
<td>There is certainly a parking problem and we support the introduction of a PPA, though we would prefer the restriction to be between 9:30 to 11:30 which we believe would be sufficient and more appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR19</td>
<td>Again I am raising the problem we face of our 7.5 metres moterhome which we use during the summer and need to have by our house to pack and unpack when in use. We live here and need a solution please. We only have one car which many others have multiple per household.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR20</td>
<td>I think you should offer alternative means of visitors parking permits other than by online as there is quite an elderly population in my street – not so computer literate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR21</td>
<td>This is the third time you have canvassed our opinion – is it your intention to continue to do this until we have parking control on our street? There are no parking problems on Saturdays and I object to having to pay you more to park my cars. This is just another money making scheme by the Council!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR22</td>
<td>There is a problem as Kingston has three schools in a row and no parking for them. It is only drop and pick up times that are really bad. Otherwise times busy , some not, I will not pay to park my car - Kingston Council made this problem and I hope not to just make more money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR23</td>
<td>This plan would in some ways be far worse than the other idea (CPZ). Someone who park off the road would not have the protection of times indicating ‘Don’t park here’. There was talk of painting white lines for the dropped kerbs in Durlston Rd - this has not been done. Not everyone wants to do anything involving money ‘online’. The permit system described is complicated and too expensive. This plan and anything similar will just add new problems, inconvenience, expense, stress and worry. I feel very angry that yet again there is such a plan happening in Durlston Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR24</td>
<td>With this proposal you are pushing non-residential parking to Latchmere Rd, Latchmere</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lane, Cardinal Avenue, Hollbush Rd, etc. Why not extend PPA scheme to all roads mentioned above?

DR25 I am strongly against any changes to the present situation except for removal of restrictions in Albany Park Rd which are the main causes for any parking problems.

DR26 There is definitely commuter parking problem; people leave their cars sometimes for weeks, teachers of 3 schools, parents all creating congestion and problems, can’t continue.

DR27 Please put double yellow on road junction corners. What is the use of paying money to install impaired sight crossing points and allow cars to park across them? This needs doing regardless of the outcome of the PPA.

DR28 The parking problem in the road has existed for years, but with the new school expansion and the Albany Park Rd CPZ it is really terrible. We need a PPA urgently.

DR30 The hours must be reviewed as I believe the proposal (11am - 2pm) are not restrictive enough. I think 11am – 4pm would be better suited to our residents parking requirement.

DR32 Even apart from never being able to park my small mini anywhere near the house – I have had punctures as a result of road rage and multiple wing mirror scraps.

DR33 Please confirm that the corner would be yellow lined. Thank you.

DR34 We believe there is a commuter problem on our road. Also trade vans are left for weeks, parked here until they are needed.

DR35 Need to deal with the number of long term users and abandoned vehicles, thank you.

DR36 11am to 3pm minimum Monday to Saturday.

DR37 8:30 - 4pm to cover the school run for Fernhill which makes it very difficult.

DR38 A PPA is a good idea, but I really resent a £90 charge per year to park where I park here free. Why so? That is a huge hike on Tax. It is a free privilege in other boroughs. Also why Saturday restriction? Shops are open 7 days so why charge Saturday? Visitors come on weekends and should not have to pay to park here on a Saturday. Rip off Council.

DR40 More revenue for Kingston Council – certainly should be a review. If implemented after one year, the measure will not correct the problem of too many cars. More investment in Public transport needed.

DR41 I don’t think there is much of a problem during the day, except when there is building work going on. There is more of a problem at night time.

DR42 A while ago local residents were asked whether they wanted parking restrictions, the answer was NO, why therefore does the Council continue to raise new schemes like this which go against a democratic verdict.

DR43 There is a terrible parking problem on our road. I have 2 small children, carrying bags, shopping from the other end of the road really every day is unacceptable, when we pay Council Tax we expect to be able to park near our homes, please.

DR44 Commuter parking is a major problem in Durlston Road, with the 65 bus stops just few yards away the Richmond end (where I live) is very crowded in the morning.

DR45 Impossible to park after 8:30am. Definitely need parking restrictions.

DR46 I am much happier with a PPA than a CPZ. The restricted hours may need to be extended to combat parking during school drop off times, which is also a problem, but the above proposal will be a good start.

DR48 I would prefer the restrictions to be Mon – Fri 11am -2pm, but can live with it extended to Saturday.

DR49 On line only registration system for permits and visitor permits discriminate against those unable to use computers. Must have manual (paper system for visitor permits/ vouchers or have parking meter which takes cards/ cash in Studland Rd with limited parking. Please reduce single yellow line restriction length in Durlston Rd 5-7pm – only needs to be a few metres in length. Your plans seem to concur with this restriction.
There is a huge commuter parking problem in Durlston. I am a full time mother and at the house all day and often struggle to park anywhere near my home, which makes life extremely difficult with two young children. A PPA is essential to improve life for residents of this road, and it taking far too long to be implemented, as the situation is getting worse.

As soon as possible please!

1. The Saturday 11-2pm restriction is unnecessary and will cause inconvenience and added expenses for friends and family visits.
2. Concern over the impact on adjacent non-zone neighbourhood.
3. Problem is not only commuters but also school parking from Richmond Rd.

RBK should consider car size differentials for permits and higher costs for 2nd/3rd permits per household, as most other boroughs do. What monitoring systems will be in place?

A PPA is better than a CPZ because fewer spaces are lost. I can always find a parking space so don’t have a problem with parking. The problems seem to be closer to the main road where people park to go to the school, doctor, dentist or shopping/commuting. Also, I don’t want to pay £90/year to park.

Why did the Council not propose a PPA in the first place? No loss of parking allowed in front of own drives, cheaper to implement. Surely this was no brainer?!

Remove parking restriction on St Albans Park Rd

I agree with the proposed scheme.

There is a major problem with parking in Durlston Rd. I really object to having to pay in Albany Park Rd while commuters have free parking in my road.

The parking problem caused by residents having too many cars and drivers, not caused by outsiders.

Double yellow lines on crossings. Remove Albany Park Rd parking, all homes and flats have parking places. People are running business from homes and have 2/3 cars if PPA is permitted, then only 1 permit per address. Even if parking come in No guarantee that a parking place can be found any time of the day – This is just a money making scheme!

Do not see the need to pay £90 (TAX) to park outside my own home. Happily accept proposal if free to residents. There is no problem with the current arrangement, therefore should not be changed.

I don’t feel there is a problem with commuter parking. Most of our neighbours can park within 50m of their house at any point in time, plus visitor permit is way too complicated. What if you don’t have a computer or internet?!

There is a shortage of parking spaces everywhere, too many cars in the world! PPA is only making everybody’s life more difficult – how can you have visitors, not everybody is able to use public transport. In my road some staff from the schools park for a few hours, then move on to different schools for more teaching lessons, they need to be flexible and have cars, just one small example.

Please see my comments below. Thanks!
- The proposed timings do not include school drop off and pick up times, (and out of school hours events/classes) which I feel have got busier and busier and will likely only get worse as the Academy expands further in size.
- The timings do not include Sundays, and I feel there is a strong likelihood of all day shoppers/shop workers parking here on that day.
- I can see the benefit of not having marked bays (being able to continue to use our dropped kerb, having more spaces generally available). However, this will still not address the issue of cars parking right up to the corners at junctions eg on Studland Road, making it dangerous and difficult to turn safely into the next road. And it still
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>annex 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>won’t prevent people from overhanging my driveway either, which often happens and makes it difficult to get on/off the drive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Which zone would we be under? It seems it would be its own unique zone? It would be of more 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 permit area. I personally would prefer to be the same zone as Albany Park Road was granted – Zone C?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- In conclusion, we have a driveway and only the one car to park, no regular guests with cars to visit, so we still feel, at present, that any introduction of permits, will only cause us extra expense and admin for very little additional benefit. We feel nervous that any introduction of parking schemes will be difficult to reverse or change if they don’t prove successful, so would rather, at this stage, remain permit free.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DR73</strong></td>
<td>I strongly disagree, can’t see or feel there is a problem with parking in Durlston Rd, at any time, there is enough parking for everyone including commuters, besides I don’t want to be charged for parking yearly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EG1</strong></td>
<td>Bends in the road in Earle Gardens require double yellow lines to ensure safety and reduce potential of obstruction and collisions, also would allow emergency services and trade deliveries passage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EG2</strong></td>
<td>Hostilities with commuters at all time high, Earle Gardens is used by residents in nearby roads as well because they can’t park in their own roads because of commuter/ students parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EG4</strong></td>
<td>Definetly excellent idea!! The cars of people who don’t live here leave debris, tins, cigarette ends, paper etc. It is often double parking which is dangerous and make further pollution for families with kids and all other residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EG5</strong></td>
<td>Depends what you call a problem! Many have 2 or 3 cars/vans. Then there is a problem regarding space. Our biggest problem is commuter parking, no consideration from them they have even parked across my drive entrance, as that is our problem, I agree to proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EG6</strong></td>
<td>I don’t see any benefits as £90 a year. The time of 11am -2pm only stops commuters. Time should be 8am to 6:30 pm and even that doesn’t stop overnight trade vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EG7</strong></td>
<td>I do not agree that commuters are mostly responsible for the parking problem in my street. Please see below: I wish to oppose to the introduction of a permit parking area in the roads east of Richmond Rd, Kingston. I would like the following comments to be considered: 1. I agree that there is a significant parking nuisance and pressure on parking in these streets. I believe that the problems are caused, in order of impact, by school traffic (staff and parents), residents (with multiple cars, business vehicles and leisure vehicle) and commuters. For this reason, I feel that the proposal will not address the parking problem although it will increase cost and disruption for residents. This is why I am opposed to the scheme. 2. I agree that a PPA is fairer and less disruptive than the CPZ previously discussed. I am relieved to learn that the CPZ idea is no longer being pursued. 3. If a PPA is approved (and I hope it will not be) I would like to see the following changes: Hours of operation There should avoid lunchtimes and weekends when residents are more likely to have visitors. Since the stated scheme is to reduce all day commuter parking. I cannot understand why Saturdays and lunchtimes need to be included in the proposal. I would prefer hours of 8:30 -10:30am, Monday to Friday. This would prevent all day parking by commuters and would additionally reduce the nuisance caused by school traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG8</td>
<td>Does this mean that the double yellow line across our drive will be removed? Although it will help with commuter/shopper parking, I also feel the Council are enjoying another way to get more money out of residents. Permits seem expensive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG9</td>
<td>We agree that there is an issue with parking but we object to the fact that we will have to pay for a parking permit for visitors to park in front of our drive, which is already protected by usual rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG10</td>
<td>I am against paying £180 a year to variously keep two family cars on or adjacent to my own property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG11</td>
<td>If a payment scheme is introduced, the following should be taken into consideration. 1. All residents should have one permit for free to enable them to park outside their property. It is wrong to discriminate, especially for the elderly who may have a lot of regular visitors. N.B. My council tax (including 25% discount) is already more than all my utility bills put together. 2. Not everyone has internet access. If ad hoc parking is required then date stamped tickets should be made available from libraries, post offices &amp; newsagents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG12</td>
<td>I can usually find parking in our road easily. There is no problem parking in my experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG13</td>
<td>We would agree before we knew that any resident of their visitors, builders etc could block a private driveway, if they purchase a permit. No one has blocked us as yet because like us we bet they all thought it wasn’t allowed, now it would be clear that they could, it looks like a permit would allow this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG14</td>
<td>The proposed PPA should all be zoned, each road/gardens designated a letter/number and indicated on signs S1, S2 when a permit is issued it should only covers that zone. Not only does Earle Gardens suffer from commuter parking, residents outside, park their 2nd vehicles for weeks on end of Earle Garden is a cul-de-sac, and should be designated with resident parking only. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG15</td>
<td>I have lived in the area for 20 years and the parking problem has not got worse in that time. Secondly, extending into Saturday penalises residents who commute Mon- Fri, who also provide spaces for incoming commuters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR1</td>
<td>I think that 11-2pm is not long enough, but it is a start.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR3</td>
<td>Only have one problem! What about the mess at junction of St Albans/ Studland Roads? It needs double yellow lines on all four corners to protect school children crossing and facilitate access of large vehicles. You won’t do anything about it because you are not bothered and you won’t respond to the need!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR4</td>
<td>Restricted parking hours should be longer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR5</td>
<td>I do not agree that introducing PPA in my road is necessary. I don’t want to buy a permit to be able to park across my own drive way, when I can park across it for free now. I paid to get a driveway made in the first place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR6</td>
<td>Please put double yellow lines around all junctions. The parking is illegal and dangerous but happens consistently. They don’t require consultation, so you can do them immediately otherwise nothing has happened for more than 2 years!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR7</td>
<td>You have to something ASAP as there is a major parking problem in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR1</td>
<td>We propose restricted hours to be 12:30 -1:30 which still support the idea but will also help our Medical Practice to function properly. We are open to patients Mon – Fri throughout the day but with less traffic (patients/ visitors) between 12- 1:30pm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| RR2 | There is no a commuter parking problem. There is a problem associated with the users of St Albans Medical Centre and to a lesser extent ‘Physio and Move’ who park to use these services. When the Medical Centre closes for lunch between 12 noon to 13:30 Monday to Friday, you can find a parking spot in Latchmere, St Albans and Durlston Roads. So it is not so much commuters putting pressure on parking, it is visitors to the doctors and physiotherapists.
The PPA would seriously disadvantage these often elderly and young patients who are driven to appointments.
The PPA would inconvenience home owners with off street parking as people with permits can park across their driveways.
The PPA would not solve the problem as it not a commuter issue.
The proposed unallocated spaces on St Albans Rd would not be sufficient for the numbers of people using cars who are registered and attend the medical practice and physiotherapist.
NO to the PPA proposal. |
| RR3 | This scheme fails to consider fully the requirement for local businesses and care in the community.
There is no parking allocation for patients and visitors to the medical practice or dental practice. Both practices have multiple surgeries and see patients up to over 10 minutes.
Not everyone drives but a large proportion of them need to, and have no parking facilities. This will severely disrupt the running of the practices. Additionally the costs of the business permits are prohibitive to many small businesses. |
| RR4 | There is no parking on Richmond Rd, but locally introduced CPZ has increased daytime parking pressure on roads in this PPA. |
| RR6 | Kingston Council, please stop restricting parking for residents parking. |
| RR8 | Any parking problem in Durlston Rd and St Albans Rd are a direct result of the Albany Park Rd CPZ, which does not work properly. The Albany Park Rd area has very few cars parked at any time and is a huge renounce of onstreet parking that could solve the problems for Durlston and St Albans without residents being charged for permits. |
| RR9 | I witnessed the Council Committee meeting in June, when it was resolved that the CPZ in Albany Park Rd (a major cause of current problems) would be withdrawn and that no restriction would be introduced in Latchmere etc roads.
However from comments made by Mr Hamade following the vote I came away with the firm impression that the officers were not inclined to implement the Committee decision. It seems I was right and that we are now to have even more restrictions. I can only conclude that this is really nothing more than a revenue raising exercise. |
Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee
24 January 2018

Park Road - Objection to Traffic Management Order proposal to introduce new waiting restrictions

Report by the Interim Head of Shared Environmental Service

Call-in deadline 5pm on Wednesday 6 February 2018 (ten working days after the meeting)

Purpose
To consider an objection raised to a Traffic Management Order (TMO) with proposals for new waiting restrictions in Park Road as shown on Annex 1.

Recommendations
To Resolve that the Committee:

1. notes the comments and the objection received in response to the publication of the TMO, as set out in paragraph 7-16, and officer's comments as set out in paragraphs 17-20; and

2. sets aside the objection received, and approves the implementation of the TMO for the introduction of new waiting restrictions in Park Road; and the objector is informed of the Committee’s decision.

Key Points

A. A draft TMO to introduce new waiting restrictions in Park Road, between 217 Park Road and Kelvedon Close was published in October 2017. One objection was received by the closing date for the receipt of objections on 20 October 2017.

Context

1. Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee at their meeting 6 July 2017 considered a report outlining the result of the local consultation for the introducing of 20mph in Park Road and to convert the existing temporary single yellow lines (between Bat Gardens and Kelvedon Close), operating from 8am - 6:30pm, Monday to Friday into permanent. The Committee approved these changes.

2. Prior to the publication of the Traffic Management Order (TMO) for making the single yellow lines permanent, we received request from Bat Gardens residents to make the single yellow outside their crossover into double, as they have been facing difficulties existing their driveway when the single yellow lines restrictions are finished. A request from 217 Park Road was also
received asking for single yellow lines to be extended to cover their driveway, as they are having the same problem as at Bat Gardens.

3. Taken these requests into consideration, we amended the proposed plan or the TMO - the existing single yellow to be made double and to extend it to cover the crossover of 217 Park Road. This would accommodate the above requests, improve visibility sight lines and making sure that bus access is provided at all times.

4. While we were preparing for the publication of the draft traffic management order, the road was programmed to be resurfaced and the single yellow lines were re-painted but with an additional length covering the crossover of 217 Park Road.

5. The traffic management order (TMO) was been published in the Surrey Comet and street notices have been placed on lamp columns in your road.

6. Subsequently, a letter was delivered to residents at the vicinity of the proposal. Explaining to them the latest changes and the reasons behind it. Several comments were received, and one of them was objection.

Comments and Objections Received

7. “I am a local resident living at 114 Park Road, KT2 and would like to comment on the recent letter send through regarding traffic problems between 217 Park Road to Kelvedon Close.”

8. “Our property is located opposite the single yellow line and we would support it being made a double yellow to help traffic flow. However, the problem is also present on our side of the road and putting a double yellow lines in force will mean even more vehicles parked and blocking the road between numbers 118 and 110. Currently there are no restrictions in place between 118 and 112 and the road outside the houses is used by non-residents, builders working at various local projects etc. It is not used by residents for parking as we all have driveways.”

9. “The problem here is that the road is narrower than normal due to the bus stop serving Kelvedon Close and the traffic island crossing outside 116 / 118. As a result, cars parked here severely hinder traffic flow and I have witnessed several ‘near misses’ as well as three serious accidents with vehicles attempting to swing round parked cars and into incoming traffic.”

10. “I have also written to you previously about the problem of vehicles parking across the driveway at 114 and 112, blocking our right of way.”

11. “Taking this into consideration, please will you consider putting double yellows in place between 118 to 112 where the road is narrow, concurrently to the project above? Otherwise I fear the problem will simply shift from the existing side of the road to the opposite one. I look forward to hearing from you.”

12. **Bat Gardens:** “Last week we couldn’t turn right out of our road because someone had parked with the front of their car sticking actually into the road. I will send you a photo. I first made contact with Kingston Council back in February and this is the first response I’ve had back so far so 5 months have gone past already. I really think that there will be an accident here at some
point as its so hard to see when turning out the top of the road in either direction.”

13. “Residents of Bat Gardens have an exceptionally difficult and dangerous road to try and exit. Last week I nearly hit a cyclist cycling down the middle of the road as I was unable to see him due to traffic parked up the very edges of our road. It is impossible to get a clear view before existing our road. I can only imagine that if there is any accident Kingston Council is at risk of being sued because all residents of this road have flagged up the danger and nothing is being done about it. Your note below said that it would take 6 months which are now over - when will we get the double yellow lines painted onto Park Road so we can safely exit and enter our road? Added to the difficult and danger of exiting our road is the unending lorries and vans parking across the entrance so that we can not access our road easily. I have to be honest I am extremely fed up of this.”

14. **Objection:** *Firstly at this point in time the extended single yellow line outside 217 Park Rd was incorrectly painted and there is no mandate for it so it should be removed as agreed by the officer in my conversation with him in August 2017, I expect this to be done and for the officer to confirm that this will be put in hand.*

15. *With the notices only being distributed today (12/10/17) I would expect that whatever the statutory time period for objections to be made (I assume it is 21 days from the notice) be allowed and therefore the advised date of 20th October be revised to 2nd November 2017, this will of course mean that a new set of notices will have to be distributed. If this is not going to be complied with please confirm why and under what grounds it will not be extended.*

16. *Currently there is a mandate for a single yellow line from Kelvedon Close to Bat Gardens, the consultation must be conformed to this mandated single yellow line and the consultation should be for this to be made a double yellow line. If a further change is consulted about i.e. that the parking restriction be extended to outside 217 Park Rd and made a double yellow line then this must be clearly identified as an option as the way the consultation is written it appears that the single yellow line outside 217 Park Rd has already been mandated where it has not, a fact confirmed to me by the officer.*

**Officer’s response:**

17. *With regard to the comments received asking for new double yellow lines to be introduced in Park Road, that will be looked after the scheme been implemented in order to make sure not additional yellow lines is introduced unnessaccary.*

18. *Regarding the objection received, it is recognised that, the single yellow lines should not be extended to outside 217 Park Road before the publication of the Traffic Management Order was made. To address this point and the other request received, a letter went out to residents within the vicinity of the*
scheme outlining the new proposals and asking them for their views/comments.

19. The request by the objector not to proceed with this scheme until a local consultation is carried out. I am with the opinion that, the recent letter was considered as a local consultation, where residents were given the opportunity to comments/object to the scheme.

20. Taken all the above into consideration, the proposed scheme converting the single yellow lines into double, and extend it to cover the crossover of number 217 Park Road will improve the visibility sight lines for Bat Gardens and 217 Park Rd residents, and access for buses on Park Road.

21. Members are asked to note the comments and the objection received, and set them aside in order for the Traffic Management to be made.

Consultations

22. As part of the TMO process there is a statutory consultation period, the TMO was advertised on 22 September 2017. One objection was received by the closing date for the receipt of objections on 20 October 2017.

Timescale

23. If the Committee sets aside the objection, the works to implement the scheme will be programmed for early March 2018.

Resource Implications

24. The scheme is estimated to cost £2,000, and it will be met out of the Kingston Town Neighbourhood traffic management budget.

Legal Implications

25. The Statutory consultation process has been followed, and the objection raised is being referred to the Neighbourhood to consider before deciding on the way forward. As such there are no legal implications to be considered.

Risk Assessment

26. The scheme does not involve any additional physical speed reducing features and should improve visibility sight line and reduce the risk of accidents to the benefit of the whole community.

Equalities Impact Assessment

27. 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

28. There are no significant network implications associated with the proposed scheme.

Environmental Implications and Air Quality

29. 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.

Background papers
Copy of TMO (Traffic Management Order);
Copy of the consultation letter;
Copy of the comments received;
Copy of the objection received.

held by author - Younes Hamade, Senior Professional Traffic Engineer, tel 020 8547 5922 email: younes.hamade@kingston.gov.uk
Kingston Town Neighbourhood – Park Road - Proposed double yellow lines between 217 and Kelvedon Close
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. In order to deal with this petition strategically, the proposed scheme is extended to include Crescent Road and Queens Road which are within Maldens and Coombe Neighbourhood area.

Recommendations:

To Resolve that:

1. the local consultation on the proposed width restrictions at Crescent Road and Queen’s Road, to reduce the number of heavy good vehicles using residential roads, as set out in paragraph 11, be approved; and
2. a working group with local residents be set up to discuss further options on Kings Road.

Key Points

1. An online petition with 42 signatures, from residents in the section of Kings Road between Park Road and Queen’s 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 / comments and approval for local consultation, the result to be reported to a future Committee’s meeting for consideration.

2. As highlighted above the administrative boundary between Maldens and Coombe & Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committees runs along the middle of Queens Road, and as such any proposals affecting the operation of the road network here, needs to be considered and approved by both committees. If the two Neighbourhoods cannot reach an agreement, the final decision will be taken by the Residents Committee.

Context

3. A Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) ban was introduced into the North Kingston Area, including Kings Road, in 1985 aimed at restricting vehicles greater than 7.5 tonnes from entering the area, except for access.
4. In November 2006 Kingston Town 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 2007.

5. A petition was received in March 2010 from residents of Kings Road, located between Park Road and Queens Road. The petition called for a reduction in speed and congestion, and stopping larger vehicles from using this section of Kings Road.

6. The petition requested a one way system was introduced in the area, as petitioners felt that 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.

7. The December 2010 Kingston Town 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.

8. 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 which was 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 road’s capacity, and 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**

9. Further to the online petition, a meeting took place with some residents from Kings Road, Chair of Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee, a local councillor and officer. At this meeting there was view that, in order to deal with the traffic management improvements to the area, particularly HGV intrusion, we need to have holistic approach to deal with this issue, hence the proposed scheme will consider issues affecting both Kingston Town Neighbourhood and Maldens and Coombe Neighbourhood.

10. The main objectives of these proposal are to examine how we can reduce the number of heavy good vehicles using residential roads, and maintain genuine deliveries taken place whilst considering the recent on-line petition, and the points raised at the meeting with residents.

11. The following have been suggested:

- The introduction of two width restrictions, at Crescent Road and at Queen’s Road. Each width restrictions will only restrict the access for HGV’s.
In addition to the new width restrictions, a working group will be set up with local residents to discuss further options on Kings Road (between Queens Road and Park Road).

12. Members should be aware that, although these options may address some of the issues raised by residents, there is the possibility that at the same time it may result in generating other problems, such as an increase in traffic volume and speeds on other roads/routes.

13. Members are asked to note this report, and give agreement to proceed with consultation on these proposals, the outcome of which will be reported to the future meetings of Kingston Town and Maldens and Coombe Neighbourhood Committees for consideration and decision.

**Consultations**

14. Subject to Committee approval, local residents and stakeholders will be consulted on the proposals to introduce width restrictions in Crescent Road and Queens Road.

15. It is also proposed that there should be further consultation with residents by way of a Working Group to consider proposals for Kings Road.

**Timescale**

16. Should the consultation results show positive support for the proposals, and subject to the relevant approvals from both Neighbourhood Committees it is anticipated that the scheme will be designed and delivered within 2018/2019 financial year.

**Resource Implications**

17. The cost for the local consultation will be met from the LIP 2018/19 Neighbourhood Improvement allocations. At present the scheme is not included in the Neighbourhood Improvement allocation for either of the Committee areas, and subject to the scheme being supported members/officers will need to review the 2018/19 programme to assess whether there is scope for implementation in-year, or whether the scheme will need to be added to the 2019/20 LIP scheme list.

**Legal Implications**

18. There are no specific legal implications at this stage, however should the scheme proceed Traffic Management Orders (TMO) would be required to make the proposed changes, and any legal issues arising at that stage would be the subject of a further report to this Committee.
**Risk Assessment**

19. 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**

20. LIP Schemes are covered by an overarching EQIA, and as such no individual assessment is undertaken.

**Network Implications**

21. 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**

22. 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 and displacement will remain.

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

**Author of report** - Younes Hamade, Senior Professional Engineer, 0208 547 5922
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Work Programme  
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Planning Applications  
Road Safety  
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