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

2. Apologies for absence

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 22 January 2019

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.

   Planning Application - The Barge Dock Site, Down Hall Road, Kingston Upon Thames, KT1 1PS (18/12421)  Appendix A

7. Planning Application - The Barge Dock Site, Down Hall Road, Kingston Upon Thames, KT1 1PS (18/12421)
   To determine the application

8. Planning consultation: 4 Manorgate Road, Kingston upon Thames, KT2 7EL (18/13000/FUL)  Appendix B
   To provide comments on the proposed application which will be determined by Development Control Committee

9. King's Road Outcome of Consultation  Appendix C
   To note the results of the consultation on traffic management measures and consider the way forward
10. **Latchmere Lane Area - result of parking beat survey**  
    Appendix D  
    To note the results of the parking beat surveys and consider the way forward

11. **Neighbourhood Working Arrangements**  
    Appendix E  
    To consider how the committee wishes to utilise some of the new powers and flexibilities in its working arrangements

12. **Community Grants Programme**  
    Appendix F  
    To note the grant funding streams available for 2019/20 and to agree the working arrangements for the allocation of the Committee’s Councillor Ward Funding

13. **Work Programme**  
    Appendix G  
    To note the work programme

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

15. **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**

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

- Tuesday 4 June 2019
- Thursday 5 September 2019
- Tuesday 5 November 2019
- Tuesday 7 January 2020
- Tuesday 10 March 2020
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 a minimum of 100 people who live, work or study in the Borough or 9 Councillors. 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 reviewed by a meeting of the Council’s Scrutiny Panel. The Panel at this meeting cannot change the original decision. It may decide that no further action is necessary, in which case the decision will be implemented or will refer the issue back to the decision making Committee (or, exceptionally, to a meeting of the Full Council) with its views and a request that the decision is reconsidered taking account of these views.

Minutes

The minutes briefly summarise the item and record the decision. They do not record who said what during the debate.
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: 10.00am Monday 25 March 2019.

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>1. Planning Officer to present item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Objector(s) (5 minutes)</td>
<td>Land/property owner (5 minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Applicant (5 minutes)</td>
<td>The Council as applicant and/or supporters of the action proposed (5 minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions from Committee to Objector(s) and Applicant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Objector(s) (5 minutes)</td>
<td>Land/property owner (5 minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Applicant (5 minutes)</td>
<td>The Council as applicant and/or supporters of the action proposed (5 minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sweep up by Planning Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Questions from Committee to Officers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Debate and decision by Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## KINGSTON TOWN NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMITTEE

**WEDNESDAY 27 MARCH 2019**

**REPORT BY**

HEAD OF PLANNING & REGENERATION

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

### INDEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO</th>
<th>REGISTER NO</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>PAGE NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>18/12421</td>
<td>The Barge Dock Site Down Hall Road, Kingston Upon Thames, KT1 1PS</td>
<td>Erection of a traditional boathouse style building incorporating nine residential apartments and encompassing the existing plant room over the Barge Dock</td>
<td>REFUSE</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report 441472
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:  18/12421/FUL  
Address:  The Barge Dock Down Hall Road, Kingston upon Thames, KT1 1PS

(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 traditional boathouse incorporating nine residential apartments and encompassing the existing plant room over the Barge Dock

Plan Type
Full Application

Expiry Date
17/07/2018

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE/PLANNING POLICY STATEMENTS

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
RBK Riverside Public Realm SPD 2018

NATIONAL POLICY
National Planning Policy Framework 2019
National Planning Practice Guidance (web based)

POLICIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LONDON PLAN MARCH 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LP 3.16 Protection and enhancement of social infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP 3.19 Sports facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP 3.3 Increasing housing supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP 3.4 Optimising housing potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP 3.8 Housing choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP 5.12 Flood risk management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP 5.13 Sustainable drainage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP 5.14 Water quality and wastewater infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP 5.3 Sustainable design and construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP 7.17 Metropolitan Open Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP 7.19 Biodiversity and access to nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP 7.2 An Inclusive environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP 7.24 Blue Ribbon Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP 7.25 Increasing the use of the Blue Ribbon Ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP 7.27 Blue Ribbon Network: supporting infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP 7.4 Local character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP 7.5 Public realm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP 7.6 Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LDF CORE STRATEGY CORE POLICIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS 01 Climate Change Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 02 Climate Change Adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 03 The Natural and Green Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 04 River Thames Corridor, Tributaries and t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 05 Reducing the Need to Travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 06 Sustainable Travel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PREVIOUS RELEVANT HISTORY

05/12214/FUL Erection of "boathouse" building (821m²) over the Barge Dock for use as a restaurant / café on first floor with ground floor reception, plant room and alterations to mooring facilities Permitted with conditions 27/12/2012

15/12466/FUL Variation of Condition 2 of Planning Permission 05/12214/FUL (Erection of "boathouse" building (821m²) over the Barge Dock for use as a restaurant / café on first floor with ground floor reception, plant room and alterations to mooring facilities) Permitted with conditions 03/09/2015

17/12347/FUL Erection of a mixed-use development over the Barge Dock comprising nine residential apartments and a restaurant, encapsulating the existing ground floor plant room and alterations to mooring facilities Refuse 07/06/2017
CONSULTATIONS

The application was advertised on site and 306 surrounding properties were notified in writing of the application. 42 letters of objection have been received, their objections are summarised as follows

- The design is out of keeping with the area
- The proposal would harm the Conservation Area
- The proposal would be inappropriate for the Metropolitan Open Land
- Flooding
- Impact on Biodiversity
- Impact on Water Quality
- Noise
- Impact on views across the river
- Land ownership
- Loss of barge dock
- Lack of parking

2 letters of support have been received, their reasons for support can be summarised as follows

- This is a brownfield site in need of regeneration
- It would upgrade the entrance to the park
- The existing site is subject to antisocial behaviour, the proposed development would prevent this

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RBK Neighbourhood Engineer</th>
<th>No Objections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RBK Flooding Officer</td>
<td>We object to the application for the following reasons: <em>Insufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate why a green roof cannot be incorporated into the</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td>Objection (flooding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston Conservation Area Advisory Committee</td>
<td>No objection Biodiversity subject to Planning Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic England (Archaeology)</td>
<td>No Objection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| North Kingston Forum        | Objection  
  - Design  
  - Light pollution  
  - Biodiversity |
SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The site is located on the eastern bank of the River Thames within the North Kingston area of the Town Centre. North Kingston has been subject to major regeneration over recent years, with the redevelopment of the former Power Station, Gas Works, Station Yard and Factory sites for residential, leisure, and commercial uses, along with highway and landscape improvements.

The site lies next to the southern entrance of the Canbury Gardens, a Green Flag award winning 19th century public park. The park is identified as a major open space and an area of high landscape value, containing avenues of trees, pavilions, tennis courts, a bandstand, a café, and a Public House.

The site falls within land designated as Metropolitan Open Land, land given the same protection, for planning purposes, as Green Belt Land.

The site and wider area is located within the Riverside North Conservation Area. The conservation area is characterised by its intimate relationship with the River Thames, the islands, the Barge Dock and the riverside buildings on the opposite bank, which include Victorian boathouses and large Victorian houses within landscaped grounds.

The site forms part of both the Council’s Green Chain and Green Corridor network. Green-Chains are defined as a series of elongated MOL surrounding the Borough’s major watercourses linking the Green Belt and broader areas of open land within the urban area. Green Corridors, are relatively continuous areas of open space that run through the Borough’s built environment, consisting of railway embankments and cuttings, roadside verges, canals, parks, playing fields and rivers which links sites to each other. These Green Chains and Corridors allow animals and plants to be found further into the built up area than would otherwise be the case and provide an extension to the habitats of the sites they join.

The site falls within an area designated as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation, The River Thames and Tidal Tributaries.

The application site comprises a sheet piled quayside separated from the landside by a dock approximately 9.3m wide. The south side of the site partially bridges the dock and provides access to the western quayside. The northern, eastern and southern boundaries are enclosed by a galvanised palisade security fence. The barge dock historically served the former Kingston Power Station which, when operational, contained a conveyor building of approximately 5 storeys in height, the building spanned over the dock and neighbouring land and transported coal from barges moored at the dock to the coal store at the power station. The building and associated infrastructure was demolished / removed by the mid-1990s.

To the east of the site is the former Kingston Power Station, redeveloped for residential and hotel development, to the south of the site is the Council operated Thames Side car park which currently accommodates 2 house boats moored on its riverside.
The site currently contains a single storey brick building. This building contains a plant room associated with the Kingston Height development (former Kingston Power Station site).

The barge dock provides mooring facilities for the Thames Venturer, a vessel operated by the River Thames Boat Project (RTBP). The RTBP is a charity which offers therapeutic cruises and educational activities on the River Thames for people of all ages, including those with a disability or mental health condition.

PROPOSAL

1. The application seeks full planning permission for the erection of a residential development over the Barge Dock encapsulating the existing ground floor plant room.

2. The development would comprise 9 residential units over the 1st and 2nd floors (2nd floor is located in the roofspace) above. The application includes the retention of a boat mooring facility for the River Thames Boat Project.

3. The 9 residential units would comprise:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Bedrooms / Person</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>1 Bedroom 2 Person</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>2 Bedroom 3 Person</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>2 Bedroom 4 Person</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Total 9 units 33%

4. The development would provide 24 bicycle storage spaces.

5. The development would not provide any car parking facilities and would be expected to be car-free i.e. future residents would not be able to apply for parking permits to park on the public highway.

6. The proposed development would have a generally rectangular footprint, would measure approximately 20m by 38m and would span the width of the barge dock with supporting columns anchoring the building at the quayside and on the landside. The building would be 3 storeys (1 storey would be located within the roofspace) with a maximum height of 15m.

7. The architecture of the building would be of a “traditional boathouse” similar to the boathouse permitted in 2015.

8. Access to the residential units would be from a point located at the south-east corner of the proposed building, access to the quayside and plant room would also be provided in this location.

---

1 It is to be noted that the Planning Statement indicates that 8 units would be built, however, the Plans and Application form shows 9 units.
2 It is noted that the Planning Statement indicates only 20 spaces would be provided, however the submitted plans show space for 24.
ASSESSMENT

- Policy Context
- Principle of the Development (MOL)
- Delivery of Housing
- Housing Mix, Quality of Accommodation, and Density
- Community Facility
- Flood Risk
- Water Framework Directive
- Impact on Blue Ribbon network
- Design and Heritage
- Impact on Residential Amenity
- Highways impact
- Biodiversity
- Other material considerations
- Very Special Circumstances

Policy Context

The Borough Council as Local Planning Authority has a duty under Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to determine this application in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) (1990 Act) requires local planning authorities when determining planning applications to “have regard to (a) the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application, (b) any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application, and (c) any other material considerations”. At present in relation to this application the Development Plan consists of the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames LDF Core Strategy 2012 and the London Plan March 2015.

The 3rd iteration of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in February 2019. This document provides guidance to local planning authorities in producing local plans and in making decisions on planning applications. The NPPF is intended to make the planning system less complex and more accessible by summarising national guidance which replaces numerous planning policy statements and guidance notes, circulars and various letters to Chief Planning Officers. The document is based on the principle of the planning system making an important contribution to sustainable development, which is seen as achieving positive growth that strikes a balance between economic, social and environmental factors. The Development Plan remains the cornerstone of the planning system. Planning applications which comply with an up to date Development Plan should be approved. Refusal should only be on the basis of conflict with the Development Plan and other material considerations.

The NPPF states that policies in Local Plans should not be considered out of date simply because they were adopted prior to publication of the framework. However, the policies in the NPPF are material considerations which planning authorities should take into account. Due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing
plans according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF (the closer the policies are to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight they may be given).

**Principle of the Development**

The application site is located on land designated as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). The site is currently free from development save for a single storey brick built building which serves as a power plant room associated with the neighbouring Kingston Heights development.

The site has historical ties to the Kingston Power Station providing a dock for barges to moor in association with that use. However, any visual link with that industrial heritage is much diminished with the only vestige of its industrial past being the barge dock itself. The large conveyer building which occupied the site was removed in the mid-1990s.

Save for the visual interruption associated with the single storey power plant room, the site remains relatively open, a key characteristic of MOL.

There is an extant planning permission on the site for the erection of boathouse building (821m2) over the Barge Dock for use as a restaurant / cafe on first floor with ground floor reception, plant room and alterations to mooring facilities. This was initially granted in 2012 with alterations approved in 2015. This permission has not been built out, the applicant submits that the permission granted in 2015 was implemented as a result of the erection of the power plant room and is therefore extant.

Regional and local planning policy provides that the strongest protection should be given to London's Metropolitan Open Land and that inappropriate development should be refused, save in very special circumstances, giving the same level of protection as the Green Belt. Planning policies direct that the policy guidance contained within the NPPF on Green Belts applies equally to Metropolitan Open Land.

The London Plan provides that inappropriate development [in the MOL] is, by definition, harmful and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. It further states that when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the MOL and that 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the MOL by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

The London Plan directs that a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the MOL save for a number of exceptions. The pertinent exception in this case can be found at paragraph 145 of the NPPF:

*limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would:
• not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or
• not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority.

i. Officers acknowledge and accept that the application site is previously developed land and as such the limited, partial or complete redevelopment of the site may not amount to inappropriate development. However, Officers conclude that the proposed development, when compared to the existing development (para 145(g) bullet 1) – the single storey power plant room, would have a greater impact on openness. It is also noted that the application does not provide any affordable housing, and cannot therefore benefit from para 145(g) bullet 2. As such, it is concluded that the proposal would amount to inappropriate development which is by definition harmful and that this harm, as directed by the NPPF, should be attributed substantial weight in the planning balancing exercise.

i. The applicant submits that the proposed developed wouldn’t have a greater impact on openness than the existing and previous development on the site (reference to previous development does not resonate with paragraph 145 of the NPPF). Officers consider that paragraph 145 of the NPPF is clear and unambiguous, the baseline for assessing the impact on openness is the existing development. The only development existing on site is the single storey power plant room and some fencing, not the previous development, the barge dock industrial building, nor the permitted development.

ii. Delivery of Housing

i. The application proposes the delivery of 9 residential units, of the 9 units, 0 would be family units, and 0 of the units would be affordable units.

i. National planning policy seeks encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land). National planning policy further recognises that residential development can play an important role in ensuring the vitality of centres.

i. National, regional and local planning policies recognises the pressing need to boost significantly the supply of housing so as to ensure that more homes are delivered in order to promote opportunity and provide a real choice for all Londoners in ways that meet their needs at a price they can afford.

i. Policy CS10 of the Core Strategy and Policy K7 of K+20 provides that the Council will take full advantage of opportunities to deliver new housing and, in particular maximise the delivery of affordable housing. Kingston Town Centre is a preferred location for new housing.

i. Paragraph 59 of the NPPF (2019) states *inter alia* that to significantly boost the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay.
The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character and appearance, and as such the policies of the current development plan would not preclude such developments. Therefore, the principle of creating additional residential units is acceptable, subject to the below considerations.

The Borough's annual housing target has increased since the adoption of the LDF Core Strategy and Kingston currently has an annual housing target of 643 new residential dwellings per year (London Plan 2016). This application proposes 9 additional residential units, therefore helping to contribute to these annual housing targets. In addition, the Council are currently unable to demonstrate a 5 year supply of land for the delivery of housing. As such, in normal circumstances, the Council would be in titled balance (paragraph 11d of the NPPF); however, given that the application site is located within MOL and the London Plan directs that it should be given the same weight as Green Belt policy in the NPPF, Footnote 6 to paragraph 11 disengages the titled balance.

77. Notwithstanding, in isolation, the delivery of market housing is considered to carry weigh in favour of the proposal.

Housing Mix, Quality of Accommodation, and Density

National, regional and local planning policies operate so as to ensure that future occupants have a genuine choice of homes that they can afford and which meet their requirements for different sizes. Policies further direct that new development should always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

Policy DM13 of the Core Strategy directs that 30% of the proposed units should be family units (3 bedroom or more) and that each unit should provide appropriate amenity and play space. The appropriate amount of amenity space is set out in Policy Guidance 13 of the Residential Design SPD, where it provides that 10sqm of private amenity space should be provided per flat plus 1sqm per additional occupant and an additional 50sqm.

The application proposes the delivery of 9 residential units, 0 of which would be family units. The applicant has not robustly demonstrated that the delivery of 3 family units on site (family units are defined in the London Plan as having 3 or more bedrooms) would not be viable nor has it been demonstrated that the site is unsuitable for family accommodation.

The proposal would comprise 128 units per hectare and approximately 358 habitable rooms per hectare. Each of the units would be provided with balcony / terrace space, however with the exception of Flat 1 and Flat 9, the outdoor space would be of limited functional use owing to its size. The proposed development would not provide any communal amenity space.

In terms of density, the proposal would fall below the density range in Policy 3.4 of the London Plan. Moreover, it is noted that each flat (with the exception of Flat 3) would exceed the internal space standards as set out in regional policy. This over-provision of internal space equals approx. 80sqm of accommodation. It is
considered that this over provision results in the development not making the optimal use of this brownfield site and a distribution of internal space in line with policy could result in the delivery of affordable homes.

In terms of mix of units the proposed development mix would not be in accordance with the requirements of policy inasmuch as it fails to provide 30% of the units as family units (defined in paragraph 3.31 of the London Plan as having 3 or more bedrooms). This under provision would come at a time when the Council’s Strategic Housing Market Assessment identifies an overwhelming need for family housing.

With some exceptions, the proposed units would not be provided with the required amount of private amenity space nor would the development provide the required amount of communal space. Officers consider the shortfall in both private and communal amenity space, couple with the under provision of family units along with the suboptimal use of the site would be contrary to Policy DM13 of the Core Strategy and Policy an acceptable in this instance given the close proximity of Canbury Gardens.

**Community Facility**

The application site has been used as a mooring facility by the River Thames Boat Project (RTBP) for their vessel, the Thames Venturer, for approximately 18 years. The RTBP is a charity which offers standard and bespoke programmes that provide a choice of **day and residential cruises** for older people and for people with a physical disability, a learning disability, or a mental health condition.

The RTBP run **education and learning programmes** for children and young people. Their schools programme is based on the National Curriculum and their learning activities are bespoke.

Given the length of time the barge dock has been used as a mooring for the RTBP, officers consider that the site has an established use as a community facility. The Core Strategy defines such a use as including **inter alia** education facilities and services provided by the community and volunteer sector. The Core Strategy identifies that these types of facilities are essential for local residents and contribute towards health and well-being.

National planning policy provides that the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. Regional and local planning policy build on this by directing that the Council will resist the loss of community facilities unless; there is evidence to suggest the facility is no longer needed; where appropriate, it has been vacant and marketed for a community use without success; or it can be re-provided elsewhere or in a different way.

The applicant has confirmed that the proposed development would maintain the mooring on the western quayside for the RTBP.

The retention of the established community facility would carries positive weight in favour of the proposal.
Flood Risk

The application site is located within Flood Zone 3B. Flood Zone 3B is classified as functional floodplain, and is deemed to be the most at risk land of flooding from rivers or the sea.

National planning policy directs that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk, but where development is necessary, making it safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere. The NPPF directs that development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower probability of flooding. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment will provide the basis for applying this test. A sequential approach should be used in areas known to be at risk from any form of flooding.

Paragraph 163 of the NPPF states that when determining planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere. Inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk, but where development is necessary, it should be made safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere.

Table 2: Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification, contained within the PPG, classifies residential development as ‘more vulnerable’ and restaurant development as ‘less vulnerable’.

Table 3: Flood risk vulnerability and flood zone ‘compatibility’ contained in the PPG, directs that ‘more vulnerable’ or ‘less vulnerable’ development should not be permitted within Flood Zone 3B.

The application is supported by a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The FRA concludes that the site is located within Flood Zone 3A, this is incorrect.

It is important to note that in dealing with the previous application for planning permission on the site (ref 05/12214/Ful) the Council also identified the site as falling in Flood Zone 3B.

The Environment Agency have objected to the proposed development.

In accordance with advice from the Environment Agency Officers conclude that the proposed development’s vulnerability classification (more vulnerable) is inappropriate for Flood Zone 3b (functional flood plain) according to the National Planning Policy Framework and should not therefore be permitted; Moreover, the proposed development on and over the river will have a major impact on the water environment due to encroachment over a main river. It is important to further note that the Environmental Agency indicate that the developer would be unlikely to receive a Flood Risk Permit because it would restrict essential maintenance and emergency access to the River Thames and the river wall at this location.

In relation to surface water flooding (notwithstanding the objection to the development in terms of flooding impact) in accordance with paragraph163 of the
NPPF development should only be allowed in areas at risk of flooding where it can be demonstrated that: *inter alia* it incorporates sustainable drainage systems, unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate. It has not been demonstrated that a sustainable drainage system in particular the incorporation of a green roof, is not appropriate.

**Water Framework Directive**

The European Water Framework Directive came into force in December 2000 and became part of UK law in December 2003. It gives us an opportunity to plan and deliver a better water environment, focusing on ecology. It is designed to:

- enhance the status and prevent further deterioration of aquatic ecosystems and associated wetlands which depend on the aquatic ecosystems
- promote the sustainable use of water
- reduce pollution of water, especially by ‘priority’ and ‘priority hazardous’ substances
- ensure progressive reduction of groundwater pollution

The applicant has failed to assess the impact on the water environment through the production of a Water Framework Directive assessment. However, the Environment Agency are content that a package of ecological enhancements and environmental controls could be secured by planning condition.

**Impact on Blue Ribbon network**

Access to the river, from the barge dock, is currently limited to activities associated with the RTBP. The Council acknowledges the community benefit of the charity and its service, and whilst recognising that river access is currently limited, it is acceptable in this instance.

The Blue Ribbon Network (BRN) is London’s strategic network of waterspaces and covers the River Thames, canals, tributary rivers, lakes, reservoirs and docks alongside smaller waterbodies. The network is of cross cutting and strategic importance for London. The nature of waterbodies is that there are linked, natural or semi natural systems, therefore the concept of the network is of vital importance. The Blue Ribbon Network is multi-functional. It provides *inter alia* a transport corridor, drainage and flood management, a series of diverse and important habitats, green infrastructure, heritage value, recreational opportunities and important landscapes and views.

Regional planning policy in the London Plan directs that the starting point for consideration of development and use of the Blue Ribbon Network and land alongside it must be the water. The water is the unique aspect and consideration must initially be given as to how it can be used, maintained and improved.

Regional and local planning policies direct that proposal should seek to increase the use of the Blue Ribbon Network for passenger and tourist river services and should protect existing facilities for waterborne passenger and tourist traffic. Applications which remove existing facilities should be refused unless suitable replacement facilities are provided. Moreover, Council’s should protect and
improve existing access points to (including from land into water such as slipways and steps) or alongside the Blue Ribbon Network (including paths).

Given that the development now seeks to retain the RTBP mooring there is no conflict with Blue Ribbon Network policies.

**Design and Heritage**

The application site sits on a prominent historic site located at the southern end of the linear Riverside North Conservation Area which stretches from Kingston railway bridge to the northern end of the barge path reaching the borough boundary with Richmond upon Thames.

The conservation area is focused on high quality public realm and historic importance of Canbury Gardens and its history as a Victorian pleasure Garden. It is a purposeful landscape with a clear design intent. The Council sees Canbury Gardens, and its contribution to the part of North Kingston and the wider Arcadian Thames, as the defining positive characteristics of the area. The site’s main relationship is with the park and river.

Section 72 of the Planning Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 provides that in the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

The site is visually prominent by nature of its location at the junction of a number of important views. K+20 identifies two Secondary Views which converge at/on the site; in addition the area is identified as a secondary gateway (associated with the crossing of the railway bridge), and the location of an envisaged improved riverside public space (K+20 Policy K10). The Council secured funding to improve the link to the Thames from the station which sees Down Hall Road as the main route for pedestrians and cyclists. This brings about a significant improvement to the street and spaces in the area. This places an even greater prominence on the views along Down Hall Road to the river, the end of which the site will be visible. These views and relationships need to be understood and carefully considered in any proposal.

The site is predominantly undeveloped. Openness is key characteristic of this location at the junction of Canbury Gardens and Thames Side, a point at which the landscape setting of the Thames and old Barge walk can be understood and appreciated.

The area suffers from a number of negative influences. The quality of the landscape and boundaries associated with the entrance to the Gardens and the Barge Dock site are key amongst them. Palisade fencing is a significant negative contributing factor in the way that it creates physical, visual and notional barriers to the Thames and its appreciation. While the removal of this barrier could be seen as a positive, the true value of this positive move will only be felt if it is not replaced by further layers of barriers (again physical, visual or notional). The power plant building is another negative influence on the area today. This is mitigated by the size of the structure (which is not excessive) and its use/function
which has a purpose associated with the river which establishes a notional connection to the Thames and the dock itself, allowing an appreciation of the current and historic marine use of the site.

The site is unique in that it must be one of a very (very) small number of buildings which are proposed to be built over the open water of the Thames. The context in its own right establishes a very high bar for any proposed building, this additional demand elevates the scrutiny which any proposal will be under and requires the highest quality design approach in response.

National, regional and local planning policies require any development to follow a clear design approach driven by an in depth understanding of the demands of the site, its urban/architectural/historic/landscape context, the character of the area, the opportunities presented by the site and its emerging context. This should be used to generate a holistic urban design/architectural/landscape led concept, to which the development proposal (from strategy to detail) should respond. This should be evidenced in writing and drawing to support of any proposal. This is especially the case on sites such as this where the urban/landscape is of very high sensitivity, subject to high and increasing visual presence and prominence.

In concept the design approach to the building is consistent with the previously approved development on this site, in that it seeks to develop a new building in a traditional boathouse idiom. If this approach is to be successful it needs to be followed through with a rigorous attention to materials, details and proportions. The limited and seemingly inaccurate drawings supplied at this stage do not give confidence in the rigorousness of the approach, nor that it will be carried through to successful execution.

As seen below there are a significant number of areas of concern within the detailed design of the building which undermines the proposed design approach, and constitutes a poor quality building in design and detail. The building will be highly visible and, as a standalone building in a very prominent position, will be subject to significant scrutiny. Joined to this is the fact that the building will be seen from all directions, not least because this is one of the busiest stretches of the Thames for craft, meaning the river elevation will also be highly visible.

- Due to internal planning the first floor East elevation does not relate to the colonnade. This disrupts the composition of the facade, working against the logic of the architecture.
- On the north elevations the third northernmost column on the west side of the dock, is seen to be the launching point of the arched lintel. This is appears to be inaccurately drawn (as this column sits well behind the northern facade), meaning that when this is rectified, and seen from the north, the launching point of the arched lintel will not be visually supported by the nearest column (about 1m away).
- The larger gable/dormers (furthest north and south on the west elevation) have an awkward relationship with the main north/south elevations in that the fascia boards of the two run into each other. This is a particular concern on the south side where the change in planes (or kink in the plan) creates very awkward geometry.
Below these larger dormers, the span of the columns necessitates the arched lintel to run higher than the first floor level, thereby exposing the internal floorplate.

There is no step in plan between the entrance building and the main building on the southern elevation. This creates a very awkward junction between the two ‘buildings’ and compromises the logic of the design concept. In addition meaning that no room is left for the quoin applied at this corner.

The columns proposed on the south facade do not appear in plan

The discrepancy between the floorplan and the elevations has led to visual inconsistencies including the need for the external partition at first floor between F4 and F5 should be removed; at first floor this should be reduced to a (visually) lightweight separation (details to be provided). Terraces to F6-8 should be pulled back into line with the eaves, as indicated in the South elevation.

The exposed side elevation to the main building on the south of the east elevation appears to be hatched as brick. This is inconsistent with the timber boarding on the rest of the main block.

The timber boarding should be continuous and the undefined banding which appears on the elevations (in line with the balconies) is incongruous and should be removed.

The location of bins and bikes store at the edge of Canbury Gardens does little to support or improve the site’s relationship with the public realm. This is a significant negative impact on the gardens, with blank facades and ‘back of house’ serving areas being to the forefront of the scheme and only point of contact at ground floor between the building and the gardens (the bin store appears to be missing in the north elevation). The location of and access arrangement to the bin store should be conditioned to ensure that this (the access route) does not have a negative impact on the current or future operation of this part of the gardens, including appropriate access for refuse vehicles.

A landscape plan is needed to evidence the interface with the park and areas surrounding the proposed building. With the on-going and planned improvements to Thames Side and Canbury Gardens the role of this building and its landscape in supporting the wider improvement to the area is vital, including the way that boundary treatments outside the site interface with the proposed, including the current palisade fences on the southern and northern boundaries.

Seemingly no information has been provided on the material choice, their relationships and application within the design.

As highlighted above is no evidence to demonstrate that the applicant understands the context of the site in terms of its key characteristics in relation to the conservation area and the buildings and space which constitute the setting of the site, including views along Down Hall Road, Canbury Gardens and the wider riverside. Moreover, there are a significant number of areas of concern within the detailed design of the building which undermines the proposed design approach, and constitutes a poor quality building in design and detail.

Officers conclude that the proposed development, owing to lack of detail, errors in the drawings, and little information to demonstrate the building could or would be
executed so as to secure a high quality form of development in this highly visible and prominent location, would not represent a good design, would harm the character and appearance of the area and would harm the designated heritage asset. Officers acknowledge that this harm would be less than substantial, however, it would not be outweighed by the public benefits associated with the development – the delivery of market homes.

**Impact on Residential amenity**

The nearest residential units to the application site are 2 houseboats moored on the western side of Thames Side car park. There would be some overlooking from the upper floor flats of the proposed development, however this would not be so significant so as to be detrimental to the residential amenities of the occupants of the houseboats. With regards to noise, there would be increased activities owing to the presence of the restaurant, however given the town centre location some evening activity should be expected.

The application site is located approximately 25 metres from the next nearest residential units, beyond a line of mature trees. The next nearest residential units are contained within the Kingston Heights development, a development which towers over the application site.

National, regional, and local policies state that planning should always seek to secure high a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

Policy 7.6 of the London Plan outlines that buildings and structures should not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings, particularly residential buildings, in relation to privacy, overshadowing, wind and microclimate. It states that this is particularly important for tall buildings.

Policy DM10 of the LDF Core Strategy seeks to safeguard residential amenities in terms of privacy, outlook, and sunlight/daylight, avoidance of visual intrusion and noise and disturbance.

Given the separation distance, and height differential, between the proposed development and Kingston Heights, there would be no material impact on the residential amenities of those properties.

A number of residents have raised concerns with the proposed development blocking their personal view over the river. The loss to a personal view is something which would not be deemed to be a material consideration in the determination of the application, however the closing down of public views and the resultant impact on character and appearance of the area is a consideration and has been discussed elsewhere in the report.

**Highways Impact**

The proposed development would provide 24 bicycle spaces, this would be in accordance with London Plan requirements.
No car parking is proposed for the development, however, in an area with good access to the Town Centre car parks and public transport, a car-free (car capped) development would be acceptable.

**Biodiversity**

The site is located in a Green Chain, Green Corridor, and Site of Importance for Nature Conservation, The River Thames and Tidal Tributaries.

In earlier consultations the Environment Agency (EA) objected to the proposed development citing the failure of the developer to demonstrate that the proposed development would not have a detrimental effect on the biodiversity and natural habitat of the local area. However, further information has been provided and the EA have removed their objection subject to the imposition of suitable planning conditions.

**Other material consideration**

In 2012 the Council approved a planning application for the erection of boathouse building over the Barge Dock for use as a restaurant / cafe on first floor with ground floor reception, plant room and alterations to mooring facilities.

The applicant submits that the development has commenced, however, the applicant further submits that this application has been put to the market place and there has been little interest in securing a tenant for the development. As such no evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the approved scheme will ever be developed.

As such, to attribute significant weight to the ‘fall-back’ position in the determination of this application would be incorrect.

**Very Special Circumstances**

As discussed above, the proposed development would be inappropriate development in MOL. As such the development would by definition be harmful, and should only be allowed in very special circumstances. Very special circumstances will not exist unless the harm to the MOL and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

Officers acknowledge that the delivery 9 market units would have both social and economic benefits both of which carry significant weight, Officers also attribute moderate weight to the ‘fall-back’ position. However, when balanced against the dis-benefits of the development, namely the poor design of the proposal and the resultant negative impact on the wider character appearance of the area, the unjustified harm to the conservation area, the failure (notwithstanding in principle objections) to optimise the site for housing including affordable housing and family housing, as well as the harm associated with flooding, Officers conclude that there are no considerations which either individually or cumulatively would amount to very special circumstances to support the development.
RECOMMENDATION

Refuse for the following reason(s):

1. The proposed development by reason of lack of detail, errors in the drawings, and the little information submitted to demonstrate that the building could or would be executed so as to secure a high quality form of development in this highly visible and prominent location, would not represent a good design, would harm the character and appearance of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies 7.4 and 7.5 of the London Plan 2016, and Policies KT1, CS8, DM7 and DM10 of the Core Strategy 2012 and Policy K13 of the Kingston Town Centre Area Action Plan 2008 and national policy contained within the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

2. The proposed development is located within land designated as flood zone 3B, within which development should be resisted. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies CS1, CS2, KT1, DM3, DM4, and Policy K24 of the Kingston Town Centre Area Action Plan 2008, Policy 5.12 in the London Plan, and national policy contained within the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

3. Notwithstanding reason for refusal 2 the applicant has failed to demonstrate that a sustainable drainage system could not be incorporated into the development contrary to paragraph 163 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy 5.13 of the London Plan and polices CS1, CS2, KT1, DM3, DM4, and policy K24 of the Kingston Town Centre Area Action Plan 2008.

4. The proposed development by reason of lack of detail, errors in the drawings, and little information submitted to demonstrate the building could or would be executed so as to secure a high quality form of development in this highly visible and prominent location, would not represent a good design, and would therefore fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Riverside North Conservation Area. The harm, albeit less than substantial, is not outweighed by any public benefits. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies 7.4 and 7.8 of the London Plan 2016, Policies KT1, CS8, DM7, DM10 and DM12 of the Core Strategy 2012 and Policy K13 of the Kingston Town Centre Area Action Plan 2008, and national policy contained within the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

5. Notwithstanding the other reasons for refusal, the development would not provide 30% of the units as family units (units with 3 bedrooms or more). It has not been robustly demonstrated that the delivery of 30% of the units as family units would be unsuitable or unviable. As such the proposal is contrary to Policy CS10 or DM13 of the Core Strategy or Policy 3.8 of the London Plan.
6. The proposed would fall below the density range in Policy 3.4 of the London Plan. Moreover, it is noted that each flat (with the exception of Flat 3) would exceed the internal space standards as set out in regional policy. This over-provision of internal space equals approx. 80sqm of accommodation. It is considered that this over-provision results in the development not making the optimal use of this brownfield site, moreover, a distribution of internal space in line with policy could result in the delivery of affordable homes. As such, notwithstanding other reasons for refusal the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the application would make the efficient use of land and could not make a reasonable contribution to affordable housing provision, contrary to paragraph 123 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019, Policy 3.4 of the London Plan, Policy 3.9 of London Plan, and Policy CS10 and DM 15 of the Core Strategy.

7. The proposed development would be inappropriate development within Metropolitan Open Land and would have a significant adverse impact on openness. The applicant has not put forward any considerations which would clearly outweigh the harm to the Metropolitan Open Land and the other harm outlined above so as to amount to very special circumstances. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy 7.17 of the London Plan 2016, Policies CS3 and DM5 of the Core Strategy, and national policy contained within the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

INFORMATIVE(S)

1. 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. We have however been unable to seek solutions to problems arising from the application as the principal of the proposal is clearly contrary to our statutory policies and negotiation could not overcome the reasons for refusal.
Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee
27 March 2019
Planning Consultation: 4 Manorgate Road, KT2 7EL (18/13000/FUL)

A Register No: 18/13000/FUL
Address: 4 MANORGATE ROAD, KINGSTON UPON THAMES, KT2 7EL

(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: Demolition of the existing buildings on site and the erection of an A1 retail foodstore (2181sqm) with undercroft car parking, external car parking, servicing, landscaping, public footpath improvements, substation, plant equipment and other associated works

Plan Type: Full Application

Expiry Date: 16/03/2019

This planning application has been brought to the Neighbourhood Committee for comment. The application for the abovementioned development will be determined at the Development Control Committee in accordance with the Council's Scheme of Delegation.

Proposal

1. The application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of the existing buildings (Use Class B8 - Storage or Distribution) on site and the erection of an retail foodstore (Use Class A1) with undercroft car parking, external car parking, servicing, landscaping, public footpath improvements, substation, plant equipment and other associated works. The applicant is Lidl, and it is anticipated that the foodstore would be occupied by Lidl; however, the application seeks permission for an unrestricted operator.

2. The proposed supermarket would be on two floors, comprising 3,760 sqm Gross External Area (3,504 sqm Gross Internal Area). It would be sited on the southern portion of the site and be of flat roof construction. The height would be approximately 8.5m - 9.3m above ground level (varying ground level), with a centrally located plant room.

3. The majority of the ground floor would comprise an undercroft car park for 44 cars, together with a warehouse (45 sqm) and covered servicing area. The sales area would be at first floor, accessed by a travelator (also customer lift and staircase) with a floor area of 1,044 sqm GIA. The first floor would also include a warehouse (241 sqm), staff welfare facilities customer WC facilities, and other ancillary areas.

4. An external car park would be provided, in the area between the building and the Manorgate Road site access. The car park would provide a further 23 parking spaces (67 in total across the site). It would include 5 Accessible Parking Bays, 8 spaces with active Electric Vehicle Charging points and 4 parent and child bays. 38 Cycle parking space are proposed.

5. The access to the site would remain as existing, onto Manorgate Road, with localised widening to accommodate service vehicles. It is proposed that a sign would be erected at the site exit, advising vehicles to exit left onto Manorgate Road, to avoid the Home Zone.
6. A footway is proposed to provide pedestrian access from Manorgate Road to the store entrance.

7. The existing wall which bounds the southern edge of the site (adjacent the public footpath) would be demolished and the existing footpath is proposed to be widened and enhanced. It would be resurfaced and mounted security lighting would be erected to the back wall of the building.

8. The majority of the building would be finished in brickwork, with the sections of the external walls including the entrance lobby area, finished in grey Alucobond cladding. A green wall is proposed at first floor level on the western side of the building.

**Previous Relevant History**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89/0755/FUL</td>
<td>Erection of windows at first floor level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28168</td>
<td>Erection of a Warehouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32878</td>
<td>Erection of six light industrial units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/06/1989</td>
<td>Permit 5 Year Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/06/1984</td>
<td>Refuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/06/1987</td>
<td>Conditional permission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consultation Responses**

**Neighbour Consultations:** 347 neighbouring properties have been notified of the proposal, in addition site notices have been erected around the site and the proposed development has been advertised in the local press. In response 3 letters of support have been received and 367 letters of objection have been received.

3 letter of support
1 letter expressing Neutrality

368 Letters of Objection from local residents, the Manorgate Road and Carlisle Close Residents’ Association, the Kingston Residents Alliance, the North Kingston Forum, the Kingston Cycling Campaign, and Zac Goldsmith MP raising the following issues:

**Land Use Issues:**
- The proposed retail unit is not required – the area is well served by supermarkets
- Local shops and small businesses would be adversely impacted by the new supermarket resulting in loss of local jobs. There are 55 shops within 500m of the application site, 29 of which sell goods directly in competition with the proposed supermarket, including a number of small independent specialist food and wine shops.
- The need is for more affordable housing, not businesses and supermarkets.
Retail Impact Assessment should be submitted to support the application.

Highway Issues:
- Adverse impact on local roads and roundabout
- Impact on Manorgate Road Home Zone
- Highway safety and conflict with pedestrians and cyclists
- Level of parking proposed
- Servicing
- Deficiencies in the Transport Assessment.

Heritage, Character and Appearance
- Impact on character of area, and the adjacent Park Road Conservation Area.
- Bulk and massing - the proposed building is 9.31m high (plus plant room c 2.5m)
- Materials and context

Environmental Issues:
- Air Pollution
- Noise and disturbance including service deliveries, plant and substation, customer traffic and idling vehicles etc.
- Light pollution
- Sustainability
- Lack of tree screening and softening.
- Flooding

Residential Amenity:
- Loss of light and sunlight to neighbouring properties in Coombe Road, Manorgate Road and Burnham Street
- Visual intrusion and loss of view of sky
- Loss of privacy
- Anti-social issues

Other:
- Structural issues resulting from demolition along shared boundary
- Community Engagement has focused on positive aspects of the development and not the negative impacts. The applicant has not provided the proactive response promised

Kingston Town Conservation Area Advisory Committee: Objection raised on grounds that the proposal would neither preserve or enhance the adjacent Park Road Conservation Area.

The Kingston upon Thames Society: Objection raised on grounds of the impact on traffic on Park Road Conservation Area. Also the transition from the west side of the proposed building to the adjacent residential cottages should be eased by e.g. stepping or mansarding the roof.

North Kingston Forum: Objection raised on the following grounds:
- The traffic impact both locally in Manorgate Road and the wider area of London Road and Park Road due to the significant increase in vehicle trips anticipated and the inadequacy of the on-site parking proposed.
- Noise and nuisance on the residential communities in Manorgate Road and Burnham Street and the wider area, due to site operations and the anticipated significant increase of traffic including deliveries (recommend reduced hours of servicing, between 08:00 – 16:00 weekdays, 08:00-18:00 on Saturdays and 10:00-16:00 on Sundays and Bank Holidays, with no more than 2 deliveries per day).
- Undermining the viability of the local shopping centres of Kingston Hill South/ Park Road and Coombe Rd due to the size of the proposed retail area, in particular considering the lack of a Retail Impact Assessment to suggest otherwise.
- The adverse impact on the character and amenity of the Park Road conservation area due to the scale of the proposed development, and the significant intensification of activity on the site the proposals would cause.
- The lack of consideration the consequential congestion would have on emergency services access to and from Kingston Hospital.
- Acknowledge the benefits of the building being located at the back of the site, and the improvements to the pedestrian rear access point, as this should enhance the physical environment of the rear shortcut from Burnham St to Norbiton Station.

Network Rail: Comments that the applicant should ensure the development does not encroach on railway land or infrastructure, and is required to enter an asset protection agreement prior to construction work.

Secure By Design (Metropolitan Police): Amendments were recommended to address local crime issues and the environmental features of the location, which have subsequently been incorporated into the submission. The only matter outstanding would be the management and maintenance of the external areas including the footpath. (Poorly maintained areas cause a fear avoidance cycle where crime and fear of crime can escalate.)

Neighbourhood Traffic Engineer: Comments awaited

Environmental Health Officer (EHO)
Air Quality Impact: Dispersion modelling was undertaken to predict pollutant concentrations at the development location and immediate vicinity associated with emissions from the local highway network. The results of the dispersion modelling assessment indicate concentrations of NO2 and PM10 are not anticipated to be above the relevant long or short term Air Quality Standard (AQS) objectives at all locations over the proposed site. Results indicate locations at the site would fall into the APEC (Air Pollution Exposure Criteria) A category, which would indicate that there are no air quality grounds for refusal. As such, mitigation measures are not required to protect future users from exposure to poor air quality. Additionally, the impacts from the additional traffic generated from the proposed development are anticipated to be negligible.

Air Quality Neutral: An Air Quality Neutral Calculation, included in the AQ report (Ref.: 17-3023) has considered emissions from the development (traffic flow and energy consumption) and compared them with set benchmarks as referred to the London Plan (GLA,2016a). The building related emissions associated
with the proposed development are both below the relevant benchmark. In contrast the Total Development Transport Emissions exceed the total benchmarked transport for NO2 and PM10, as such, the development is not classed as air quality neutral with regards to transport emissions and further reduction measures or off-setting is required. Appropriate onsite measures to reduce petrol and diesel emissions and encourage the use of other modes of transport are included (cycle parking, electric car charging, travel plan etc). Additional Offsetting measures sought in the form of a financial contributions to support implementation of actions from the borough’s Air Quality Action Plan in pursuit of meeting the air quality objectives.

Noise: The Environmental Health Officer is satisfied with the methodology and proposed target noise level for fixed plant and machinery.

The applicant is proposing to have deliveries to the premises between 7am and 11pm and their acoustic report advises that noise from these activities will not create adverse impact. In their draft Delivery and Servicing Plan they have adopted a number of principles contained within relevant guidance for quieter deliveries, however it is in draft form. Full details of the finalised delivery and servicing plan detailing how noise from deliveries will be controlled, should be secured by condition. In particular external refrigeration plant attached to vehicles should be switched off upon entering Manorgate Road and only switched back on upon leaving the road.

Flood Risk Officer: Submission under review

Sustainability Officer: Submission under review

**Site and Surroundings**

9. The site is an irregular shape, approximately 0.33ha in area. The site is currently vacant and comprising 3 x two storey buildings last used for a B8 storage and distribution purposes. It was most recently occupied by Minatol, a cleaning business, who have since vacated and sold the site.

10. Parking and access is currently from Manorgate Road. There is an existing parking area for approximately 20 car parking spaces.

11. The site has a good public transport accessibility level, PTAL 4. The site is located within a controlled parking area and adjacent a Home Zone. A few metres east of the northern entry point into the site, Manorgate Road becomes a Home Zone which promotes a reduction in car speed with planting and public realm treatments. The site is located approximately 60m from the roundabout junction with Kingston Hill, Park Road, Clifton Road, London Road and Manorgate Road.

12. A footpath runs along the southern boundary of the site, linking Coombe Road/ Norbiton Station with Burnham Street.

13. The Park Road Conservation area bounds the site to the North and East, and to the south along the railway embankment.
14. The site is within an area of mixed use, with residential flats and houses surrounding the site.

15. The site is has a low risk of fluvial flooding, and is within Flood Zone 1.

**Assessment**

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

- Principle of Proposed Development
- Land use implications
- Highways and Parking
- Heritage and Impact on Character of Area
- Impact on Neighbour’s Residential Amenity
- Noise
- Air Quality
- Trees
- Sustainability
- Flood Risk
- Other Material Considerations

**Conclusion**

All comments raised will be taken into account in the assessment of the planning application.
Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee  
27 March 2019

King’s Road

Report by Assistant Director - Transport, Highways and Regulatory Services

Call-in deadline: Tuesday 9 April 2019

**Purpose**

This report outlines the results of a local consultation on the introduction of new traffic management measures in King’s Road area, and seeks Members’ views on the way forward.

**Recommendations**

That the Committee -

1. notes the results of the consultation as set out in Annex 2;

2. Approves the scheme shown in Annex 5 on an experimental basis and resolves to authorise footway parking under the provisions of Section 15 of the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1974 on the footway outside 267 / 269 Kings Road to 303 Kings Road inclusive, and between no.s 284 to 328 Kings Road inclusive; and

3. Agrees a report is brought back to the Committee after the footway parking authorised above has been in force for 6 months to assess its impact on the area.

**Benefits to the Community:**

Further reduction of through traffic and vehicular speeds, and improvements to the local environment, thus encouraging other modes of transport such as walking and cycling.

**Key Points**

A. An online petition with 42 signatures, from residents in the section of King’s Road between Park Road and Queen’s Road, was submitted to Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee in Spring 2017. The petition requested that the council implements significant traffic reducing measures to urgently calm and limit traffic using the upper part (eastern section) of King’s Road, between Park Road and Queen’s Road.

B. The Committee, at their meeting on 22 January 2019, approved traffic management measures in King’s Road area, subject to local consultation.
This report outlines the results of the local consultation, and seeks members approval on the way forward.

Context
1. A Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) ban was introduced in the North Kingston Area, including King’s Road in 1985. This was aimed at restricting vehicles greater than 7.5 tonnes from entering the area, albeit the restriction included an ‘except for access’ element.

2. In November 2006 the Committee agreed to include the section of King’s Road, between Park Road and Queen’s Road, in an area-wide 20mph speed limit. This was an extension of the existing Canbury 20mph zone, which already included King’s Road between Richmond Road and Park Road, and was implemented in 2007.

3. A petition was received in March 2010 from residents of King’s Road, between Park Road and Queen’s Road. This called for a reduction in speed and congestion and stopping larger vehicles from using this section of King’s Road. The petition also requested that a one-way system was introduced in the area, as the petitioners felt that King’s Road was not wide enough for two way traffic. Residents also wanted speed cushions replaced with speed humps, and a width restriction installed to prevent large vehicles from turning into Queen’s Road.

4. At the meeting in December 2010, Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee considered a report on the petition issues and resolved that no changes were to be made to the traffic management arrangements in King’s Road, between Park Road and Queen’s Road.

5. A new online petition was commenced in February 2017, with 42 signatures from King’s Road residents living in the section between Park Road and Queen’s Road, asking the council to implement significant traffic reducing measures to urgently calm and limit traffic using the upper part of King’s Road, between Park Road and Queen’s Road.

6. On 22 January 2019 the Committee considered the outcomes of a working group meeting that had been set up to develop options. The Committee resolved to undertake a local consultation on one of the proposals developed, the details of which are set out below.

Proposals and Options
7. The following option was approved by Committee for local consultation:
   - **Option**: To make King’s Road one way westbound, towards Park Road and to make New Road and Tudor Road one way eastbound, towards Queens Road. With the current traffic calming measures in Kings Road, this proposal will reduce the level of through traffic, reduce air pollution and remove congestion. However, the proposals for the other two roads are likely to increase the level of traffic and speed in these
two roads, as they have no traffic calming features. As such, it is proposed to introduce traffic calming measures to compensate for the potential issues. See Annex 1 for more details.

- Option 2 is to take no further action.

**Consultation Results**

8. In February 2019, 668 consultation letters were delivered to residents within the scope (please see Annex 4 for the area of delivery). 179 responses have been received from the affected roads (26.8% response rate), with an additional 76 responses from residents living outside the consultation areas.

9. 102 (57%) residents within the scope think there is an issue with the current situation in King’s Road, between Park Road and Queens Road. However, 63 (35.2%) do not think there is a problem in Kings Road.

10. 72 (40.2%) residents within the scope support the introduction of one-way working in Kings Road between Park Road and Queens Road, New Road, and Tudor Road, whereas 104 (58.1%) do not support the proposed one-way scheme in these roads.

11. 48 (32.2%) out of 149 properties responses received from Kings Road between Acre Road and Queens Road, for question one 46 (95.8%) out of the received agreed there is a problem in their road, 2 (4.2%) do not agree there is a problem. For question two 42 (87.5%) out of the responses received support the introduction of one-way working in Kings Road (between Park Road and Queens Road), Tudor Road and New Road, 4 (8.2%) said no, and 2 (4.2%) don’t know.

12. 40 (63.5%) out of 63 properties responses received from Tudor Road. 10 (25%) agreed there is a problem in Kings Rd, 22 (55%) do not agree there is a problem, and 7 (17.5%) don’t know. Out of these responses received, 1 (2.5%) supports the introduction of one-way working in Kings Road (between Park Road and Queens Road), Tudor Road and New Road, and 39 (97.5%) do not support the scheme.

13. 17 (39.5%) out of 43 properties responses received from New Road. 3 (17.6%) agreed there is a problem in Kings Rd, 10 (58.8%) do not agree there is a problem in Kings Road, and 4 (23.5%) don’t know. Out of these responses received 1 (5.9%) supports the introduction of one-way working in Kings Road (between Park Road and Queens Road), Tudor Road and New Road, and 16 (94.1%) do not support the proposed scheme.
14. Overall, including responses received from residents living outside the consultation area, 67.1% think there is an issue with the current situation in King’s Road between Park Road and Queens Road, whereas 27.5% do not think there is a problem in Kings Road.

15. 64.5% out of the overall responses received, support the introduction of one way working in Kings Road between Park Road and Queens Road, New Road, and Tudor Road, and 31.6% do not support the proposed one-way scheme in these roads.

16. Please see Annex 2 for street by street results, and Annex 3 for comments received.

17. During the consultation period, a petition was received with 173 signatures objecting to the proposed schemes:

Our conclusion as residents is that even though the Proposal may solve some of the current difficulties in the upper part of King’s Road, it will produce immense problems elsewhere. There will be increased congestion at the bottom of King’s Road. Congestion will increase in all other roads, apart perhaps from New Road. Traffic flows will be enormously heavier in Tudor Road which will be turned at peak times into a choked rat run. Speeds will be higher at non-peak times in the one-way system. Safety concerns will be more widespread and much greater. More right turns are statistically likely to lead to increases in collisions. There is no evidence to show that pedestrian experiences will be improved or be made safer. The benefits to cyclists are uncertain and need further analysis.

For all the above reasons we strongly believe that there is an overwhelming case for the Proposal to be shelved. We propose that alternatively the Council should look again at:

(i) A new consultation for width restrictions in Queen’s Road. We believe a new form of questionnaire which will encourage a wider response. We would like to discuss this proposal and the questions which should be asked at greater length with the Council Officers.

(ii) A widening of King’s Road. It is our understanding that at a relatively recent date (we do not have the exact date), the pavements in King’s road were widened. If this widening was reversed, there would be more space on the road surface, and this would hopefully deal with some of the concerns of the King’s Road residents. On kerb parking is also a viable option.

18. A suggestion was received from Kingston Cycling Campaign outlining their proposals which is “copying Walton Forest mini holland scheme, which means closure to traffic all the roads between Park Road and Queens, and divert the traffic to use Queens Road, Kingston Hill, and Park Road”.

C4
19. Such a proposal needs to be looked at in more depth. According to the current traffic data, such a proposal will lead to the displacement of 7500 vehicles per day into surrounding roads, in particular Kingston Hill and Park Road. Considering that the existing capacity and flows on these roads are high during peak periods, in particular at their junctions, such as Queens Road / Kingston Hill; Kingston Hill / Galsworthy Road; Galsworthy Road / Coombe Lane West and Kingston Hill / Park Road. All these junctions are connected together as part of the local network, and any impact on one of them is likely to impact on the others. Hence, it is not recommended to consider such a suggestion as part of this scheme.

Officer’s comments

20. RBK officers do not dispute most of the information in the petitions and the comments received, and made it clear that, such a scheme will have displacement to the surrounding roads and junctions, and it is not possible to quantify these changes unless modelling for the area is carried out; such modelling will demonstrate with a value the extent of these changes. This could be looked at if members want to proceed further with these changes.

21. Reflecting on the above result, it was expected that there is no strong support for the scheme, however, before we recommend any decision, we need to establish the reason/objective of this scheme, the options available, analyse the comments/objections received, in order to be able to make the decision on the way forward.

22. The current traffic flow in Kings Road during peak hours of 514 vehicles per hour, New Road has 116 per hour and 172 per hour in Tudor Road. It is estimated that the proposed scheme will reduce the volume of traffic in Kings Road to about 407 vehicles per hour, increase the traffic volume in New Road to about 200 vehicles per hour, and to Tudor Road to about 250 vehicles per hour during peak hours, these figures are only estimated, to get the correct figure network modeling will be needed.

23. Considering the result of the consultation, the petitions and the comments received, it is not recommended for this scheme as it stands now to be taken to the next stage for implementation, however, the issue in Kings Road between Park Road and Queens Road needs to be addressed.

24. Hence, it is recommended to consider the scheme at Annex 5 to introduce footway parking on both sides of Kings Road, which will address the conflict between drivers and reduce congestion. The proposed scheme will reduce footway width from 2.2m to 1.7m. It is not ideal but it will accommodate the pedestrians footfall along this section of Kings Road, and the carriageway width becomes 4.8m which will allow cars to pass each other safely. This scheme will make cycling safer as well, however, this may not address the level of pollution and HGV intrusion. It is therefore proposed as a trial to establish whether the issues of concerns have been
addressed, and bring a report to a future Committee meeting outlining the outcomes of this trial. As part of this trial all poles need to be placed at the back of the footway.

Timescale

25. Subject to Committee approval, it is anticipated for the scheme to be implemented in July 2019,

Resource Implications

26. It is expected that, if scheme approved, the cost of local the introduction of the scheme to be around £5,000. And it will be met from Local Implementation Plan (LIP) allocation 2019/20.

Legal Implications

27. Section 15 of the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1974 empowers the Council, as Highway Authority, by resolution, to authorise the parking of vehicles on the footway. The Authority is required to display traffic signs on the footway and to published in a newspaper circulating throughout the whole of Greater London a notice giving publicity to the resolution and to the general effect of authorised footway parking.

Risk Assessment

28. Introduce the scheme on Annex 5, may not address the residents concerns in terms of congestion and hgv intrusion. Hence, the trial is proposed to establish the extent of these risks.

Equalities Impact Assessment

29. Schemes of this nature are covered by an overarching Local Improvement Plan Equalities Impact Assessment, and as such do not require a specific assessment.

Health Implications

30. It is anticipated that the proposed schemes will remove conflict and encourage walking to school, hence it is expected to have a positive impact on health and well being.

Road Network Implications

31. The proposed schemes will not have network implications on surrounding roads. However, the footway width will be reduced to achieve footway parking which may impact on pedestrians footfall.
Environmental Implications and Air Quality

32. Kings Road has a 20 mph speed limit, therefore, is is anticipated that the proposed schemes should not impact negatively on air quality. Whilst it is expected to enhance conditions by reducing queues and congestion along this road, there is the offset that conditions in other roads will possibly worsen.

Background papers -

Previous Committee meeting agenda and minutes;
Local consultation;
Result of local consultation;

held by author  Younes Hamade
Author of report - Younes Hamade, Senior Professional Engineer, younes.hamade@kingston.gov.uk
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROAD</th>
<th>Q1 DELIVERED</th>
<th>Q1 RECEIVED</th>
<th>Q1 YES</th>
<th>Q1 NO</th>
<th>Q1 DON'T KNOW</th>
<th>Q1 YES</th>
<th>Q1 NO</th>
<th>Q1 DON'T KNOW</th>
<th>Q2 DELIVERED</th>
<th>Q2 RECEIVED</th>
<th>Q2 YES</th>
<th>Q2 NO</th>
<th>Q2 DON'T KNOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King’s Road</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Road</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen’s Road</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandra Road</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tudor Road</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Road</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortlands Road</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Road</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elm Road</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acre Road</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaumont Close</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherrywood Close</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool Road</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Park Road</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whyndam Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOT</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER ROADS</td>
<td>Q1 DELIVERED</td>
<td>Q1 RECEIVED</td>
<td>Q1 YES</td>
<td>Q1 NO</td>
<td>Q1 DON'T KNOW</td>
<td>Q1 YES</td>
<td>Q1 NO</td>
<td>Q1 DON'T KNOW</td>
<td>Q2 DELIVERED</td>
<td>Q2 RECEIVED</td>
<td>Q2 YES</td>
<td>Q2 NO</td>
<td>Q2 DON'T KNOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REF NR</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR1/KR1b</td>
<td>Kings Road</td>
<td>The road is a terrible trap. Drivers enter and get caught in traffic with no way out. Aggression between drivers is commonplace, which must cause them stress. The pollution is building, bicycles mount the pavement, and cars are damaged as people have to reverse under pressure. Our car has been scrapped, bumped and smashed over the years. That’s bad for us - but the poor road users are having the same thing happen to them. The shouting and honking is getting serious. I saw cars unable to make the roundabout on kings/park road as cars were stuck higher Kings road blocking cars from entering. Above all, the road is getting dangerous and it’s only a matter of time before something horrible happens. The park is Kingston’s pride and we are not doing it any justice at all. I have a busy schedule at school so when I get home I want do homework or have peaceful sleep yet I am constantly woken up by car horns and shouting. I look out of my window and see a congested street due to a stand-off. The people get out of their cars and start shouting and swearing. My parents are always stressed by the road as our car is constantly hit. They don’t like the idea of lorries hurtling down the road and cars pulling in and hitting our car.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR2/KR2b</td>
<td>Kings Road</td>
<td>Traffic on Kings road is effectively calmed by parking on both sides, which limits flow to a single lane. First objection is that a single lane in one direction will speed up traffic irrespective of speed cushions. Second objection is to the narrowing of the south side pavement because it is used by mothers with children and buggies to the park and school. A wider central roadway can only increase speed, the opposite to that intended. Third objection is that the nimbyism of certain Kings Road residents to shift the problem elsewhere. This is an old chestnut and has been ongoing for some 20 years without solution. It strikes me that these proposals place an onerous burden on Tudor Road and, the unintended consequences are likely to be more traffic in Alexandria Road past the school. A solution no right minded person would support. You conveniently leave Alexandria Road off the map and fail to mention the issue of traffic redistribution and its effect on the school. The Kings Road/Liverpool Road to Kingston Hill will now become the Alexandra Road/Crescent road rat-run. In my opinion there is no satisfactory solution to traffic in Kings Road without a profound negative effect elsewhere, including Kings Road itself with a reduced width pavement. To simply shunt the problem elsewhere is morally indefensible without even mentioning where the money may be better spent. Concern about entry to roundabout with park road where all other traffic appears to have priority by virtue of being on the roundabout. It will be extremely difficult to exit at peak times, causing traffic build-up in Kings Road thereby negating the alleged benefits. Also concerned about potentially imposing additional traffic on Alexandria Road past the schools...not a good outcome.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR3</td>
<td>Kings Road</td>
<td>I am supportive of the move to one way. It is crucial that the traffic calming measures are adopted and monitored to keep the road safe. It would also be useful to indicate to people entering Queens road that there is limited access so that in time people use the wider roads as they should if they are not entering the park.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR4</td>
<td>Kings Road</td>
<td>This is imperative for the safety of the road users and the residents of the road. The current traffic levels are unsustainable and the inability to safely drive down the road is causing bouts of real road rage. Cyclists are not safe in the current set up. It has to change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR5</td>
<td>Kings Road</td>
<td>I strongly support the proposed scheme. The problems the proposed scheme seek to address are wide ranging and acute. They are not limited to issues of through traffic, congestion and air pollution as mentioned in the description above. The problems sought to be addressed also relate to driver, bicycle and pedestrian safety, quiet enjoyment of the neighbourhood, damage to property and traffic management. The proposed scheme takes a sensible holistic approach to the issues which arise. The proposed scheme would address each of the problems. In particular, the proposed scheme would promote reduced pollution levels, increase the pleasant enjoyment of vehicle users, pedestrians and cyclists in the area. The proposed solution would enhance the traffic flow, reduce traffic concerns and improve sustainable transport in the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR6</td>
<td>Kings Road</td>
<td>I don’t think the plans go far enough. Living in between Park Rd and Acre Rd, there are not enough traffic calming measures. Cars frequently drive far too fast and I think the one-way measures should be extended down to Acre Rd stretch of Kings Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR7</td>
<td>Kings Road</td>
<td>The road has become very dangerous and polluted. There is a tremendous amount of road rage as drivers who enter get caught. When two cars meet they cannot pass. When each has other cars behind them we have mayhem. This causes greater pollution and a knock on to the surrounding roads with increased accidents for cars, bikes and potentially pedestrians. ADDITIONA VIA EMAIL: Having lived and brought up 3 children on kings road for 10 years the road has now become intolerable. It always was busy but it is now at full capacity. You open your door in the morning to angry drivers swearing four letter words at each other you collect the children from school again having to witness angry confrontations between motorists. The pollution has noticeably increased and I have an asthmatic child. So many pedestrians use kings road to visit the park why can’t there be more trees make the whole experience much more pleasant for walkers, families, motorists, cyclists even horse riders. Kingston is growing in size more homes more cars. We all need to do our bit to keep this town a pleasant one to live in. Something has to change and I believe as our councillors it is your duty of care to our younger generation to do something about this. Thank you.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR8</td>
<td>Kings Road</td>
<td>We live between Park Road and the junction of Kings Rd and Acre Rd. We have two young children and feel some traffic drives too fast in both directions on our section of King’s Rd, We are unsure if the proposals will improve or worsen that situation. We would like to see improved traffic calming measures on our section. Many children are in the area due to schools and we feel traffic does need to be calmed. We feel one-way system operating in the opposite direction to the proposal would be beneficial for us.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR9/KR9b</td>
<td>Kings Road</td>
<td>Would really appreciate anything that would help reduce the regular visits to the garage to get scrapes fixed, the regular exposure to road rage, cars tooting their horns all day, and the overall sense that something terrible is going to happen one day. I think the road is noisy and dangerous. I worry about the environment and all the pollution caused by the traffic jams outside our house every day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR10/KR10 0bis/KR10 tri/KR10 of/outh</td>
<td>Kings Road</td>
<td>The current situation should not be allowed to continue. The difficulty emergency services have getting down the road endangers the whole community. In addition, as the flow of traffic has increased, the confrontations between frustrated drivers who are nose to nose facing each other are becoming more and more common. At some point, there is going to be a serious incident between drivers which has been completely foreseeable. As a minor point, thousands of pounds of damage has been done to our cars as each wing has been clipped, not one incident which has been owned up to, so it is not possible to claim on the guilty party’s insurance for the damage they have caused. Our house, which is part of the Conservation area, physically shakes as the heavy goods vehicles go down the road at pace. The houses were not built with lorries and the current volume of traffic in mind. Finally, stepping out onto the pavement can be pretty risky at times, as it is so often used at speed by cyclists when they cannot get down the road. I have narrowly avoided being knocked down on a number of occasions. A child or elderly person may not have been as lucky. The behaviour of the cyclists is completely understandable as they too are often involved in collisions with vehicles.--- The current road layout is not fit for purpose. Most days there are incidents where cars come face to face. Drivers are often out in the road shouting at each other and at some point there is a real risk that there will be violence. I have witnessed a number of emergency vehicles stuck unable to move. That is a risk to the whole community that they serve, not just the residents of Kings Road. Our house is in a conservation area and currently shakes when the lorries race down the road. Neither the road nor the houses were built for the current levels of traffic. Cyclists are often forced onto the pavement and stepping out onto the pavement can be pretty risky as a result. I do not blame the cyclists though, as I have seen a number clipped by the cars, particularly when the road is jammed. As the major cycle route into the Park, more should be done to protect cyclists on Kings Road. The damage that has been done to our cars by drivers trying to squeeze into spaces that are not there totals thousands of pounds.--- As I sit at my desk doing homework, I often hear terrible swearing as drivers scream at each other after blocking themselves in. My whole room shakes as well as the lorries speed down the road, which can be quite frightening at times. Crossing the road, particularly in the mornings is also quite scary as the drivers are just looking to try to get out into Queens Road and do not seem to focus on the pedestrians at all. Pollution is also very bad at times as the cars idle waiting to move. It is particularly bad as often they are idling facing each other with no way of moving. I am strongly in favour of making it one way too in order to protect the cyclists who use the road extensively in order to get into the Park. I have also seen many emergency vehicles stuck in traffic which is a huge concern for the whole community.--- The current road system does not seem adequate for the amount of traffic using it. I have seen a number of emergency services vehicles not able to move as they are penned in by cars trying to come up the hill. When I am doing school work at my desk, I often hear terrible language as drivers scream at each other. The whole house also shakes as the lorries speed down the road. Cyclists are often forced onto the pavement as the whole road is blocked. As the major route for cyclists to enter the Park, it seems strange to force them onto a road with too much traffic. The pollution for cyclists, pedestrians and residents at times seems to be very high...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR11 Kings Road</td>
<td>How will this proposal affect the rest of Kings Road?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR12 Kings Road</td>
<td>This needs to be extended for the rest of Kings Road (Park - Acre). On-street parking not suitable for pavement use (not enough space for prams and wheelchairs). Speeding/volume of traffic also very much an issue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR13 Kings Road</td>
<td>Q3: The section between Acre Rd and Park Rd of Kings Rd must be included in the one-way system. Our section has the same noise, pollution, speed and issues as Kings Rd section between Park Rd and Queens Rd. Q4: It is unacceptable that the section of Kings Rd from Acre to Park Rd was taken completely out of scope. There are the same serious speed and noise and particularly pollution issues. Pavement Park is a problem also.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR14 Kings Road</td>
<td>If implemented, we think the volume and speed of traffic on the remainder of Kings Rd needs to be assessed as traffic already regularly exceeds the 20mph speed limit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR15 Kings Road</td>
<td>I am not an expert in road traffic so feel that I cannot voice my opinion confidently. I think it should be up to a panel of experts to come up with ways to improve pollution issues, road traffic and similar issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR16 Kings Road</td>
<td>Q3: It’s a good start but I think it would be better as access only. I think the current plan will result in the road having higher use of cars and more pollution. I think it is a temporary solution to a bigger problem. Q4: Do not remove parking. Do not allow/change to parking on the curb. I wish the Council would use this roads a bike lane only into the park. It’s the featured, populated pedestrian entrance to the park.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR17 Kings Road</td>
<td>Further conversion plus traffic calming measures on Kings Road from Acre Road to Park Road would be of benefit to residents. Currently, too much traffic. My wing mirror on my parked car has been repeatedly knocked off plus my house shakes when a lorry comes off the speed bump, outside my house at speed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR18 Kings Road</td>
<td>Something has to be done before a fatal accident/injury caused by angry confrontation/danger to pedestrians and cyclists.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR19/KR19 9bis Kings Road</td>
<td>Q2: Good proposals - with traffic directions well thought through. Great proposal, we are fed up with constant road rage - often quite aggressive shouting and swearing - also our cars are regularly damaged (scrapes, etc.). Q4: Please implement these proposals as soon as possible to remove the constant congestion created by the two-way road system in Kings Road. Too many vehicles trying to pass each other is too narrow a road.--- We’ve sent comments back by post but are filling this in to make sure you receive it. Don’t trust the post. We desperately need this new scheme. Almost Every day between 730-9am there is a road rage incident as vehicles are unable to advance or reverse. Swearing, shouting, threats etc. The constant stopping of traffic flow means constant running of engines. Residents’ cars are scraped regularly. It’s difficult to see cyclists when pulling out of a parking space. These plans will really help everyone’s quality of life - drivers AND residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR20/KR2</td>
<td>Kings Road</td>
<td>Kings Rd has huge safety problems, due to the volume of traffic, including HGVs. Cyclists are regularly on the pavements and the road has high levels of pollution due to volume and traffic jams. It is used heavily by visitors to the park on foot and cycle being the closest entrance. RBK has a duty of care to all road uses, not just the residents. Evidence has been submitted that stands testament that RBK has to act for the many, not the few.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR21/KR2</td>
<td>Kings Road</td>
<td>The road usage by vehicles is to the point of abusive which is impacting not only the residents but other users such as cyclists and pedestrians who use upper Kings road as the obvious gateway to Richmond Park. If other local roads do not want to change then I would be happy for just upper Kings road to be made one way. It cannot stay as is.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR22/KR2</td>
<td>Kings Road</td>
<td>The current situation is a disaster waiting to happen. Something must be done immediately.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

| KR20/20 | Kings Road | The current situation is a disaster waiting to happen. Something must be done immediately. |
| KR21/KR2 | Kings Road | The current amount of traffic being forced up and down Upper Kings Road is a major problem, causing (on a daily basis) congestion, pollution, physical and verbal aggression and a danger to drivers, pedestrians, cyclists and public/private property. The decision not to control traffic along Queens road will perpetuate this situation. Making Upper Kings road one way, with traffic calming measures, will help massively, as will doing the same to New Road and Tudor road. This may not be popular with all residents of the latter, but fact is, if something isn’t done, all of us in all the roads leading up to the park will suffer. This is meant to be a conservation area but currently, nothing is being conserved. Quite the opposite I’d say. |
| KR22/KR2 | Kings Road | The current amount of traffic being forced up and down Upper Kings Road is a major problem, causing (on a daily basis) congestion, pollution, physical and verbal aggression and a danger to drivers, pedestrians, cyclists and public/private property. The decision not to control traffic along Queens road will perpetuate this situation. Making Upper Kings road one way, with traffic calming measures, will help massively, as will doing the same to New Road and Tudor road. This may not be popular with all residents of the latter, but fact is, if something isn’t done, all of us in all the roads leading up to the park will suffer. This is meant to be a conservation area but currently, nothing is being conserved. Quite the opposite I’d say. |

---

| Q3 | I can’t cross usually as traffic blocks the crossing. Traffic isles waiting to get up the road right next to my bus stop. Pollution is hurting my lungs. |
| Q4 | Ambulances are getting stuck on our road. There’s road rage almost everyday. I almost got hit by a cyclist the other day on my way to work. I’ve lived on Kings Road for 10 years and the recent build-up of traffic has a direct negative impact on Kings road. Please sort it! |
| KR23 | Kings Road | Q3: Yes going down but ideally no through traffic. I breathe lots of fumes walking to the bus stop |
| KR24/KR2 | Kings Road | KR24/KR2 Kings Road | It is essential that we solve the serious road traffic issue on Kings Road. The build-up of traffic over the recent years means the road is very dangerous and not fit to operate as a two way road. Road rage is a daily occurrence. Emergency vehicles often get stuck and cyclists are regularly using the pavements. |
| KR24/KR2 | Kings Road | Ambulances are getting stuck on our road. There’s road rage almost everyday. I almost got hit by a cyclist the other day on my way to work. I’ve lived on Kings Road for 10 years and the recent build-up of traffic has a direct negative impact on Kings road. Please sort it! |
| KR24/KR2 | Kings Road | The pollution on our road has become much worse over the last few years. There are often big traffic jams on our road because cars and vans get stuck in the middle. Yesterday I saw an ambulance stuff in the middle. We need to sort this problem. |
| KR24/KR2 | Kings Road | I really hate the pollution on our road due to the increasing volume of idling traffic. Almost everyday cars and lorries get stuck in the middle of the road causing big road rage issues. It’s not nice to hear the bad language. Often our car gets scratched but cars getting stuck. Please help!!! |

---

**Annex 3**

C12
<p>| KR25/KR25 5bis | Kings Road | Q3: I think the proposal for Kings Road is good but I think it would be better if either, the direction of traffic on New Road was the same as Tudor Road (i.e. both roads in the opposite direction to Kings Road) or that Kings Road was one way, as proposed, and the other two roads were left as they are. |
|----------------|------------| Q4: I also think that action is needed to prevent/discourage heavy goods vehicles and other through traffic from entering the area through measures on Crescent Road and Queens Road. |
|                |            | ------ |
|                |            | Q3: By making Tudor Rd the only one-way road in the opposite direction you have provoked an almost 100% negative response from those residents. Even if New Road was also made one way (west-east) most of those roads’ residents will be against it as they don’t seem to see that there is any problem. I would settle for being the only road to be one way or, failing that, only have the traffic calming measures providing they are effective. |
|                |            | Q4: None of the proposed alterations reduce traffic flow which is the root cause of all the problems. A (trial) barrier at the top of Crescent Road (below Kings Nympton entrance) coupled with width restrictions as previously proposed at the beginning of Queens Rd, Liverpool Rd and Crescent Road and a blanket (but effective) 20mph speed limit on all local roads north of London Rd/Kingston Hill would probably lead to a significant reduction in traffic and improved quality of residential roads involved. Doing nothing to the upper (east) part of King’s Road is no longer an acceptable option nor is making changes to improve the convenience of King’s Road for rat-running through traffic. RBK needs to show leadership and imagination in producing a neighbourhood solution for all the aforementioned roads. This latest proposal has at least mobilised a much larger and organised response from residents, many of whom did not know what is going on. The council needs to do a much better job of communicating their plans and explaining the longer term and wider area strategies if they are not to continue receiving a majority of negative or inadequate responses. The GLA has clear stated objectives and TfL has two clear strategies and funds for better (healthy, calmer, quieter etc.) residential streets. RBK needs to embrace and promote these initiatives. Once clear to residents, I think a majority will support the necessary changes and councillors will be judged by their voting record on them. There is clearly a groundswell of lobby groups that will help to promote positive changes once RBK have shown leadership. |
| KR26/KR26 6bis | Kings Road | Q3: The proposed directions seem ok. Please also consider filtered permeability at the junction of Crescent Road and Kingston Hill. |
|                |            | Q4: King’s Road &amp; the surrounding area is full of young families and teeming with children. These residents ought to be the clear priority. King’s Road is fast and dangerous. The current priority is rapid and convenient flow for motorists. In order to make neighbourhoods safe and liveable, passage along the roads must be made less convenient for motorists. |
|                |            | ------ |
|                |            | Q3: It would be better to remove one line of parked cars and replace it with a two-way segregated cycle track, then make the road one way. |
|                |            | Q4: I think King’s Road is dangerous and needs addressing. |
| KR27/KR27 7bis | Kings Road | Q3: It may make more sense to make New Road one way in the other direction to share the burden with Tudor road. If there are objections to one way routes on New and Tudor Road could Kings Road be made one way on its own? |
|                |            | ------ |
|                |            | Please do something. The current road set up is not fit for purpose. It is dangerous polluting and frequently intimidating due to the aggression caused by the trapped traffic. Cyclists are frequently forced to use the pavement. Lorries cannot turn into the top of Kings Road and have to use the wrong side of the road and pavement to proceed. |
| KR28/KR28 8bis | Kings Road | Q3: Constant issues with vehicles blocking road due to congestion in the street. This has led to numerous cases of road rage and aggressive behaviour from drivers including both physical and verbal confrontation. |
|                |            | ------ |
|                |            | There is an increased issue with congestion due to the current two way traffic flow, causing daily blockage of the road at different times of the day. This has caused many incidents of road rage and damage to parked vehicles. I believe the proposal would alleviate some of the issues we are experiencing. |
| KR29/KR29 9bis | Kings Road | The road is often completely blocked. This often results in high levels of road rage and high levels of car fumes. Emergency vehicle access is often impossible! I often can’t access my own house! Lots of excessive speeding when drivers see the road is clear (at least to the half-way point) - this is very dangerous as there are many children and pets around. Damage to parked vehicles is observed all the time. This has been a problem for years, and something needs to be done about it - people need to access Richmond of course, but it makes sense that other roads should share this traffic burden, so it is less of problem for all involved. |
|                |            | ------ |
|                |            | The road is blocked for substantial periods most days. Cyclists often use the footpath because the road is blocked, which is dangerous to both themselves and pedestrians (also this is even more foolish, as there are driveways which are not easy to spot, especially when the cyclists are travelling at speed on the pavement - which they often are). Road rage is a daily occurrence, this results in lots of verbal abuse. Damage to parked cars as drivers attempt to squeeze past each other is a common occurrence. Drivers often speed quite excessively down this section of road, as they are keen to get through before someone appears at the other end - this can be very dangerous given the number of children who live in this residential area. |
| KR30/KR30 0bis | Kings Road | I am so pleased that this issue is being addressed. Every day there is an issue with the traffic and whilst the bad language, shouting and horns tooting is disturbing there is a very real issue with safety. I have witnessed countless lorries on the wrong side of the road, reversing out of Kings Road into the paths of cyclists and pedestrians. Daily cyclists, for their own safety, cycle on the pavement. Emergency vehicles often get held up in the traffic, again a huge safety concern. Please make this change for the people of Kingston to be safer on their own streets. |
|                |            | ------ |
|                |            | I think the plans put forward make complete sense. If the road carries on the way it’s going, someone is going to get seriously hurt. I have two dogs that have on numerous occasions been almost mowed down. From people mounting the pavement to get in the park. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KR31/KR3 1bis/KR31 tris/KR31f outh</th>
<th>Kings Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q3</strong>: I support the current directions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4: Kings Road is long overdue for these measures &amp; we have more support than ever before. Our road is frequently dangerous, jammed both ways, party to aggressive behaviour &amp; dialogue, polluted &amp; our pavements are used as a cycleway because of all the above. It’s time for our council to LISTEN to us &amp; take action.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q3</strong>: I think one - way traffic is THE only solution having lived on the road for over twenty years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4: I have lived on Kings Rd for over twenty years. I’ve witnessed all the traffic calming measures that have been introduced and their subsequent failure. The road has become steadily worse which would be fine if it was occasional cross tempers. However the road in my opinion is now dangerous. Certainly for road users such as cyclists (who also regularly mount the pavement), pedestrians (especially school children, my son was knocked down by a speeding van five years ago) and tourists visiting the park. Emergency vehicles cannot possibly use the road at certain times of the day. I honestly believe someone is going to get seriously hurt. But aside from it being dangerous, it’s actually impassable in the rush hour morning and evening. Gridlock is the only word to describe it. The noise, profanity and threats emanating from the blocked road is pretty unpleasant. As is the pollution. Furthermore, there is no one in the road I know who has not had their car damaged by other road users. Really the only solution is to make the road one-way which I feel would change things instantly and greatly improve lives an general and perhaps save someone’s life in the long run.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our road is always ‘angry’ with people who are stuck on it &amp; swearing at each other. I saw someone go to hit another person last week too!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many cycles on our pavements because our road is so bad.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KR32/KR3 2bis</th>
<th>Kings Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q3</strong>: I think making King's Road one-way westbound is correct (it can be difficult doing a right hand turn onto Queens Road, which would impede the flow of traffic if the road was one-way eastbound). To me it would make sense for both New Road and Tudor Road to be one-way westbound. I think it would give a more balanced flow of traffic across the 3 roads, and be a fairer option to Tudor Road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4: I have lived on this section of Kings Road for nearly 8 years and the traffic situation is unacceptable. The road rage that we witness is horrendous. My young kids hear other motorists being called ‘the C word’ (their words) on a regular basis. The fumes are harmful (my eldest child is asthmatic) and very prevalent with the large amount of idling traffic. There is a massive knock on effect of the gridlock on our road that blocks traffic on Park Road and Queens Road and probably further afield. I am lucky enough that I am able to walk for most of my local journeys (school etc.), but I own a car, which is knocked and scraped continually by cars unable to manoeuvre properly and I am left with the expense of the repairs. Please introduce these traffic management measures, as the current arrangement is not working and this situation seems to be deteriorating.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q3</strong>: I support the scheme but I think it would be improved if Kings Road took West bound traffic and both New Road and Tudor Road shared East bound traffic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KR34</th>
<th>Kings Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We absolutely need the one way system to ensure the safety and well-being of all that use Kings Road, children, residents, cyclists, pedestrians, animals and drivers. We have loved here for almost 6 years and have witnessed so many concerning issues that at times have included violence and aggression.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KR35</th>
<th>Kings Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lots of traffic jams, lots of pollution, lots of shouting of drivers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KR36/KR3 6bis</th>
<th>Kings Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If the proposed scheme does not happen can we still have speed bumps to calm those drivers coming from Lowe kings road. Please no reduction in parking spaces. If the scheme does not go ahead can we please still have a speed bump at the lower end of upper Kings road. Especially to slow down traffic coming from lower kings road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KR37</th>
<th>Kings Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q3</strong>: I cannot believe that to ease the congestion on the top part of Kings Road it requires such drastic action as this. Three one-way roads with cyclists going against the oncoming flow of cars is not safe, and if that is an island outside the park gates that will only squeeze cars and cyclists together causing more problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4: Before implementing these changes surely a cheaper alternative should be considered. Why not try introducing two passing places at 1/3rd and 2/3rd of the way down the road and removing the centre one. I also see you are proposing to reduce the pavement width, which would widen the road, which will help considerably.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KR38</th>
<th>Kings Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should consider leaving Tudor Road to be two-way to ensure better distribution of traffic for cars coming down Liverpool Road and Crescent Road. If road is one-way in other direction would make traffic flow simpler. The traffic volume and speed issues also apply to Kings Road between Acre Road and Park Road. You have not considered on-pavement parking for upper Kings Road but are happy to have it on the other part of the road. This is an inconsistent approach. Should also consider having other part of Kings Road one-way.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KR39</th>
<th>Kings Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q3</strong>: Will the traffic coming onto the rest of Kings Road go faster?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4: I think there will be problems initially with traffic at the roundabout trying to turn left from Park Road, but that will hopefully ease over time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KR40</th>
<th>Kings Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measures of traffic-flow do not take into account the behaviour of drivers! My parked car has been damaged on each four corners (with no one admitting responsibility), it’s only a matter of time before drivers (who already shout and swear) come to physical blows. Often ambulances get stuck in the build-ups. I wouldn’t want to be waiting for an ambulance or fire-engine. I think the road needs to be one-way on safety grounds alone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KR41</th>
<th>Kings Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Rd is totally unsuitable for directing large amounts of traffic down whether one way or not. If there is a problem this is just shifting it. I also feel that multiple flows of traffic turning right at a number of junctions could result in more accidents. I also note you are proposing allowing cyclists to contraflow in both New and Tudor road, these are both nasty narrow parking chicaned roads. Unless you are going to supply separated isolated cycle lanes there could be serious contention.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KR42</th>
<th>Kings Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q3</strong>: Yes, but due to the Kings Road / Park road junction there will be considerable pressure on the small roundabout so traffic lights should be considered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4: We are also concerned that this scheme should in no way affect Alexandra road where there is a school and extra and/or speeding traffic would be unsafe. We would like heavy commercial traffic bannned from Kings Road since our houses are badly shaken daily.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| KR43 | Kings Road | Q3: I fully support the Kings Road proposal but would like to understand why both New and Tudor roads are not proposed to be one way in the opposite direction to help share the traffic load.  
Q4: Traffic problems have continually worsened over the years despite a number of previous schemes to install speed humps and restrictors all of which have failed to address the fundamental problem that the road is not capable of dealing with the traffic load traveling in both directions. The road grinds to a halt on a daily basis. Since living in the road every single panel on my car has been damaged by traffic with the exception of the roof. I have witnessed three RTA’s one involving a cyclist being thrown into the roundabout at the junction with Park Road. We regularly see bikes using the pavement to avoid the gridlocked cars and the bikes they have to avoid the families walking to and from the park particularly at the weekend. The one-way system would act for the benefit of drivers cyclists and pedestrians as well as those who live on the road and the surrounding area. |
| KR44 | Kings Road | Please also urgently add signage to prevent adult cyclists riding on our pavements in Kings Road. My small son has been nearly knocked off his feet countless times. It's crazy, and against the law! Cycle lanes in the park lead directly onto the pavements and apparently this is an excuse. They should either get on the road or dismount. |
| KR45 | Kings Road | I agree that there are issues but these also affect the part of Kings Road between Park Road and Acre Road. I would welcome measures to reduce speed but these need to be not all on Kings Road. |
| PR1 | Park Road | This afternoon we received the proposed plans for the introduction of one way traffic to Kings Road and New Road and Tudor Road. Although I have followed the advice to express my opinions, I am making my feelings know quite clearly on this matter:  
1) in principle the intentions are all well and good but have not really being thought through  
2) the plans only appear to benefit cyclists  
And so here are my thoughts and opinions on this matter and hope a more common sense approach can be reached. These are the same views expressed on the discussion links, but I wanted some assurances they were actually going to be read and considered:  
Having looked at these plans, it is plain to see that these changes are only for the benefit of cyclists, who are not necessarily local residents, and not beneficial to local residents or other visitors to the Borough. Under these proposed plans, if I wanted to go for a drive through the Park, I would have to drive away from myself to come back on myself, therefore increasing my carbon footprint, my fuel spend and adding to congestion. I have thought for a long time that some sort of one way system for these roads around the entrance to Richmond Park to make it safe for all road users including pedestrians was needed, but also to help lighten the burden of congestion. I therefore believe that these plans should be reconsidered and re-thought. I believe the traffic should flow up Kings Road, rather than down. The reason being people are more likely to travel up Kings Road for access to Richmond Park. Especially if using Richmond Park as a cut through, but I was approaching this from a point of view for visitors to the Borough.  
Accidents always seem to be caused more often by traffic entering Kings Road from either Queens Road or from Richmond Park. Especially when witnessing the damage to bollards, lamp-posts, sign-posts and traffic islands over the years. Refuse and larger vehicles can turn easier onto Queens Road than they can into Kings Road, however generally they are the cause of congestion on collection days. As there is somewhat of a blind corner on Tudor Road/Park Road, I feel that this should be an up road to Queen’s road with the ability to join two way traffic on Queen’s Road or at least turn right onto Queens Road, allowing for a cycle path to the left. The main cycle route through Kingston comes up Elm Road and has been a main sign-posted cycle route for many years, way before the recent spike in bicycle usage, therefore this should flow over Park Road and up Tudor Road towards the Park. I would like to know what studies have been made regarding the increased congestion this will bring to Alexandra Road and Park Road given the concentration of population in this part of the grid already? Has any thought been given to the effect of pollution on the schools on this road? I also feel there can be better signage on both sides of Richmond Park Gates to show road users that they can filter out onto Kingston Hill via Liverpool and Crescent Roads and not just via Queen’s Road and Park Road, providing more alternatives to road users who may not necessarily be local. Will this idea be spread to other roads? For example Alexandra Road could also possibly be a down road, making it safer for all road users and helping to take some of the congestion away from New Road. I know this is not about allocating blame for accidents, but the way in which many cyclists, not just a few, are the cause to many accidents, they think Kings Road is a part of the ‘Tour de France’ when speeding up or down with no regard for pedestrians or stopping/slowing for zebra crossings as generally they fail to stop for pedestrians. These plans only favour cyclists and not all road users or local residents. To cut Tudor Road off is wrong as there is hardly any width to turn a car with the amount of parked cars at all times of the day and is often a cut through for hospital access. At a minimum cars should be allowed to turn right out onto Queen’s Road. I will also be writing in the coming days regarding the continuing parking sagas we are enduring and feel these plans will also have a knock on effect of people parking up elsewhere just to make it easier to get out, whether it be for work, school runs or recreation, using up and taking away more of our spaces. On behalf of concerned residents at Park Road House. |
| PR2 | Park Road | The increase in traffic flow outside the school will be bad. This will increase the flow and traffic along Tudor Road - I don’t see why we should put up with this. |
I do not believe that the current plan should be adopted for a few reasons: - Traffic calming measures are ineffective as they currently are - cars simply straddle/speed over them. - The idea that cyclists can use the road to go in the opposite direction to the traffic is an accident/fatality waiting to happen. - Cyclists will be more prone to use pavements more than they do now to avoid being knocked over. The knock-on effect on pedestrians being hurt is greater as a result. - New Road and Tudor Road are narrower than Kings Road. The houses/flats are not set as far back from road so pollution and noise levels will be greater, particularly for HGVs, oversize lorries, etc. using these roads. - There is a pub on New Road - so their business will be greatly affected by this increase in traffic and the environmental issues this brings. - A few metres from New Road/Park Road is a (soon to be opened) children's nursery (60 Park Road) which has a capacity for 50 children - is it right that these measures will impact on the health of these children/babies as well as their safety (the nursery staff would be likely to take the children for walks to the park)? - Pavements on New Road/Tudor Road are narrower than Kings Road - higher risk for pedestrians being 'clipped' by passing traffic or cyclists using the pavement. - Children/families walking to nearby primary schools - increased traffic will make it more difficult to cross New Road/Tudor Road - especially as these roads are narrower than Kings Road which currently has a pedestrian traffic island and Alexandra Road has a zebra crossing? What arrangements will be in place for Tudor and New Road? - Parts of New Road and Tudor Road are in the Liverpool Road conservation area (as is Kings Road), how does increased traffic, noise and pollution adhere to this? - How much of this plan is at the request of the Counsellor who happens to live on the affected Kings Road - or is this just a coincidence?

Alternatives: * Perhaps the plan should be to keep Richmond Park closed to traffic until 10am and close from 4pm which will reduce the volume of traffic in Kings Road - as most only use that Road to gain entry to the Park - they will then be forced to use Park Road/Tudor Drive to Richmond or the A308/Kingston Hill to Roehampton and beyond. This will also mean that the Park can be used more as a Nature Reserve (protecting the wildlife) and not a cut through for road users to get to their destinations. * Alternatively, reduce the number of parking bays and lay down double yellow lines on Kings Road so fewer cars can park there (encouraging residents to use their own drive ways) - thus allowing for more crossing points for two-way traffic.

I cannot support this proposal. There is no evidence to suggest that this part of Kings Rd suffers more traffic/air pollution issues than other parts of KT2. Any proposal should also have options. It is not clear why the council is making this proposal and not considering alternatives. There is a safety risk with this proposal. Cyclists are likely to ignore one way streets and may even use the pavement to access Richmond Park. Also, cars will speed (speed cushions are easily avoided). We should not be changing road layouts to encourage more speeding and car use. Also, Residents themselves need to understand the impact of their decisions: large cars, multi car households and increased deliveries = more congestion = motorists behaving selfishly. Option: why not make three passing points on Kings Road (double yellow or reds) outside houses with access to off street parking: 271-277 Kings Road, 300-310 and 301-303. Or persuade Richmond Park not to open to Kingston gate until 0930 to take some pressure off rat runs.

Q3: Kings Road should be one way in direction of the Park. If one way are proposed, Park traffic will be turning right at the Park Road roundabout, across traffic from Park, to get to Tudor Road. Tudor Road is narrower than Kings Road and not designed for heavy traffic and unsuitable.

Q4: This should have been done years ago! You should also make Richmond Park one way as well and then make the spare lane a cycle-track (two-way).

Q5: Better to make Alexandra Rd one-way as well (same as proposed for Tudor Road) - that would take the pressure off Tudor Rd.

Q6: This appears to be presented as 'traffic calming solutions' but really this does not support local residents at all. I park my car on Tudor Road because my home is on the corner of Tudor and Park Rd. I cycle or drive through Richmond Park at least 4 times per week. To prevent me from turning into my own road is ridiculious and not thought through at all. The traffic will undoubtedly be increased on our road so in effect causing the complete opposite to 'traffic calming measures'. Solution - Have more passing places on Kings Rd. I travel through the park during 'rush hour' anytime from 7.15-8.30am and cannot see any problem here. Decision making is done by people who do not live here, it's insane. Thank you for you time in reading my comments.

Q7: Park Road

Congestion of cyclist going down one way system the opposite way. Problems with new nursery is Park Rd for children crossing road and parents parking (dropping off), causing traffic jams at both Tuner and New Rd and pollution.

Q8: Park Road

I'm concerned about volume and speed of traffic on Tudor Road, which will be the single eastbound route to the Park. Some sort of traffic calming will be essential. Restriction width would be ideal - unsuitable for refuse vehicles.

Q9: Don't support the introduction of one-way traffic but if it was to be introduced Upper Kings Road should be eastbound, not westbound. Cyclists will bomb down the road (despite the proposed traffic calming) causing dangers at the roundabout - likely to be slowed down if it is eastbound-uhhh. I think cyclists should be able to go both ways if one-way system is introduced. There are huge groups of cyclists at weekend racing.

Q10: Park Road

Q3: Kings Road should be one way in direction of the Park. If one way are proposed, Park traffic will be turning right at the Park Road roundabout, across traffic from Park, to get to Tudor Road. Tudor Road is narrower than Kings Road and not designed for heavy traffic and unsuitable.

Q4: This scheme appears to be entirely to the benefit of Kings Road. If parking was on one side only, there is enough room for two lanes of traffic. Regarding cyclists, in my observation it is the behaviour of cyclists that causes problems.

Q11: Park Road

For the small number of households who will get the benefit (top of Kings Road), a disproportional number of properties will be adversely affected by this. For any reason Tudor Road gets blocked - road works, accidents, etc. - the only access to Queens Road would be via Alexandra Road where we have St Pauls school and church. Total cost of this traffic management scheme we can ill afford when we are still suffering pot holes.
Q3: When you increase the traffic through New Road and Tudor drive, as the traffic then has to pull out into a main road, which already can be a problem at peak times, this will greatly increase the number of cars idling in these roads causing much greater pollution than currently exists. Pulling out of New Road into Park Road as suggested is already difficult due to cars parked in/on the corner of New Road blocking the view of traffic coming from the right. This will just get much more worse and will cause cars to be waiting for long periods in new road. Having a cycle route against traffic flow on new road/kings road is just plain dangerous especially against parked cars. As it is cars drive fairly slowly down these roads, if they are made one way, it will be far more dangerous for all users especially a cyclist seemingly going the wrong way. New Road is a narrow road and will struggle with an increase in traffic. The natural route of people coming from Kings road and crossing Queens road to Liverpool road will mean a diversion to Tudor road increasing for every single car the journey and level of pollution. We live on the corner with New Road and have access to off road parking infant of our house via new road (as do our neighbours at number 66) Most of our journeys are along park road. If these measures are put into place we would have to drive all the way to Tudor Road, up there to Queens road and then back down new road just to be able to access our parking space. Thereby driving 4 sides of a rectangle. Even if the no entry was from after our drive, I imagine with the increase of traffic driving down new road to Park road it would be near on impossible to turn into new road from park road making our parking space redundant.

Q4: Watching the daily mess of Kings road (at peak times only) my observation is that the problem rests with people who are very impatient and think that their journey is more important than everyone else, so they block the road when they can see there is no way through yet. My experience is that traffic flows if people observe the road ahead and are patient and polite. Maybe put some signs up to encourage people to wait until the road ahead until they can pull in is clear. Whilst I agree there is a problem, I really believe these proposals are wrong and will increase the level of pollution for the whole area both by increasing the mileage done by every car that passes through and increasing the time cars take to pull out of New Road and Tudor Road with a much greater number of cars idling. People already use New Road and Tudor Road as alternatives and speed up/down both roads. This will only get worse. It will be far more dangerous in an area where cyclists and pedestrians share the space especially in the morning as the children are on their way to school. By having two way traffic it forces people to drive more slowly. Whilst we have sympathy for the residents of Kings Road, this problem only exists for a short while in the day. People will have bought/rented houses in New Road and Tudor Road because they are quieter streets. By changing this you will be changing the environment of these streets and probably knocking off the value of all the houses on those streets. This would need to be compensated for. ------

I think the traffic calming measures in New Road will endanger cyclists. I cycle New Road twice each day and live on the corner of New Road and Park Road. Unless the traffic calming cushions are wider, most cars will be able to drive over them at more than 20 mph. Cyclists will be faced by a line of stationary cars to their left, and fast-moving cars moving across the road to line up their route to go fast over the cushions. There’s also a car park entrance on the corner of New Road outside number 66 that blocks the view left into Park Road for drivers. A driver will have just been looking at a speed cushion and will then be expected to take into view cyclists turning from Park Road into New Road that’ll have been hidden by the vehicle on the corner outside 66. That’s a dangerously uncomfortable set of circumstances for cyclists.

Q3: Making a road with 2 schools in it one way and blocking a road will cause more dangerous exhaust fumes for the children and more traffic leading to more chances of accidents.

Q4: You can’t see the map properly it has a big part of it covered with something that says lots of numbers.

Q3: I agree with making Kings Road one-way westbound, and also New Road a one-way road but feel it should be eastbound. Leaving Tudor Road as is, two-way.

Q4: This is a great proposal and very much hope will be approved. The traffic congestion on King’s Road is terrible and also dangerous to cyclists.

Q2 - PR2

Most of the traffic in Kings Road is through traffic, moving from the A3 area towards A4 (M4/Heathrow) and vice versa. Without an overall London plan to re-route such “rush hour” traffic away from North Kingston, this proposal will, as you state, increase vehicle flow and speed. Accidents will happen. I strongly object to this proposal.

Q3/Q3b

I disagree with the proposal to make Tudor Road a one-way eastbound road, as this will just move traffic from Kings Road and New Road on to Tudor Road. It will triple the volume of traffic on Tudor Road if the other two roads become westbound-only. It is also very difficult and slow to turn either left or right onto Queens Road from Tudor Road; both lanes on Queens Road need to be clear in order to turn safely. Consequently, there will be long tailbacks down Tudor Road during peak travel times as Queens Road gets very busy, which could possibly then impact on the flow of traffic along Park Road as well. The increased noise and pollution due to an increased concentration of traffic flow will make Tudor Road a less desirable road to live on.

Q4: Need more than just Tudor Rd going towards the park. Either Alexandra Rd too or no entry to any of the small residential roads & direct everyone along Queens Rd & down Kingston hill.

Q4/Q4b

This proposal will result in increased traffic speeds and volume on the one way roads, and neighbouring roads); instead speed restrictions (bumps) should be introduced across all of the surrounding roads by Kingston Gate, and width restrictions at the key entrance points (Queens Road and Crescent Road). This will reduce the volume of traffic entering Kings Road and the surrounding roads.

The proposal is not tackling the issue which is to reduce the traffic flow by Kingston Gate. To achieve this, width restriction measures should be introduced at the key entrance points (Queens Road and Crescent Road), as well as speed bumps along the length of Queens Road. Non-park traffic will then be more likely to travel to Park Road roundabout down Kingston Hill, and not use Kings Road as a cut through route.

Q5

The increase in speed of traffic on one way roads is not advisable and bumps encourage acceleration. Increase in volume of traffic on Alexandra Road - with schools should be avoided.
| QR6 | Queens Road | Q3: I wholeheartedly agree with the proposed scheme, however I feel 20mph limit needs to extend as far as St Paul’s church given that all surrounding roads are limited to 20mph. Q4: I also feel that resident parking should now be extended to include a Sunday in the 8:30-18:30 restriction - currently, it's extremely challenging to park anywhere near where we live on Sundays. |
| QR7 | Queens Road | Q3: Tudor Road should follow the same direction as New Road. The proposed directions will cause Tudor Road to be the busiest - Kings Road should remain the busiest out of the three as it effects less residents and less pedestrians (especially children) crossing on school runs. Q4: The proposed directions will cause queueing/crossing traffic at the park gates. Kings Road should go up towards the park and New Road/Tudor Road should go down away from the park. |
| QR8 | Queens Road | Your proposal will simply move the traffic to other roads. Why is the Council spending so much time and money to appeal a small number of residents in Kings Road. They knew what the traffic was like when they bought their houses. The nearest two-way road will be Alexandra Road which has two schools. Pushing extra traffic there is not a good idea. The only benefits are for people in Kings Road. |
| AR1 | Alexandra Road | Whilst sympathising with residents of Kings Rd, they bought houses on a busy road and your proposal will increase traffic going towards the two infant primary schools. Traffic will simply block on Kings Rd below Park Rd with eastbound traffic unable to turn right at the roundabout to get to Tudor Rd. You will also see increased traffic on Alexandra Rd as eastbound traffic is diverted from Liverpool Rd to Crescent Rd. |
| AR2 | Alexandra Road | Q3: Reduce parking spaces on Kings Road and it will heavily improve traffic both ways. Q4: Kings Road has the best visibility from Park Road /Queens Road junction both ways. If you will move cars to Tudor Road and Alexandra Road, you will not fix the problem, but instead will have even more accidents on New Road, Tudor Road and Alexandra Road. Then you will get complaints from three roads. |
| AR3 | Alexandra Road | I live in Alexandra Road and we got lots of traffic as we three schools there. My thought is the scheme will make our road even more open traffic. |
| AR4 | Alexandra Road | Q3: The existing proposed plans will divert a significant amount of traffic along Alexandra Road, which is clearly already very busy with St Paul’s and Alexandra schools. At the weekend there are also extra-curricular clubs on Saturdays and Sundays, making any added traffic volumes unsustainable. Q4: In addition to safety concerns for the children at the schools, I am very concerned by the obvious increase in air pollution that would result. I note Kings Rd does not contain any schools, but does have some large houses, so it should be clear whose interests are most important. |
| AR5 | Alexandra Road | Q4: Kings Road has the best visibility from Park Road /Queens Road junction both ways. But even if the existing issues were not there, the extra traffic down our street which would be caused by the changes to Kings Road would definitely be a problem. It will also increase noise and air pollution in the street, when we already have enough from the traffic mentioned above. |
| AR6 | Alexandra Road | Making Kings Road one-way will force more cars down the quieter roads making them dangerous. The problem is there are too many cars on the roads. |
| AR7 | Alexandra Road | The proposed scheme will drive extra traffic up our road (Alexandra Road), simply moving the problem a few roads down to our street rather than Kings Road. This is not acceptable, particularly as driving and parking on our street can already be quite difficult on a regular basis for those of us who live here and is made worse due to a combination of traffic to the schools and visitors to the churches in the area. We need more holistic measures to reduce traffic entering the area. |
| AR8 | Alexandra Road | RE Proposed conversion of Kings Road (between Park Road and Queens Road) and New Road and Tudor Road into one way roads. Thank you for your letter of the 14 February 2019 regarding the proposed conversion of Kings Road (between Park Road and Queens Road) and New Road and Tudor Road into one way roads. Alexandra School is one of the two schools situated in the area between Alexandra Road and Princes Road, the other being St Paul’s C of E Junior school Kingston Hill. We believe that cars would be more likely to introduce speed humps and also to avoid the junction of Kingston Hill and Queens Road. There is one zebra crossing at the Park Road end of Alexandra Road and we have already had reports of cars crossing this without stopping for parents and children to cross. The current proposal will make the crossing at the Park Road end of Alexandra Road and the bottom of Kingston Hill to avoid using the one of the proposed one way roads with speed bumps and also to avoid the junction of Kingston Hill and Queens Road. |
| TR1/TR1bis | Tudor Road | Traffic levels in Tudor Road will increase as a result of these planned changes leading to more noise and general congestion within the area. We are against the one way traffic proposal. The introduction of one-way traffic is wholly unsuitable. 1) This proposal would mean a disproportionate increase in traffic in Tudor Road, a narrow, quiet road in a Conservation Area. Studies have shown that one way traffic increases the speed of vehicles and thus associated accidents; and the proposed solution to this problem is to introduce speed humps- has equally been shown to increase pollution as cars brake then accelerate. The proposed changes would be detrimental to the safety and the long-term health of residents, pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles in Tudor Road. 2) Already, it is such a tight turn, that it is only possible to turn left into Queens Road from Tudor Road when there is no traffic coming from the left. Having all traffic routed via Tudor Road eastbound would cause long tailbacks and jams along Tudor Road due to this difficult junction. 3) On rubbish collection day this proposed road layout would cause absolute chaos! Tudor Road is not wide enough for an ordinary car to pass a dustcart if cars are legitimately parked in bays; and if other routes around are westbound only, the traffic would back up and come to a standstill very quickly. I feel strongly that this proposal is a short-sighted "solution" which only benefits the residents of Kings Road, a wider and historically busier road, to the detriment of all the surrounding areas. |
| TR2/TR2bi s | Tudor Road | The proposed eastbound direction in Tudor Road would impede access to my drive as the current parking spaces at the bottom of my drive would make it more difficult to access my drive. In addition the plan does not show any traffic calming positions for Tudor Road. The current two way system is self-calming because people have to give way both ways. With one way traffic this would increase the speed and increase the volume of traffic. It will also increase the pollution on Tudor Road. If there is a problem on Kings Road you are not solving it just moving it elsewhere. 

---

I strongly object to the proposal. The solution does not solve any alleged problems but will just move the problem to Tudor Road. The increased traffic on Tudor and New roads will increase the pollution on these roads. When road works have redirected traffic to Tudor Road it as caused tailbacks of standing traffic particularly traffic exiting east on to Queens Road. This causes extra noise and pollution and also impedes residents trying to get off their drives. |

| TR3 | Tudor Road | Thanks for your letter of 14th February on the above issue. I appreciate that traffic flows in this area are difficult and complex. The Council needs to balance the competing issues to achieve a correct balance. However the news of a one way system in Tudor Road has come as a shock to me and my neighbours. Your letter is the first indication that such a scheme is being considered. We only have 16 working days to respond under the consultation process. I would like to request the following information so that I and my neighbours can properly respond as a group or individually. 
1. I have seen the traffic flow information for Tudor Road and Kingston Road. I assume this information was gathered during weekdays? The data refers to peak flows. Are the figures for this period for ‘cars per hour’? If so what time of the day does the peak flow start (for both AM and PM)? Is there any breakdown of how much traffic flows east west or vice versa? If no such data exists would it be reasonable to assume that the traffic flowing east west and west east is in equal measure? 
2. There have been various proposals about traffic calming in the area. My neighbours tell me that Tudor Road residents attempted to persuade the Council to install traffic bumps some years ago in the light of the speed of vehicles travelling in the road. The proposal was rejected on the basis that the bumps would cause problems for emergency vehicles. Do you have any records about these proposals?
3. Can you confirm that your letter or 14th February is the first time that Tudor Road residents have been informed by the Council that a one way system is being proposed for the road?
4. The map of the area attached to your letter does not indicate the positioning of any traffic calming measures in Tudor Road. The map for New Road indicates the location of traffic cushions in that road. Can you identify the location of any traffic cushions that are proposed for Tudor Road? Is it indeed the case that the proposed traffic calming measures will consist of traffic cushions or is some other method of traffic calming to be put in place (if the proposals are formally accepted)?
5. Your map also indicates that cyclists will be entitled to travel in an east-west direction against the flow of motor traffic. Can you provide details of how cyclists travelling in an opposite direction to motor vehicles will be enabled?
6. It is not clear from your map as to whether there will be a 20 mile per hour speed limit along Queen’s Road between Kings Road and Crescent Road. Can you confirm that this is the intention?
7. Can you inform me whether there has been any consideration by the Council before 2018 of a proposal to implement a one way system in Tudor Road? If such a proposal has been considered can you provide information as to the reasons why that proposal never preceded?
8. I’m sorry for the length of these questions but I’m sure you will understand that they are important to the consideration to be made by the residents in considering these proposals. I suspect that there may be a meeting of the residents early next week bearing in mind the very tight timetable for responses. Accordingly I should be very grateful if you could let me have your reply by close of business on Tuesday 19th February. 
Kind regards |

| TR4/TR4bi s | Tudor Road | Q3: The recent proposal to restrict vehicle widths down Queens road and Kings road was a good one. It would have helped the situation on all roads in the area. The leaflet we received was so badly worded that we understood that we only had to comment if we disagreed with it! Maybe this is why you didn’t receive many replies! 
Q4: There will be a massive increase in traffic eastbound up Tudor Road. At present eastbound traffic is split across the three roads. The new proposal will funnel all traffic to the park, Queens Road and New Road. So about Tudor Road. AM peaks will rise from 123 to over 480 vehicles per hour! Allowing cyclists the ‘wrong way’ down the one-way systems without proper and fully segregated lanes will leave them more vulnerable to anger from car drivers. Any cycle lane running directly next to parked cars leaves cyclists vulnerable to being ‘doored’. Due to the single yellow line outside 32/34 Tudor Road it is at present almost impossible for me to exit my drive and turn right when cars park there. (Disabled vehicles all day and other cars before 8:30. I often have to leave 6-8am). The one way traffic will make it incredibly difficult to both enter and exit my drive. 
---

1/ All this proposal will do is move the current problems on Tudor, New and Kings road and condense them into Tudor Road. 2/ There will be a massive increase in traffic eastbound up Tudor Road. At present eastbound traffic is split across the three roads. The new proposal will funnel all traffic to the park, Queens Road and Liverpool road up Tudor Road. 3/ Turning left at the Tudor/Queens Road junction is only possible at present when there is no traffic coming from the left. Turning right is also difficult and takes time. The massive increase in traffic down Tudor Road will result in long tailbacks of traffic down Tudor Road, dramatically increasing pollution from standing traffic. 4/ The new traffic direction would make it almost impossible for cars to exit their driveways. The majority would have to reverse into Tudor Road, into oncoming traffic and cyclists. A huge increase in accident risks and driver frustration. 5/ Allowing cyclists the ‘wrong way’ down the one-way systems without proper and fully segregated lanes will leave them more vulnerable to anger/frustration from car drivers. Any cycle lane running directly next to parked cars leaves cyclists vulnerable to being ‘doored’. There is no planned signage/indication to cars turning down Kings, New and Tudor Road to expect oncoming cyclists. 6/ On the map there is no indication that speed reducing cushions will be put on Tudor Road. This would result in vehicles speeding up Tudor Road. 7/ When cars are waiting at the Tudor/Queens Road junction it is difficult for pedestrians, dog walkers and people with children to cross the junction. The increase in traffic will make this a difficult and dangerous junction to cross. Car drivers will be frustrated and too eager to get onto Queens Road. The increased traffic turning into Tudor Road from Park Road will also make it significantly more difficult and dangerous for pedestrians to cross this junction. 8/ What about access for emergency vehicles? 9/ The current generous pavement width on Kings road could be narrowed leaving more road width for traffic and easing congestion. The recent proposal to restrict vehicle widths down Queens road and Kings road was a good one. It would have helped the situation on all roads in the area. |
| TR5 | Tudor Road | What an extraordinary proposal. All the traffic coming from Kingston gate and queens rd would come down Tudor rd. I would not be able to access Queens rd which is crucial for me. You can’t push a problem two roads down in addition Tudor rd is a narrower rd than the same part of kings rd. maybe residents of Tudor rd should have a petition out to stop vehicles accessing from park rd and queens rd making it difficult for me to get out of my driveway in the mornings and evenings as cars speed up and down the road because there are no speed bumps on our rd. Might I suggest that you only allow parking on one side of kings rd to keep the traffic flowing more easily in the morning and evening rush hour. Kings rd has a roundabout to control traffic Tudor rd does not. There is a pedestrian crossing and two bus stops so the traffic would be chaos. Further consultation should take place as I think there is too much self-interest and no idea of cause and effect this may have. |
| TR6 | Tudor Road | Worried about parking restrictions in Tudor Road which is already bad. Cyclists going too fast coming down from the park if it’s one way. Difficulty in reaching my home. I’ve lived in the road for 50 years recently moved from 23 to 35 because It was a quiet road. If it’s one way traffic will be faster even though the speed limit is 20 miles an hour. |
| TR7 | Tudor Road | All I can see from the proposals are that they won’t make Kings Road any safer as I suspect the tight two way traffic at present actually limits car speeds on the road. If you turn it to one way cars will actually increase their speed down it despite any traffic calming measures. This has proved to be the case in similar schemes elsewhere. In the meantime my road (Tudor Road) and New Road will become far more dangerous as a result of (1) increased traffic on these roads, (2) one way traffic flow encourages faster speeds than at present (3) No proposed traffic calming measures on these roads at all. Tudor road will also become impossibly congested as both the right and left turns onto Queens road are difficult already and with far more cars coming down Tudor Road that will get considerably worse. Pollution on Tudor Road will increase considerably due to the increased number of cars on it and the congestion stemming from the Tudor Road/Queens Road junction. I also think Alexander Road (WHICH HAS A PRIMARY SCHOOL ON IT) will become much busier as access to Queens Road to Park Road and vice-versa becomes more restricted on other roads. In summary I strongly object to the proposal as I don’t believe it will improve congestion or safety on Kings Road whilst significantly worsening safety and congestion on surrounding roads. Tudor Road and Alexander Road in particular. I strongly oppose it. |
| TR8 | Tudor Road | The sheer volume of traffic trespassing off Tudor Road as well is a nightmare and is very dangerous to say the least. And sooner or later a serious accident will occur. With reference with pedestrians, an accident just waiting to happen. |
| TR9 | Tudor Road | Where are the traffic calming measures you promise for Tudor Road on the plan? You have forgotten to put them on. This is clearly a poorly thought out plan with omissions on your proposal. Your proposal outlines an increase in traffic in neighbouring roads. I do not think this is an appropriate way to manage traffic, especially for a conservation area like Tudor Road. |
| TR10 | Tudor Road | The proposal would make our road (Tudor Rd) unsafe. We absolutely do not support the proposal to make Tudor Rd one way. We would take legal action to prevent it happening as it clearly only provides benefits to King’s Rd (if any) and not to us on Tudor Rd at all. It would materially devalue our property to no net benefit to local residents on Tudor Rd or New Rd. |
| TR11/TR11 | 1/1s/TR11/1ri s | Q3: I initially felt the one way system might be a solution but having spoken to family and neighbours, and understanding the proposals better, I am now rescinding my earlier support. The knock on effects to the level of pollution, danger to pedestrians and increase in traffic flow in our road and the area in general will be huge. I therefore urge the council to reconsider their proposal. Q4: As it is traffic goes too fast down our road so I would still support traffic calming measures. |
| | Tudor Road | Q3: There appear to be inconstancies regarding traffic calming measures, along with no real proposals to ensure no increase in traffic flow. All of the proposals are centred on the preferences of the residents of Kings Road and don't deal with the implications on New Road, Tudor Road and indeed Alexandra Road, even the map doesn’t show the whole of Tudor Road. Q4: Park Road and Queens Road are built to be major thoroughfares, whereas Kings Road, New Road, Tudor Road and Alexandra Road ought to have measures in place that restrict all but local traffic. The aim should be to discourage and inhibit drivers from using any of these roads as shortcuts. |
I am strongly against this proposal and believe it will lead to further congestion in the area for all residents and visitors to the area. On the map the benefits identified are for Kings Road only and there are major disbenefits for the other roads in the area. Currently the 3 roads in this proposal (Kings, New and Tudor Roads) have two way traffic connecting Queens Road with Park Road. This gives drivers and cyclists 3 options for travel. If this scheme is implemented in one direction and 1 option in the other. All the eastbound traffic will be directed to Tudor Road leading to traffic queuing on Park Road, increased pollution and residents unable to move their cars off the drive. In addition to this there will be queues of traffic entering and exiting the park. There are 2 schools on Alexandra Road and many children cross Tudor Road at both junctions. The increase in traffic and congestion will make these junctions hazardous for the children and their families. My family and I have lived on Tudor Road for 15 years. We chose this road because it was a quiet, residential road, sadly this proposal would change that adversely. I do understand the concerns of the Kings Road residents but that road is a known thoroughfare and therefore the council should consider widening the road (in a similar way to the other part of Kings Road) and allowing areas for cars to pass by. Many of the residents in Tudor Road and the surrounding roads do not agree with the proposal. I really hope the councillors will listen to the residents and residents will be heard.

Q1: I do not support the introduction of one way traffic.
Q4: I am firmly against this proposal for the following reasons, 1. The changes in traffic direction on the 3 roads proposed will lead to increased congestion, pollution and compromise the safety of children and their carers walking to and from school. My children walk to and from school so I will be concerned for their safety too when crossing the road. 2. Instead of taking the shortest route, cars approaching the roundabout at the bottom of Kings Road will need to drive up Tudor Road to access Richmond Park. 3. It is very difficult to turn left and right at the top of Tudor Road and if all the traffic is coming this way it will lead to congestion. 4. Residents will find it difficult to move their vehicles from their drives. 5. If there is a stationary vehicle e.g. refuse truck then cars will be stuck behind it 6. Tudor Road will change from a quiet residential road to a busy, congested, noisy road. My family and I chose to live here because it is quiet. 7. There is a danger to cyclists with this scheme as there is a proposal to allow them to travel in any direction on the road. 8. Kings Road is a known thoroughfare and therefore the council should consider widening the road (in a similar way to the other part of Kings Road) and allowing areas for cars to pass by. Many of the residents in Tudor Road and the surrounding roads do not agree with the proposal. I really hope the councillors will listen to the residents and residents will be heard.

Q3: The proposed traffic directions are not suitable. I live in Tudor Road and currently struggling with the traffic during school run in the morning and in the afternoon. I find it difficult to use my drive way due to heavy traffic. I end up in a long queue every morning as I use the road to Richmond Park.

Q4: Introduce a locals-only system where cars who are local can have access to those roads and non-locals are only able to use main roads such as Park Road and Queen's Road. One way traffic through can be around Park Road and Queen's Road without having to use King’s Road, New Road and Tudor Road. Access for local, emergency and announce them as private roads.

Q5: The full width of the roads should be removed and allowing areas for cars to pass by. The proposal would change that adversely. I do understand the concerns of the Kings Road residents but that road is a known thoroughfare and therefore the council should consider widening the road (in a similar way to the other part of Kings Road) and allowing areas for cars to pass by. Many of the residents in Tudor Road and the surrounding roads do not agree with the proposal. I really hope the councillors will listen to the residents and residents will be heard.

Q2: The manufacture of traffic at the roundabout will make these junctions hazardous for the children and their families. My family and I have lived on Tudor Road for 15 years. We chose this road because it was a quiet, residential road, sadly this proposal would change that adversely. I do understand the concerns of the Kings Road residents but that road is a known thoroughfare and therefore the council should consider widening the road (in a similar way to the other part of Kings Road) and allowing areas for cars to pass by. Many of the residents in Tudor Road and the surrounding roads do not agree with the proposal. I really hope the councillors will listen to the residents and residents will be heard.

Q6: I am firmly against this proposal for the following reasons, 1. The changes in traffic direction on the 3 roads proposed will lead to increased congestion, pollution and compromise the safety of children and their carers walking to and from school. My children walk to and from school so I will be concerned for their safety too when crossing the road. 2. Instead of taking the shortest route, cars approaching the roundabout at the bottom of Kings Road will need to drive up Tudor Road to access Richmond Park. 3. It is very difficult to turn left and right at the top of Tudor Road and if all the traffic is coming this way it will lead to congestion. 4. Residents will find it difficult to move their vehicles from their drives. 5. If there is a stationary vehicle e.g. refuse truck then cars will be stuck behind it 6. Tudor Road will change from a quiet residential road to a busy, congested, noisy road. My family and I chose to live here because it is quiet. 7. There is a danger to cyclists with this scheme as there is a proposal to allow them to travel in any direction on the road. 8. Kings Road is a known thoroughfare and therefore the council should consider widening the road (in a similar way to the other part of Kings Road) and allowing areas for cars to pass by. Many of the residents in Tudor Road and the surrounding roads do not agree with the proposal. I really hope the councillors will listen to the residents and residents will be heard.

TR12/TR1 2bis Tudor Road
I am strongly against this proposal and believe it will lead to further congestion in the area for all residents and visitors to the area. On the map the benefits identified are for Kings Road only and there are major disbenefits for the other roads in the area. Currently the 3 roads in this proposal (Kings, New and Tudor Roads) have two way traffic connecting Queens Road with Park Road. This gives drivers and cyclists 3 options for travel. If this scheme is implemented in one direction and 1 option in the other. All the eastbound traffic will be directed to Tudor Road leading to traffic queuing on Park Road, increased pollution and residents unable to move their cars off the drive. In addition to this there will be queues of traffic entering and exiting the park. There are 2 schools on Alexandra Road and many children cross Tudor Road at both junctions. The increase in traffic and congestion will make these junctions hazardous for the children and their families. My family and I have lived on Tudor Road for 15 years. We chose this road because it was a quiet, residential road, sadly this proposal would change that adversely. I do understand the concerns of the Kings Road residents but that road is a known thoroughfare and therefore the council should consider widening the road (in a similar way to the other part of Kings Road) and allowing areas for cars to pass by. I sincerely hope the council will take my views in to consideration and discard this proposal.

TR13/TR1 3bis Tudor Road
One-way traffic is a terrible idea on Tudor Road. There is already too much traffic coming up Tudor Road and it’s already dangerous enough for walkers, cyclists and children, especially crossing the road. Not to mention, it’s not possible to turn on to Queens Road, if there is any traffic in either direction due to street parking. To push all eastbound traffic to Tudor Road is a horrible idea and will surely result in a terrible rise in pollution, more accidents and very frustrated citizens. I only see queues for Kings Road at very peak time and even then it’s not that bad. Most locals avoid this road smartly by using other roads. Leave it alone.

TR14 Tudor Road
Q3: The proposed traffic directions are not suitable. I live in Tudor Road and currently struggling with the traffic during school run in the morning and in the afternoon. I find it difficult to use my drive way due to heavy traffic. I end up in a long queue every morning as I use the road to Richmond Park.

Q4: Introduce a locals-only system where cars who are local can have access to those roads and non-locals are only able to use main roads such as Park Road and Queens’ Road. One way traffic through can be around Park Road and Queens Road without having to use King’s Road, New Road and Tudor Road. Access for local, emergency and announce them as private roads.

TR15/TR1 5bis Tudor Road
To make Tudor Road into the main access road into the Richmond Park is to change a quiet highly populated road into a busy thoroughfare. Access onto Queens Road is dangerous and difficult now, under the proposals traffic will be permanently backed down the road causing air pollution and inconvenience to residence. I live towards the bottom of Tudor so will have to drive up onto Queens Rd back down New or Kings to reach Park Rd that I live 20 meters from. If a person moves onto a busy road that is a choice, Tudor Road is a narrow, quiet, family orientated road where children can ride their bikes. That is why we live here and paid accordingly for our houses. We are a mixed community of flats and houses with many children. The proposed plan will mean a huge increase in traffic flow, light and heavy, a huge increase in noise and pollution. I don’t understand why it is acceptable to change our lives significantly to placate a group who bought their houses knowing where they were situated. You can’t buy a house next to an airport and expect the planes to be stopped because they are inconvenient. As an asthmatic I fear the changes would not be good for my health. SAME PERSON:

These proposals make Tudor Road the main access road to Richmond Park. This will completely change Tudor Road. It will become noisy, dangerous, with speeding traffic. Our animals are not used to heavy traffic, there will be fatalities.

TR16/TR1 6bis Tudor Road
1. Increase in traffic on the road 2. Increase in pollution on the road 3. Harder than now to exit the road and will leave tailbacks down the road 4. Hard for residents to exit driveways 5. Cyclists are at more risk, my partner and sons are keen cyclists 6. The road will become less desirable to live on.

You are moving the problem not resolving it. I am very concerned about the increase in pollution and traffic on Tudor Road a quiet family road.

Comments
via email

Tudor Road
This is the first proposal of changes to the Kings rd, New rd, & Tudor rd we have received and the final decision we are informed will be on March 27th. Planning permission to cut down a tree takes longer than that! As a resident of Tudor rd we are not happy about this proposal For Tudor rd to become one way. Tudor rd is much narrower than Kings rd and was originally built as a side rd whereas Kings rd was built as a main thoroughfare. The residents who bought properties there would have known that!

We have lived in Tudor rd for 36years and so have seen the difference in traffic in all the roads. Kings rd has always been a through rd and it is unfair to penalise Tudor rd residents with the one way system. There are many reasons apart from the width of the rd.
A) Cushions do not work as 4by4's and supermarket delivery vehicles sail over them at speed without even slowing down.
B) When driving up Tudor rd and turning left into Queens rd is very difficult anyway and then to turn right into Liverpool rd is also very difficult, so the one way would produce a huge back log down Tudor rd and your plans will be giving any Kingston residents a license to do a rat run up Tudor rd at speed with many more vehicles.

C) I suffer from Asthma and there are probably others also, pollution fumes from standing traffic would exacerbate this.

D) A new nursery school is opening in Park rd between New and Tudor rd. Not only will the increased traffic on Tudor rd make it very difficult for parents to cross Tudor rd to the nursery. Accidents will happen! The contra flow for cyclists down Tudor rd is madness and will make them more vulnerable to accidents.

E) Residents trying to turn into or exit their driveways will have a great problem with fast rat run drivers losing patience and causing a backlog again.

F) The map that you sent us has completely disregarded the last third of our road where there are flats and houses. They are
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TR17</th>
<th>Tudor Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I do not think that making Tudor Road a one way scheme is a good idea. There will be too many cars waiting at the top of the road, which will cause more pollution and frustration. It will be dangerous for parents and children heading to school as they will not be able to cross the road and prams will be pushed between the waiting cars. Cars will go even faster down the road and it will only cause more accidents. Please, please re-consider.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TR18/TR18 bis</th>
<th>Tudor Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I strongly object to the proposal for the following reasons: it will simply move the current problems on Tudor, New and Kings Road and condense them into Tudor Road resulting in a massive increase in traffic up Tudor Road. It will funnel all traffic to the Park, Queens Road and Liverpool Road up Tudor Road. AM peak time traffic could rise from 123 to over 450 vehicles per hour - Tudor Road will be gridlocked. Turning left and right onto Queens Road from Tudor Road is already difficult and takes time. The increased traffic on Tudor Road will lead to long tailbacks dramatically increasing pollution from standing traffic. It will be almost impossible for cars in Tudor Road to exit their driveways. We will have to reverse into Tudor Road, into oncoming traffic and cyclists leading to a huge increase in accident risks and driver frustration. Absolutely crazy considering a cycle contra-flow system without fully segregated cycle lanes - accident waiting to happen. Increased traffic will make it more dangerous and difficult for pedestrians. There is a new nursery opening at the end of Tudor Road increasing pedestrian traffic flow. Despite having a 20 mph speed limit on Tudor Road, traffic speed up the road. This will be worse if it is one-way, as no traffic calming cushions are set out on the proposed plan. The proposal will change the nature of Tudor Road. We purchased our house in Tudor Road because it is quiet and very desirable to live here. Increased traffic, pollution and safety issues will have a negative impact making Tudor Road less desirable to live in.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q3: I do not support the introduction of one way traffic systems in the area |
Q4: Firstly I believe that the Consultation process is flawed. The petition by some King’s Road residents was lodged over 2 years ago. This consultation process was first communicated to Tudor Road residents 3 weeks ago and responses were requested within three weeks. It seems that a decision will be “pushed through” on 27th March. This does not allow for due process and consideration of all the issues. There should have been a meeting just for Tudor, New and Queen’s Road residents to explore the proposals before formal consultations started. There was apparently a Working Group established by the Council of local residents. However that Group was described by the Council as being a group to “discuss further options on Kings Road”. The overwhelming number of residents in Tudor Road believed that the Group would not examine a one way system or other fundamental changes in Tudor Road and quite understandably did not become involved. We are now being asked to respond to this proposal in a totally under-prepared way and within an inadequate time scale. There are a number of other criticisms what could be made of this consultation process (including the design of this questionnaire, the lack of background information and the little time given to King’s Road residents to voice their views over the last two years) but basically they all concern how the interests of Tudor Road residents have been side-lined. Turning to the Proposal itself, |

I do not understand why the proposal has been made before a full risk analysis has been made so that all stakeholders can assess the proper risks in a meaningful way. It seems that the cart is being put before the horse. The one area where all parties can agree is that any change to the current layout must centrally address the question of safety. The Council’s own statistics and opinions show that 1. There will be more congestion at the west end of King’s Road, the east end of Tudor Road and along Queen’s Road. 2. The traffic in the area will be more widely dispersed so that pedestrians will need to more careful at a substantially increased number of road junctions. 3. More congestion will lead to higher levels of pollution in more areas. 4. Speed will increase in the one way systems and yet traffic calming measures will probably not significantly reduce speeds, (I note that the Council have not identified any traffic calming measures in Tudor Road) in addition and, as the Response from a group of Tudor Road residents has demonstrated, there will be a much larger number of right turns by vehicles at road junctions if the proposal proceeds. 70% of accidents at T junctions are caused by vehicles turning right. 77% of accidents involving motor cycles at similar junctions involve vehicles making right turns. It is clear that whilst there have been some accidents in Kings Road, it is likely that the proposal will cause many more “accident black spots” and this crucial area of safety issues has not been thought through properly. I would add that (1) there is no evidence that the new scheme will benefit pedestrians. Indeed it is my view that as the proposal would create more risk , it will reduce pedestrian use (2) the Kingston Cycle Campaign has decided firmly not to support the proposal. I realise that no decision has yet been made. However there is momentum behind the proposal and the Committee would not have supported the draft proposal if they thought that it was inappropriate. The concern of Tudor Road residents is that a decision has been made in principle to approve the proposal. The proposal needs much more analysis with the full and equal involvement of all parties. I urge the Committee to reject this proposal and to continue to look for another solution. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TR19</th>
<th>Tudor Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making Kings Road one-way will increase traffic volume and speed. At the moment it may sometimes be difficult to navigate but it helps to keep down the traffic volume, noise and speed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TR20</th>
<th>Tudor Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This must not be allowed to happen for many reasons, some being the road don’t take that amount of traffic, you are bringing the traffic nearer to the school and making it harder for pedestrians to cross the road, people can’t. Cars will be blocked if any lorries use this road and they could be damaged or worse. This scheme isn’t a solution to the problem - and I haven’t even started in the knock-back problems you will get on Park Rd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TR21</th>
<th>Tudor Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Re Tudor Rd, it is madness to allow cyclists to turn into Tudor from Queens Rd only to meet oncoming traffic. Cyclists will use pavements to avoid cars (witnessed this while walking in Queens Rd). One-way traffic will present problems while reversing out of drive - cars never slow down to allow for this now. Cars will travel much faster if Tudor made one way. In Norbiton Avenue cars frequently drive at great speed over speed cushions. Therefore, no guarantee it will be different in Kings Rd area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TR22</th>
<th>Tudor Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There roads are too narrow for what you suggest.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TR23/TR2 TR23t ris</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tudor Road</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TR24</strong></td>
<td>Tudor Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TR25</strong></td>
<td>Tudor Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
TR26/TR27

Tudor Road

Speeding during off peak & congestion during peak times coupled with difficult junctions will increase safety risks & pollution over a wider residential & school areas. There has been no proper assessment of impact or consultation. The proposal to widen the carriageway to ease the flow & mitigate the problems in Kings Rd should be re-examined.

The one way scheme is ill conceived. It will cause wider risk to pedestrians, cyclists (including children on their way to school) and motorist. Queuing traffic during peak hours will further extend the pollution.

TR27/TR28

Tudor Road

Q3: I do not support the proposed one way traffic scheme. I think that the problem is in Kings Road and that adopting parking half on the pavement on one side (probably going down the road) would allow two way flow of traffic and reduce the issues. It would also be useful to restrict wide vehicles and lorries from travelling along residential roads - probably with restrictions at the top of Crescent Road and into Queens Road. Introducing a one way scheme into Tudor Road, as proposed, would have massive implications for the number of cars and pollution levels in the street. The junction at the top of Tudor Road is very tight, especially to turn left. So there is likely to be constant backdowns Tudor Road increasing pollution levels. I am also concerned that the bicycle traffic will be very vulnerable as it comes down a street with cars going up. It is important to have the traffic spread across the four roads between Park Road and Queens Road, so introducing one way traffic is unlikely to help this process. Experience elsewhere in London shows that one way streets result in faster traffic, considerably increasing the potential danger to pedestrians and cyclists. There are lots of children crossing Tudor Road to get to the schools in Alexandra Road and the nurseries on Park Road. These people need the roads to be as calm and clean as possible.

Q4: I do not think that Tudor Road was given much notice to these plans, and were not invited to the consultations with Younes Hamade. This is in stark contrast to the approach taken to the people living in Kings Road, and not a fair way to behave. There is a risk that the decision will be made before fair consultation and discussion has been had with all the residents affected by these plans.

This is the wrong time to be proposing such long term changes and they seem to be driven by a few residents in Kings Road without full consultation of the other roads, or evidence to suggest the overall traffic flows will be safer, better or less polluting. Kingston has faced a prolonged period of significant roadworks over at least a year such that there has been the inevitable increase in traffic flow. That work needs to be concluded, and the expected increase in traffic flow should lead to seating and overall measures to dissuade the use of residential streets by non-residential vehicles considered. This is an inappropriate solution being proposed when any evidence gathered recently is not reflective of the long term situation. Kings Road has always been the more significant traffic path, along with Park Road & Queens Road and the residents will have known this. What’s proposed is a significant re-routing of traffic onto more minor roads without any evidence offered that this is a good solution overall. One way roads may cause their own speed and attention issues, even with calming, so it’s unproven as a safer option. Traffic flows by local residents increase as people have to go “round” to get into their road the right way, not to mention the safety issues of multiple turns on crowded streets to do that. Again, where the evidence that the overall effect will be any better. There is currently a ban on large delivery vehicles using the local roads as shortcuts should be considered as these often add significantly to the already congested local road network.

TR28

Tudor Road

I think the congestion issue in King’s Road could be helped considerably by widening measures and/or priority passing places. The one way proposal, of which it appears that there is a dangerous increase in traffic flow and speed in Tudor Road. This would put road users (including cyclists) and pedestrians at risk, particularly at both junctions onto and from the two main roads at either end which are used constantly throughout the day by parents and children attending the local nurseries and schools. In addition, to encourage cyclists to use one way street in the wrong direction on such a narrow road as Tudor Road with parked cars on both sides is incredibly dangerous. Also, the expected increase in traffic flow would lead to queuing traffic from the Queen’s Road junction....leading to increased pollution from cars attempting to leave Tudor Road. I think the one way proposal will worsen the traffic situation in the whole area and in particular will not only completely but actually encourage dangerous levels of speeding vehicles (two way traffic acts as a natural speed reducer) in Tudor Road. I am strongly against the proposal and I’m sure that the best plan would be to re-focus on a physical change of the road layout in King’s Road to allow a more generous passing place. Also a ban on large delivery vehicles using the local roads as shortcuts should be considered as these often add significantly to the already congested local road network.

TR29

Tudor Road

To improve cycle safety there needs to be a way to slow cycles down. If you drive around the local roads or through the park doing 20 MPH you have cycles over and undertaking. This area is not a cycle race track and action needs to be taken. Tudor Road is not safe for cycles. The drains at the bottom of the hill don’t work and the area is a swimming pool when it rains. There will be more cycle accidents sending more traffic up Tudor Road not less. Fix the drains, and road subside or you are going to see more traffic up this road and reduce cycle safety.

TR30

Tudor Road

In Kings Road no more issues than ours. All roads bad when people visiting the Park, but not all year round. I strongly oppose this proposal. This is absolutely ridiculous to think of making this and New Road one-way. You are clearly not aware of the volume of traffic that comes through this road. If you have a delivery lorry or refuse truck and this was one-way we would never get out to work as we couldn’t turn back. It’s difficult enough getting out of Tudor Road onto Queens Road; also Kings Road is wider than ours so you need to look at that. I don’t want to be living here with a stream of vehicles with running engines because of pollution. Who is thinking this up? Maybe it’s someone who lives in Kings Road?

TR31

Tudor Road

Q3: I do not support any form of one way traffic system, as this will create more problems than it solves. This will create more risk in Tudor Road for pedestrians and cyclists, and will exacerbate any air pollution problem. One way traffic is shown by the latest research to speed up traffic, and is now being universally limited and reversed, especially here in the U.K. for example Baker Street.

Q4: I have carefully measured the Kings Road in all the upper and middle sections, and agree the very best suggestion was the enabling of two wheels to be parked on a modified pavement as it is currently on the middle portion of Kings Road. After meetings with The Kings Road residents at their request, we asked them about this as a solution for them, our group of residents, were shocked to hear that their objection to the pavement parking was that it looked unattractive, and only to be asked by the Kings Road members, would you like it like that in your Road? Showing everyone that their objection to a sensible solution was one purely about the aesthetics, a very superficial priority.

TR32

Tudor Road

Tudor Road is totally unsuitable to carry the entire burden of eastbound traffic to Richmond Park and Liverpool Road for the following reasons: 1. The road is narrow, with off-road parking throughout, with frequent access to driveways required, which causes total blockage of the road and has poor visibility due to frequent poor parking in on-road bays, often overhanging driveways in both directions, and at weekends it is used as a passageway from Richmond Park as well as frequent equestrian traffic, which use our road as a safe haven. 3. Due to the current quiet nature of the road, properties are occupied by a large number of people requiring relative tranquility, including many retirees with health problems and night/home workers, who would be disproportionately affected by increases in noise and particulate pollution. The north side of the road is also a conservation area, where most houses do not have double glazing due to
planning requirements. 4. The current quiet nature of Tudor and New Roads also means that property prices incur a premium, which would then be lost causing significant devaluation, with considerable financial harm to residents. Property in these roads is currently in high demand as there are many people seeking the rare peace that living here offers. Residents of King’s Road have not paid this premium on the grounds that it has always been a broad road, busy road, designed for a higher traffic throughput. Due to the quiet atmosphere there is also a high degree of pet ownership, with animals frequently in the road and unused to high volumes of traffic. Likewise, child cyclists also preferentially use this and New Road, especially at weekends. 5. Eastbound traffic has a tendency to fail to stop and give way at the junction of Elm Road and Park Road, which results in near misses on a frequent basis. Increased traffic at this junction, which is not suitable for installation of a roundabout, is present at the junction of King’s Road and Park Road, will result in accidents at this junction. This can also make it difficult to cross Tudor Road at busy times - when there are a lot of children walking to the primary school in Alexandria Road. 6. Turning left at the top of Tudor Road is extremely difficult at peak times, due to the high volume of incoming traffic from the right along Queen’s Road. During times where traffic has increased eastbound along Tudor Road (for example on the evening of Feb 21st when there was an incident which drove a significantly larger amount of traffic along this route), Tudor Road is very quickly at a standstill and backed up to the junction with Park Road, causing tailbacks and frictions between drivers. Any residents wishing to exit or enter driveways incur threats and poor language during these periods, and tempers fray along with aggressive and unsafe driving practices required to exit at the Queen’s Road junction. Cyclists are also at risk as they are either forced onto the pavements, representing a risk to pedestrians, or given very little clearance by car traffic, representing a risk to themselves. 7. The narrow clearance and fast speeds of eastbound traffic accelerating uphill also means that any cars parked on-road on the south side of Tudor Road will be near-impossible to access on the driver’s side whilst traffic is flowing. New Road also seems extremely narrow and is currently used mostly for westbound relief when King’s Road is congested. There is very little visibility to the sides, and again there are many pets and the road is a haven for inexperienced cyclists and residents. It would seem more appropriate to keep the broad thoroughfare of King’s Road as is, or alleviate congestion by removing parking bays along one side. I think that we would all rather have more competition for occupancy of the on-road parking in Tudor Road than the increase in traffic noise the current westbound orientation of all the eastbound traffic would cause. A mini-roundabout at the junction of King’s and Queen’s Road may be feasible to allow traffic to exit King’s Road safely and with minimal disruption. I am also very concerned by the suggestion that cycle traffic could continue to use Tudor Road westbound against the flow of traffic! Cycle traffic is already at risk when travelling with the flow, as indicated above, and there simply is no room for cyclists to travel on both sides of the traffic simultaneously (on an otherwise one-way road)). There is also the danger that frustrated eastbound traffic would use Alexandra Drive as an alternative run due to inevitable tailbacks at peak times. This would be unsafe for schoolchildren crossing to attend the primary school.

Q3: I don’t support the introduction of one-way traffic. One thing I often hear from drivers is how much they dislike the main one-way system in Kingston, I can’t see any benefit in adding to the confusion for drivers (especially for those just visiting for the park, Riverside, or some of the other great things about Kingston).

Q4: One general comment: the writing on the detailed map linked to from this survey is unreadable - even if you zoom in, it’s not possible to read the text in boxes. I am very strongly against these proposed measures. They appear to solely benefit Kings Road, and move more than half their existing traffic onto other roads (i.e. Tudor Road and New Road). This is a huge change (and a large benefit to Kings Road), at a huge cost to the other two roads. By making Tudor Road one way, then the entire flow of eastbound traffic will pass through this single narrow road. There are already issues with people struggling to pull out of their drives in the morning. The road is also frequently blocked when delivery vans or postmen stop to deliver, on rubbish collection days, or when cars are reversing out of their drives. Traffic is currently split across 3 roads, which seems both fair and practical. It also means if there are any issues/roadworks/breakdowns blocking one road, then there are still other options. For people on Tudor Road that need to commute towards town in the morning, the change would significantly increase their journey time. They’d need to join traffic on Queen’s road (which is already hard to pull out into when it’s busy, as cars don’t often leave gaps to pull out), and then loop back down and around on one of the other one way roads. Given that it’s generally hard to pull out on to Queen’s road from Tudor road on busy times, making it one way will lead to significant tailbacks. This sometimes happens at the moment, even with the traffic being 2 way. This has often lead to dangerous behaviour from drivers when pulling out on to Queen’s Road. Traffic coming up this road from Elm Road is also often congested - some drivers (especially trade van drivers) tend to join the road on to Tudor Road without stopping at the junction in some cases. This would likely worsen if all traffic from Elm Road is forced up Tudor Road. Tailbacks up Tudor Road (from traffic coming up Elm Road) have already been a significant issue when King’s Road has been congested/blocked - this is guaranteed to worsen if it becomes the sole eastbound route. Tudor Road and New Road are also currently popular for cyclists, dog walkers, and horses heading to and from Richmond Park. There are often families with young children cycling up those roads together as they’re safe, this would no longer be the case if traffic increases significantly. It’s also likely that any increase in traffic, or introduction of a one-way system would drive traffic onto Alexandra road - this has a school on it, and young children frequently cross that road, these changes risk making things less safe for them. I’d also point out that one of the reasons many people chose to move to Tudor Road and New Road was because they were a bit quieter and less polluted. Many retired people, young with children, and several residents with health issues I’ve met have commented that they moved here from noisier and polluted areas especially for that reason. They also ended up paying a lot more for buying/renting a house because of that. While I sympathise with traffic issues on Kings Road, residents will have been aware of that when they moved in, and also paid less for buying/renting because of that. The proposed changes aren’t just a minor alteration to traffic, but a massive redirection of heavy traffic on to a quiet/clean road (as well as being a risk to children and cyclists). The proposal for having cycle traffic going against the one-way traffic also seems extremely dangerous. The road is already narrow enough, and cyclists have to cycle in the middle of the road in order to avoid car doors opening, wing mirrors, etc. There simply won’t be room for this if there’s a constant flow of traffic going in the opposite direction.

SAME PERSON:
I do not support driving half the current traffic from the broad thoroughfare of Kings Road through the narrow street of Tudor Road, which has numerous off road vehicle accesses, high pet ownership and high retiree and night worker resident numbers due to current quiet nature, for which they all paid a premium! When there have been incidents (e.g. as witnessed 5-7pm 21st Feb) driving extra traffic through Tudor Road and New Road, this has caused immediate tailbacks to Park Road, near misses at the Elm Road junction and caused big problems to people needing access to and from driveways. In short, this will cause chaos at the junctions of Elm Road and Park Road, and at Queen’s Road plus Tudor Road/New Road.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TR33</th>
<th>Tudor Road</th>
<th>Remove some 'on-road' parking spaces in King’s Road to allow traffic to progress far more rapidly. I’ve walked along this road for 18 years and notice that the excess of parked cars cause the delays. The imposition of three one-way systems is total overkill and spreads the problem to other road: totally unnecessary.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| TR34/TR3 4bis | Tudor Road | Q3: I do not support the introduction of on-way traffic in the area.  
Q4: While it is clear that the surrounding areas of Kingston Gate (entry to Richmond Park) are busy with traffic, especially at the weekend, the proposed changes and traffic management plan only shift the problem to other roads. Those roads will be unable to cope and I believe the problem will worsen not improve overall. Tudor road will be severely and adversely affected by the proposal. The introduction of a one-way system, will result in all traffic from the surrounding area having to use Tudor Road to access the park and this is unacceptable. Tudor Road would essentially (at least) triple the amount of traffic it has currently as it will receive the existing traffic from both King’s Road and New Road. Tudor Road has off road parking and for those properties, at peak times, they will not be able to safely access the road. Kings Road does not have this problem. We understand that Kings Road is busy but this is not the right solution. It has been poorly thought through and should not be accepted. This area is a residential area, with many families and children, walking and on bikes. The proposed changes will result in increased speeds down Tudor Road in lower peak times causing a safety issue. In peak times, tail backs will be guaranteed as turning right will become problematic. That means cars will be sitting on the road causing unacceptable increased pollution - again this is a family area and increasing children’s exposure is unacceptable. We are also surrounded by schools and children’s groups. |
| TR35 | Tudor Road | Q3: I do not believe the introduction of one way traffic is a good idea.  
Q4: This is not well thought through - there will be significantly more traffic on narrower roads. Tudor road will become congested with an increase in pollution. My child has asthma and there are health implications for him. There will be a backup of traffic as it will be difficult for the increased volume of traffic to turn out of Tudor Road - this junction is not as wide as King’s Road and it is tight already. This will hold up traffic down the road making it difficult for people to get out of their driveways. |
| TR36/TR3 6bis | Tudor Road | I do not support the proposed one way traffic scheme for this area. As residents we feel it is important that we can use the roads in both directions. Furthermore, these proposals are with the purpose of relieving through-traffic, congestion, and air pollution. The proposal would not solve or relieve these issues, but may actually increase traffic flows, congestion and confusion in the area. The main problem seems to be the sheer volume of traffic in the area due to the Richmond Park entrance, adjacent residential areas, and the historic narrow roads in the area.  

I am strongly opposed to the scheme. I believe, based on the proposed plans and existing traffic plans that the scheme (as proposed) would lead to an increase in traffic throughout the area. The proposal does nothing to provide for alternative means of access or egress to the Park nor does it support alternative methods of travel. From the specific perspective as a resident of Tudor Rd, the one way traffic flow would increase vehicular volume and with it, noise and pollution. Because we’re in a conservation zone, we can’t easily mitigate against this with things like double glazing: the effect on our quiet enjoyment of our property would be significant. Finally, it would increase the amount of time we would need to spent in our car driving to the shops etc. around Kingston - ironically, this would of course cause more pollution, noise and nuisance for other residents. At the moment, it’s far too easy to drive into and through Richmond Park. Rather than cause more problems for local residents, RBK and Royal Parks should concentrate on a joint, comprehensive strategy to reduce vehicular traffic in and around the Park, with a strong emphasis on cycling etc. This should consider reducing parking provision in the park to deter car journeys. Without a comprehensive plan, this is simply moving any problems which might exist around which ultimately benefits no one. |
| TR37 | Tudor Road | Q3: If there had to be any changes, it would be better for traffic to go up Kings Road from Park and down New Road and Tudor Road.  
Q4: Make parking on Kings Road on one side only. |
| NR1 | New Road | This seems like clearly a bad outcome for New Road. It will increase traffic and road speeds on our road and mean we can only leave our house in one direction. It is not clear that this is designed to improve the situation overall, it feels like Kings Road residents wish to move their problems to New Road and Tudor Road. We are concerned about the impact of the traffic calming measures. Cars slowing down and breaking to use them will make additional noise. And if there is any loss of parking spots that will be a big problem as it is already very difficult to park on New Road. |
| NR12/NR1 2bis/NR12 tris | New Road | I would like New Road And Tudor Road to remain two-way traffic - it naturally slows people down.  
One-way would undoubtedly increase the traffic and speed of cars, therefore as a resident I strongly object to the introduction of one-way.  

I am happy with current situation as width of road keep traffic speed minimalised, plus we are not interested in having speed bumps plus one-way which would result in extra traffic - also, we prefer option of a two-way thoroughfare. |
| NR3 | New Road | I do not support one-way traffic. Particularly on New Road which is very narrow and would become a rat run. It goes against the character of the street to have traffic calming measures. |
| NR4 | New Road | Q3: All park traffic west of the area will be forced up Tudor Rd: simply impossible! All residents from King’s Rd and New Rd will also be forced up Tudor Rd to access the park on Liverpool Rd.  
Q4: There is major problem with this proposal (or seems to be). All traffic going to the park from Park Rd, Tudor Dr and from Ham will be directed along Tudor Rd - a tiny road. Residents from Kings Rd and New Rd also need to go up Tudor Rd to get to the park or Liverpool Rd. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NR5</td>
<td>New Road</td>
<td>By turning (New Rd) &amp; Kings Rd as one way system you’ll create more traffic in both ways therefore more noise and risk of collision, and damaging cars parked. The best way is to have humps on New Road to slow down the traffic and cars would choose another way to keep away from humps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR6</td>
<td>New Road</td>
<td>We purchased our house in New Road to avoid living on a main thoroughfare. The proposals change New Road into a main road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR7/NR7b</td>
<td>New Road</td>
<td>In New Rd parking is always a problem in the evenings (parking on one side only, when most families have at least two cars, not enough spaces) - with road restrictions, will lose even more parking. For us living in one of the two roads will be totally frustrating to sit in a traffic jam going in the wrong direction that we need to go in to then do it again trying to get up one of the main roads. People will use Alexandra Rd to avoid these two roads, far from ideal on a road with a school on it. I can only see this leading to more congestion in all the roads and surrounding roads, this in turn will lead to more pollution, speeding in other side roads and dangerous driving, the local schools should be very concerned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR8</td>
<td>New Road</td>
<td>New Road: exiting onto Park Road is hazardous due to limited visibility to the right. Installation of traffic mirrors would be required at the New Road/Park Road intersection. Extra traffic north-bound on Tudor Road would cause major issues at rush time for those wanting to turn right onto Queen's Road. Traffic in New Road is already very fast; hazards to children. Signage on Kingston Park Gate to indicate new traffic arrangements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR9</td>
<td>New Road</td>
<td>New Road is very narrow and all the houses and flats have no front gardens to distance themselves from road air pollution and extra noise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR10</td>
<td>New Road</td>
<td>This will mean an extra half mile drive every time I come home or want to go up Kingston Hill. Massively increased traffic congestion. Kings Road buyers knew where they were buying. I will take legal action against the Council if this proceeds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR11/NR1</td>
<td>New Road</td>
<td>You are not interested in local views on last century’s dangerous scheme. 1. It will inevitably increase pollution, on the quiet, narrow roads and endanger the many young children walking down from Liverpool Road to the 4 or 5 schools off Park road. 2. New Road is too narrow to accommodate speed humps. 3. Residents with off road parking find it difficult enough already to get on and off their drives, depending on what is parked opposite. 4. Cyclists, young and old will, literally, be squished out against cars or prevented from learning to ride safely and there will be no safe route to Richmond Park for horses. 5. I hope this idea will not be resurrected again! Same person: Again and again this idea has been seen by RBK and residents as unworkable. The roads are too narrow for humps. One-way will restrict, be dangerous to cyclists and walkers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR12/NR1</td>
<td>New Road</td>
<td>I would like New Road And Tudor Road to remain two-way traffic - it naturally slows people down. One-way would undoubtedly increase the traffic and speed of cars, therefore as a resident I strongly object to the introduction of one-way. I am happy with current situation as width of road keep traffic speed minimalised, plus we are not interested in having speed bumps plus one-way which would result in extra traffic - also, we prefer option of a two-way thoroughfare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR13</td>
<td>New Road</td>
<td>The roads are busy at peak times but I don’t believe the proposed changes will provide any improvement to the area as a whole. The changes will have a particularly detrimental effect on traffic volume in Tudor Road. At peak times, particularly mornings there will be a huge queue of traffic attempting to join Queen’s Road. At peak times I suspect the flow of traffic on Queen’s Road towards the park will be such that traffic wishing to turn right into Kings Road and New Road will have little opportunity. The western ends of both King’s Road and New Road will be busier as joining onto Park Road will be significantly more difficult due to the traffic that once travelled eastwards on King’s Road will be forced to head for Tudor Road. Overall, I feel the scheme address the concerns of a few to the detriment of the many.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR14</td>
<td>New Road</td>
<td>Q3: Straddle speed ramps are ineffective on one way roads. I hope this scheme is not approved, but full sleeping policemen must be used in all roads if it is. Q4: To the extent that there is some delay caused by restricted space for two-way traffic on Kings Road, surely that is the aim of traffic calming. If you want the traffic to flow faster again, make more ‘passing points’ by cancelling some parking spaces and/or allowing cars to park partly on the pavement like in the lower section of Kings Road. The proposed one way system is a waste of money that will extend distance travelled, increase pollution and create pedestrian hazards outside two busy schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR15</td>
<td>New Road</td>
<td>Q4: Is it possible to increase the number of parking bays? For example, remove the posts in New Road which were to protect the ticket machine which has now been removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR17/NR1</td>
<td>New Road</td>
<td>I do not support the one-way system down New Road and Tudor Road. It is going to cause congestion during busy periods. There is no traffic circle or traffic lights to help the flow during busy period. Kings Road does have a traffic circle which helps the flow. All the benefit of this change benefit Kings Road. Furthermore speed reducing cushions are not enough to stop speeding down New Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR1</td>
<td>Shortlands Road</td>
<td>Kings Rd is a busy road, but only at peak times. The junctions at both ends of this section of Kings Rd will be just as busy and groups of cyclists will go even faster round and between cars. Proposal will increase traffic on Alexandra Rd which has 2 primary schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR2</td>
<td>Shortlands Road</td>
<td>Q3: I do not support one sentence at all (very opposed to one-way traffic). The existing situation is absolutely acceptable. Q4: The parking permit system is absolutely ridiculous (no criminal). Not only have you closed the bend on RD shop (+ Guildhall Office), the system within the tender fine in the north is a nightmare (UNCLEAR HAND WRITING). Please scrap the permit system and revert back to free parking as was the case before 2003.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| SR3/SR3bis  | Shortlands Road | Kings Road is frequently brought to a standstill by inconsiderate drivers. I walk to Richmond Park every day with my dog, and am constantly amazed at what I see. Cars gridlocked as some refuse to let others by; road rage incidents; bike rage incidents; coaches and lorries that get stuck trying to turn into the top of Kings Road when they realise they cannot go through the park. It’s dangerous to try and cross and cyclists are regularly on the pavement, which is not safe for them or pavement users. The speed some of the cars try to travel at does not help as well. Something urgently needs to be done before someone is injured or killed.  

The sheer volume of cars is immense in this area - the area cannot cope. The resultant pollution has not been mentioned at all in this consultation. The upper end of Kings Road is frequently gridlocked. It’s dangerous. Cars parked on this road are often damaged; drivers get very angry; and it’s not safe for people walking and cycling to the park. This situation needs to be resolved urgently. |
| SR4 | Shortlands Road | If these are the same residents who insisted on the relocation of playground in Richmond Park, they should be told to count their blessings and not expect the rest of us to pay to their inconveniences. The Council has far more important priorities for their funds. |
| SR5 | Shortlands Road | Great idea - but please provide a cycle lane on Kings Rd leading to the park which is heavily used by cyclists for training. Seems to work ok on Fairfield West for example. Besides this, the sooner the better. |
| SR6 | Shortlands Road | Q3: Traffic coming down New Rd should only be able to turn left onto Park Rd to prevent congestion of cars trying to turn right across Park Rd towards Kings Rd.  
Q4: Unnecessary expenses to put speed bumps and move disruption of installation to a continually disrupted area due to never ending road works. Traffic congestion in Kings Rd mainly occurs with school traffic - no traffic when park closed and half term school holidays. Money should be spent on keeping our roads and pavements clear from broken glass, dog mess, etc. |
| SR7/SR7bis  | Shortlands Road | Q3: I do not support the one way traffic system, see comments below for an alternative suggestion - restricting parking to one side - which should be considered in the first instance before such a disruption change to other roads.  
Q4: We do not support the changes proposed as this will only create more havoc for the local residents. In particular, it will increase the risk of traffic and air pollution for more children living in this very residential area. The area has a very high population of children under 10 years of age – the age group which are at most risk of developing asthma and other respiratory problems. Kings road congestion only occurs on sunny days at the weekend. Even roads where schools are, have more traffic during the week compared to this section of Kings road. Having lived here for several years, most other times during Monday to Friday and when not a sunny weekend the road is very quiet and a large part of time, only a couple of cars passing by which cannot justify such a change in the other roads. New Road is a very narrow road and diverting traffic down this road can increase accidents especially at the junction between New Road and Park Road due to low visibility. If this becomes a route – more drivers will also try to drive across park road onto Shortlands Road – this is not a direct path and I have seen a number of near misses as a result of this. The end of Kings road has a wide junction with a roundabout to prevent these sorts of accidents. It would be better to restrict parking to only one side of Kings road – the side that already has many off street parking households. This will thus allow traffic to flow more easily as 2 cars can pass by each other easily – you can see this when there are several free parking spaces and 2 way traffic is very clearly possible. This should be considered as a first option in order to prevent an increase of traffic onto roads which are NOT designed to take such a diversion. We hope you will consider this alternative approach.  

Q3: I strongly do not support the proposed solution, I don’t believe that it is an issue and would be interested to know what other options were considered.  
Q4: There are many of roads that have off street parking on this section of Kings Road, yet despite this they still have on street parking options along the full length of the road on both sides unlike most of Kings Road. This would appear to result in an over capacity of parking as there is often a fair proportion of the parking space unused. The cheapest and easiest solution would be to reduce the on street parking to allow more efficient traffic flow. Was this option considered at all? Given the number of cars normally utilising the on street parking, reducing parking to one side only would allow two way traffic to proceed unhindered, without impacting the wider neighbourhood. Was this cheap option considered? Even a small reduction of the on street to provide addition passing places and more space near the junctions would improve traffic flow. Increasing the volume of traffic on New Road would elevate the risk of accidents as the pub on New Road is full of families in, combined with the narrow nature of the road which increases the risk of accidents. The proposed solution adds any possibility issues. The junction New Road - Park Road - Shortlands Road is off-set and often dangerous to cross given the speed of traffic on Park Road. Increasing the volume of traffic on New Road will elevate the risk of accidents at this junction. Encouraging increased traffic to use Shortlands Road is also likely to lead to knock-on congestion as this section of Shortlands Road is relatively long and does not have any passing places. Even today, congestion often occurs along this section whilst one car waits for the other to drive the length of the road. All the junctions involving New Road and Tudor Road on to Park Road or Queens Road will see increased traffic compared to the current situation. With Park Road and Queens Road busy and relatively fast, without addition traffic calming measures or road layouts, I suspect that these will become new points of congestion, accidents and disruption. Increasing traffic on to Alexandra Road would be problematic during school terms, as there are frequent periods of bad congestion along this road already. Overall this seems to be a very disruptive and expensive solution to something that is not that bad, negatively impacting more residents than will benefit from it. |
| SR8 | Shortlands Road | New Road and Tudor Road are not suitable for an increase in traffic. |
| SR9 | Shortlands Road | Q3: Increasing traffic on Alexandra Road will create chaos, especially as two schools are there.  
Q4: Why can’t cyclists comply the same as cars? |
| SR10 | Shortlands Road | The proposed outline will have an enormous effect on Alexandra Road where they will significantly increase traffic pollution directly outside two primary school playing grounds. They will also increase traffic on Alexandra Road potentially endangering children as they arrive/leave school. I live very close to Kings Road and do not find the road particularly congested, so don’t think the proposed measures are necessary. |
| SR11 | Shortlands Road | Q3: I do not support one way traffic.  
Q4: 1. Walking up Kings Road into Richmond Park every day at peak periods I have not noticed any traffic issues - the current traffic bumps regulate traffic. 2. Routing traffic from Park Road (from both Ham and Norbiton directions), Kings Road (south), Shortlands Road and Elm Road into Tudor Road will overload the narrow Tudor Road as well as be a potential danger to cyclists. 3. Refuse vehicles have problems navigating ALL the above mentioned roads and block them for the short amount of time once a week that they are operating in each road. 4. Cyclist accidents will be moved from Kings Road to Tudor Road (Queens Road and Park Road junctions). |
| SR12 | Shortlands Road | Q3: I agree that one-way proposals are sensible, however I am concerned about the impact on Alexandra Road.  
Q4: I am very concerned that Alexandra Road has not been considered as part of these proposals. The road has two schools and a church and the proposals would seem to increase traffic on this road, posing safety concerns for children. Please consider Alexandra Road as part of a wide set of proposals. |
| ER1 | Elm Road | Q3: | I OBJECT to the introduction of one-way traffic and besides this is a loaded question! I suggest if the council intends to seek public consultation on this proposal that it do so properly otherwise it risks an administrative law challenge on grounds that it has failed to consult properly on this proposal. Q4: | | | The council's proposal to introduce one-way traffic along Kings Road may well ease traffic flow along solely Kings Road during peak hours. However, that will be the significant detrimental of adjacent residential streets, which will suffer significant increased traffic flow, congestion with corresponding dangers to pedestrians, noise and air pollution. Directing traffic southbound down Tudor Road (currently a very quiet residential back street) is a terrible idea. Not only will it ruin Tudor Road, a quiet residential street, it is unreasonable for the council to expect that traffic to then turn left or right along Park Road, when instead drivers are likely to continue along Elm Road, a residential street that already suffers from being a ‘rat run’ during peak hours and needs no further traffic flow or congestion pressure. Elm Road is frequently used by families and school children walking to the various primary schools in the area and increased traffic flow along Elm Road will cause a danger to pedestrians notwithstanding increased noise and air pollution. Not only will the council’s proposal directly affect Tudor Road and Elm Road, it will also cause greater congestion along all surrounding roads as the traffic flow along just Kings Road is eased has a knock on effect of creating bottle necks along these adjacent quiet residential streets. Current peak traffic is confined to Kings Road, a street that is right next to Richmond Park and known to be busy during peak hours. Why does the council see fit to appease residents of Kings Road to the detriment of residents, pedestrians and schools in the surrounding area? The council’s plan is not a viable proposal. A far better consideration would be to work with Richmond Park around the times Kingston Gate is open during the week peak hours to vehicle traffic. The reason Kings Road gets so busy is drivers using Richmond Park as a peak hour commuter through fare. That should not be the appropriate use of the park – it is not there as a rat run for commuters during peak hours. The council’s plan seeks to fix traffic along one small section of road. Its plan will have a significant and dangerous detrimental effect on all surrounding residential streets and should be opposed on those grounds. |
| ER2 | Elm Road | Q3: | I think it’s a good idea but suggest you look carefully at the junction of Tudor Rd and Queens Rd. I often have difficulty in turning left onto Queens Rd without swinging over to in oncoming traffic as it is very narrow and tight bend. Q4: | | | Would it work any better the other way around? |
| ER3/ER2bi s | Elm Road | Q2: | Traffic exiting Richmond Park and wishing to turn right into the proposed one way system in Kings Road will be prevented by traffic going North heading for the park in Queen’s Rd. Neither New Road nor Tudor Road can accommodate traffic flow, especially Tudor Rd dealing with all traffic heading for Richmond Park. Alternatively have King’s Road Eastbound only (towards the park) and have left and right only lanes at the junction of Queens Rd. Make New Road AND Tudor Rd Westbound only. Q4: | | | The current proposal will cause a bottle neck at King’s Rd J/W Queen’s Rd. With my proposal New Rd & Tudor Rd going Westbound only will not have issues turning into Park Rd as most traffic will have turned East into King’s Rd heading for Richmond Park. VIA EMAIL: Regarding the proposed traffic calming measures for the above roads. 1. There is no need for calming measures on these roads due to their narrow widths and two way traffic currently using all three roads. 2. The issue is King’s Road. Congestion in this road will no doubt be causing concern of residents, cars stationary and pumping out pollution. Vehicles travelling in both directions spending time stationary being the issue. 3. The proposed scheme is not well thought out. Having lived in Elm Road for over 25 years and using all three roads I have experience of the problem. I prefer not to use King’s Road due to the conflict of two way traffic which impacts on my journey time. 4. I support a change in the roads layouts HOWEVER: a. Traffic exiting Richmond Park will be blocked from turning right into King’s Rd by traffic intending to enter the Park from Queen’s Rd. i. A better solution would be to make King’s Road one way but in the other direction, thereby vehicles intending to enter the park will have a left turn lane only facilitating a free flow of traffic, a right turn only lane at this junction will have some issues in filtering into the traffic from Richmond Park. ii. Make New Road and Tudor Road one way Westbound. Vehicle from the park will take their first opportunity to head towards Park Road, traffic from Kingston Hill may take Tudor Road. At the roundabout at Park Road, Kings Road those heading to the park will have a simple left turn rather than a more complex turning movement which would be a conflict in trying to exit King’s Road where traffic from Park Road heading South will have right of way. This will back up traffic and the pollution issue continues. iii. Under my alternative proposal traffic exiting from both New Road & Tudor Road will not have problems as most traffic in this area are either heading to or from Richmond park. iv. Under the existing proposal New Road is too small to accommodate all the traffic from the park heading towards Park Road. Please visit this road it really is too narrow. As an aside there is little that can be done to reduce cyclists’ accidents whilst they believe Richmond Park is a racetrack and believe they can ride without any consideration to other road users, cutting across motorists, overtaking vehicles with no regard to pedestrians, dogs, horses or other vehicles. A visit to the park on a sunny Saturday and you will see cyclist riding two three or more abreast, over and undertaking cars. As a motorist I have to spend most of my time watching my mirrors. i am sorry for the length of this email but hope you can see my point. Regards |
This scheme will cause more congestion in more areas that the couple of hours a day currently ONLY affecting kings road at the moment!!! So why do it?

IF IT HAS TO BE DONE BECAUSE I KNOW KINGSTON IS MAD ON ONE WAY SYSTEMS AND KEEPING TRAFFIC STUCK IN ONE AREA THEREBY CAUSING MORE POLLUTION I PROPOSE THE FOLLOWING:

- ONLY put one way going UP into the park in kings road and leave the others as normal. This would limit the damage you are proposing to 3 roads and allow the natural flow of traffic into the park or up Kingston hill /queens road when park is closed.
- From a 30 + year resident of the area of Kingston Richmond park.

ER4
Elm Road
Q3: Just Put a 10mph speed limit in place (and enforce it) in the area, get police on the street with guns.
Q4: Why are you so concerned with here when there is a far worse situation going on at Manorgate Rd with the proposed LIDL store?

ER5
Elm Road
Q3: I think Kings Road/Queens Road should be no entry as it causes a little neck at the park gates. Therefore, Tudor Road/Queens Road should be one-way; Tudor Road/Park Road no entry.
Q4: Need to ensure there is still provision for pedestrians to cross at Park Road/Kings Road as a lot of traffic. Will the “cycle lane island” be made enough to accommodate a buggy/family?

ER6
Elm Road
A great idea!

ER7
Elm Road
Q3: I am very concerned about the volume of traffic pushed onto Tudor Road, Elm Road and the crossroads between them on Park Road, as access routes to the park. Would it be better to make New Road one-way in the opposite direction to Kings Road, and leave Tudor Road as it is?
Q4: The proposal is unfair on residents of Tudor Road and Elm Road. They will become the main access points to the park for vehicles and increasing numbers of cyclists. There will be considerable congestion at that crossroad.

ER8
Elm Road
Q3: Although I am sympathetic to measures to reduce traffic on King’s Road, the road is much wider and has more capacity than New Road and Tudor Road. New Road in particular is very narrow. It is inappropriate for Tudor Road to absorb all of the traffic travelling up towards Queen’s Road - this would represent an enormous increase in flow for a relatively narrow road. It will also cause considerable congestion at the junction between Tudor Road and Park Road. It is highly likely that traffic will be pushed down to other roads, including Alexandra Road, which has two primary schools on it - posing a danger to children from both traffic and air pollution.
Q4: Speed reducing cushions are not very effective in slowing down cars in particular (sinusoidal speed bumps would be better). The map provided by the council is very poor quality, some of the captions are barely legible. In addition, no information is provided regarding expected knock-on effects for surrounding roads.

BC1
Beaumont Close
Please consider extending the 20 mph limit to include the top end of Kings Road, New Road, Queens Road and Crescent Road. Justifiable on safety grounds.

CROSS1
Cross Road
Q3: No I do not support the proposed changes at all. I think parking down 1 side of the top end of Kings road would be a good idea to stop the bottle necking of traffic but if you visited the roads today with the current road works you would clearly see the impact the traffic has on these roads. If you make the 2 roads in question 1 way and add speed humps all you will do is push the traffic down the additional roads (which has 2 schools on it). Already the roadworks at the bottom of Kingston Hill has had a massive impact and I now get hundreds of cars going along my road (Cross Rd) to avoid the traffic jams already present on Park Rd. The main problem is there is no way to get ths Kingston without using the basically useless pointless one way system which has certain bottle neck areas.
Q4: It would be a good idea if the people who thought up these ideas actually drove round these streets at busy times to witness the impact traffic has on this area already.

CC1
Cherrywood Close
We think there will be a “knock-on” effect on the roads around. Despite traffic calming measures, one way system will encourage traffic, not restrict it.

CC2
Cherrywood Close
In principle I support the scheme, but only on the condition that peak hour access restrictions are introduced (as was being discussed) in Alexandra Road at the same time.

LR1
Liverpool Road
We are looking forward to a reduction in speed in this whole area. The zebra crossing on Queens Rd is so unsafe... drivers plough through as often as stopping. Also we hope this will reduce the amount of road rage we hear down that corner, and in Kings Rd, almost daily.

RPR1
Richmond Park Road
Chevaliers cycling club, based in Kingston, with over 100 members, supports the proposal. We regularly meet at Kingston Gate, and many members have experienced challenges cycling on the short stretch of road (Kings Road between Queen’s Road and Park Road). The current infrastructure is not well suited for two way traffic of motorised vehicles alone, but it’s highly unsuitable for two way traffic and cyclists together. It’s particularly problematic when cyclists are riding in the uphill direction and only able to travel at a speed which frustrates some drivers of motorised vehicles which sometimes leads to them overtaking on a stretch of road where there is insufficient space to do so safely.

RPR2
Richmond Park Road
It is clear that inaccurate SATNAV directions are part of this problem as so many HGVs seem to be using Park Rd/Queens Rd. It would be great if Richmond Park would consider closing the park to vehicular traffic (apart from blue badge) 1 day per month to encourage people to leave their cars at home and enjoy walking/cycling in the park. The park really does need to take the lead in encouraging people to think before they jump in the car for so many reasons. During the mid-week rush hour the park might as well be considered akin to a major A road when you observe the traffic jams in there. This is so wrong.

COW1
Cowper Road
The proposals would allow faster traffic on Kings Road with traffic heading away, downhill from Queens Road. With no on-coming traffic drivers will go faster I believe which will not be good for cyclists trying to cycle up hill on the contra-flow. The proposal also displaces more traffic to New Road and Tudor Road. Tudor Road has/is a signposted cycle route between Kingston centre to Richmond Park and you are proposing to put all the traffic going towards Richmond Park from Park Road up Tudor Road. This appears to be a bad idea for cyclists and pedestrians. If there are insufficient passing places on Kings Road why does the council not propose introducing some passing places? That is the simple and obvious answer.

WR1
Willoughby Road
Q3: Support one way traffic however current suggestions will just push existing traffic to another road.
Q4: Yes. The main reason there is a lot of traffic on Kings Road is numerous cars taking a short cut to/from Kingston Hill using Crescent Road and Liverpool Road. Perhaps a way could be found (wide car barriers?) to reduce traffic taking this shortcut? Need to redirect traffic to take Park Road.

Annex 3
| WR2 | Willoughby Road | Q3: If you are going to do this then you HAVE to extend the scheme to include ALEXANDRA Road as well if you are going to make all the other roads one way between Park and Queens Roads. Alexandra Road is just as bad for traffic and pollution as Kings, Tudor and New Roads, but has the extra major factors of having TWO PRIMARY SCHOOLS WITH MORE THAN 720 CHILDREN coming and going on the road. It is already hideously dangerous, local parents have already had to fight to get a road crossing after several accidents outside the schools involving children pedestrians. There are daily fights between angry drivers and very dangerous behaviour, the heads have had to call the parking attendants in to help manage the situation. If you use this scheme as it is, all you will do is the push the problems right on the door step of 720 under 11 year old children with potentially fatal consequences. Q4: It’s awful that Kings Road is so congested, but councillors were asked to look at neighbouring Alexandra Road and its schools as part of this visit, so am at a loss to understand why Alexandra road and its schools have not been considered in this scheme. |
| WR3 | Willoughby Road | It seems the only option to reduce time and issues for all drivers & the poor residents on the top half of Kings Road KT2. |
| CR1 | Clifton Road | There seems to be a heightened congestion in the whole area down from Liverpool and Crescent Rds. In the winter when the days are shorter the traffic on Richmond Rd through Petersham is increasingly challenging. The Zebra crossing at Park Gate is regularly ignored by cyclists and other road users. I thought potentially it was worse currently due to the improvements in Kingston’s town centre road network being improved but possibly not. |
| CR2 | Clifton Road | The proposals risk increasing traffic on Alexandra Road and subjecting the pupils at both St Pauls C of E school and Alexandra School to further congestion, air pollution and road danger. For this reason, the proposal should not go ahead until Alexandra Road becomes a designated schools street i.e. closed to non-residential motor traffic at drop-off and pick-up times. |
| DR1 | Dinton Road | It is an absolutely awful road, I am surprised someone hasn’t been injured. One of the worst roads in the area. |
| CPR1 | Canbury Park Road | I wholeheartedly support the plan to make kings road and neighbouring roads 1 way. This will ease hideous traffic ‘stand off’s’ and make them hopefully significantly less dangerous. |
| CPR2 | Canbury Park Road | This should be a first step to reduce motor traffic. The next stage should be to eliminate all motor traffic from the affect residential roads (apart from for immediate residents) so that traffic is restricted to the main roads only. |
| RC1 | Ravensbury Court | Encourage people to share their car journeys. The school kids could also travel by public transport more often - most of the peak traffic is made up of parents driving their kids around, then going wherever with mostly empty SUVs... Good luck! |
| IHC1 | Isabel Hill Close | The challenge is drivers will inevitably get frustrated with cyclists coming up the hill from a standing start and try to come down the road at the same time. |
| WRBrent | Windmill Road, Brentford | Use Kings Road a lot as a cyclist and this would certainly improve safety so it gets my vote. |
| BR1 | Berserford Road | It may push more traffic heading away from the park and pollution on to Alexandra Road which has two schools on it. |
| CG1 | Chatsworth Gardens | It would be better to restrict through traffic completely rather than introduce a one way System. |
| KV1 | Kingston Vale | Too difficult to use that road as a driver and dangerous for cyclists. Something must be done. |
| SMG1 | St Mary’s Grove, Barnes | There needs to be a plan to reduce commutes through the Park, charging or something, as that is the real cause of all the congestion not users of the Park. |
| LG1 | Lytten Grove | Q3: We need to do more to deter and/or replace private car journeys in the area to the park. Q4: On week days, most cars seem to be people arriving at the park, using the free parking then walking to the train station. These people provide no revenue to the park, cause congestion and pollution in the park and increase traffic congestion around the park, particularly for local residents. Car parking cannot be free in a Royal Park, nor should it be acceptable to use it as a rat run and cut through. |
| BEAR1 | Bearfield Road | Q3: Directions are suitable but all routes MUST allow cycles to go in both directions. We should not be introducing any traffic management schemes that make is more difficult to cycle. |
| TP1 | The Pleasance | Think the proposed measures are a step in the right direction, but think the council could do more to keep children and families safer on the road during weekends when the circular around the park practically becomes a parking lot with the amount of cars on it. I think finding a way to remove cars from the park on the weekend would be ideal, and only allowing access to the park. Perhaps separate entrances can be built to allow cars to park and then walk into the park? Thank you. |
| PD1 | Pine Dell | Q3: It’s important to slow down traffic and limit large vehicles. I’m not sure parking on the pavement is a good idea. Q4: This route is used as a cut through increasingly because of roadworks on the one way system. |
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congestion and causes no additional hazard to parents taking children to the three adjacent schools, St. Paul's Primary School, Alexandra Infants, Park School, and several community day nurseries.

KEMP1 Kempshott Road Richmond park is a National Nature Reserve and Site of Special Scientific Interest but suffers from excessive traffic and consequent pollution, as well as disruption to wildlife. It should be closed to through traffic with motor vehicles allowed only for visits to the park - and not as a short cut.

DAW1 Dawson Road Q3: New Road is far too narrow for 2-way cycling and 1-way driving to work properly. Needs to be 1-way for all traffic to accommodate the increased volume of cars on New Rd. There's no way anyone on a bike can safely ride up New Rd into oncoming traffic and to make it seem like that's a safe option is negligent, unless a priority to cycles with "give way to cycles" is also signed and enforced. Tudor Rd and Kings Rd are wide enough for 2-way cycling so that's fine. Q4: Speed reducing cushions don't actually slow down drivers as they are generally too narrow and most cars are wide enough to get their tires either side without slowing down or causing a bump. If New Rd is to have 2-way cycle traffic and 1-way car traffic as proposed, it needs to be proper speed tables all the way across.

CRP1 Cranes Park I think the proposed scheme will reduce congestion around Kingston Gate significantly which can only be a good thing for drivers and cyclists.

NOTT1 Nottingham Road, London Cycling contraflows need to be done carefully not to be dangerous for cyclists. Car drivers tend to treat one way with cycling contraflow as a one way road, and not consider giving way when (e.g. due to parked cars) if not enough room for car and cyclist going opposite directions. Q3: One way could work, but greater speed reduction measures would be required. Q4: Make it traffic-free.

GC1 Gibson Close Q3: Make it traffic-free. Q4: Impossible to see the small text on the drawing or the proposal. Cannot open the drawing in a way to allow it to be zoomed in.

UC1 Ulster Court There is a problem with congestion in this section of King's Road, however, the way drivers handle it by helping others to negotiate their way through, does bring out the best in us. Some may find it frustrating, but I feel we can live with it.

Beryl Berylsted Do not support the proposals. There is a significant issue with through traffic using these roads which is creating a danger to people walking and people on bikes. The proposals will better manage this traffic which could lead to the amount of traffic increasing. As the Council acknowledges, traffic speeds could also increase. This does therefore not solve the problem with traffic on these roads and increasing speeds will decrease safety. An alternative should therefore be found. I believe that the Council should incorporate more roads in its review (for example, Crescent, Connaught and Liverpool Roads) to reduce/stop through traffic in this area. Through a combination of modal filters/width restrictions, through traffic could be stopped or significantly reduced. Stopping or significantly reducing through traffic will keep motor traffic to main roads, returning residential roads to residents and will encourage sustainable travel in the wider area. If the plans are to go ahead then despite this objection, I support the plans to allow contraflow cycling on all roads. However, better road markings are required to warn drivers that contraflow cycling is allowed (for example, see the paint markings applied to Acre Road). I am concerned that the contraflow cycling lane on King's Road is in the door zone creating a risk to cyclists. There is also no traffic calming proposed for Tudor Road which should be changed. All speed humps or cushions should be implemented as sinusoidal speed bumps. A raised table should be implemented at the Queen's Road and Tudor Road junction to slow traffic too. I strongly support the 20mph extension proposals as a first step to significantly increasing the number of 20mph roads across the Borough.

BH1 Bowater House The problem of making roads 1 way is that traffic speeds will increase. Changes should make it less convenient and slower for motor vehicles to discourage rat running.

CA1 Canbury Avenue I drive and cycle in the area regularly. Broadly I think this is a good idea. My concerns are: 1. Not sure that having New and Kings Rd flowing in same direction is sensible, although proposed direction for Kings is probably best option. 2. Speeds on these roads need limiting to 20mph. One way flow will lead to increased speeds otherwise, so I suspect cameras will be required at the mid-point of each road. 3. This will increase traffic to Alexandra Rd, which has 2 schools. This proposal should NOT proceed without explicitly planning for the impact to Alexandra Rd. Again, strict speed enforcement will be needed including cameras outside each school. Perhaps Alexandra will also need to be made one way. 4. What is the provision for cycle lanes? Will they be protected lanes? Will they be 2-way on each road or follow main flow? This needs to be clear, and needs to be part of the solution as cycle traffic is high here.

CONN1 Connaught Road One way traffic risks higher speeds and drawing in yet more traffic. A low traffic neighbourhood scheme, by filtering out through traffic, would be safer.

UX1 Ukbridge Road The proposed scheme will increase traffic speeds; make the roads more dangerous for children, pedestrians and cyclists; and by making traffic flow faster increase an number of vehicles using the road. I cannot support this. Instead the scheme should be stopping these roads being used as rat runs, by keeping through traffic on the main roads.

TA1 The Avenue Q3: Agree. Traffic direction on Kings road should be from Queens Road towards Park road. So car traffic is flowing with majority of cyclists i.e. traveling from Kingston Gate toward Kingston Bridge. Q4: Impossible to see the small text on the drawing or the proposal. Cannot open the drawing in a way to allow it to be zoomed in.

DU1 Durrston Road Q3: It offers nothing to walkers and cyclists using the park. These are the types of users we should be trying to encourage. In fact it may endanger cyclists more, as vehicle speeds may increase. Q4: Segregated cycle lanes please. And more space for pedestrians. Please do NOT prioritise motor vehicles in this region near to the park - it just encourages rat-running. Leisure / sustainable users should be front and foremost.

GR1 Gibbon Road I think it's long overdue sorting the traffic problem on Kings Road, I welcome this.

GLEN1 Glenville Road I would extend the scheme to Alexandra Road. This road is often congested with traffic going in two directions when there are only room for one lane of traffic due to parked cars on both sides. Making this one way would help that. This would also help with the problems with school parents parking which is causing problems for neighbours, school users and road users.

WIND1/WIND11 Windmill Rise Q3: One way traffic will only serve to move the problem to the next available two way street - rather than solving the problem. Worryingly the next available wide street is Alexandra Road, with two primary schools. Clearly this will increase congestion and subsequently increase pollution and increase the risk of harm to young children. Unfortunately this makes your proposal completely unacceptable and will be met with fierce resistance by local parent groups. Q4: One way traffic will only serve to move the problem to the next available two way street - rather than solving the problem. Worryingly the next available wide street is Alexandra Road, with two primary schools. Clearly this will increase congestion and subsequently increase pollution and increase the risk of harm to young children. Unfortunately this makes your proposal completely unacceptable and will be met with fierce resistance by local parent groups.

Annex 3
| CHE1 | Chesfield Road | The proposals would certainly benefit Kings Rd but the deflected impact on Tudor and Alexandra Road is quite substantial. I would support New and Tudor being made one way only though. |
| YR1 | York Road | Q3: One way traffic is not the answer. Q4: Why do they require a change. |
| KH1 | Kingston Hill | Q3: No. It needs to stay two way. |
| WOOD1 | Woodlands Road | Q3: I do not support the changes because this is a missed opportunity to make a better intervention. Q4: I object to these proposals including the following key points: The Council’s proposals are unlikely to reduce through traffic and, as the Council notes, could increase traffic speeds. This therefore does not do enough to protect the safety of vulnerable road users on these roads. The Council should be bolder in its proposals and look at ways to reduce through traffic using these and surrounding roads (including Alexander, Liverpool and Crescent Roads) to keep traffic to the main roads such as Kingston Hill. If the one-way proposals were to go ahead, I am concerned that the contraflow cycle lane on King’s Road is in the ‘dooring’ zone creating a risk to cyclists. In addition, we would like clearer paint markings on New and Tudor Road to show people in motor vehicles that contraflow cycling is permitted on these roads. I would also like further traffic calming to be considered for Tudor Road (particularly as it is part of a signed cycle route). Notwithstanding my objections to the scheme as a whole, we are pleased that cycling has at least been considered in the one-way proposals and that contraflow cycling is to be permitted on all affected roads. In addition, we strongly support the proposals to extend 20mph limits onto Queen’s, Liverpool and Crescent Road. |
| UPR1 | Upper Park Road | I support the Kingston Cycling Campaign feedback. These are residential streets and better prioritising of car traffic misses the point. Obstruct them and ensure through traffic uses the main routes. |
| NL1 | Northweal d Lane | The proposed one-way flows will create two crossover/friction points at Queens Road/Kings Road and Park Road/Tudor Road as traffic heading in/out of the park will have to cross traffic heading the other way. This is a fatal flaw. If a one-way system is to be introduced then it should be the other way round, i.e. into the park from Kings Road. |
| KCC | KCC | OVERALL COMMENT Kingston Cycling Campaign strongly objects to the proposed measures on King’s/New and Tudor Roads as it will do little to reduce through traffic on these busy roads and, as acknowledged by Council officers, traffic speeds are likely to increase. This area has a long history of cyclists and pedestrians being injured through collisions with motor vehicles and we believe the best way of reducing the incidence of these collisions is to reduce the amount of through motor traffic using these roads and to reduce the speeds of remaining motor traffic. By implementing the one-way arrangements, traffic in the area will become better managed which could increase the amount of through traffic as well as leading to increased traffic speeds. We do not believe this will improve the safety of those walking or those on bikes; reduce air pollution or noise; nor encourage sustainable travel. SUGGESTED ALTERNATIVE Instead of the one-way plans, we would like the Council to be more ambitious and look at alternatives across a wider area to successfully reduce through traffic. We believe that the size of the area being looked at should also include Alexander; Crescent and Liverpool Roads. Through limiting through traffic using these primarily residential roads, there would be less congestion; noise and pollution with the benefits of improving safety and encouraging sustainable travel methods. From the local residents we have spoken to, we also believe that this would be strongly supported by them. We believe there are a number of methods that could be investigated and trialled to reduce through motor traffic including: permanent bollards; removable bollards; signed closures (with or without camera enforcement); signed access only (with or without camera enforcement); width restrictions; and the implementation of a “school street” (timed closure). Evidence has shown that tackling through traffic on a whole neighbourhood basis can reduce traffic across a wider area (not just in the neighbourhood itself) as people stop taking unnecessary trips by motor vehicle and switch to sustainable methods (for example, start walking their children to/from school). By trialling these low-cost ideas, the Council could see if they are successful and could then tweak them as needed. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss these ideas further with the Council and officers. ELEMENTS OF THE PROPOSAL WE SUPPORT Notwithstanding the above, Kingston Cycling Campaign supports the planned extension of the 20mph limit onto Queen’s, Liverpool and Crescent Roads to reduce motor vehicle speeds. The Council should however work with local police to increase enforcement of 20mph limits in the Borough. Although we disagree with the one-way proposals, we do welcome that the Council has considered cycling in the plans and plans to permit contraflow cycling on all affected roads. Therefore, if the one-way plans were to proceed despite our objection above, we support the plans to permit contraflow cycling on all the roads, however, we have also detailed a number of improvements required below. DETAILED COMMENTS ON IMPROVEMENTS REQUIRED TO THE ONE-WAY PROPOSALS If the one-way proposals were to go ahead, we would like a number of amendments to be made as part of detailed design. We ask that the design of the proposed contraflow cycle lane on King’s Road is reviewed as it appears this will be placed in the “dooring” zone which is potentially unsafe and contrary to good practice. We ask that contraflow cycle markings are added to the carriageway on Tudor and New Road (TSRGD diagrams 1057 + 1059 as recently added as part of the cycle contraflow works on Acre Road) - this will provide greater clarity that contraflow cycling is permitted on these roads and will provide an additional warning of contraflow cycling to people in motor vehicles. We also ask that cycle markings (TSRGD 1057) are placed in the centre of the each lane of the carriageway on Queen’s Road to encourage cyclists to adopt a ‘primary’ cycling position on this narrow road. We ask that raised tables are installed at the 2 junctions of New/Queen’s Road and Tudor/Queen’s Road (particularly for Tudor Road which is part of a signed cycle route) to reduce traffic speeds at the junctions where most collisions occur. We finally ask that traffic calming (e.g. sinusoidal speed humps) are considered for Tudor Road to reduce vehicle speeds and that the proposed speed cushions for New Road are changed to sinusoidal speed humps which are generally safer for people on bikes. |
Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee
27 March 2019

Latchmere Lane Area - Result of Parking Beat Survey
Report by Assistant Director - Transport, Highways and Regulatory Services

Purpose
To consider the parking beat results of roads from two areas in North Kingston;

1. Upper Latchmere Road, Latchmere Lane, Aldersbrook Drive, St Agatha's Drive, Cranleigh Gardens, Kelvedon Close Wingfield Road, Bertram Road, and Upper Park Road; and

2. Aragon Road, Lancaster Gardens, Lancaster Close, Fernhill Gardens, Wolsey Drive, Cardinal Avenue, and Hollybush Road.

Recommendations:
That the Committee:

1. Note the results of the Parking Beat surveys results set out in Annex 1;

2. Approve the making of a traffic management order to introduce waiting restrictions in Latchmere Lane, between Latchmere Road and Tudor Drive to create passing places to assist drivers and pedestrians along this section of the carriageway (locations to be agreed with the Chair, Vice Chair, and Ward Members); and

3. Take no other action on parking in the areas subject to the parking beat survey at this stage but, to review the areas after the new Permit Parking Area scheme in roads east of Richmond Road has been in operation for a year to assess its impact on the areas;

Benefits to the Community:
Residents will find it easier to park their vehicles in their own roads.

Key Points

A. The Committee on 22 January 2019 received a petition from residents of Latchmere Lane which Councillor Lidbetter presented on behalf of the residents, requesting the introduction of a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in the Latchmere Road and Tudor Drive areas.

B. The reasons given were commuter and trade parking displacement, as a result of the new Permit Parking Area (PPA) scheme in the roads east of Richmond Road; the difficulty with limited passing places and the danger
presented to pedestrians, including school children, crossing Latchmere Lane safely.

C. The Committee resolved that a Parking Beat Survey should be undertaken in the area.

D. This Report outlines the results of the Parking Beat survey and seeks member approval on the proposed way forward.

Context

1. A PPA is now in operation in Latchmere Road (part), Durlston Road, St Albans Road, Studland Road, Fernhill Gardens and Earle Gardens.

2. The main risk posed by the introduction of a new PPA scheme is the displacement of vehicles, particularly commuter parking, onto surrounding roads.

Parking Beat Survey results

3. On 22 January parking beat surveys were carried out, covering a range of times in order to establish the extent of the parking problem, and to assess if there is any reserve capacity in these roads. The table as Annex 1 shows the results of the parking beat survey.

4. The conclusion of the parking beat survey indicates overall parking is not a problem for the majority of the day in most roads. The reserve capacity overall is as follow: at 5am 24%, 9am 30%, 1pm 27%, 5pm 35%, 7pm 37% and at 9pm 32%.

5. Latchmere Road is busy during school opening times and at 9am when it occupied to 86% of capacity.

6. Bertram Road is occupied to 90% of capacity at 5am, and it considered that this will be resident parking.

7. Kelvedon Close is over-capacity at 106% at 9 pm, which again is likely to be due to residents parking, and parking across driveways would indicate the overcapacity figure.

Proposal and Options

8. The results of the parking beat show that at certain times of the day parking spaces are in high demand in some of the roads. However, overall, there appears to be reserve capacity in most roads during the day, and the highest level of on-street parking is the overnight resident parking, which is still within the available capacity for each road. It is highlighted that the
introduction of daytime parking schemes will not impact on the night parking situation.

9. Hence, at this stage, it is recommended that no action be taken on parking in the area (except that detailed in para 10 below) but, to review the areas after the new PPA scheme in roads east of Richmond Road has been in operation for a year to assess its impact on the areas.

10. In the meantime, it is recommended that a traffic management order (TMO) be made to introduce yellow line waiting restrictions in Latchmere Lane, between Latchmere Road and Tudor Drive to create passing places to assist drivers and pedestrians along this section of carriageway (locations to be agreed with the Chair, Vice Chair, and Ward Members).

Timescale

11. Subject to Committee approval, the yellow line waiting restrictions and the creation of passing places will be introduced on Latchmere Lane by June 2019, subject to the statutory TMO consultation not resulting in any unresolved objections.

Resource Implications

12. There is no funding available for any parking schemes for these roads. If a scheme were approved at a later date, funding would need to be sought from RBK Capital Programme. However, for the passing places, the cost will be met from the Neighbourhood Traffic Management Scheme revenue budget and it is expected to be £2000.

Legal Implications

13. Any TMO must be made in accordance with the detailed provisions of the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 (SI No.1996/2489), as amended. These Regulations require formal consultation, the publication of notice of any proposed order, consideration of any objections received before any Order is confirmed, with or without modification, and giving notice of any order made.

On the assumption the TMO is made in accordance with the Regulations there are no legal implications at this stage.
Risk Assessment

14. The key issues that would need to be considered are any displaced traffic to surrounding roads which could be addressed by a second consultation to the roads concerned.

Equalities Impact Assessment

15. Schemes of this nature are covered by an overarching Equalities Impact Assessment, and as such it does not require a specific assessment.

Health Implications

16. None at this stage.

Road Network Implications

17. Surrounding roads may be affected by overspill parking when on the edge of a PPA.

Environmental and Air Quality Implications

18. Any scheme could 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
Survey results and letters.

Author of report - Younes Hamade Senior Professional Traffic Engineer
tel 020 8547 5922 email: younes.hamade@kingston.gov.uk

The result of parking beat survey;
The petition;
Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee minutes 22 January 2019;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROAD</th>
<th>05:00 am</th>
<th>09:00 am</th>
<th>13:00 pm</th>
<th>17:00 pm</th>
<th>19:00 pm</th>
<th>21:00 pm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aragon Road</td>
<td>30/60 (50%)</td>
<td>32/60 (53%)</td>
<td>37/60 (62%)</td>
<td>40/60 (67%)</td>
<td>45/60 (75%)</td>
<td>48/60 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(total spaces available is 60 spaces)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster Gardens</td>
<td>54/62 (87%)</td>
<td>45/62 (73%)</td>
<td>43/62 (69%)</td>
<td>37/62 (60%)</td>
<td>42/62 (68%)</td>
<td>46/62 (74%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(total spaces available is 62 spaces)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster Close</td>
<td>17/17 (100%)</td>
<td>13/17 (76%)</td>
<td>12/17 (70%)</td>
<td>14/17 (82%)</td>
<td>13/17 (76%)</td>
<td>13/17 (76%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(total spaces available is 17 spaces)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernhill Gardens</td>
<td>38/50 (76%)</td>
<td>46/50 (92%)</td>
<td>46/50 (92%)</td>
<td>31/50 (62%)</td>
<td>30/50 (60%)</td>
<td>31/50 (62%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(total spaces available is 50 spaces)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolsey Drive</td>
<td>88/95 (93%)</td>
<td>79/95 (83%)</td>
<td>89/95 (94%)</td>
<td>76/95 (80%)</td>
<td>72/95 (76%)</td>
<td>79/95 (83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(total spaces available is 95 spaces)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardinal Avenue</td>
<td>97/120 (81%)</td>
<td>63/120 (52%)</td>
<td>74/120 (62%)</td>
<td>58/120 (48%)</td>
<td>65/120 (54%)</td>
<td>71/120 (59%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(total spaces available is 120 spaces)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollybush Road</td>
<td>26/26 (100%)</td>
<td>21/26 (81%)</td>
<td>16/26 (62%)</td>
<td>22/26 (85%)</td>
<td>18/26 (69%)</td>
<td>18/26 (69%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(total spaces available is 26 spaces)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latchmere Lane</td>
<td>81/126 (64%)</td>
<td>78/126 (62%)</td>
<td>99/126 (79%)</td>
<td>86/126 (68%)</td>
<td>66/126 (52%)</td>
<td>72/126 (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(total spaces available is 126 spaces)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latchmere Road</td>
<td>51/75 (68%)</td>
<td>72/75 (96%)</td>
<td>65/75 (87%)</td>
<td>58/75 (77%)</td>
<td>46/75 (61%)</td>
<td>46/75 (61%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(total spaces available is 75 spaces)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldersbrook Drive</td>
<td>13/39 (33%)</td>
<td>15/39 (38%)</td>
<td>11/39 (28%)</td>
<td>9/39 (23%)</td>
<td>9/39 (23%)</td>
<td>10/39 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Percentage of Spaces Utilized</td>
<td>Percentage of Spaces Utilized</td>
<td>Percentage of Spaces Utilized</td>
<td>Percentage of Spaces Utilized</td>
<td>Percentage of Spaces Utilized</td>
<td>Percentage of Spaces Utilized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Agatha's Drive</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranleigh Gardens</td>
<td>27/31 (87%)</td>
<td>23/31 (74%)</td>
<td>21/31 (68%)</td>
<td>18/31 (58%)</td>
<td>27/31 (87%)</td>
<td>29/31 (93%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertram Road</td>
<td>27/23 (117%)</td>
<td>22/23 (96%)</td>
<td>17/23 (74%)</td>
<td>21/23 (91%)</td>
<td>24/23 (104%)</td>
<td>24/23 (104%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>549/724 (76%)</td>
<td>509/724 (70%)</td>
<td>530/724 (73%)</td>
<td>470/724 (65%)</td>
<td>457/724 (63%)</td>
<td>487/724 (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelvedon Close</td>
<td>13/15 (86%)</td>
<td>10/15 (66%)</td>
<td>12/15 (80%)</td>
<td>10/15 (66%)</td>
<td>16/15 (107%)</td>
<td>16/15 (106%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wingfield Close</td>
<td>50/50 (100%)</td>
<td>36/50 (72%)</td>
<td>49/50 (98%)</td>
<td>37/50 (74%)</td>
<td>50/50 (100%)</td>
<td>54/50 (108%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>63/65 (97%)</td>
<td>46/65 (71%)</td>
<td>61/65 (94%)</td>
<td>47/65 (72%)</td>
<td>66/65 (101%)</td>
<td>70/65 (108%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Park Road</td>
<td>40/58 (69%)</td>
<td>45/58 (78%)</td>
<td>30/58 (52%)</td>
<td>41/58 (71%)</td>
<td>42/58 (72%)</td>
<td>44/58 (76%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Neighbourhood Working Arrangements
Report by Director, Corporate & Commercial

Purpose
To provide the Committee with the opportunity to consider the way in which it wishes to utilise some of the new powers and flexibilities available to it in its working arrangements.

Recommendation that -
Consideration be given to whether:

1. a Sub-Committee should be established to consider planning and related issues within its remit and, if so,
   (a) the membership of the Sub Committee be decided on the basis of either all Members or one or two Members from each Ward on a rotational basis; and
   (b) the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Sub-Committee be appointed for the 2019/20 Municipal Year

2. a ‘guillotine’ should be applied to meetings of the Committee (subject to the ability of the Committee to waive the guillotine by resolution when necessary) and, if so, at what time it should be applied.

Key Points

A. The Council is committed to improving engagement with local communities and ensuring that decision making better reflects local priorities, issues, challenges and need. Over the course of the summer and autumn of 2018 a review of the Neighbourhood Committee arrangements was therefore undertaken with a view to ensuring that they have the powers and resources to help achieve the Council’s aspirations.

B. The outcome of this review was reported to Council on 11 December 2018, at which point a number of changes to the roles and functions of the Neighbourhood Committees were agreed as part of a wider package of governance improvements. This has opened the way for the adoption of a variety of new working arrangements and the following report presents the Committee with the opportunity to consider a number of these, namely whether it wishes to:
   - establish a separate Sub-Committee specifically to determine Planning applications and planning enforcement matters;
   - collectively pool Members ward funding budgets in order to support local projects and initiatives; and
   - set a cut off point (a ‘guillotine’) by which time formal meetings of the Committee should be concluded
Planning Sub-Committee

1. Feedback from Members during the course of the review highlighted the substantial proportion of each meeting which in most, though not all, Neighbourhoods, is usually devoted to the consideration of planning applications. It was emphasised that there is a need to examine the way in which planning applications are dealt with in order to ensure that Committees have the capacity to manage their newly extended decision making and engagement remits.

2. It was therefore agreed by Council that each Neighbourhood Committee should have the flexibility to opt to establish a planning sub committee to deal with planning decisions separately to other business should it so wish. This will not only have the advantage of creating space for the consideration of different types of business at the main Committee meetings but will also remove the confusion that can sometimes occur amongst members of the public when the different public speaking and engagement processes which relate to planning and non planning items are utilised in the same meeting. It will also reduce the inconvenience to residents attending meetings in the public gallery who presently often have to wait for considerable periods of time before any non-planning matters in which they may be interested are considered.

3. The Committee is thus asked to consider if it wishes to establish a Sub-Committee specifically to deal with planning applications and planning enforcement matters within its terms of reference. Dates have already been set aside in the Calendar of meetings for the 2019/20 Municipal Year in order to accommodate the necessary meetings for this Committee as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
<th>Planning Sub</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kingston Town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 June</td>
<td>16 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Sept</td>
<td>18 Sept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Nov</td>
<td>3 Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Jan</td>
<td>12 Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 March</td>
<td>21 April</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. If the Committee is minded to establish a Sub-Committee it will also need to agree its membership and appoint a Chair. It is recommended that the Sub-Committee should consist of either one or two Members per ward. This would ensure that there was always at a minimum one Ward Member who was not on the Sub-Committee and therefore free to represent residents views in a manner not available to those subject to the usual Planning Protocol restrictions around bias and predetermination. Membership could be on a rotational basis if this was so desired in order to minimise the additional meeting burden on individual Members.

Meetings ‘Guillotine’

5. If the determination of planning applications is removed from business meetings of Committees this creates the opportunity to place a limit on the length of each meeting. The Committee could, if it so wishes, introduce a ‘guillotine’ which would automatically end debate at a set time. If business remains to be transacted at that time it stands deferred to the next meeting, though the Committee would always retain the ability to agree, by resolution, to extend the length of the meeting if it felt there were particularly good reasons for doing so.

6. While such provisions have not typically been used in Kingston they are common in many local authorities. An earlier finish to meetings can help to focus and concentrate debate, reduce inconvenience to residents in the public gallery waiting for a specific item and assist Members with family and caring responsibilities, thereby helping to ensure that the membership of the Council can properly reflect the communities it represents. It may also enable a greater range of venues to be considered for each meeting because many community halls and schools which may otherwise be suitable to host Neighbourhood meetings are unable to do so due to restrictions on finish times.

7. No guillotine can be applied to any meetings at which planning applications are considered because of the risk of challenge if any debate on an application was ended prematurely before all the relevant matters had been taken into consideration.

8. The Committee is therefore asked to consider whether it wishes to apply a ‘guillotine’ to meetings and, if so, at what time that should be applied.

Resource Implications

9. Provision for the additional costs associated with the establishment of Planning Sub-Committees, both in respect of the staffing of additional meetings by the Democratic Services team and the hire of external venues and audio facilities (where required) was included within the 2019/20 Budget approved by Council at its meeting on 26 February.

Background papers - None

Author of the Report - Gary Marson, Democratic Services Team Leader,
email gary.marson@kingston.gov.uk /0208 4547 5021
Purpose
To note the grant funding streams available for 2019/20 and to agree the working arrangements for the allocation of the Committee’s Councillor Ward Funding.

Recommendations
To resolve that the Neighbourhood Committee -

1. notes the Neighbourhood Community Grants budget, as set out in Key Point B, and that the Committee will be asked to review applications and agree allocations for these grants throughout the year until the fund has been exhausted;

2. notes the Borough-wide Community Grants budget as set out in Key Point C;

3. determines how it wishes to allocate the Neighbourhood’s Councillor Ward Funding as set out in paragraph 9 of the report;

4. notes the opportunities available for further grant funding and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) receipts, as set out in paragraphs 10-21 of the report, and that the Committee will be asked to consider any future bids that are made for these funds; and

5. considers whether it wishes to apply a cap to the amount of CIL funding that can be allocated to individual projects each year as set out in paragraph 14.

Benefits to the Community:
To encourage local voluntary and community sector organisations, faith groups, charities and not-for-profit organisations to access funding and expand their capacity.

Key Points
A. There are four different funding sources under the new Community Grants Programme available for Neighbourhood Committees and Ward Members to support and encourage local voluntary and community activity in their neighbourhoods, as follows:

B. Neighbourhood Community Grants (previously known as Your Kingston Grants and New Initiatives Grants), of up to £3,000 per application, are available to fund projects/ activities/ services to benefit communities in each of the four neighbourhood areas. Each Neighbourhood is awarded £20,000 per annum, which is reduced as Neighbourhood Community Grants are awarded throughout the financial year. Guidelines for Neighbourhood Community Grants have been appended to this report as Annex 1.
C. **Borough-wide Community Grants** of up to £3,000, per application, are available to fund projects/activities/services to benefit communities across the Borough. There is a £20,000 allocation per annum, which is reduced as the Borough-wide grants are awarded throughout the year. Guidelines for Borough-wide Community Grants have been appended to this report, also included in Annex 1.

D. **Councillor Ward Funding**, at £2,000 per Councillor per financial year, will remain at the discretion of individual Ward Councillors unless the Neighbourhood Committee decides to pool all or part of the Councillor Ward Funding budget. Guidelines for Councillor Ward Funding have been appended to this report as Annex 2.

E. **Community Infrastructure Levy** (CIL) must be spent on infrastructure needed to support development in the Borough. The upper limit of funding to apply for will be the amount allocated to each Neighbourhood Area - allocation will vary by Neighbourhood and is not time limited. Guidelines for ‘the Neighbourhood portion’ of the CIL have been appended to this report as Annex 3.

**Neighbourhood Community Grants** (up to £3,000)

1. Neighbourhood Community Grants are for the benefit of community-based groups, or organisations that need a small amount of funding to enable them to have a big impact on their local community, particularly projects or activities that focus on meeting the needs of marginalised or isolated people or communities and fund local initiatives provided for community benefit. The funding is intended to support local activity that engages communities in projects or activities that contribute to meeting the outcomes set out in the Neighbourhood Committees’ adopted Community Plans or the Council’s Corporate 3 Strategic Outcomes and Priorities to 2023, which are:
   - Healthy, independent and resilient residents with effective support to those who need it most.
   - A safe borough which celebrates our diverse and vibrant communities, with local priorities shaped through participatory democracy.
   - A sustainable approach to new homes, development and infrastructure which benefits our communities, in a well maintained borough.

2. The Neighbourhood Committees are currently reviewing their Community Plans and revised versions of these plans are scheduled to be approved by the individual Neighbourhood Committees in the Autumn of 2019.

3. Neighbourhood Community Grants will be annual grants for events, activities and projects which can include a contribution to project overheads. Projects must be completed within 12 months of starting. Grants will not be awarded to activities or projects that result in ongoing cost commitments to the Council, unless agreed, in writing, with the relevant Council Service Director.

4. Although the upper limit for these grants is £3,000 it is envisaged (based on previous applications made for similar grants) that a significant number of applicants will both request and be awarded a lower sum. Applications for Neighbourhood Community Grants will be reported to the Committee for consideration and approval.

**Borough Wide Community Grants** (up to £3,000)

5. An additional fund of £20,000 will be dedicated to Borough Wide Grants with the relevant strategic Corporate Head of Service or Service Director signing off the final grant award decision under their delegated authority.
6. The Borough Wide Grants are intended for projects which cross neighbourhood boundaries and may, for example, be used for funding activities responding the needs or aspirations of a specific population group in the borough rather than activity in a specific locality.

7. The Borough Wide Community Grants have the same eligibility criteria as the Neighbourhood Community Grant, with the exception that applications must clearly state how the activity is available to people across the whole borough.

**Councillor Ward Funding**

8. The Councillor Ward Funding scheme was first introduced in 2016/17 to provide local Councillors with the ability to support the award of flexible, small and timely funds for local initiatives within their Ward. The scheme provides increased opportunities to improve levels of engagement and influence at a very local street based level addressing the ‘here and now’ issues. Ideally projects/activities should enable communities to help themselves and lead on delivering local solutions. Overall the fund should enhance the social, economic or environmental well being of the Ward community and residents quality of life.

9. The budget for Councillor Ward Funding is allocated at £2,000 per Councillor but the Neighbourhood Committees may decide how to distribute these funds. The options available to the Committee are:
   i. retaining the existing Councillor Ward Funding scheme.
   ii. pooling the Neighbourhood’s entire Councillor Ward Funding budget so that it can be allocated as additional funding for Neighbourhood Community Grants.
   iii. pooling the Neighbourhood’s entire Councillor Ward Funding budget so that it can be allocated to larger versions of the type of projects that are currently supported by Councillor Ward Funding. If this option is pursued then the Committee should note, given the larger value, that these allocations will be subject to these projects being reported to the Committee for approval.

**Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL):**

10. This is the final category of grant funding for Neighbourhoods. CIL is a charge on new development in the Borough, which must be spent on infrastructure needed to support development. For example, transport, social and green infrastructure. The Levy cannot be used to fund affordable housing.

11. CIL legislation requires that a ‘meaningful proportion’ of the income raised through CIL in a neighbourhood be spent in the neighbourhood in which the development took place, stating that Local Authorities must allocate 15% of levy receipts on priorities that should be agreed with the local communities in which the levy was raised.

12. The ‘meaningful proportion’ must be spent on schemes that will help support the development of the neighbourhood area by funding any of (a) the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure; or (b) anything else that is concerned with addressing the demands of infrastructure; or (c) anything else that is concerned with addressing the demands that development places on an area.

13. The Council’s Neighbourhood structure is an appropriate way to divide and spend the ‘meaningful proportion’ of the CIL. The amount of Neighbourhood CIL available
in each Neighbourhood is based on the amount of development in each Neighbourhood area. As the South of the Borough sees less development than the other Neighbourhoods, it receives less funds than the others. As at February 2019, the amount of Neighbourhood CIL available is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kingston Town</th>
<th>Maldens &amp; Coombe</th>
<th>Surbiton</th>
<th>South of the Borough</th>
<th>Borough Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£85,157</td>
<td>£62,288</td>
<td>£75,901</td>
<td>£15,817</td>
<td>£239,164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. It should be noted that, once the allocation of CIL has been spent, this will not be available year on year. This funding available is entirely dependent on there being development in the area and therefore the amount available is subject to change. Therefore, Neighbourhood Committees may consider capping the amount groups can apply for per project each year due to the allocation being limited.

15. The Neighbourhood CIL can be used to fund a range of community infrastructure including the following:

- community gardens/spaces
- local green space improvements
- children’s play spaces
- tree Planting
- baby changing facilities
- projects to improve the public realm, like boroughwide bulb planting by residents, public artwork
- the installation of borough-wide defibrillators (although ongoing maintenance costs may not be made available from the CIL)

16. Planning guidance on the CIL requires the Council to engage with communities where development has taken place as to how best to spend the ‘meaningful proportion’. The Council must clearly and transparently engage with communities, and the use of neighbourhood funds should match priorities expressed by local communities, including priorities set out formally in local Community Plans.

17. Through community engagement, the Council should encourage the community to submit ideas for the neighbourhood portion of the CIL, and the list of projects would be the primary starting point for the Neighbourhood Community Plan. Other sources of information, e.g. area planning documents, like the draft Tolworth Area Plan can be used by communities to identify infrastructure projects to support development.

18. Anyone can submit a Neighbourhood CIL idea. Projects may be delivered by community organisations, council officers, or third party organisations, external Groups and organisations must be registered with a Regulatory Body (e.g. Charity Commission and/or Companies House).

19. All projects must:

- meet the terms of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010) (No.948) (as amended)
- reflect the priorities of the Council and Neighbourhood
- have community backing (including any adopted Neighbourhood Plan)
- support, or mitigate the impact of development in an area
- be a one-off project (or identify and agree longer term revenue implications)
- benefit the broadest section of the community
20. Communities should be aware that funds will be accessible only once and projects should not have ongoing running costs for the council. If ongoing costs are likely, then permissions from the relevant service Director at the Council will be required, in writing. Communities should be encouraged to support project maintenance and to seek additional forms of funding, if necessary, e.g. through crowdfunding to match the amount.

21. Applications for Neighbourhood CIL funding will be reported to the relevant Neighbourhood Committee for consideration and determination.

Timescale

22. Neighbourhood Community Grants and any retained Councillor Ward Funding will be allocated over the Financial Year 2019/20. CIL funding does not have the same time limitation and may be rolled over to subsequent financial years.

23. Although the four grant programmes are yet to begin, the Council will welcome expressions of interest. More information about the application process, and how individuals and groups can express their interest in the respective funding streams, will soon be made available on the Council’s website. In the meantime, queries and questions can be sent to neighbourhood_management@kingston.gov.uk.

Resource Implications

24. No additional resources will be required. This will be delivered within budget by existing resources and operates within Financial Regulations.

Legal Implications

25. Part 11 of the Planning Act 2008 provides for the imposition of the Community Infrastructure Levy. The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010, as amended, (the Regulations) implement the detail of the CIL using powers provided in Part 11 of the Act, including specifying how the CIL should be spent by charging authorities. The Government has also issued Planning Practice Guidance on the CIL.

26. Provided the CIL is spent in accordance with the restrictions contained in the Regulations and the Guidance there should be no legal implications arising from the Report.

27. The award of community funding grants and councillor ward funding grants by the Neighbourhood Committee or councillors should not give rise to any legal implications provided the grants are distributed in accordance with the relevant criteria to appropriate persons, bodies or organisations.

28. Under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 (the 2010 Act) the Council must, when exercising its functions, including considering applications for grant or CIL funding, have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other prohibited conduct, to advance equality of opportunity and to foster good relations between those who share a ‘protected characteristic’ under the 2010 Act and those who do not. A ‘protected characteristic’ is defined as age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation. Marriage and civil partnership are also protected characteristics for the purposes of the duty to eliminate discrimination.
Equalities Analysis

29. A full EQIA was carried out during the Neighbourhoods Review, this included the consideration of grants and grant allocations.

30. There are no known direct equalities impacts arising from the decisions set out in this paper however, Community Groups funded through these grants will need to consider equalities when planning their projects and/or submitting bids.

Health, Environmental & Air Quality Implications

31. Organisations and groups will be encouraged to submit grant applications that promote the health and wellbeing of their local communities.

Road Network Implications

32. Grant awards are unlikely to impact on local road network or Parking issues. However, in the event of a grant being considered where road closures may apply i.e. street play/ playing out/ community road party, the Neighbourhood Manager will review and liaise with Highways and road network officers.

Background papers held by the authors of the report:

Neville Rainford, Neighbourhood and Communities Manager, Maldens & Coombe. Tel: 0208 547 4625 - neville.rainford@kingston.gov.uk
James Geach, Neighbourhood and Communities Manager, Surbiton. Tel: 0208 547 5062 -james.geach@kingston.gov.uk
Martha Earley, Public Health Principal. Tel 0208 547 4605 martha.earley@kingston.gov.uk

Annex 1 - Community Grants Guidelines (Neighbourhood and Borough-Wide Grants)
Annex 2 - Councillor Ward Funding Guidelines
Annex 3 - CIL ‘The Neighbourhood Portion’ Guidelines
Community Grants - Neighbourhood Grant and Borough Wide Grant Guidelines

Background

1. A new approach to the grants programme was agreed at Finance and Contracts Committee on 11th December 2018 making 4 new funding streams to form a new ‘Community Grants Programme’ available to not for profit organisations and community groups to access.

2. With effect from the financial year 2019/2020 the Your Kingston Grants (up to £750) and New Initiatives Grants (up to £3,000) will be replaced with ‘Neighbourhood Community Grants’ and ‘Borough-wide Community Grants’.

3. Neighbourhood Community Grants of up to £3,000 per application, are available to fund projects/activities/services to benefit communities in each of the four neighbourhood areas. Each Neighbourhood is awarded £20,000 per annum, which is reduced as Neighbourhood Community Grants are awarded throughout the financial year.

4. Borough-wide Community Grants of up to £3,000, per application, are available to fund projects/activities/services to benefit of communities across the Borough. There is a £20,000 allocation per annum, which is reduced as the Borough-wide grants are awarded throughout the year.

Neighbourhood Community Grants programme (from May 2019)

5. Neighbourhood Community Grants are to be made available to support local activity that engages communities in meeting priorities identified by the Neighbourhood, which may also be in the respective Neighbourhood Community Plans. Community plans are likely to be in place in the Autumn 2019. Maximum award amounts for each initiative/project/activity are up to £3,000. All Neighbourhood Community Grants will be available on a rolling programme throughout the year.

6. The Neighbourhood Manager and grant budget holder will be responsible for gathering monitoring reports from the successful organisations' projects/activities/events and how the grant has been spent.

7. Organisations will be able to submit up to two grant applications per financial year if the applications are for completely separate projects/activities/events, not just a repeat of the previous application and must meet the grant criteria to be considered for a grant. Please note, applications may be deferred to another Committee later in the year if there are multiple applications made at once from the same organisation.

8. Neighbourhood Managers will report applications and recommend grant allocations to the appropriate Neighbourhood Committee for a final decision.

9. The overall budget for Neighbourhood Community Grants for 2019/2020 will be up to £80,000. Therefore, £20,000 will be made available to each Neighbourhood Committee to decide which projects/activities/events, in the relevant geographical area, should receive an award.
Borough Wide Community Grants

10. The overall budget for Borough-wide Community Grants is up to £20,000. Maximum award amounts for each initiative/project/activity are up to £3,000.

11. An additional £20,000 will be allocated for Borough-wide projects with the relevant strategic Corporate Head of Service or Service Director signing off the final grant award decision under their delegated authority.

12. Organisations will be able to submit up to two grant applications per financial year if the applications are for completely separate projects/activities/events, not just a repeat of the previous application and must meet the grant criteria to be considered for a grant. Please note, applications may be deferred to another point later in the year if there are multiple applications made at once from the same organisation.

Criteria: Neighbourhood Community Grants and Borough Wide Community Grants (up to £3,000)

13. Both the Neighbourhood Community Grant and Borough Wide Community Grants have the same criteria except the Neighbourhood Community Grant is for activity in that locality and the Borough Wide grant is for activity that crosses Neighbourhood Boundaries or may benefit a specific population group.

14. For example, the Borough Wide Grant would be suitable to apply for if a project targets certain population groups who may live anywhere in the borough i.e. refugees, carers, older people at risk of certain long term conditions or people on a low income.

15. These are annual grants for costs towards the running of events, projects and activities which can include a contribution to project overheads but cannot be used for the day-to-day running costs of the organisation.

16. Events can include:
   - events in community halls to celebrate or raise awareness of important causes
   - events to support community markets to take place or local businesses to thrive

17. Funding towards projects or activities can include:
   - start up, 'pump-priming', developmental or piloting activities to see how they work
   - one-off projects but they must be completed within 12 months of starting
   - costs towards venue hire or equipment to run the activity
   - costs towards staffing on the specific project applied for
18. This grant funding is to support local activity that engages communities in events, projects or activities that have to contribute to meeting one or more of the Council’s **Strategic Outcomes and Priorities to 2023**, which are:

- Healthy, independent and resilient residents with effective support to those who need it most.
- A safe borough which celebrates our diverse and vibrant communities, with local priorities shaped through participatory democracy.
- A sustainable approach to new homes, development and infrastructure which benefits our communities, in a well maintained borough.

19. Neighbourhood Community Grants and Borough-wide Community Grants are especially for the benefit of community-based groups, or organisations that need a small amount of funds to enable them to have a big impact on their local community.

20. We welcome projects, events or activities that:

- focus on meeting the needs of marginalised or isolated people or communities
- focus on funding local initiatives provided for community benefit

In addition, for Neighbourhood Community Grants we welcome applications that:

- contribute towards priorities:
  - identified by the Neighbourhood
  - which appear in the local Neighbourhood Community Plan

**Who can apply**

21. Eligible groups are:

- not-for-profit organisations
- voluntary or community sector organisations
- faith groups

**Grant applications process**

22. The Officer or Neighbourhood Committee decision on all Community Grant applications is final. To apply the applicant needs to include the following:

- have a written constitution or memorandum and articles or set of rules that establishes that it is a voluntary, community, faith or other not-for-profit organisation
- be able to say how surpluses are re-invested if the group is a not-for-profit organisation
• have a management committee or board of trustees with at least three members
• have a bank or building society account in the name of the organisation
• have at least two unrelated people to authorise cheques and make withdrawals (including debit card or internet purchases or cash withdrawals)
• have an accounting system such as annual accounts to record income and expenditure
• not have an ongoing deficit that the grant application could be used to fill

23. The organisation needs to have all of these aspects to apply. In the application form the group will also need to provide as much of the following as is possible:

• describe what the grant request will be used for
• show there is a need or demand for the suggested activity (if possible)
• show how the suggested activities contribute to meeting at least one of our Strategic Outcomes and/or local neighbourhood community plan priorities identified (showing how the project or activity promotes community integration or inclusion and/or focuses on reducing inequalities, closing the gap for disadvantaged, isolated people and/or groups will also be advantageous)
• show that the organisations is open to the whole community, no matter the gender, race, disability, religion, age, marital status or any other protected characteristic group.
• describe how the project, event or activities will continue once the funding has ended, or how any legacy from the project or activities will be passed on, if appropriate.
• have a significant proportion of beneficiaries resident in the Neighbourhood in which it submits its application if the group is submitting a Neighbourhood Community Grant application
• provide evidence of its fundraising/match funding plans as part of its application to ensure the best value for money possible for any Community Grant contribution
• demonstrate that these activities are additional and do not duplicate existing work
• demonstrate added value i.e. social and environmental considerations
• show how the group will engage and consult regularly with users or members in developing and monitoring events, activities or services to identifying the need for changes
24. The organisation will also have to commit:

- good practice in terms of equality legislation, health and safety, safeguarding (children and vulnerable adults) and promoting environmental good practice
- that it will collect and use performance management data to measure the event, activity or project's impact and to monitor and improve effective delivery
- that it has adequate financial information including a budget for the event, project or activities in the application
- a clear indication of the state of the organisation's reserves, including designated and restricted funds and the reason that they are designated or restricted

What the grants will not fund

25. Groups can't apply for the grant:

- on behalf of an individual or commercial organisation
- if it is a repeat application from the same organisation for the same or similar activities. However, we will consider repeat applications where the organisation can demonstrate that its activities deliver significant community benefit and can provide evidence of efforts to fundraise and/or apply for grants from elsewhere.
- for projects or activities whose primary purpose is to promote religion or belief. However, applications are welcomed from faith organisations to carry out work with the community that is not primarily of a religious nature and does not exclude people from other faiths, or those who have no faith
- if the application is related to a current planning application, licensing application or other application yet to be determined by the Council
- Applicants should be aware that funds will be accessible only once and projects should not have ongoing running costs for the council. If ongoing costs are likely, then permissions from the relevant service Director at the Council will be required, in writing. Applicants are encouraged to support project maintenance and to seek additional forms of funding, if necessary, e.g. through crowdfunding to match the amount.

26. Grants cannot be used to pay for:

- major building works
- a minibus or minibuses
- political activities
- teaching community languages
- activities that are part of normal day-to-day running (though not capacity building)
- activities that are normally undertaken by Statutory organisations
- organisational fundraising activities
- endowments (to provide a source of income)
- retrospective events/ activities
Grant conditions

27. If the organisation is awarded a grant it will need to agree to the Council’s standard grant conditions which are to:

- use the grant only for the purpose for which it was awarded
- complete a grant monitoring form about its use of the grant (we’ll send the group the form)
- operate with a commitment to Equal Opportunities issues in relation to its workers, volunteers, members and users and other relevant policies such as Safeguarding (children and vulnerable adults), Health and Safety and good environmental practice
- comply with the Local Government Act 1986 (Section 2) which prohibits local authorities from giving funding or assistance to others to publish material that appears to influence people’s support for a political party
- tell us if the organisation either closes or does not operate for any significant period during the grant aid year
- acknowledge the borough’s financial support in any related publicity material
- not use any grant awarded to promote religion or belief
- seek our permission if grant monies are carried forward into the next financial year or if any changes to the purpose are required

28. The Council may add special conditions to a group’s grant award. If this happens these will be laid out in the offer letter.

How to apply

29. Complete and submit your application form. Please send this to the Council as soon as possible before the event or project is due to start. Please submit the application as soon as possible and to the email identified on the correspondence you have received, thank you

Your application will be assessed

30. If your application is not complete, the Council will send this back to you and give 10 working days to provide any missing information. You may also be contacted for further clarification.

Notification of decision (Borough-wide grants)

31. The Council aims to let applicants know the outcome of the decision within 6 weeks of receiving an application.

32. If the council offers your organisation a grant it will be conditional on you signing the offer letter and accepting the terms and conditions of the grant. If your application is unsuccessful the relevant Council Officer may be able to provide you feedback upon request, as to why it was unsuccessful.
Notification of decision (Neighbourhood Community Grants)

33. The Council will let applicants know when their application will be considered by the relevant Committee and applicants will be able to attend the Committee meeting where their application will be determined. Applicants will be informed of the outcome within 10 working days of the meeting.

34. If the council offers your organisation a grant it will be conditional on you signing the offer letter and accepting our terms and conditions of the grant. If your application is unsuccessful the relevant Neighbourhood Manager or Council Officer may be able to provide you feedback, upon request, as to why it was unsuccessful.

Offer letter

35. Please sign and return the documents within 10 days of receiving the Council’s offer letter.

Start your event/ activity or project

36. You will be asked to complete an end of year report against your outputs and outcomes and the budget you set for the activity applied for. If there are differences during the project, please get in touch with your Neighbourhood and Communities Manager or Community Development Lead.

Help and Advice

37. If you are unsure of which grant funding to apply for due the nature of your project, please get in touch with your Neighbourhood Manager. 
neighbourhood_management@kingston.gov.uk

38. If you require help with your governance arrangements, filling out your application or other funding streams you could access outside of the Council, please contact Kingston Voluntary Action Tel: 0208 255 3335; your local voluntary sector umbrella organisation, who can assist you.
Councillor Ward Funding - Guidelines

Background

1. The Ward Funding Scheme was first introduced in 2016/17 aimed at providing local Councillors with the ability to support the award of flexible, small and timely funds for local initiatives within their Ward. The scheme provides increased opportunities to improve levels of engagement and influence at a very local street-based level addressing the ‘here and now’ issues. Ideally, projects/activities should enable communities to help themselves and lead on delivering local solutions. Overall the fund should enhance the social, economic or environmental well being of the Ward community and residents quality of life.

Ward Funding Review

2. A review of the first year of operating the scheme was undertaken and circulated by email to Councillors on 20th April 2017 and a number of recommendations were made to clarify the process and make it easier to manage. As recommended then the following information sets out a step by step guide to the process.

2019/20 Information and process to be followed by Ward Councillor

3. The budget for 2019/20 has been agreed and Ward Funding remains at £2,000 allocation per Councillor. The Neighbourhood Committees may agree to pool or divide the fund, to be determined at the March 2019 Committees, the options available to the Neighbourhood Committees are:
   ● retaining the existing Councillor Ward Funding scheme.
   ● pooling the Neighbourhood’s entire Councillor Ward Funding budget so that it can be allocated as additional funding for Neighbourhood Community Grants.
   ● pooling the Neighbourhood’s entire Councillor Ward Funding budget so that it can be allocated to larger versions of the type of projects that are currently supported by Councillor Ward Funding. If this option is pursued then the Committee should note, given the larger value, that these allocations will be subject to these projects being reported to the Committee for approval.

Key Points

4. A new budget of £2,000 per Councillor will available for allocation from 1 April 2019.

5. Ideally in the first financial quarter (April - June) Ward Members will engage directly with the community and consider their approach and options for the allocation of funds based on the arrangements agreed at the Neighbourhood Committees in March.

6. The Ward funding scheme will be promoted in Ward by Councillors and Officers. Promoting and publicising the Councillor Ward Funding will be at the individual Councillor’s discretion but, to help to get a wider reach in the local community, the following communication methods will also be used:
   ● posters/leaflets in Neighbourhood Noticeboards
   ● social Media
   ● promotion at local community events on stalls
   ● local media press releases
   ● Council Community Grant Funding pages
Governance and administration

Neighbourhoods retaining the existing scheme where each Member allocates £2,000 individually:

7. Supported schemes/activities to be identified and approved with funding allocated by Ward Councillor ideally between April and October and by no later than January. (Any funds unallocated by 1st January may be declared available for redistribution by the Neighbourhood Committee.)

8. Once allocation is decided, Ward Councillor to complete, sign and submit funding template (example attached) to Neighbourhood Manager to be processed.

9. Ward Councillors to encourage local communities to raise funds, seek external grants and pursue new social media forms such as crowdfunding to boost the value of supported activities within their Ward. The Council's External Funding Team will be available to provide advice on external funding streams.

External Community Projects

10. If the scheme/activity/project is **externally funded** with payment directly to the community then Ward Councillor(s) are to liaise with residents to confirm by letter or email their support, the level of funding to be given and to request an electronic invoice from the community be sent to the Council’s Communities Support Officer by email to nick.spicer@kingston.gov.uk

11. Communities Support Officer to process payment and take any enquiries relating to invoicing or payment.

Internal RBK Projects

12. If the scheme/activity is to be **internal funding**, Neighbourhood Manager will identify and advise Councillor(s) of the Lead Officer from the appropriate service area.

13. Ward Councillor(s) liaise directly with Lead Officer and once activity details and timetable is agreed and any other issues resolved, the Ward Funding template is finalised and signed by Councillor(s).

14. If required, Councillor informs residents of their Ward improvement.

15. Once the funding allocation is confirmed the Communities Support Officer will complete an internal journal transfer to reallocate funds to the service area so that funds are held and expended by the appropriate responsible Officer.

16. Throughout the process the Communities Support Officer will maintain an audit trail of expenditure. The respective Neighbourhood Manager will monitor the overall budget and individual Councillors expenditure and provide regular reports to Neighbourhood Committee.
Neighbourhoods with pooled Councillor Ward Funding

17. The process will be same as the individual scheme as outlined above but the allocation will be subject to the allocations also being reported to the appropriate Neighbourhood Committee for consideration and approval.

If you would like any further information or advice, please get in touch with your Neighbourhood Manager by using the following mailbox neighbourhood_management@kingston.gov.uk
Background

1. Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is a charge that councils and the Mayor of London can apply to new developments like new houses or flats, residential extensions of over 100sqm, and commercial development. The money collected is spent on new infrastructures, such as roads, schools and parks. CIL is separate from Section 106 planning obligations, which are used to provide specific infrastructure associated with development.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in Kingston

2. In Kingston, developers must pay two types of CIL:
   - **Kingston’s CIL** came into force on 1 November 2015. The charge varies from £20 to £220 per square metre depending on the location and type of development. Public service and community facilities do not have to pay the CIL.
   - **the Mayor of London’s CIL** has been in force since 1 April 2012. The charge is £35 per square metre of development in the borough, but there are some exceptions. The money collected helps to fund Crossrail. These funds are collected by the council and transferred to Transport for London.

What can CIL be used for?

Strategic Priorities

3. The levy must be spent on infrastructure needed to support development in the borough. For example, transport, social and green infrastructure. We cannot use the levy to fund affordable housing.

Neighbourhood Priorities

4. The Localism Act 2011 and the CIL Regulations require that a ‘meaningful proportion’ of the income raised through CIL in a neighbourhood be spent in the neighbourhood in which the development took place. This is to encourage people to support development in their local area by providing direct financial incentives that can be spent on local priorities. The CIL Regulations (amendment) 2013 sets out that Local Authorities must allocate 15% of levy receipts on priorities that should be agreed with the local communities in which the levy was raised.

5. The ‘meaningful proportion’ must be spent on schemes that will help support the development of the neighbourhood area by funding either:
   - A. the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure;
   - B. anything else that is concerned with addressing the demands of infrastructure; or
   - C. anything else that is concerned with addressing the demands that development places on an area.
6. The Council’s Neighbourhood structure is an appropriate way to divide and spend the ‘meaningful proportion’ of CIL. The amount of Neighbourhood CIL available in each Neighbourhood is based on the amount of development in each Neighbourhood area. As the South of the Borough sees less development than the other Neighbourhoods, it receives less funds than the others. As at February 2019, the amount of Neighbourhood CIL available is as set out in the table below. CIL will be an ongoing revenue stream linked to development as and when it comes forward, and the amounts available in each Neighbourhood will vary over time. Therefore, there will not be a new allocation each year, the funding available below is set until there is a new development in the area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kingston Town</td>
<td>£85,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldens &amp; Coombe</td>
<td>£62,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surbiton</td>
<td>£75,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of the Borough</td>
<td>£15,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough Total</td>
<td>£239,164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Neighbourhood CIL can be used to fund a range of community infrastructure including the following examples:
   - Community gardens/spaces
   - Local green space improvements
   - Children’s play spaces
   - Tree Planting
   - Baby changing facilities
   - Projects to improve the public realm, like boroughwide bulb planting by residents, public artwork
   - The installation of boroughwide defibrillators

**Proposals for Neighbourhood Committees**

10. Planning guidance on CIL requires the council to engage with communities where development has taken place as to how best to spend the ‘meaningful proportion’. The council must clearly and transparently engage with communities, and the use of neighbourhood funds should match priorities expressed by local communities, including priorities set out formally in local Community Plans.

11. Through community engagement, the council should encourage the community to submit ideas for the neighbourhood portion of CIL, and the list of projects would be the primary starting point for the Neighbourhood Community Plan. Other sources of information, e.g. area planning documents, like the draft Tolworth Area Plan can be used by communities to identify infrastructure projects to support development.
12. Selection criteria for projects:

- Anyone can submit a Neighbourhood Community Infrastructure Levy idea
- Projects may be delivered by community organisations, council officers, or third party organisations
- External groups and organisations must be registered with a Regulatory Body (e.g. Charities Commission and/or Companies House)

All projects must:

- meet the terms of the CIL Regulations (2010)
- reflect the priorities of the Council and Neighbourhood
- have community backing (including any adopted Neighbourhood Plan)
- support, or mitigate the impact of development in an area
- be a one-off project (or identify and agree longer-term revenue implications)
- benefit the broadest section of the community
- provide value for money

13. Communities should be aware that funds will be accessible only once and projects should not have ongoing running costs for the council unless this has been agreed in writing by the Council’s relevant Director. Communities are encouraged to support project maintenance and to seek additional forms of funding, e.g. through crowdfunding to match the amount.

Neighbourhood Forums and Neighbourhood Planning

14. Under the Localism Act 2011, communities can create Neighbourhood Forums; made up of groups of people who live or work in a particular area. A Neighbourhood Forum, once created, has the power to prepare a statutory Neighbourhood Plan. These plans, once adopted after independent assessment and if successful at a referendum, set the vision for the neighbourhood and become part of the statutory planning policies for deciding planning applications. In areas with an adopted Neighbourhood Plan, the ‘meaningful proportion’ of CIL will rise to 25% of CIL income arising from development that takes place within the confines of the designated neighbourhood area (the area covered by the Neighbourhood Plan).

15. In practical terms, any Kingston CIL required from a planning permission that was subject to an adopted Neighbourhood Plan will contribute 25% of the CIL to that Neighbourhood Area, rather than 15%. The 25% will also apply when the levy is paid in relation to developments which have been granted permission by a Neighbourhood Development Order\(^1\) (including a Community Right to Build Order). The confines of a designated Neighbourhood Area will also define where the ‘meaningful proportion’ (25%) will be spent, i.e. only 25% of the CIL raised in the Neighbourhood Area will be prioritised for spend within the Neighbourhood Area, regardless of the wider Neighbourhood Committee area.

\(^1\) Section 61E of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as applied to neighbourhood plans by Section 38 3c of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
16. There are currently no adopted Neighbourhood Plans in the Royal Borough of Kingston. However, there is a designated North Kingston Neighbourhood Forum which represents the Tudor and Canbury Wards. The Forum is currently preparing a Neighbourhood Plan and it is expected that this will include priorities for the spending of the neighbourhood portion of CIL.

17. It is proposed that once a Neighbourhood Plan has been adopted, a member of the Neighbourhood Forum will be co-opted onto the relevant Neighbourhood Committee.
Kington Town Neighbourhood Committee
27 March 2019
Work Programme

Neighbourhood Committee Meetings

Tuesday 4 June 2019
- Gloucester Road/Cambridge Road Junction
- Richmond Road/Bank Lane Junction
- Albany Park Road CPZ
- Road Safety in Kingston

Thursday 5 September 2019
Tuesday 5 November 2019
Thursday 16 January 2020
Tuesday 10 March 2020

Planning Sub Committees
Tuesday 16 July 2019
Wednesday 18 September 2019
Tuesday 3 December 2019
Wednesday 12 February 2020
Tuesday 21 April 2020

Community Forums
Discussion topics to be confirmed
Tuesday 7 May 2019
Thursday 17 October 2019
Thursday 7 January 2020