Maldens and Coombe Neighbourhood

Date: Wednesday 31 October 2018
Time: 7:30 pm
Place: Richard Challoner School, Manor Drive North, New Malden KT3 5PE

Members of the Committee

Beverley Ward
- Councillor Mark Durrant
- Councillor Jaesung Ha
- Councillor Lesley Heap (Vice-Chair)

Coombe Hill Ward
- Councillor Rowena Bass
- Councillor Ed Fram
- Councillor Ian George

Coombe Vale Ward
- Councillor Roy Arora
- Councillor Kim Bailey
- Councillor Munir Ravalia

Old Malden Ward
- Councillor Kevin Davis
- Councillor Jason Hughes
- Councillor Nicola Sheppard

St James Ward
- Councillor Tim Cobbett
- Councillor Simon Edwards (Chair)
- Councillor Annette Wookey

Everyone is welcome to attend the meeting

This agenda is available to view on: www.kingston.gov.uk
You can also access this agenda through the Modern.gov app
Agenda

1. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

A period of up to 30 minutes for public questions on matters relevant to the Committee’s remit which are not related to items featuring on the agenda. Advance notice of questions is preferred but not essential.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

4. PETITIONS

5. NEIGHBOURHOOD MANAGERS REPORT

6. MINUTES

To confirm that the minutes of the meeting held on 12 September 2018 are a correct record.

7. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

To determine the following Planning application(s):

1) 18/14466 - Maple Court Acacia Grove, New Malden, KT3 3BX
2) 18/14686 - Development Land Rear of 36-38 Church Road, Worcester Park, KT4 7RD
3) 18/14753 - Kincross, 13 Coombe Lane West, Kingston upon Thames, KT2 7EW

8. SHORT FRONTAGE AGREEMENT - 69 BURLINGTON ROAD KT3 4LP

To consider an applicant’s appeal against the officers’ refusal for installation of a vehicular crossover where the property frontage is less than the minimum 4.57m which is required under the Vehicle Crossover Policy.

Appendix A

Appendix B
9. **QUEEN'S ROAD AND CRESCENT ROAD WIDTH RESTRICTIONS**  
   **OUTCOME OF CONSULTATIONS**

   This report outlines the outcome of a public consultation on proposed width restrictions in the above roads.

10. **NEIGHBOURHOOD REVIEW**

   To seek the views of the Committee on emerging outline proposals for the strengthening of the Council’s Neighbourhoods arrangements.

11. **APPOINTMENT TO HENRY SMITH CHARITY**

   To appoint a Neighbourhood Committee representative onto the Henry Smith’s Charity for a 5 year term of office.

12. **TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT UPDATE**

   To note the traffic management update.

13. **EXCLUSION OF THE 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 x 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.

14. **URGENT ITEMS AUTHORISED BY THE CHAIR**
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 Maldens and Coombe Neighbourhood**

The 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.

**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 are deaf or 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.

**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.

**Neighbourhood manager’s surgery** - The Neighbourhood Manager will be available from 7:00pm before the meeting to answer any questions or address areas of concern.

**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.

**Information for members of the public** - Details on access to the meeting, asking questions, speaking on items, call in and other information are just after the list of items.

There is a **Question Time** of up to 30 minutes from 7.30pm – 8pm.

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

**Contact for further information** - For further about Council Committees and meetings please contact: **Samuel Nicholls tel 020 8547 5533, e-mail: sam.nicholls@kingston.gov.uk**
More meeting information

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

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

Question time - Questions may be submitted in writing before the meeting or handed in at the start of the meeting on the green forms provided. For enquiries please contact Samuel Nicholls tel 020 8547 5533, e-mail: sam.nicholls@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.

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.

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

- **Interests** - Councillors must say if they have an interest in any of the items on the agenda. Interests may be personal or pecuniary. Depending on the interests declared, it might be necessary for the Councillor to leave the meeting. The detail on interests is in Part 5A of the Constitution - Members’ Code of Conduct.

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

The call in means the decision will be considered at a meeting of full Council which may either

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

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

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**

Registration deadline: 10:00am, **Monday 29 October 2018**

To register please contact: **Samuel Nicholls tel 020 8547 5533, e-mail: sam.nicholls@kingston.gov.uk**

**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 are 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The order of speaking is:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning applications</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Planning Officer to present item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Objector(s) (5 minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Applicant (5 minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Questions from Committee:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Objector(s) Applicant (5 minutes) (5 minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PLANNING APPLICATIONS

**INDEX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>REGISTER NO</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>PAGE NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>18/14753</td>
<td>Kincross, 13 Coombe Lane West, Kingston upon Thames, KT2 7EW</td>
<td>Erection of two storey side extension, part single storey, part two storey rear extensions and front dormer window roof extensions to facilitate loft conversion with balconies to the rear. Conversion of existing dwellinghouse into 8x residential units, providing 3x 3 bed, 4x 2 bed and 1x 1 bed with associated car parking, cycle storage and refuse storage (Amended plans- alterations to layout, set back of side extension and internal alterations)</td>
<td>PERMIT</td>
<td>A29 A2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MALDENS AND COOMBE NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMITTEE

31.10.2018

REPORT BY THE

Assistant Director of Strategic Planning & Infrastructure

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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.
(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: Coombe Vale
Description of Proposal: Demolition of garages and conversion into car parking together with the erection of boundary fencing
Plan Type: Full Application
Expiry Date: 13/07/2018
Applicant’s Plan Nos:

5000956 - A - 019 Rev A Existing Location Plan Received 18/05/2018
5000956 - A - 019-1 Rev A Proposed Location Plan Received 18/05/2018
5000956 - A - 019-10 Rev A Existing Garages 1-10 Received 18/05/2018
5000956 - A - 019-11 Rev A Proposed Spaces 1-19 Received 18/05/2018
5000956 - A - 019-12 Rev A Proposed Spaces 20-37 Received 18/05/2018
5000956 - A - 019-13 Rev A Proposed Spaces 1-37 Received 18/05/2018
5000956 - A - 019-2 Rev A Existing Site Plan Received 18/05/2018
5000956 - A - 019-3 Rev A Proposed Site Plan Received 18/05/2018
5000956 - A - 019-4 Rev A Existing Garages 1-9 Received 18/05/2018
5000956 - A - 019-5 Rev A Existing Garages 10-18 Received 18/05/2018
5000956 - A - 019-6 Rev A Existing Garages 19-26 Received 18/05/2018
5000956 - A - 019-7 Rev A Existing Garages 27-37 Received 18/05/2018
5000956 - A - 019-8 Rev A Existing Garages 1-19 Received 18/05/2018
5000956 - A - 019-9 Rev A Existing Garages 20-37 Received 18/05/2018

BASIC INFORMATION

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012

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

Policies

LDF CORE STRATEGY CORE POLICIES
CS 08 Character, Heritage and Design
LDF CORE STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT
DM10 Design Requirements for New Developments
Previous Relevant History

1. There is no relevant planning history relating to this site.

Consultations

1. Neighbour notification 49 properties along Maple Court, Poplar Grove and Jacaranda Close. 4 letters of objection have been received which raise the following concerns;
   - the removal of the garages would result in a loss of privacy due to the proposed height of the fence
   - no provision has been put in place to protect existing boundary walls
   - the fence would need more upkeep than a boundary wall
   - the proposal will affect the trees in the rear gardens of Acacia Grove.
   - Cars are more likely to damage a fence than a wall
   - The removal of the garages and construction of the fence may damage the boundary walls to neighbouring properties.

2. Neighbourhood Traffic Engineer: No objection

3. Network Rail: No objection.

Site and Surroundings

4. The application site includes a 4 storey block of flats (Maple Court) and garages to the west and south of Maple Court. The site is not located in a conservation area but is adjacent to the Groves Conservation Area to the West of the site. There are no trees protected by tree preservation orders on the site and none in neighbouring properties.

5. To the South of the site is a railway line and residential properties to the west and east of the site.

Proposal

6. Planning permission is sought for the demolition of the garages to create car parking spaces. Fencing is also proposed to the boundary where the garages have been. The fences would measure 1.8m in height and be close boarded fences constructed from timber. It is the applicant’s intention to retain the back walls of the garages if possible. However, this may not be the case and fencing will be erected instead.

Assessment

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

7. The removal of the garages would not result in the loss of off-street parking for residents as the garages would be replaced with parking spaces. Therefore the principle of the demolition of the garages is acceptable.

Impact on Character of Area

8. Policies CS8 and DM10 of the Council's LDF Core Strategy advise that proposals should relate well to their surroundings and be of a high standard of design.

9. The site relates to single storey garages located on the western and southern side of Maple Court. The garages are in a poor state of repair and detract from the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It is considered that removal of the garages would be an improvement.

10. Fences are proposed to the boundaries where the garages are to be removed. The fence would measure 1.8m in height and would be constructed from timber. The height and design of the fence are considered to be residential in character and would not detract from the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

11. In light of the above, it is considered that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area complying with Policies CS8 and DM10 of the Councils' LDF Core Strategy.

Impact on Neighbours' Residential Amenity

12. The existing garages measure 2.4m in height and have a flat roof. The proposed fence panels would measure 1.8m in height. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed fencing would not result in a harmful loss of sunlight or daylight or an increased sense of enclosure for occupiers of neighbouring properties.

13. The height of the boundary treatment would be reduced from the current height of the garages. A number of flats already overlook the rear gardens of properties along Acacia Grove. The difference in height of the garages and the fence would be 0.6m. It is considered that the reduction in height of the boundary treatment would result in a material
loss of privacy for neighbouring properties as this height would be sufficient to maintain privacy.


Highways & Parking

15. The Council's Neighbourhood Traffic Engineer has reviewed the proposal and given that the garages and access to and from the garages already exist it is considered that the removal of the garages would not result in a detrimental impact on the highway and would replace the existing parking.

Trees

16. There are mature trees in the rear gardens of properties along Acacia Grove. The demolition of the garages is unlikely to result in harm to the trees or their roots and the depth required for the erection of the fence is unlikely to be significantly deep to harm the roots of the neighbouring trees.

Legal Agreements

17. No legal agreements are required for this development.

Sustainability

18. There are no sustainability matters relating to this application.

Other Material Considerations

19. Network Rail have raised no objection to the proposal. However they have advised that the applicant will need to sign an asset protection agreement with Network Rail. Therefore, it is recommended that the applicant should be advised of this through an informative.

Recommendation:

Approve subject to the following conditions:

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

- 5000956 - A - 019-4 Rev A Existing Garages 1-9 18/05/2018
- 5000956 - A - 019-7 Rev A Existing Garages 27-37 18/05/2018
- 5000956 - A - 019-5 Rev A Existing Garages 10-18 18/05/2018
- 5000956 - A - 019-6 Rev A Existing Garages 19-26 18/05/2018
- 5000956 - A - 019-13 Rev A Proposed Spaces 1-37 18/05/2018
- 5000956 - A - 019-11 Rev A Proposed Spaces 1-19 18/05/2018
- 5000956 - A - 019-10 Rev A Existing Garages 1-10 18/05/2018
- 5000956 - A - 019-9 Rev A Existing Garages 20-37 18/05/2018
- 5000956 - A - 019-12 Rev A Proposed Spaces 20-37 18/05/2018
- 5000956 - A - 019-8 Rev A Existing Garages 1-19 18/05/2018
- 5000956 - A - 019-2 Rev A Existing Site Plan 18/05/2018
- 5000956 - A - 019-1 Rev A Proposed Location Plan 18/05/2018
- 5000956 - A - 019-3 Rev A Proposed Site Plan 18/05/2018
- 5000956 - A - 019 Rev A Existing Location Plan 18/05/2018

Reason: For avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

The fencing hereby approved shall be erected within 1 month of the demolition of the garages and retained in perpetuity.

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

Details of the hard surfacing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, 1 month after the demolition of the garages. The hard surfacing shall be implemented 6 months after the demolition.

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

Informatives:

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

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

3 As the proposed site is near to Network Rail's operational railway infrastructure, you are required to enter into an asset protection agreement with Network Rail. For further guidance contact Network Rail: TownPlanningSE@networkrail.co.uk
Maldens and Coombe Neighbourhood Committee

Date of Meeting: 31/10/2018

A2 Register No: 18/14686/FUL

Address: Development Land Rear of 36-38 Church Road, Worcester Park, KT4 7RD

(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: Old Malden
Description of Proposal: Demolition of existing garage and erection of 2x semi-detached dwellings and formation of new vehicular access and crossover
Plan Type: Full Application
Expiry Date: 19/09/2018

Applicant's Plan Nos:
CRW1807/PL01/A Site Location & Block Plans Received 20/07/2018
CRW1807/PL02/A Proposed Floor Plans Received 20/07/2018
CRW1807/PL03/A Proposed Elevations Received 20/07/2018
CRW1807/PL04 Proposed Street Elevation Received 20/07/2018
CRW1807/SL01 Site Survey & Existing Garage Received 20/07/2018
Design, Access & Planning Statement Received 20/07/2018
Lifetime Homes Standards Checklist Received 20/07/2018
National Space Standards Compliance Check Received 20/07/2018
TPP 01 Tree Protection Plan Received 20/07/2018
Tree Survey Schedule Received 20/07/2018

BASIC INFORMATION

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012
National Planning Policy Guidance (web based resource)

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

Policies
LONDON PLAN MARCH 2016
LP 3.3 Increasing housing supply
LP 3.5 Quality and design of housing development
LP 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
LP 6.13 Parking
LP 7.4 Local character
LDF CORE STRATEGY CORE POLICIES
CS 06 Sustainable Travel
CS 07 Managing Vehicle Use
CS 08 Character, Heritage and Design
CS 10 Housing Delivery
Previous Relevant History

17/14384/FUL Single storey extension to garage and conversion to a one bedroom dwelling
Refuse Full Application 04/07/2017

Consultations

1. Neighbour notification: 22 properties along Stroudes Close and Church Road were notified of the application. To date, 10 letters of objection have been received together with a petition containing 25 signatures.

2. The letter of objection raise the following concerns:
   - Loss of privacy to Nos. 1 and 2 Stroudes Close
   - Loss of light to Nos 1 and 2 Stroudes Close
   - The construction of the dwellinghouses would result in an increase in dust which would affect residents at No. 2 Stroudes Close who have a dust allergy.
   - Stroudes Close suffers from high levels of off-street parking which will be exacerbated by the proposed dwellinghouses
   - The layout and the design of the proposed dwellinghouses would not integrate with the design and feel of the existing buildings and the surrounding area
   - The proposal would result in an unacceptable level of noise during the construction works
   - The proposal will affect animals
   - construction lorries will block the road
   - the proposed houses are too large
   - the proposed house would reduce the selling potential of existing properties
   - the proposal would result in an increase in flooding of the area
   - the design of the proposed houses do not integrate with the design of the existing buildings.

3. RBK Climate change and Sustainability Officer: no response received

4. RBK Neighbourhood Traffic Engineer: No objection subject to planning conditions.

5. RBK Tree Officer: No objection subject to planning conditions.

Site and Surroundings

6. The site relates to the end of the rear gardens of Nos. 36 and 38 Church
Road. The site is no longer in the ownership of these properties.

7. The site is not located in a conservation area, however to the east of the site is the Old Malden Conservation Area. There are no trees protected by tree preservation orders on the site.

8. The surrounding area is predominantly residential comprising two storey semi-detached properties with short front gardens and reasonably sized rear gardens. The properties along Church Road have bay windows to their front elevations at ground and first floor levels. They have off-street parking to the front of the properties. Properties along Stroudes Close also exhibit bay windows at ground floor level. These properties also benefit from off-street parking to the front of the property.

Proposal

9. The proposal involves the demolition of the existing garage on the site and the erection of a pair of semi-detached properties. The proposed houses would be two storeys in height and have a hipped roof.

Assessment

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

- Principle of Proposed Development
- Housing Delivery
- Impact on Character of Area and Conservation Area
- Impact on Neighbour’s Residential Amenity
- Highways and Parking
- Trees
- Legal Agreements
- Sustainability
- Planning Balance/Conclusion

Principle of Proposed Development

10. Paragraph 122 of the NPPF directs that where there is an existing or anticipating shortage of land for meeting residential housing needs. Planning decisions should ensure that developments make optimal use of the potential of each site. Paragraphs 122 directs that planning decisions should support development that makes efficient use of lands, taking into account [inter alia] the desirability of maintaining an areas prevailing character and setting.

11. Policy CS10 of the Council’s LDF Core Strategy states [inter alia] that the Council, with partners will take full advantage of opportunities to deliver new housing.

12. Policy CS8 of the LDF Core Strategy states that the Council will protect the primarily suburban character of the Borough.
The site is located within a well-established residential area. The proposal would provide two additional family houses within the Borough. The principle of residential development on the site comprising a pair of semi-detached family dwellinghouses is considered acceptable subject to complying with other Policies in the development plan.

Housing delivery

Policy 3.3 of the London Plan (March 2016) states that the Mayor recognises the pressing need for more homes in London 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. Working with relevant partners, the Mayor will seek to ensure the housing need identified in paragraphs 3.16a and 3.16b of the London Plan (49,000 (2015-2036) and 62,000 (2015-2026)) is met particularly through provision consistent with at least an annual average of 42,000 net additional homes across London which will enhance the environment, improve housing choice and affordability and provide better quality accommodation for Londoners.

Table 3.1 (Annual average housing supply monitoring targets 2015 - 2025) of the London Plan requires the delivery of 6,434 dwellings within the plan period 2015-2025 and a rate of 643 dwellings per year within the Royal Borough of Kingston-upon-Thames, which is almost double the previous rate of 375 dwellings per year identified in the 2011 London Plan.

With regard to housing land supply, the Council is able to demonstrate a supply of 3,636 residential units against a requirement of 3,683. This equates to a housing land supply of 4.94 years. Short of the 5 year requirement.

As there is no 5-year housing land supply, paragraph 11 of the NPPF indicates that planning permission should be granted unless (a) any adverse impacts of doing so significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against policies in the Framework as a whole or (b) specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted.

Housing Mix

LP Policy 3.8 (Housing Choice) states that Londoners should have a genuine choice of homes that they can afford and which meet their requirements for different sizes and types of dwellings in the highest quality environments.

Core Strategy Policy CS10 (Housing Delivery) states that the Council will take full advantage of opportunities to deliver new housing and, in particular maximise the delivery of affordable housing. New housing should be delivered in the most sustainable locations, and with the associated infrastructure necessary to support it.
20. CS Policy CS10 states that the Council will seek to ensure that a broad mix of accommodation options are available to residents and that a range of local housing needs are met.

21. More recently, the Council has completed its Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), published in June 2016, together with three other Surrey authorities (Mole Valley, Epsom and Ewell and Elmbridge), which identifies a more pressing need for family housing. Table 6.14 of the SHMA identifies a need for 70% of new dwellings delivered to be 3+ bed units by 2035. A figure well in excess of the 2012 Core Strategy figure.

22. The proposed development has proposed two 3 bedroom units.

23. The proposed development would therefore be considered to be in accordance with Policy 3.8 of the London Plan (March 2016) and Policies CS10 and DM13 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy Adopted April 2012.

Affordable Housing

24. The NPPF states that major residential development of 10 or more units or 1,000 sqm of floorspace, should make an affordable housing contribution.

25. The proposed development neither proposes 11 units or 1,000 sqm of floorspace and therefore does not have to provide any affordable housing.

Impact on Character of Area

26. Policies CS8 and DM10 of the Council’s LDF Core Strategy advise that proposals should relate well to their surroundings and be of a high standard of design.

27. Church Road is characterised by semi-detached properties as is Stroudes Close which also has short rows of terraced properties. The properties on Church Road and Stroudes Close have hipped roofs and properties along Stroudes Close have small porches to their front elevations. The properties benefit from off-street parking and small front gardens with low level front boundary treatment.

28. The proposed houses would be located 2m from the pavement, off street parking is provided to the side of the properties. The houses would sit forward of the side elevation of No 1 Stroudes Close by 4m. The proposed houses sit 2.9m behind the side elevation of No. 36 Church Road. The proposal for the semi-detached properties is in-keeping with the pattern of development within the surrounding area.

29. The proposed dwellinghouses would have hipped roofs which is in keeping with the roof design of neighbouring properties. Hipped roof porches are proposed over the front doors reflecting the character of the properties along Stroudes Close.
30. The design and position of the windows to front elevation of the building are in-keeping with the design and location of windows of properties along Stroudes Close, with the windows sitting close to the eaves of the roof.

31. The design and access statement submitted with the application states that the materials proposed for the proposed dwellinghouse are painted render, facing brickwork and clay tiled roof to be in-keeping with the existing materials at neighbouring properties. It is recommended that a planning condition is imposed requiring details of the proposed materials to ensure a satisfactory external appearance.

32. The design of the proposed dwellinghouses is considered to be in-keeping with the surrounding area and as such would not detract from the setting of the Old Malden Conservation Area. Given their design, size and appearance would not appear overly dominant within the streetscene of Stroudes Close.

33. In light of the above, the proposed the design and appearance of the proposed dwellinghouses is considered to be residential in character and in-keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area and would not harm the setting of the Old Malden Conservation Area. Therefore, the proposal is considered to not harm the character and appearance of the streetscene or the surrounding area complying with Policies CS8 and DM10 of the LDF Core Strategy.

34. Low level walls are proposed to the front gardens to be in-keeping with the open design of front garden of the properties along Stroudes Close. A mix of soft and hard landscaping will be provided to the front garden of the property. The mix of hard and soft landscaping is considered to be acceptable and is in-keeping with the general layout of front gardens of properties along Stroudes Close. It is recommended that a planning condition is imposed requiring details of the species of plants proposed in the landscaping scheme as well as samples of the proposed materials for the hard standing.

Impact on Neighbours’ Residential Amenity

35. Policy 3.3 of the London sets out the minimum internal space standards for new dwelling.

36. For a 3 bedroom 6 person dwellinghouse the internal floor area should be a minimum of 102sqm. The floor area of each dwellinghouse 124sqm exceeding the minimum required.

37. Policy Guidance 13 of the Residential Design SPD (July 2013) advises
that new houses should have 50sqm of private amenity space. The proposed garden to plot 1 would have a garden measuring 10.1m x 7m resulting in a garden of 70.1 sqm. The rear garden to plot 2 would measure 10.2m x 7m resulting in a garden of 70.2 sqm. It is considered that this level of private amenity space would be adequate for a 3 bedroom property.

38. The properties would benefit from good levels of outlook and light.

**Impact on Neighbours Residential Amenity**

39. There is 11m from the flank elevation of the plot 1 and the rear elevation of No.1 Stroudes Close and 3m from the side elevation of plot 1 and the rear garden of No.1 Stoudes Close. There would be 21m from the flank elevation of plot 2 to the rear elevation of No.36 Church Road. The proposed dwellinghouse (plot 1) would be positioned 12m from the rear elevation of No,2 Stroudes Close and 4m from the boundary with the rear garden of No.2 Stroudes Close. The proposed dwellinghouse (plot 1) would be positioned 12m from the rear elevation of No,2 Stroudes Close and 4m from the boundary with the rear garden of No.2 Stroudes Close.

40. The proposed distances would not result in an unacceptable overbearing impact or an increased sense of enclosure for Nos. 1 and 2 Stroudes Close nor No.36 Church Road.

41. The proposed dwellinghouses would overlook the ends of the rear gardens of No.40 and 42 Church Road. The windows to the rear elevation of the proposed dwellinghouses would be 7m from the boundary with the garden of No.40 Church Road. The level of overlooking is considered to not be significantly different to the existing levels of overlooking of the gardens from properties along Stroudes Close. The impact on Nos. 1, 2 and 3 Stroudes Close would be limited to the ends of the rear gardens and would be of relatively oblique angles.

42. The proposed dwellinghouses would sit to the south of No.1 Stroudes Close. There is currently a pitched roof garage which sits close to the boundary with No.1 Stroudes Close. The garage measures 4.2m in height, the proposed dwellinghouse measure 9m in height at their highest point. Due to the hipped roof the height of the dwellinghouse closest to the boundary with No.1 Stroudes Close would measure 5.7m to the eaves which is not significantly higher than the existing garage on the site. The proposed dwellinghouse would have an overshadowing effect and some loss of sunlight and daylight to the rear gardens of Nos. 1 and 2 Stroudes Close.

43. The proposed dwellinghouses would sit to the north of No.34 and 36 Church Road. Given the orientation of the site and the distance of the proposed dwellinghouses from the rear elevations of Nos. 34 and 36 Church Road, it is considered that the proposed dwellinghouses would not result in a harmful loss of sunlight or daylight or an increased sense
of enclosure for occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Highways & Parking

44. Policies DM9 and DM10 of the Council's LDF Core Strategy seek to ensure the new development does not contribute to the congestion or compromise highway safety. Policy 6.13 of the London Plan further provides car parking standards requiring development to provide a maximum of 2 spaces for the proposed dwellings. It does, however stipulate that development within an area of good transport accessibility should aim for significantly less than 1 spaces per unit.

45. The site is located in area with a PTAL of 2 (poor).

46. Off-street parking has been provided to both properties in the form of driveways to the side of the properties. The existing crossover to the garage will be retained for plot 1 and an additional crossover will be created for plot 2. The Council's Neighbourhood Traffic Engineer has commented on the application and has not raised any concerns regarding highway safety. However, has advised that viability splays of 2.8 x 3.3 would need to be provided in each direction where the access meets the back of the highway. It is recommended that this is controlled through a planning condition.

47. Cycle parking for two bicycles is proposed in the rear gardens of both properties. This level of cycle parking is considered to be acceptable in this instance.

48. Refuse and recycling storage is proposed within the rear gardens of the properties. It is recommended that detailed drawings of the refuse and recycling storage are provided by condition.

49. It is recommended that a planning condition is imposed requiring a Construction Traffic Management Plan to be submitted before development commences to prevent any adverse impact on the safe and free flow of traffic on neighbouring roads. The applicant has agreed to this condition.

50. In light of the above, the proposed dwellinghouses are not considered to have a detrimental impact on on-street parking or highway safety complying with Policy 6.13 of the London Plan and Policies DM9 and DM10 of the Council's LDF Core Strategy

Trees

51. There are 2 mature trees on the site and there is a lime tree on the street adjacent to the site. Neither of the trees are protected by a tree preservation order. A tree survey schedule has been submitted with the application. An assessment of the street tree has been made and its structural condition is considered to be good and it is a Category B tree.
However no assessment has been made of the trees on the site. It is recommended that a planning condition is imposed requiring a tree protect method statement to be submitted including on the site trees along with a landscaping plan to ensure the protection of the trees and adequate landscaping is put in place before development commences. The applicant has agreed to this condition.

Legal Agreements

Mayoral CIL

52. The proposal is Mayoral CIL liable at a rate of £35 per sq.m on the net increase in gross floor space proposed.

Kingston CIL

53. Kingston CIL was introduced in November 2015. The creation of a new dwellinghouse would be CIL liable. The site is located in CIL charging zone 4. Therefore, the charge for this development is £50 per square metre. The charge would be subject to Tender Price Index.

Sustainability

54. Policy 5.2 of the London Plan and Policy DM1 of the LDF Core Strategy states that new residential development would be expected to achieve the equivalent of Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 in terms of energy and water. The applicant has not provided a sustainability statement highlighting measures during the construction of the proposed dwellinghouse to reduce energy use and water consumption. Therefore, it is recommended that a planning condition is imposed requesting this information.

Planning Balance/Conclusion

55. The dis-benefits associated with the proposed development, loss of some sunlight and daylight to the rear gardens of 1 and 2 Stroudes Close would not significantly nor demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the provision of two dwellinghouses as set out in Paragraph 11 d of the NPPF.

Recommendation:

Approve subject to the following conditions:

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

Reason: In order to comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990. (As amended)
The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

- CRW1807/PL03/A Proposed Elevations 20/07/2018
- CRW1807/PL04 Proposed Street Elevation 20/07/2018
- CRW1807/SL01 Site Survey & Existing Garage 20/07/2018
- Design, Access & Planning Statement 20/07/2018
- CRW1807/PL02/A Proposed Floor Plans 20/07/2018
- CRW1807/PL01/A Site Location & Block Plans 20/07/2018
- Tree Survey Schedule 20/07/2018
- TPP 01 Tree Protection Plan 20/07/2018
- National Space Standards Compliance Check 20/07/2018
- Lifetime Homes Standards Checklist 20/07/2018

Reason: For avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

A sample of the facing materials to be utilised in the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any above ground works on site are commenced. The development shall then be built in accordance with these approved samples.

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

Fences, walls or other means of enclosure shall be erected along the boundaries of the site (and individual plots) prior to the occupation of the dwelling to which they relate, in accordance with details which shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall thereafter be permanently retained.

Reason: In order to ensure the privacy of adjoining occupiers and visual amenity of the area is retained in accordance with Policy DM10 (Design Requirements for New Developments including House Extensions) of the LDF Core Strategy Adopted April 2012.

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

(a) Provision for loading/unloading materials.
(b) Storage of plant, materials and operatives vehicles.
(c) Temporary site access.
(d) Signing system for works traffic.
(e) Measures for the laying of dust, suppression of noise and abatement of other nuisance arising from development works.
(f) Location of all ancillary site buildings.
(g) Measures to protect any tree, shrubbery and other landscape features to be retained on the site during the course of development.
(h) Means of enclosure of the site.
(i) Wheel washing equipment.
(j) The parking of vehicles of the site operatives and visitors

The details are required prior to commencement of development because the relevant works would take place at the beginning of the construction.

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

6 Prior to commencement of the development, a detailed arboricultural method statement and tree protection plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. This submission shall include:

(a) A plan to a scale and level of accuracy appropriate to the proposal, that shows the positions, crown spreads and root protection areas (RPA) of every retained tree on site, and on nearby ground or land adjacent to the site, in relation to the approved plans.
(b) A schedule of pre-construction tree works for the above-detailed trees, where appropriate.
(c) Details and positions of the tree root protection zones.
(d) Details and positions of tree protection barriers and ground protection where appropriate including details for the grass verge.
(e) Details and positions of the construction exclusion zones.
(f) Details and positions of the existing and proposed underground service runs, to be routed to avoid root protection zones where possible.
(g) Details and positions of any change in levels or the positions of any excavations within 5m of the root protection area of retained trees.
(h) Details of any special engineering required to accommodate the protection of retained trees (e.g. in connection with foundations, service installation, bridging water features, surfacing).

(i) Details of the working methods to be employed for the installation of drives, paths within the RPA's of retained trees in accordance with the principles of 'No Dig' construction. The details shall be in accordance with British Standard BS: 5837: 2005 sections 9.3, 9.2, 9, 11.7, 5.2.2 and 10 for requirements (c) to (h) inclusive.

The approved protection scheme shall be implemented prior to commencement of any work on site and maintained to the reasonable satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority until the completion of the development.

The details are required prior to commencement of development because the relevant works would take place at the beginning of the construction.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenities and so that the Local Planning Authority shall be satisfied as to the details of the development in accordance with Policy DM10 (Design Requirements for New Developments including House Extensions) of the LDF Core Strategy Adopted April 2012.

7 Before any above groundwork commence a hard and soft landscaping scheme including where applicable the retention of the existing trees shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented within the first planting season following completion of the development and the tree planting and landscaping shall thereafter be maintained for five years to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. Any trees or shrubs which die during this period shall be replaced in the first available planting season, and the area shown to be landscaped shall be permanently retained for that purpose only.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and also that the Local Planning Authority shall be satisfied as to the details of the development in accordance with Policy DM10 (Design Requirements for New Developments including House Extensions) of the LDF Core Strategy Adopted April 2012.

8 Before occupation of the proposed dwellinghouses. The hard surface hereby approved shall be implemented and made of porous materials and retained thereafter or provision shall be made and retained thereafter to direct run-off water from the hard surface to a permeable or porous area or surface within the curtilage of the property.

Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding and pollution and increase the level of sustainability of the development and to comply with Policy CS1 (Climate Change Mitigation) of the LDF Core Strategy Adopted April 2012.
9 Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order, 2015 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting this Order) no extensions (including porches or dormer windows) to the dwelling houses or buildings shall be erected within the curtilage.

Reason: To safeguard the privacy and amenity of adjoining occupiers, maintain adequate amenity space and safeguard the cohesive appearance of the development in accordance with Policy DM10 (Design Requirements for New Developments including House Extensions) of the LDF Core Strategy Adopted April 2012.

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

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

11 Prior to the occupation of the dwellinghouses, details of secure cycle parking facilities for the occupants of, and visitors to, the development hereby approved have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These facilities shall be fully implemented and made available for use prior to the occupation of the development hereby permitted and shall thereafter be retained for use at all times.

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

12 No part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied until evidence has been submitted to the council confirming that the development has achieved not less than the CO2 reductions (ENE1), internal water usage (WAT1) standards equivalent to Code for Sustainable Homes level 4. Evidence requirements are detailed in the "Schedule of evidence Required for Post Construction Stage from Ene1 & Wat1 of the Code for Sustainable Homes Technical Guide. Evidence to demonstrate a 19% reduction compared to 2013 part L regulations and internal water usage rates of 105l/p/ day must be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, unless otherwise agreed in writing.
Reason: In the interests of sustainability and energy conservation in accordance with Policies 5.2 (Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions) and 5.3 (Sustainable Design & Construction) of the London Plan (July 2011) and Policy DM1 (Sustainable Design and Construction Standards) of the LDF Core Strategy Adopted April 2012.

By the time the development hereby permitted is substantially complete, pedestrian/vehicular intervisibility splays of 2.8m x 3.3m shall have been provided in each direction where the access meets the back edge of footway, and shall be permanently retained free from any obstruction to visibility higher than 1.0m above ground level.

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

Informatives

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

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

3 Any vehicular crossing must be constructed in accordance with the provisions of the Highways Act 1980 by the Service Director (Planning & Transportation) (Highways), Directorate of Environmental Services, Guildhall II, Kingston upon Thames.
4 The development approved by this planning permission will be liable to pay the Mayor of London's Community Infrastructure Levy (MCIL). Payment will be due once the owner/developer serves a development Commencement Notice on the Council, and a payment Demand Notice has been received by the owner. Failure to submit a Commencement Notice will incur a surcharge of 20% of the chargeable amount or £2,500, whichever is the lower amount.
When you have discharged all pre-commencement conditions the Council will issue a Liability Notice to the owner setting out the MCIL calculation. Accompanying the Liability Notice will be a blank Commencement Notice and if necessary a blank Assumption of Liability form, both of which need to be completed and returned to the Council prior to development commencing. A failure to do so will incur a surcharge.
Should you have any questions in respect of the contents of this letter or the MCIL more generally, please contact the Council's Contact Centre by email mcil@rbk.kingston.gov.uk or phone 0208 547 5002.

5 The development approved by this planning permission will be liable to pay the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames Community Infrastructure Levy RBK CIL. The RBK CIL rates are available on our web pages and are subject to the national Tender Price Index. In the event that the All-in Tender Price Index ceases to be published, the index referred to is the retail prices index; and the figure for a given year is the figure for November of the preceding year.

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

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

Should you have any questions in respect of the contents of this letter or the RBK CIL more generally, please contact the Council's Contact Centre by email: cil@rbk.kingston.gov.uk or by phone: 0208 547 5002.

6 The following notes relate to Condition 5 of this permission and should be followed in order to safeguard the amenities of the surrounding residential occupiers and to safeguard highway safety and the free flow of traffic.

Notes:
Deliveries to the site will avoid peak traffic times. This is due to existing congestion along Malden Road and Church Road which will be exacerbated with the proposals;
Deliveries to the site should where possible avoid waiting on the highway as this could result in a reduction to road safety and emergency access;

Any parking that cannot be contained within the site must park considerately and safely, so as not to obstruct sightlines at junctions or site accesses. The applicant should be aware that any such parking will cause unnecessary concern and agitation within the local community; should make full use of the site accesses to maximise the availability of off street parking.

Service parking and deliveries should not cause any damage to the verges or margins, and no parking is allowed on both.

A license from the Compliance Team will be required to erect off site direction signs. This same team will issue the hoarding license (if necessary) and seek appropriate deposits.

The applicant should be advised that a licence is needed for a tower crane, and should contact the Street Scene Compliance Team on 020 8547 5002. A traffic management arrangement for the delivery, erection, dismantling and removal of a tower crane (if it would be used) should be submitted for approval.

The applicant should be advised to consider if a parking suspension might be needed to allow access for big delivery construction vehicles involved. To apply for parking suspension (if needed), the applicant should contact the Environment Contact Centre on 020 8547 5002.

The provision of the above information ensures that the Borough and the applicant are able to consider the construction at an early stage. This ensures that construction and any traffic management is completed in a professional and timely manner.

Advanced Notice of Works

The proposals will lead to disruption to users of the highway network including the adjacent TfL and SRN in the Borough. As a result the applicant should contact the Boroughs Street Works Team (0208 547 5002). This must take place at least four month prior to works commencing due to the need to obtain TfL Network Assurance approval, and it is required under the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991, and the Traffic Management Act 2004, in order to satisfy the licensing requirements of the Highways Act 1980.

This is to ensure the amenities of the surrounding residential occupiers and to safeguard highway safety and the free flow of traffic.

Highway Cleaning

Should the access into the site during construction not be paved, spoil could be carried from the site onto the public highway. The access into the site should be paved to minimise the carryover of spoil onto adjacent roads. We would also require the applicant to sweep and wash down the adjacent roads to ensure that the public highway is kept clear of debris. This is to ensure a satisfactory road surface for road safety reasons at all times.

Road Condition Survey
It is highlighted that any proposed works will result in substantial movement of heavy vehicles on Kingston Road, and therefore the Council will require the applicant to undertake a road and footway/verge condition survey before construction begins.

This will take the form of a joint inspection with a member of the Street Scene Team and will involve a photographic record and visual observation of the roads, verges and margins.

This will allow the condition of the carriageway and footway to be monitored, should any damage result from the use of heavy plant associated with this site.
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Ward: Coombe Hill
Description of Proposal: Erection of two storey side extension, part single storey, part two storey rear extensions and front dormer window roof extensions to facilitate loft conversion with balconies to the rear. Conversion of existing dwellinghouse into 8x residential units, providing 3x 3 bed, 4x 2 bed and 1x 1 bed with associated car parking, cycle storage and refuse storage.
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Applicant’s Plan Nos:

- 2305-LOC01 Site Location Plan Received 08/08/2018
- Cover Letter Received 08/08/2018
- Design & Access Statement Received 08/08/2018
- PL-07-A Comparative Elevations Received 08/08/2018
- PL01-B Proposed Floor Plans Received 04/10/2018
- PL02-B Proposed Block & Roof Plans & Schedule of Accommodation Received 04/10/2018
- PL03-B Proposed Front & Side Elevations Received 04/10/2018
- PL04-A Proposed Rear & Side Elevations Received 04/10/2018
- PL05-A Proposed Landscape Plan & Bin Store Details Received 04/10/2018
- PL06-A Comparative Floor Plans Received 08/08/2018
- PL08 Comparative Shadow Diagrams Received 08/08/2018
- SURV01 Existing Site Location & Floor Plans Received 08/08/2018
- SURV02 Existing Elevations & Section Received 08/08/2018

BASIC INFORMATION

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012

National Planning Practice Guidance (web based resource)
Development Plan: Mayor for London
London Plan March 2016 (consolidated with alterations since 2011)
LDF Core Strategy Adopted April 2012

Policies

LONDON PLAN MARCH 2016
LP 3.3 Increasing housing supply
LP 3.5 Quality and design of housing development
LP 3.8 Housing choice
LP 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
LP 5.7 Renewable energy
LP 5.8 Innovative energy technologies
LP 6.10 Walking
LP 6.13 Parking
LP 6.9 Cycling
LP 7.1 Building London’s neighbourhoods
LP 7.2 An Inclusive environment
LP 7.4 Local character
LP 7.5 Public realm
LP 7.6 Architecture
LDF CORE STRATEGY CORE POLICIES
CS 01 Climate Change Mitigation
CS 02 Climate Change Adaptation
CS 06 Sustainable Travel
CS 07 Managing Vehicle Use
CS 08 Character, Heritage and Design
CS 10 Housing Delivery
CS 14 Safer Communities
LDF CORE STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT
DM01 Sustainable Design and Construction Standards
DM03 Designing for Changing Climate
DM09 Managing Vehicle Use for New Development
DM10 Design Requirements for New Developments
DM12 Development in Conservation Areas
DM13 Housing Quality and Mix

Previous Relevant History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13/14811/FUL</td>
<td>Erection of two detached 5 bedroom dwellings with basement and rooms in the roof space following demolition of existing dwelling</td>
<td>Permit with conditions</td>
<td>08/04/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/14192/PNH</td>
<td>Erection of single storey rear extension</td>
<td>Prior Approval is Refused</td>
<td>08/04/2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15/14383/PNH  Erection of single storey rear extension (8m in depth, maximum height of 2.29m and eaves height of 2.29m).  Prior Approval is not Required 02/06/2015

15/14469/FUL  Erection of 1 x detached 5-bed dwellinghouse with accommodation within the roofspace.  Permit with conditions 20/07/2015

15/14874/HO U  Erection of Single storey rear extension and roof extension including dormer to facilitate loft conversion.  Permit with conditions 27/10/2015

Consultations

1. 31 neighbours have been notified of the application.
2. In response 12 letters of representation and 1 petition have been received, summarised as follows:
3. Letters of objection:
   • Out of character with surrounding development
   • Inappropriate density
   • Loss of trees
   • Increased air and noise pollution
   • Inadequate parking provision
   • Loss of privacy for neighbouring occupiers
   • Poor design
   • Highway safety risk and increased congestion
   • Loss of light to neighbouring houses and gardens
   • Not appropriate for the Coombe Hill and Kingston Hill Strategic Area of Special Character
   • Sustainability
   • Impact on natural environment
4. 1 Petition with 9 signatures objecting on the grounds of overdevelopment; out of character; impact on local area and impact on neighbours.
5. Letters of support: None
7. RBK Highways: No objection, subject to conditions.

8. Any late consultation responses received will be presented to the committee as late material.

Site and Surroundings

9. The site is on the north side of Coombe Lane West which is characterised by large detached houses. The dwellings of Wolsey Close are to the rear.
10. The site is within the Maldens & Coombe Neighbourhood; the Kingston
Proposal

11. The application seeks full planning permission for the erection of a two storey side extension, part single storey, part two storey rear extensions and front dormer window roof extensions to facilitate loft conversion with balconies to the rear. Conversion of the existing dwellinghouse into 8x residential units, providing 3x 3 bed, 4x 2 bed and 1x 1bed with associated car parking, cycle storage and refuse storage.

12. This application has been amended by way of alterations to the internal and external layout, and setting back of the side extension.

Assessment

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

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

Principle of Proposed Development

13. The application site is in a residential area, as such the residential redevelopment of the site is, subject to detailed consideration of all other relevant matters, in principle acceptable.

14. Density

15. The application proposes extensions, 2 storey at the side and single storey at the rear of the existing dwelling, and the configuration of resultant property to 8 residential units. The new units would be 3 x 3 bedroom units, 4 x 2 bedroom units and 1 x 1 bedroom unit.

16. The proposed development seeks to optimise the use of the site whilst retaining the character of the surrounding area and reflecting the scale and massing already approved on the site.

17. This approach is compliant with policy 3.4 of the adopted London Plan 2016 which requires development to optimise the housing output of development sites subject to local context and character. This emphasis on optimising development sites is expanded within the draft new
London Plan. Draft policy H2 states that there should be presumption in favour of small housing development which provide between 1 and 25 homes where:
- the development would comprise infill development on vacant or underused land; and
- proposals seek to increase density within PTAL’s 3-6 including infill development within the curtilage of a house.

18. The draft policy states that boroughs should “recognise in their Development Plans and planning decisions that local character evolves over time and will need to change in appropriate locations to accommodate additional housing provision and increases in residential density through small housing developments”. This part of Kingston, in close proximity to Norbiton station, is such an area where an opportunity exists to increase density, but this does not mean an overhaul of the over-arching character of the area.

19. The principle of the development on the site for the delivery of housing is established within Policy CS10 and MC1 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy. The principle of the development for residential is considered to be acceptable.

20. Housing

21. Housing Need

22. Policy 3.3 of the London Plan (March 2016) states that the Mayor recognises the pressing need for more homes in London 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. Working with relevant partners, the Mayor will seek to ensure the housing need identified in paragraphs 3.16a and 3.16b of the London Plan (49,000 (2015-2036) and 62,000 (2015-2026)) is met particularly through provision consistent with at least an annual average of 42,000 net additional homes across London which will enhance the environment, improve housing choice and affordability and provide better quality accommodation for Londoners.

23. Table 3.1 (Annual average housing supply monitoring targets 2015 - 2025) of the London Plan requires the delivery of 6,434 dwellings within the plan period 2015-2025 and a rate of 643 dwellings per year within the Royal Borough of Kingston-upon-Thames, which is almost double the previous rate of 375 dwellings per year identified in the 2011 London Plan.

24. With regard to housing land supply, the Council is able to demonstrate a supply of 3,636 residential units against a requirement of 3,683. This equates to a housing land supply of 4.94 years. Short of the 5 year requirement.

25. CS Policy CS10 states that the Council will seek to ensure that a broad mix of accommodation options are available to residents and that a range of local housing needs are met. It continues that the Council will expect all new residential developments to positively contribute to the Borough’s existing residential environment and character, in accordance
with the Borough Character Study, while optimising housing output in line with London Plan density policies.

26. As there is no 5-year housing land supply, paragraph 11d of the NPPF indicates that planning permission should be granted unless (a) any adverse impacts of doing so significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against policies in the Framework as a whole or (b) specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted.

27. Housing Mix

28. LP Policy 3.8 (Housing Choice) states that Londoners should have a genuine choice of homes that they can afford and which meet their requirements for different sizes and types of dwellings in the highest quality environments.

29. CS Policy DM13 (Housing Quality and Mix) states that, the Council will expect proposals for new residential development to incorporate a mix of unit sizes and types and provide a minimum of 30% of dwellings as 3 or more bedroom units, unless it can be robustly demonstrated that this would be unsuitable or unviable. On sites particularly suited to larger family housing, this minimum figure should be exceeded.

30. Core Strategy Policy CS10 (Housing Delivery) states that the Council will take full advantage of opportunities to deliver new housing and, in particular maximise the delivery of affordable housing. New housing should be delivered in the most sustainable locations, and with the associated infrastructure necessary to support it.

31. 37.5% of the units will be 3 bedroom units which is in accordance with the requirement of DM13.

32. The proposed development is considered to be in accordance with Policy 3.8 of the London Plan (March 2016) and Policies CS10 and DM13 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy Adopted April 2012.

33. Housing Quality

34. All the proposed units would meet or exceed the London Plan minimum internal space standards. Two of the ground floor units would have access to private amenity space and the remaining 6 units would have access to 1,100 sqm of communal garden to the rear of the building.

35. To complement the character of the surrounding area, the scheme has not included private balconies for the upper floor accommodation. The absence of this private space is off-set by the significant level of communal garden area which exceeds the Kingston Design SPD standards (which requires 50 sqm of communal space plus the shortfall of private amenity space of 10 sqm per unit, a total of 110 sqm).

36. The scheme has been designed to fully accord with the London Housing SPG standards with regards accessibility (M4(2) compliant), dual-aspect and privacy.

37. Affordable Housing
38. The NPPF states that major residential development of 10 or more units or 1,000 sqm of floorspace, should make an affordable housing contribution.

39. The proposed development neither proposes 11 units or 1,000 sqm of floorspace and therefore does not have to provide any affordable housing.

Impact on Character of Area

40. Policies in the NPPF, London Plan and the Core Strategy seek to ensure that development proposals will incorporate principles of good design.
41. NPPF Paragraph 124 states that the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve.
42. London Plan Policy 7.4 (Local Character) states that development should have regard to the form, function, and structure of an area, place or street and the scale, mass and orientation of surrounding buildings.
43. London Plan Policy 7.6 (Architecture) outlines that the architecture should make a positive contribution to a coherent public realm, streetscape and wider cityscape.
44. CS Policy CS08 (Character, Heritage and Design) of the Core Strategy states that the Council will protect the primarily suburban character of the Borough, existing buildings and areas of high quality and historic interest from 'inappropriate development'.
45. CS Policy CS08 also states that the Council will also require higher standards of design generally to achieve a more attractive, sustainable and accessible environment.
46. CS Policy DM10 (Design Requirements for New Developments) identifies the most essential elements which contribute toward the character and local distinctiveness of a street or an area which should be respected, maintained or enhanced.
47. The brickwork to the side extension will match that of the existing dwelling and the single storey rear extension will be rendered.
48. The extended building would sit comfortably within the plot providing sufficient breathing space on the eastern boundary. The resultant massing would be similar to the large buildings which define the character of this stretch of Coombe Lane West.
49. Overall, the proposed design, scale and mass of the proposed development would sit comfortably within its plot and with neighbouring properties. In accordance with Policies CS8 (Character, Design and Heritage), DM1 (Sustainable Design and Construction), DM10 (Design Requirements for New Developments) and DM11.

Impact on Neighbours’ Residential Amenity

50. Policies in the NPPF, London Plan and the Core Strategy seek to ensure that development proposals will safeguard residential amenity.
51. NPPF Paragraph 170 e) states that planning policies and decisions
should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of noise pollution.

52. CS Policy 7.6 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.

53. CS 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.

54. In order to prevent overlooking and protect the privacy of future occupants and neighbouring residents, most windows to habitable rooms face the rear garden of the front looking towards the street. A small number of room's windows on the flank elevations above ground floor are used to serve bathrooms. Windows on the existing west flank at both ground floor and first floor are already in existence to habitable rooms which establish the principle of windows on flank elevations. The additional window on the west flank at first floor level which serve a bathroom and so would be obscured glazing. The flank windows on the ground floor have planting in front and in addition prevent overlooking neighbours as a result of the close board fence (1.8m high).

55. On the eastern flank, the ground floor windows, would serve bedrooms and bathrooms and are similarly do not increase overlooking by merit of a planting in front of habitable room windows which protects the occupant's privacy as well as the close boarded fence on the boundary which protects neighbour's privacy.

56. The first-floor private amenity spaces will be screened to prevent overlooking to the left and right towards neighbouring properties. Planting to the front of the balcony with proposed canopies over the ground floor terraces would ensure privacy for future occupants of the property.

57. The landscaping scheme helps to promote privacy, maintaining much of the mature trees and established hedges to the rear garden and creating a natural screening in front of habitable rooms from parking spaces and passing occupants.

58. It is considered that there would not be a significant impact on neighbouring amenity in terms of loss of light and outlook. It is considered that, subject to conditions, there would not be a significant detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity.

Highways & Parking

59. Policies in the NPPF, London Plan and the Core Strategy seek to ensure that development proposals will incorporate sustainable transport.

60. LP Policy 6.13 (Parking) states that the Mayor wishes to see an appropriate balance being struck between promoting new development and preventing excessive car parking provision that can undermine cycling, walking and public transport use.

61. CS Policy CS7 (Managing Vehicle Use) states that car use should be
managed to ensure sustainability, road safety and reduce congestion, including car club schemes and the provision of electric vehicle charging points and managing on and off-street parking provision to promote sustainability and residential amenity.

62. CS Policies DM08, DM09 and DM10 seek to ensure that new development has regard to local traffic conditions and does not contribute to congestion or compromise highway safety.

63. The Public Transport Accessibility Level of this site is 3. 4 car parking spaces are currently provided and an additional 4 will take the total number of parking spaces to 8. The London Plan standard will allow a maximum of 9 car parking spaces. This is considered acceptable.

64. The provision of 15 cycle parking spaces is required. A cycle store is proposed in the rear garden. This can be secured by condition.

65. The development is not considered to result in significant additional parking pressure on surrounding streets or have a detrimental impact on highway safety.

66. Given that the property is close to Norbiton train station and near regular bus services it is considered that the parking level proposed is suitable for this proposal.

67. The scheme would need to be formally designated as a 'car capped' scheme. This will prevent the occupiers of the dwellings from obtaining parking permits for present and future car parking zones. A legal agreement is required.

Landscape

68. Policies in the NPPF, London Plan and the Core Strategy seek to ensure that development proposals incorporate landscaping into the design.

69. CS Policy DM10 (Design Requirements for New Developments) seeks to ensure landscaping is an integral part of the overall design of all new developments and that new developments have regard to the public realm and to ways in which it can be enhanced as an integral part of the design of the development.

70. Policy DM6 states that new developments should protect and promote biodiversity as part of sustainable design through the inclusion of sustainable drainage, tree planting, soft landscaping and habitat enhancement.

71. The landscaping scheme has been considered in relation to the local character of the area. The deep plan of the gardens suitably lends itself to communal use and exceeds the minimum requirements set out by Kingston Policy. For new housing Kingston requires a minimum of 50m2/dwelling house of private garden (+5sqm per extra bedroom over three) where the prevailing character of the area allows as stated in Policy Guidance 13 of Residential Design SPD. 1110sqm has been provided in this scheme which is adequate for communal amenity space. Private amenity space is also proposed for most of the flats which a mixture of patios to the ground floor, terraces for the first floor and small balconies to the second floor.

72. The Landscaping scheme features a mixture of more formal planting to the street frontage and private rear patios areas with more informal gardens for communal use at the rear. The front area is used for parking.
which has been carefully laid out with hedging and planters to prevent parking from over dominating the front elevation. The planting scheme will be low maintenance with a variety of perennials and evergreen plants for colour throughout the year. Planting in front of habitable room's windows and ground floor private patios allows for additional privacy and denotes public, semi-public and private areas. Areas of paving also help to delineate between private areas and those used by all occupants. The rear patios are proposed to have a simple permeable paving scheme whilst the area to the front for parking will have a level permeable surface such as resin bound or block paving material.

73. The site would be enclosed by traditional dwarf brick walls with hedging to the properties street frontage with close boarded fencing to the rear. Gated access via the side of the property provides access to the rear for bicycle storage and occupant's access to the communal gardens.

Legal Agreements

74. In the event of an approval, in accordance with the Council's SPD 'Planning Obligations' the application would be subject to a legal agreement covering the following:
   (i) 'Car capping; agreement;
   (ii) £150 Monitoring fee per planning obligation.

75. Subject to the completion of a Section 106 securing the planning obligations the proposal would be in accordance with Policy IMP3 of the Council's LDF Core Strategy April 2012.

Reason for Approval

76. Officers acknowledge that there are some disbenefits to the proposal. However, these do not significantly and demonstrably (para 11d NPPF) outweigh the benefits of the delivery of 7 additional housing units, the improved appearance of the existing building and creating additional residential units. It is therefore considered that on balance the benefits of the proposal outweigh those disbenefits and therefore it is recommended that the application is approved subject to conditions.

Recommendation:

Approve subject to the following conditions:

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

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
Design & Access Statement 08/08/2018
2305-LOC01 Site Location Plan 08/08/2018
PL08 Comparative Shadow Diagrams 08/08/2018
Cover Letter 08/08/2018
SURV01 Existing Site Location & Floor Plans 08/08/2018
SURV02 Existing Elevations & Section 08/08/2018
PL06-A Comparative Floor Plans 08/08/2018
PL-07-A Comparative Elevations 08/08/2018
PL01-B Proposed Floor Plans 04/10/2018
PL02-B Proposed Block & Roof Plans & Schedule of Accommodation 04/10/2018
PL03-B Proposed Front & Side Elevations 04/10/2018
PL04-A Proposed Rear & Side Elevations 04/10/2018
PL05-A Proposed Landscape Plan & Bin Store Details 04/10/2018

Reason: For avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3 Full details of the materials, colour and texture of the external finish of the building shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to above ground works and the development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved finishes.

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

4 No demolition or development shall take place until a written scheme of investigation (W.S.I.) has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. For land that is included within the W.S.I., no demolition or development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed W.S.I., which shall include the statement of significance and research objectives, and A. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works B. The programme for post-investigation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication & dissemination and deposition of resulting material. This part of the condition shall not be discharged until these elements have been fulfilled in accordance with the programme set out in the W.S.I.

These details are required prior to commencement of development because the relevant works would take place at the beginning of the construction.
Reason: To ensure a satisfactory completion of the development in accordance with Policy DM10 (Design Requirements for New Developments including House Extensions) of the LDF Core Strategy Adopted April 2012.

5 By the time the development hereby permitted is substantially complete, pedestrian/vehicular intervisibility splays of 2.8m x 3.3m shall have been provided in each direction where the access meets the back edge of footway, and shall be permanently retained free from any obstruction to visibility higher than 1.0m above ground level.

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

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

(a) Provision for loading/unloading materials.
(b) Storage of plant, materials and operatives vehicles.
(c) Temporary site access.
(d) Signing system for works traffic.
(e) Measures for the laying of dust, suppression of noise and abatement of other nuisance arising from development works.
(f) Location of all ancillary site buildings.
(g) Measures to protect any tree, shrubbery and other landscape features to be retained on the site during the course of development.
(h) Means of enclosure of the site.
(i) Wheel washing equipment.
(j) The parking of vehicles of the site operatives and visitors
(k) The erection and maintenance of security hoarding.

These details are required prior to commencement of development because the relevant works would take place at the beginning of the construction.

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

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

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

9 The flat roof part of the extension hereby permitted shall not be converted or used as a balcony or a sitting out area, and no access shall be gained except for maintenance purposes.

Reason: To protect the amenities and privacy of the adjoining residential properties in accordance with Policy DM10 (Design Requirements for New Developments including House Extensions) of the LDF Core Strategy Adopted April 2012.

10 Refuse storage facilities and recycling facilities shall be provided prior to the occupation of the development hereby permitted in accordance with details which shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development, such facilities to be permanently retained at the site.

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

11 No part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied until evidence has been submitted to the council confirming that the development has achieved not less than the CO2 reductions (ENE1), internal water usage (WAT1) standards equivalent to Code for Sustainable Homes level 4. Evidence requirements are detailed in the "Schedule of evidence Required for Post Construction Stage from Ene1 & Wat1 of the Code for Sustainable Homes Technical Guide. Evidence to demonstrate a 19% reduction compared to 2013 part L regulations and internal water usage rates of 105l/p/ day must be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, unless otherwise agreed in writing.

Reason: In the interests of sustainability and energy conservation in accordance with Policies 5.2 (Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions) and 5.3 (Sustainable Design & Construction) of the London Plan (July 2011) and Policy DM1 (Sustainable Design and Construction Standards) of the LDF Core Strategy Adopted April 2012.
12 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting this Order) no windows or other openings (other than those hereby approved) shall be formed in the side elevations at first floor and above of the extensions hereby approved without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenities and privacy of the occupiers of the adjoining residential properties in accordance with Policy DM10 (Design Requirements for New Developments including House Extensions) of the LDF Core Strategy Adopted April 2012.

13 Fences, walls or other means of enclosure shall be erected along the boundaries of the site (and individual plots) prior to the occupation of the dwelling to which they relate, in accordance with details which shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall thereafter be permanently retained.

Reason: In order to ensure the privacy of adjoining occupiers and visual amenity of the area is retained in accordance with Policy DM10 (Design Requirements for New Developments including House Extensions) of the LDF Core Strategy Adopted April 2012.

14 Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order, 2015 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting this Order) no extensions (including porches or dormer windows) to the dwelling houses or buildings shall be erected within the curtilage.

Reason: To safeguard the privacy and amenity of adjoining occupiers, maintain adequate amenity space and safeguard the cohesive appearance of the development in accordance with Policy DM10 (Design Requirements for New Developments including House Extensions) of the LDF Core Strategy Adopted April 2012.

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

Reason: To ensure the provision of adequate off-street parking accommodation and to avoid the congestion of surrounding roads by parked vehicles in accordance with Policy DM10 (Design Requirements for New Developments including House Extensions) of the LDF Core Strategy Adopted April 2012.
The proposed windows in the east and west side facing elevations at first floor and above, shall be constructed so that no part of the framework less than 1.7m above finished floor level shall be openable. Any part below that level shall be fitted with, and retained in, obscure glazing of a patterned type only which shall thereafter be retained as such.

Reason: To protect the amenities and privacy of the occupiers of the adjoining residential properties in accordance with Policy DM10 (Design Requirements for New Developments including House Extensions) of the LDF Core Strategy Adopted April 2012.
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Prior to occupation of units 5 and 6, details of privacy screening on the west side of the terrace of no.5 and the east side of the terrace of no.6 shall be submitted to, approved in writing, erected and thereafter be retained and maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenities and privacy of the occupiers of the adjoining residential properties in accordance with Policy DM10 (Design Requirements for New Developments including House Extensions) of the LDF Core Strategy Adopted April 2012.

Informatives

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 or our statutory policies in the Core Strategy, Supplementary Planning Documents, Planning Briefs and other informal written guidance, as well as offering a full pre-application advice service, in order to ensure that the applicant has been given every opportunity to submit an application which is likely to be considered favourably.

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

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

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

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

6 The development approved by this planning permission will be liable to pay the Mayor of London’s Community Infrastructure Levy (MCIL). We have calculated the amount of MCIL liability to be £35 per square metre and Kingston CIL to be £210 per square metre. Payment will be due once the owner/developer serves a development Commencement Notice on the Council, and a payment Demand Notice has been received by the owner. Failure to submit a Commencement Notice will incur a surcharge of 20% of the chargeable amount or £2,500, whichever is the lower amount. When you have discharged all pre-commencement conditions the Council will issue a Liability Notice to the owner setting out the MCIL calculation. Accompanying the Liability Notice will be a blank Commencement Notice and if necessary a blank Assumption of Liability form, both of which need to be completed and returned to the Council prior to development commencing. A failure to do so will incur a surcharge. Should you have any questions in respect of the contents of this letter or the MCIL more generally, please contact the Council’s Contact Centre by email mcil@rbk.kingston.gov.uk or phone 0208 547 5002.

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

8 The written scheme of investigation will need to be prepared and implemented by a suitably qualified professionally accredited archaeological practice in accordance with Historic England’s Guidelines for Archaeological Projects in Greater London. This condition is exempt from deemed discharge under schedule 6 of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.
Maldens and Coombe Neighbourhood Committee

31 October 2018

Short Frontage Agreement for a Vehicular Crossover at 69 Burlington Road, New Malden, KT3 4LP.

Report by the Director of Communities

Call-in deadline - 5pm on Wednesday 14 November 2018

**Purpose**

To consider an applicant’s appeal against the officers’ refusal for installation of a vehicular crossover where the property frontage is less than the minimum 4.57m which is required under the Vehicle Crossover Policy.

**Recommendations**

To resolve that -

1. The report be noted;
2. A decision be made on the vehicle crossover application for No. 69 Burlington Road.

**Benefits to the Community:** Reduced demand for on street parking in the area will be offset by the reduced amount of available on street parking.

**Key Points**

A. In April 2018 planning permission has been granted for a vehicle crossover at 69 Burlington Road by the Planning Inspectorate following refusal in September 2017 and the subsequent appeal.

B. In May 2018 the resident of 69 Burlington Road applied for a vehicular crossover. The application was refused in accordance with the Council’s Vehicle Crossings Policy dated 4 November 2008 due to the front garden being 3.9m deep instead of required 4.57m. The size of the parking space is limited because of the bay window which projects into the front garden.

C. It should be noted that properties subject to planning permission must also meet the vehicle crossover criteria set out in the Vehicle Crossings Policy.

D. The Council’s Vehicle Crossings Policy dated November 2008 states that where the depth of the proposed off street parking space does not meet the acceptable 4.57m standard, then applications must be refused. However policy allows the relevant Neighbourhood Committee to scrutinise vehicle crossing decisions. On a number of occasions the Neighbourhood Committees have considered extenuating circumstances and designated individual properties, a row of properties or a whole street as being suitable for short frontage parking. This is formalised through a “short frontage agreement” signed by an applicant.

E. In september 2018 a request has been received from the owner of 69 Burlington Road for their property to be designated to allow short frontage parking. If this request is approved by the Committee, the applicant would need to enter into a “short frontage agreement” (an example is shown in Annex 2), which is registered with Local Land Charges, in order to regulate the size of vehicles being parked and
take necessary actions should the applicant, or their successor, fail to comply with its conditions.

F. Having assessed the remaining properties in the road, it is the officer’s opinion that the whole road can be designated for short frontage parking to improve our service should any further applications be received from residents of Burlington Road, subject to planning permission for individual properties and garden being not less than 3.6m. Planning permissions are required for vehicle crossovers onto a classified road, in this scenario B282 Burlington Road.

Context

1. Burlington Road is a busy Class B road located close to New Malden High Street. Opportunities for on-street parking are limited for residents due to a variety of parking restrictions and the existence of numerous vehicle crossovers.

2. One property in Burlington Road, No. 73 already has a short frontage parking permitted and a “short frontage agreement” approved by the Committee in November 2014.

3. Annex 1 provides relevant photographs. There are 9 properties in Burlington Road that currently have no vehicular crossover access: No. 45, 53, 63, 69, 71, 79, 81, 85 and 85a.

Proposal and Options

4. The options available to the Committee are as follows:

   ● To approve short frontage designation to No. 69 Burlington Road.

   ● Uphold the vehicle crossover application refusal. This will result in the vehicular crossover at 69 Burlington Road not being constructed.

   ● To approve short frontage designation for the whole of Burlington Road, subject to planning permissions being granted to individual properties and front gardens being not less than 3.6m.

Consultations

5. None

Timescale

6. If short frontage designation is approved for 69 Burlington Road, the applicant will have to sign the short frontage agreement. A sustainable hard standing would need to be constructed by the applicant within the property boundary. Once this has been approved by the authority, and the applicant has paid for the vehicular crossover then, weather permitting, it will be constructed within an eight weeks period. The development permitted by the Planning Inspectorate shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of the decision.

Resource Implications
7. Vehicle crossovers are provided on a rechargeable basis so the costs to the Council of administering these applications are recouped.

Legal Implications

8. The Highway Authority has a duty under the Highways Act 1980 to provide vehicular crossovers in accordance with any specific Council policies.

Risk Assessment

9. If there is lack of resources to carry out proactive enforcement by the Council, large vehicles may overhang the public footways and cause an obstruction.

Equalities Impact Assessment

10. This is not required, as there is no change to the policy.

Health Implications

11. Minimal

Road Network Implications

12. Proposed off street parking space would remove the traffic movements and associated congestion caused by the resident when looking for an on-street parking space. However it would reduce the available on street parking.

Environmental & Air Quality Implications

13. Minimal

Background papers: Vehicular Crossover Policy dated 4th November 2008

Author of the report
Sonny Pham - Senior Professional Engineer, sonny.pham@kingston.gov.uk
Annex 1. Burlington road photographs

Photo 1. No. 69 Burlington Road front view

Photo 2. Burlington Road general view
Annex 2. Short Frontage Agreement form

THIS AGREEMENT is made the day of , between THE MAYOR and
BURGESSES OF THE ROYAL BOROUGH OF KINGSTON UPON THAMES, Guildhall,
Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 1EU (hereinafter called "the Council") of the one part

Part A

and ................................................... and ...................................................
of ................................................... ...................................................
................................................... ...................................................

[hereinafter called "the Owner/s"] of the other part. (Please delete as appropriate where indicated by )

1. (1) This Agreement is made in pursuance of Section 16 of the Greater London Council (General Powers Act) 1974.

(2) The Owner/s own/s the freehold/leasehold of the property ("the Owner's Property") (known as, and/or numbered) 00 and adjoining on to ............

(3) ........... is a publicly maintained highway for which the Council is the highway authority under the Highways Act 1980.

(4) The Owner/s has/has/have/have requested the Council to undertake works to strengthen the footway or verge ("vehicle crossing") between the said publicly maintained highway and the Owner's Property in return for which the Owner has agreed to observe and perform the agreements and undertakings in connection with the Owner's Property and contained in Clause 2 of this Agreement.

2. The Owner/s HEREBY (jointly and severally) agree/s and undertake/s, so as to bind not only himself/herself/themselves but also his/her/their successors in title to the Owner's Property and any person claiming through or under them, as follows:-

(1) Not to park any motorised vehicle, on the Owner's Property, of such size as to overhang any part of the publicly maintained highway.

(2) Not to drive any vehicle to or from the Owner's Property over any part of the footway or verge other than wholly within the constructed vehicle crossing.

(3) In the course of using the vehicle crossing, not to obstruct or damage the publicly maintained highway (footway, verge) abutting or adjacent to the Owner's Property nor to cause any nuisance, annoyance or inconvenience to any users of the said publicly maintained highway.
3. The Owner/s which for the purposes of this clause includes his/her/their successors in title to the Owner's Property and any person claiming through or under them HEREBY (jointly and severally) agree/s that, should evidence be produced by the Council to show any of the terms of this Agreement are not being complied with, the Council shall serve notice on the Owner/s giving him/her/them not less than 28 days to comply with the terms of this Agreement. During this period of 28 days, the Owner can make written representations to the Service Manager (Highway Assets) for consideration, on the basis that there has been no breach of the terms of the Agreement. The matter will be considered by the Service Managers for Highway Assets and Street Scene, whose decision shall be final on the matter.

If there are no representations within the period set out above, or there are and the decision on consideration of the representations is that there is a breach of the Agreement, the Council will be empowered to carry out works to physically prevent the use of the vehicle crossing by vehicles at the Owner/s expense.

IN WITNESS whereof the Council has hereunto affixed its Common Seal and the Owner/s has/have signed this instrument as his/her/their deed the day and year first before written.

THE COMMON SEAL OF THE MAYOR
AND BURGESSES OF THE ROYAL
BOROUGH OF KINGSTON UPON
THAMES was hereunto affixed
in the presence of:-

Mayor

Corporate Solicitor

Part B

SIGNED SEALED AND DELIVERED )
by the said ) Signed
(.................................)
Signed
(.................................)
(Signed full name/s in capitals)

Address

in the presence of:- ) Signed
(.................................)
(Signed full name in capitals)

Address of witness: 

.................................
Purpose
This report outlines the outcome of a public consultation on proposed width restrictions in the above roads.

Recommendations
To Resolve that -
1. the results of the consultation are noted, across both Kingston Town and Maldens and Coombe Neighbourhood Committees;
2. given that the response rate is low, and for the reasons explained in paragraphs B and C, no further action is taken on the proposals for Crescent Road and Queen's Road; and
3. The Committee's decision is fed back to the Residents Working Group.

Key Points
A. Following direction by the Maldens and Coombe Neighbourhood Committee on the 17 January 2018 and at the Kingston Neighbourhood Committee on 24 January 2018, a local consultation was conducted on proposed width restrictions at Crescent Road and Queen's Road. The purpose of the consultation was to consider proposals to reduce the number of heavy good vehicles using residential roads and subsequent traffic congestion.

B. Whilst it is understood that a review of Neighbourhood Engagement is being undertaken, at present the Maldens and Coombe Neighbourhood require consultations to achieve a response rate of 40% before any further action is taken. It is understood that this threshold was put in place as guidance, and to encourage full engagement with residents as part of the consultation process.

C. Irrespective of the current threshold in place, officers consider that the 10% response rate achieved does not provide a significant indication of public support, or opposition, especially given that the proposed measures would impact on a much larger proportion of the local area than have engaged in the consultation exercise. On this basis, officers do not believe the measures offer value for money and do not offer significant community benefit.
**Context**

1. As stated above, the Kingston Neighbourhood Committee and the Maldens and Coombe Neighbourhood Committees previously considered the request from petitioners to urgently calm and limit traffic using the upper part (eastern section) of Kings Road, between Park Road and Queens Road.

2. When considering options to address these matters, it was agreed by both Neighbourhood Committees that a consultation would be carried out to gauge support for the introduction of two width restrictions, at Crescent Road and at Queen’s Road. It was clarified that each width restriction would only restrict the access for HGV’s.

3. The consultation was widely distributed, and as such, it is likely that roads, where there is a significantly low response rate, may have not considered that this was a matter that concerned them.

**Proposal and Options**

4. Following discussions with the residents’ working group, two locations were identified as sites that might benefit from the proposals as shown at Annex 1. The plans developed for the public consultation were based on the residents’ concerns, but have been reviewed by officers from a technical perspective and site observations.

   **Location 1:** Width restriction in Queens Road (outside Sunniglade Court)- the width restrictions will only restrict access to Heavy Goods Vehicles on the ‘in’ coming side of the road. A 17.5m extension of double yellow lines will be applied along the frontage of 1-6 Sunningdale Court to prevent obstruction to the width restriction proposals. This will result in losing three or four car parking spaces. You can see this in more detail on the attached plan.

   **Location 2:** Width restriction in Crescent Road (outside 72 Crescent Road)- the width restriction will only restrict Heavy Goods Vehicles on the ‘in’ coming side of the road. A 15m extension of double yellow lines will be applied along the frontage of 68-70 Crescent Road. This will result in the loss of three shared use bays. You can see this in more detail on the attached plan.

**Consultations**

5. 1433 consultation letters were delivered, so far 136 responses have been received (9% response rate), and the results are set out below. The results of the consultation on a road by road basis can be found at Annex 2. The closing date for the consultation/returned responses was 21 October 2018, and as this is after the date for the preparation of the final Committee Report, the most up to date results will be submitted as late material.
1. Q1: Do you feel there is a problem with heavy goods vehicles accessing your road?

Yes □ 75  
No □ 60

2. Q2: If you answered yes to question 1, would you support a width restriction in Queens Road restricting heavy goods vehicles on the incoming side of the road? Please refer to plan.

Yes □ 65  
No □ 33

3. Q3: If you answered yes to question 1, would you support a width restriction in Crescent Road restricting heavy goods vehicles on the incoming side of the road? Please refer to plan.

Yes □ 66  
No □ 30

4. If you answered yes to question 1 (you agree there is a problem in your road), but you said ‘no’ to question 2 or 3, could you please tell us why?

Some of the comments received:

- This proposal will just shift all heavy goods vehicles down to adjoining such as ours.
- Refuse lorries?
- We think the proposals will course more congestion due to restricting access for larger vehicles to the riding stables and refuse collection, also it appears that it will force larger vehicles into surrounding side streets.
- We would not be in favour of the reduction of parking spaces as they are already under pressure in Queens Road and Crescent Road.
- This is in an Excellent idea.
- This is congestion top of Crescent Road and Kingston Hill No right turn between 8-4?
- No decision should be made until the Kings Road issue has been resolved. worry that a HGV will come into the garden.
- I’m concerned that position in Queens Road will result in HGV’s turning in Queens Road.
- Make sure they don’t become choke points for cycles in conflict with cars. HGV’s are only a small part of the problem. The volume of traffic needs to be
● If restrictions are introduced there should be 2 as 1 would serve to direct traffic to the alternate route.

● We rarely see HGV's in Crescent and Queens Road we are already narrow and constricted.

● The scheme is not necessary.

● Emergency services could not pass and parking will be lost.

● It will lead to traffic build up in both Liverpool/Queens Road/Richmond Park during rush hours.

● The restrictions will slow everyone down and will create traffic chaos.

● The bigger issue is speed in general on Queens Road.

● The is a waste of money there is no problem.

For more details please see Annex 3.

5. Whilst it can be seen from the responses above to questions 1 to 3, the response rate to the consultation is below that set, and currently in place, for the Maldens and Coombe Neighbourhood Committee. As both of the proposed width restrictions are in, or partly in the Maldens and Coombe Neighbourhood, it is considered that the recommendation is that there should be no further action taken on this matter.

Timescale

6. Given the recommendations above, it is proposed that no further action is taken and as such no forward timetable is required.

Resource Implications

7. Given the recommendations above, it is proposed that no further action is taken and as such there are no resource implications with this element of any scheme.

Legal Implications

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

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

Equalities Impact Assessment

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

Network Implications

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

Environmental Implications and Air Quality

12. It is considered that all options would have a positive impact in reducing traffic congestion and remove HGV from residential roads.

Background papers -
Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee item Jan 2018;
Maldens and Coombe Neighbourhood Committee meeting Jan 2018;
Local consultation questionnaire;
The result of local consultation;
held by author/other - Younes Hamade
Author of report - Younes Hamade, Senior Professional Engineer

- None other than those referred to in this report
- OR
- List of reports/documents
## The result of the consultation by road:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road name</th>
<th>out</th>
<th>In</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tudor Road</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescent Road</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Road</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eaton drive</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool Road</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandra Road</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windmill Rise</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Road</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haygreen Close</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaumont Close</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch Gardens</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland House</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyd Close</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Road</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsnympton Estate</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathdale Close</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer Park Close</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherrywood Close</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1433</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ANNEX 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Officers Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TR1</td>
<td>Tudor Road</td>
<td>This proposal will just shift all heavy goods vehicles down to adjoining such as ours.</td>
<td>If the proposed scheme is implemented is should result in detering HGV ‘s from entering the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR2</td>
<td></td>
<td>A one way system on Kings Road, Tudor Road and Alexandra Road with speed Humps would be preferable.</td>
<td>A one way system would result in vehicles causing congestion in Queens Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor management of Kingston Town Centre traffic and roadworks.</td>
<td>Kingston Towns roadworks are temporary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tudor Road is narrow I would not like to see a knock on effect by rerouting of HGV’s.</td>
<td>The scheme is to deter HGV’ s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR4</td>
<td></td>
<td>We need access to our roads for delivery skips etc. The section at Kings Road (between Queens Rd and Park Rd) should be allowed to use the pavement for 2 wheels as they do further down Kings Road. Also Tudor Road and New Road require speed humps ASAP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR1</td>
<td>Crescent Road</td>
<td>What about Refuse lorries?</td>
<td>Refuse lorries will be unaffected as they like emergency vehicles can pass on the unrestricted side of the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR2</td>
<td></td>
<td>We think the proposals will course more congestion due to restricting access for larger vehicles to the riding</td>
<td>Access for essential services and delivery vehicles would be unaffected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>stables and refuse collection, also it appears that it will force larger vehicles into surrounding side streets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR3</td>
<td>We would not be in favour of the reduction of parking spaces as they are already under pressure. Parking spaces would be reduced only where the restrictions are placed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking spaces would be reduced only where the restrictions are placed. In Queens Road and Crescent Road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR3</td>
<td>If you restrict Queens Road all traffic will go down Crescent Road which wouldn’t cope. Make restriction 7.5 as family cars are more than 7ft.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The restriction will stay at 7ft any more than that HGV’s could gain access.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR4</td>
<td>All these roads should be 20mph not 30mph to reduce accidents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR5</td>
<td>This is an excellent idea.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR6</td>
<td>The only problem with HGV’s is at Queens Road /Kings Road junction this would be helped by better signage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR7</td>
<td>The nature of the traffic in Crescent Road is affected by the steep gradient in the upper part.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR8</td>
<td>The issue on our road is with speeding cars and not really HGV. I have seen 4 accidents in the last 4 months.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR1</td>
<td>Everyday there is some sort of incident regarding heavy goods vehicles. My garden is not safe to use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR1</td>
<td>The scheme will deter HGV’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR2</td>
<td>This is congestion top of Crescent Road and Kingston Hill No right turn between 8-4?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR3</td>
<td>No decision should be made until Kings Road issue has been resolved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR3</td>
<td>This is ongoing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR3</td>
<td>This is congestion top of Crescent Road and Kingston Hill No right turn between 8-4?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR4</td>
<td>All these roads should be 20mph not 30mph to reduce accidents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR5</td>
<td>This is an excellent idea.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR6</td>
<td>The only problem with HGV’s is at Queens Road /Kings Road junction this would be helped by better signage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR7</td>
<td>The nature of the traffic in Crescent Road is affected by the steep gradient in the upper part.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR8</td>
<td>The issue on our road is with speeding cars and not really HGV. I have seen 4 accidents in the last 4 months.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR1</td>
<td>Everyday there is some sort of incident regarding heavy goods vehicles. My garden is not safe to use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR1</td>
<td>The scheme will deter HGV’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR2</td>
<td>This is congestion top of Crescent Road and Kingston Hill No right turn between 8-4?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR3</td>
<td>No decision should be made until Kings Road issue has been resolved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR3</td>
<td>This is ongoing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR4</td>
<td>Worry that a HGV will come into the garden.</td>
<td>The scheme will deter HGV's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR5</td>
<td>I am concerned that position in Queens Road will result in HGV's turning in Queens Road.</td>
<td>There will be signage warning of the width restriction before they enter the road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR6</td>
<td>Kings Road between Queens Road and Park Road needs to be one way.</td>
<td>No proposals for this idea at present. A consultation would be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR7</td>
<td>The real problem for us in Queens Road/Kings Road is the amount of traffic passing in both directions make it one way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR1</td>
<td>Queens Road I actually think a speed reduction would be better. HGV'S do not speed cars do.</td>
<td>Not part of the consultation but may be looked into.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR2</td>
<td>Make sure they don’t become choke points for cycles in conflict with cars.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR3</td>
<td>HGV's are only a small part of the problem. Volume of traffic needs to be reduced.</td>
<td>This proposal will not address this issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR4</td>
<td>Do not want to lose any parking spaces.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR5</td>
<td>There are not enough parking bays in this area we cannot afford to lose any.</td>
<td>The proposal would result in some parking lose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR6</td>
<td>If restrictions are introduced there should be 2 as 1 would serve to direct traffic to the alternate route.</td>
<td>This is preferable depends on residents decision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR6</td>
<td>The problem on my road is not HGVaccessing but pedestrian crossing at the Kingston Hill/Queens Road intersection.</td>
<td>The crossing is not part of the consultation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR7</td>
<td>A width restriction on one side is pointless. We have a weight restrictions already on Queens Road. Put better signage up.</td>
<td>Cannot restrict both sides of the road due to access for emergency vehicles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR8</td>
<td>Not at the expense of sending traffic down other roads where the schools are. Need a holistic solution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR9</td>
<td>I would also be in favour of speed humps in Queens Road as we have a problem with speeding vehicles on the road.</td>
<td>Speed humps may be discussed after the consultation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR10</td>
<td>I believe width restriction measures in Queens Road will increase congestion which is currently a problem. It will worsen the existing traffic situation.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED1</td>
<td>Eaton Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We rarely see HGV's in Crescent and Queens Road we are already narrow and constricted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED2</td>
<td>This will only push traffic into surrounding roads.</td>
<td>The scheme will deter HGV's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED3</td>
<td>The scheme is not necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED4</td>
<td>Any scheme that reduces parking is to deplored.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED5</td>
<td>Emergency services could not pass and parking will be lost.</td>
<td>Emergency Vehicles will not be affected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED6</td>
<td>There are no HGV's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED7</td>
<td>HGV access is necessary from time to time. This proposal is a waste of money the problem doesn’t exist.</td>
<td>Delivery vehicles will still be able to access.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED8</td>
<td>Note that Eaton Drive is a private Road - a dead end with no through traffic. Our problem is vehicles from elsewhere parking here.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR1</td>
<td>Liverpool Road More bigger speed humps as Liverpool Road is used as a cut through.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR3</td>
<td>It will lead to traffic build up in both Liverpool/Queens Road/Richmond Park during rush hours.</td>
<td>This proposal will not reduce traffic but may deter vehicles from using the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR2</td>
<td>The restrictions will slow everyone down and will create traffic chaos.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR3</td>
<td>If blocking these 2 roads on the way in only, have you thought about bin lorries which will be too wide, but also lorries used by moving companies. These roads are also used by ambulances to and from the Kingston Hill Hospital. The real problem is Kings Road between Park Road and Queens Road. Through those restrictions the problem would be worse.</td>
<td>Delivery vehicles will still be able to access.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC 1</td>
<td>Haygreen Close There is nothing wrong with the road. The lorries are only Thames Water and other utilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC1</td>
<td>Beaumont Close I would like speed bumps along Crescent Road.</td>
<td>Not part of the consultation but may be looked into.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH1</td>
<td>Cumberland House we have never seen a problem with speeding vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDC1</td>
<td>Boyd Close The bigger issue is speed in general on Queens Road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDC2</td>
<td>We would be happy if this plan was implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BCD3</strong></td>
<td>Sould have happened long ago</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Supporting data needed (e.g. frequency of HGVs over time, size/type of vehicle, etc.) to make best decision. *What constitute &quot;HGV&quot; type? e.g. width, max load, etc. Need to determine what vehicles will be restricted (e.g. refuse fire engines, builders' lorries, crane lorries, etc.). *By what route will restricted vehicles make goods delivery/service? Plans suggests side roads which will be used, to the detriment of of those residents. *If large vehicles replaced by smaller ones, likely increase of delivery costs? *OVERALL: in trying to solve one problem, will we create others? Not many HGVs observed on this section, main issue is that we have had a lot of construction/conversion projects with resulting increased parking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BCD4</strong></td>
<td>Noted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NW1</strong></td>
<td>New Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The building projects in Tudor Park and Crescent Roads will end in January 2018 so fewer HGV's will be around.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NW2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The plan would cause chaos with vehicles tailing back across Kingston Hill junction plus extra noise and pollution. This proposal will not reduce traffic but wont hinder it either.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>20mph restriction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1</td>
<td>Windmill Rise</td>
<td>This is a waste of money we do not need anymore obstacles on Queens Road or Crescent RD, sort out Kings Rd first.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPC1</td>
<td>Deer Park Close</td>
<td>We cant afford to lose parking spaces there arent enough already however I do think there is an issue with speed and 7 Parking spaces overall will be lost to accomodate the width restrictions.</td>
<td>Not part of the consultation but may be looked into.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPC2</td>
<td>Weekly refuse removal trucks need access and delivery vehicles as well as bulders trucks need access to all residents.</td>
<td>Delivery vehicles will still be able to access.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
South of the Borough Neighbourhood Committee - 18 October 2018
Maldens & Coombe Neighbourhood Committee - 31 October 2018
Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee - 1 November 2018
Surbiton Neighbourhood Committee - 6 November 2018

Neighbourhood Review
Report by the Director, Communities

Call-in deadline: N/A (this is a consultation report for decisions to be taken by full Council at its meeting on 11 December 2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To seek the views of the Committee on emerging outline proposals for the strengthening of the Council’s Neighbourhoods arrangements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation that -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Committee considers and comments upon the proposals for the strengthening of the Council’s Neighbourhood arrangements set out in Annex 1 of this report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits to the Community:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The strengthening of the role of Neighbourhoods will enable the Council’s services to better meet the needs of the local community, help ensure that the voice of the community is heard in debate on more strategic borough-wide issues and promote more active engagement with residents and other stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. The Council is currently undertaking a review in order to establish how it might strengthen its Neighbourhood arrangements. The focus of the review is on ensuring that Neighbourhood Committees have the ability to help determine local priorities; take decisions on local issues; can act as an effective means of engagement with the local community; are consulted on strategic or borough-wide issues before decisions are made at Strategic Committees, and given access to resources to help respond to local issues or priorities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. The Neighbourhoods Review complements a broader review of the Council’s constitutional structures which seeks to ensure that the governance processes are robust, efficient and flexible and to enhance clarity on responsibility for decision making.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. The presentation attached at Annex 1 sets out the areas of focus of the Neighbourhoods Review, which is intended as a framework to take the work forward and develop final proposals based on Member feedback. This includes outline proposals for Neighbourhood Committees to oversee the development of local community plans, a strengthening of the Committees consultation and engagement role, the introduction of arrangements which would provide flexibility for Neighbourhoods to determine a much broader range of issues than is presently the case where the impact is confined to a single Neighbourhood area and the devolution of certain funding streams.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. The Committee is asked to discuss and comment on the issues raised in the presentation. Questions which the Committee may particularly like to explore in its discussion include:

- How should Neighbourhood Committees carry out their dual role as decision making bodies and as a means of consulting and engaging residents?
- Should separate consultation and engagement sessions be held from decision making meetings?
- How should Community Plans be developed with input from local residents, businesses and community groups?
- What sort of decisions should be taken by Neighbourhood Committees?
- How should the views of Neighbourhood Committees be fed into decisions made by Strategic Committees?
- How should resources devolved to Neighbourhood Committees best be allocated?

E. The views of the Committee will be fed back into the review process and be used to help to shape the final proposals in respect of both the Neighbourhoods and Constitutional arrangements. Ongoing dialogue is also taking place with Neighbourhood Committee Chairs and Vice-Chairs and the detailed recommendations will be presented to the Finance & Contracts Committee on 29 November and, subsequently, to the meeting of Council on 11 December for decision.

Background papers -
Slide Deck,
Neighbourhoods Review Outline Approach October 2018

Author of report - Gary Marson, Democratic Services Team Leader, Tel, 0208 547 5021, email gary.marson@kingston.gov.uk
Neighbourhoods Review: Outline approach

October 2018
Objective

- Effective use of Neighbourhood Committees as a means of determining local priorities and bringing Council decision making, consultation and engagement closer to communities.

- Taking decisions and responding to issues at the Neighbourhood level is intended to make the Council more responsive to local priorities, opportunities and challenges.
Neighbourhoods Review - areas of focus

- **Determining local priorities** - Developing Community Plans via Neighbourhood Committees - through engagement with residents, businesses & community groups - to frame local decisions

- **Decision making at the right level** - determining which decisions made by Neighbourhood Committees and which made by Strategic Committees

- **Consultation and engagement** - Neighbourhood Committees as a means of engagement on local and Borough-wide issues

- **Resources to respond to local priorities** - Devolving resources to Neighbourhood Committees and making effective use of Community Rangers
An iterative approach

- Proposals to strengthen the role of Neighbourhood Committees will **evolve** over time
- Discussion at **Neighbourhood Committees** to develop initial proposals
- **Proposals** to Full Council on 11 December
- Keep proposals **under review** to consider what works in practice and amend accordingly
- Links to **Constitution Review**
Determining local priorities - Community Plans

- Each Neighbourhood Committee to oversee the development of a Community Plan
- Plans used to determine local priorities and provide a framework to guide local decision making and resource allocation
- Linked to wider Council priorities and objectives
- Developed via consultation and engagement led by Neighbourhood Committees
- Each Committee to determine how best to develop their Plans
Decision making by Neighbourhood Committees

- Constitution Review looking at which decisions should be made by Neighbourhood Committees and which by Strategic Committees.
- Developing **Terms of Reference** for Neighbourhood Committees to strengthen *consultative role* and refer decisions which affect a *specific Neighbourhood* to the relevant Neighbourhood Committee.
- Constitution Review reporting to **Finance & Contract Management Committee** - Constitution Review and Neighbourhoods Review working closely together.
Decision making by Neighbourhood Committees

- Current ToR for Neighbourhood Committees very detailed
- Not possible to define all matters which might arise that are suitable for decision at Neighbourhood Committee
- Alternative approach to define general principles of the kinds of decision which should be considered at Neighbourhoods, based perhaps around geographical coverage, scope and impact
- Likely to broaden the range of issues brought to Neighbourhoods for decision
- Thresholds could be set to establish boundaries between matters delegated to Officers and those decided at Committee
Local consultation and engagement

- Currently, Neighbourhood Committees meet 5 times a year as decision making Committees

- Exploring two functions of Neighbourhood meetings: 1) Formal decision making Committees; and 2) Consultation and engagement sessions

- As well as taking decisions, they should be a means of consulting Ward Councillors and residents to consider local perspectives before decisions made at Strategic Committees or Full Council

- Scope within the existing constitution to do this

- Each Neighbourhood Committee to determine how best to carry out the two functions - separate consultation meetings?
Examples of local consultation and engagement

- Examples of the type of issue that might be considered at Neighbourhood consultation sessions before agreement at Strategic Committee or Full Council:
  - Borough-wide Council strategies relating to a range of portfolio areas such as growth and economic development; Environment; culture; health; children and young people
  - Local priorities as part of strategic highways schemes (e.g. LIP)
  - Major planning and regeneration schemes
Devolving resources to Neighbourhoods

- Looking at three funding streams to provide resources to Neighbourhood Committees to respond to local priorities:
  - Proportion of Community Infrastructure Levy (15% of Borough total) - for use on environmental and infrastructure priorities
  - Ward Councillor budgets
  - Small Grants

- Proposals being developed to determine how resources should be allocated by Neighbourhood Committees - linked to priorities in Community Plans.
- Looking at how best to use Community Rangers as a means of responding quickly to local issues
Areas for discussion

- How should Neighbourhood Committees carry out their dual role as decision making bodies and as a means of consulting and engaging residents?
- Should separate consultation and engagement sessions be held from decision making meetings?
- How should Community Plans be developed with input from local residents, businesses and community groups?
- What sort of decisions should be taken by Neighbourhood Committees?
- How should the views of Neighbourhood Committees be fed into decisions made by Strategic Committees?
- How should resources devolved to Neighbourhood Committees best be allocated?
Timetable and next steps

● **Oct/Nov** - Discussion on approach at Neighbourhood Committees
  - **18 Oct** - South of the Borough
  - **31 Oct** - Maldens & Coombe
  - **1 Nov** - Kingston Town
  - **6 Nov** - Surbiton

● **29 Nov** - Constitution Review & Neighbourhoods proposals to Finance & Contract Management Committee

● **11 Dec** - Final report to Full Council
Appointment of representative onto the Henry Smith’s Charity

Purpose
To appoint a Neighbourhood Committee representative onto the Henry Smith’s Charity for a 5 year term of office.

Recommendations
To Resolve that former Councillor David Fraser be appointed as Neighbourhood representative to the Henry Smith’s Charity for a 5 year term of office (2018 to 2023) (The trustee does not need to be an Elected Member.)

Henry Smith’s Charity

1. The Council appoints two trustees to help administer local endowments from The Henry Smith’s Charity and distribute funds. Although nationally The Henry Smith Charity is a large charity (www.henrysmiticharity.org.uk/), locally it has around just £2,500 to distribute, for which there are 4 trustees (the other two trustees having originally been Elmbridge Councillors). This small charity meets annually to consider its income and how to distribute its funds, mainly to elderly people in Parishes specified by the Charity.

2. Trustee appointments are limited to five years and do not need to be elected Members. This Neighbourhood Committee can appoint a trustee representing the ‘Parish of Old Malden’. The South of the Borough Neighbourhood Committee can appoint a representative to the ‘Parish of Long Ditton and Tolworth’ and former Councillor Andrew Day was appointed to this role in June 2014 for a 5 year period expiring in June 2019.

Background documents held by the author of the report, Sam Nicholls, Democratic Services, tel 020 8547 5533 sam.nicholls@kingston.gov.uk
**LIP Schemes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A2043 Malden Road (South La to Boro Boundary)</td>
<td>Crossing by Plough Green School - Detailed design approved by Residents Ctte on 13 Sept. Scheme Submission with TfL for Signals design. Detailed civils design being and liaison with TfL being progressed by D&amp;D. SSZ Sign plates are installed but the flashing units will take longer and we are waiting for an update on UKPN programme for power supplies. Bus Priority - Feasibility report from TfL consultant is being reviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malden Manor Area (Phase 2)</td>
<td>Interim parking control scheme for Malden Manor with contractor but on hold pending further resident engagement. Installation of new bus shelters Completed. Parochial School have not responded to several meeting requests to discuss parking issues around the school, their staff arrangements and their travel plan. The commission for feasibility on long term proposals is still to be agreed with the Neighbourhood Committee and ward councillors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buxton Drive &amp; Woodside Road - 20mph Zones</td>
<td>Updated speed &amp; volume data has been collected and will be reviewed as soon as resources are available. Public consultation process and extents to be agreed with Ward Councillors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lane (Shopping Parade) - Urban Realm, Parking &amp; Loading Proposals - Detailed Design &amp; Implementation</td>
<td>Post construction snagging almost complete and final accounts to be signed off as soon as electrical connections confirmed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowness Crescent (Robin Hood School) - School Safety Zone Improvements - Detailed Design &amp; Implementation</td>
<td>Stage 1 report rec’d from WSP and has been reviewed. Programme for Stage 2 feasibility is yet to be determined but it is likely to be next financial year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painters Estate Area - Traffic Management (Reduction of Through Traffic) - Consultation, Detailed Design &amp; Implementation</td>
<td>Public meeting (20 March) Identified options for further public engagement. The Commission and Process to be followed for this scheme (possible inclusion of Malden Manor scheme also) still to be agreed. Waiting restrictions at all junctions reported by contractor as complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malden Green Avenue - 20mph Speed Limit Proposals - Detailed Design &amp; Implementation</td>
<td>Proposals approved by resident committee. Detailed design plans completed by D&amp;D. As indicated in the report to neighbourhood committee in March 2017 the proposals will require the installation of speed cushions on Broadmead Avenue. The committee agreed that details would be discussed with councillors prior to engaging with local residents on the detailed scheme. S&amp;C currently preparing documents and process details following confirmation of new public engagement procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galsworthy Rd by Hospital - Upgrade of Existing Zebra to Pedex (Signal) Crossing - Detailed Design &amp; Implementation</td>
<td>Recommendation to upgrade to a Pelican (PEDEX) agreed with TfL subject to a design and impact assessment, which we are currently discussing with TfL. D&amp;D currently finalising detailed design however there are issues around changes to London Buses use of the northbound stop, location of the crossing and blue badge holders parking on the northbound approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coombe Lane West From Traps Lane to A3 - Review of Pedestrian Facilities - Detailed Design</td>
<td>Recommendations to Committee on 17 Jan agreed. S&amp;C waiting on a response from TfL on proposal to investigate Pedex Crossings near the bus stops and at the part-time signals by Warbank Lane. D&amp;D to be commissioned to do detailed design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B283 Coombe Road - Feasibility, Detailed Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>Lime Grove Zebra - Works complete but comments about safety issues being investigated &amp; Stage 3 Audit to be ordered. Extension of 20mph Zone - Resident information letter was sent to Cllrs for comments in June and will circulated before installation however we are reviewing the timing of this due to the recent fatality by the Royal Oak. Healthy Streets Audit - WSP commissioned to do feasibility Study in January, report has been received this week and is being reviewed by S&amp;C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B282 Burlington Road - Traffic Management, Parking, Pedestrian Access &amp; Safety Proposals - Feasibility &amp; Detailed Design</td>
<td>Design &amp; Delivery has been commissioned to undertake detailed design on selected elements from Consultants’ “Stage 1” feasibility report, with the addition of reviewing the layout of the highway adjacent to the road closure on Walton Avenue and improving parking opportunities at the west end of Burlington road (near Vets). Proposed options to target funding under TfL’s Healthy Streets Initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Malden High St / Blagdon Rd Junction - Review of Signal Timings (R Turn ban Removal) - Feasibility</td>
<td>Issue to be revisited with ward councillors, to assess if this is still considered to be a priority.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TFL report assessing impact of options on the network has been received. Preferred option to be
determined and will require further discussion with TfL to review the likely impact on the road network.

Details to be added when scope and programme have been agreed.

### S106 Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coombe Lane West / Traps Lane Junction - Safety Improvement Proposals -</td>
<td>D&amp;D to investigate redesign of proposed traffic island to accomodate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed Design &amp; Implementation</td>
<td>right turn from western access of house No. 150.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B283 Coombe Lane at Former Shell Station Site - Traffic Management, Parking,</td>
<td>Proposals associated with the S106 agreement are to be developed in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Access &amp; Safety Proposals - Design &amp; Construct</td>
<td>conjunction with the LIP Corridor project for Coombe Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction has started and officer will review terms of S106 to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>confirm when developer payments are due. Any works to be linked to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other remaining works on Coombe Road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RBK Neighbourhood Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cavendish Road Homezone - Review of Signs, Markings &amp; Restrictions - Detailed</td>
<td>Officers aware of ongoing parking, traffic management and crossover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Implementation</td>
<td>issues. However no current budget to investigate/progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Road Area PPAs - Feasibility &amp; Consultation</td>
<td>Scope &amp; Programme to be determined. Possible S106 funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elm Road, 20mph Zone, Signs, Markings &amp; Restrictions - Detailed Design &amp;</td>
<td>Street audit report along with comments from fire brigade have been</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>reviewed on site with councillors. Proposed changes to signs, road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>markings to the Zebra crossing and waiting restrictions being drafted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motspur Park, Traffic Speeds &amp; Existing Speed Reduction Measures - Safety</td>
<td>for discussion with Chair/Vice Chair and Ward Councillors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Requests for review of traffic management and safety on Motspur Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enquiry about traffic speeds raised by a couple of residents, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>local cycling group through the ward councillors. Scope to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>determined along with potential funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lane/Thetford Road, Mini Roundabout - Collision Investigation &amp; Road</td>
<td>Review of the existing junction in response to an enquiry from a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Study</td>
<td>resident who thinks there is a problem with northbound vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hitting the kerb on the straight ahead exit of the roundabout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preliminary assessment of street lighting commissioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blagdon Road PPA Petition- Feasibility</td>
<td>Any parking proposals need to be considered carefully, given the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>issue of displacement, safety, and accessibility. The petition is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duly noted and will be considered, however there is no Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>budget for parking controls. LIP funding cannot be used for parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>controls, so schemes would need to be funded by other means, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>those options are being investigated but it is strongly recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that the scope for permit schemes will need to cover a broader area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>than just one road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Rd PPA Petition - Feasibility</td>
<td>Any parking proposals need to be considered carefully, given the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>issue of displacement, safety, and accessibility. The petition is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duly noted and will be considered, however there is no Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>budget for parking controls. LIP funding cannot be used for parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>controls, so schemes would need to be funded by other means, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>those options are being investigated. The issues in the PPA is that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>previously there was no strong view for any specific hours of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>operation in any of the roads, and there is a concern that any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>further review will likely reinforce that position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lane / Sheephose Way, Mini Roundabout - Safety Issues Raised at SCP</td>
<td>Speed of turning vehicles and parking on approaches blocking visibility. Urgent Action - S&amp;C to draft a proposal for DYL waiting restrictions covering the rest of the Junction and 7am-7pm on South Lane approach. Wearing course at junction breaking down so may be an opportunity to implement speed reduction measures when it is resurfaced (Domed centre island or raised junction perhaps).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RBK Signs, Lines & TMO Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coombe Gardens - Waiting Restriction Amendments</td>
<td>Resident requesting removal of a short section of the new restrictions. (Note Cllr has asked officers to hold off and await further instruction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington Crescent - New Waiting Restrictions at Jewson's Site Access</td>
<td>Plan to go for Cllrs approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickerage Road at Allotment Access - New Waiting Restrictions</td>
<td>Plan to go for Cllrs approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matlock Way - New Waiting Restrictions on Inside of Bend</td>
<td>Raised during Coombe Vale ward walk before the election. Proposal to be reviewed by current ward councillors, chair and vice chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northcote Road - New Waiting Restrictions on Inside of Bend</td>
<td>Raised during Coombe Vale ward walk before the election. Proposal to be reviewed by current ward councillors, chair and vice chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence Ave J/W High Drive - New 10m Waiting restriction on Corners</td>
<td>Raised during Coombe Vale ward walk before the election. Proposal to be reviewed by current ward councillors, chair and vice chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Walk into Muybridge Rd - New Waiting Restrictions on Inside of Bend</td>
<td>Raised during Coombe Vale ward walk before the election. Proposal to be reviewed by current ward councillors, chair and vice chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matlock Way J/W Darley Drive - New 10m Waiting Restrictions on Corners</td>
<td>Raised during Coombe Vale ward walk before the election. Proposal to be reviewed by current ward councillors, chair and vice chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coombe Lane West J/W Wonford Close - Extension of Existing Waiting Restrictions to Highway Boundary</td>
<td>Raised during Coombe Vale ward walk before the election. Proposal to be reviewed by current ward councillors, chair and vice chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lane / Green Lane, Junction - New DYL Waiting Restrictions</td>
<td>Discussed with new Cllrs &amp; adjacent business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Close - Extend DYls to 10m</td>
<td>Reported as complete by contractor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilmark Gdns J/W Ancaster Cres - New 10m DYL Waiting Restrictions</td>
<td>Reported as complete by contractor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney Road J/W Rodney Close - New 10m DYL Waiting Restrictions</td>
<td>Reported as complete by contractor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montem Road - Disabled Bays by Church &amp; Library</td>
<td>Reported as complete by contractor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lime Grove by Christs Schools - Review of Problems Caused by Indiscriminate Parking &amp; Illegal Vehicle Manoeuvres</td>
<td>Start project file, dig out original committee reports and wait for ward cllrs to request a meeting to discuss. N.B. Neither School has a Travel Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Triangle (Southside) - Review operational hours/days of loading bay</td>
<td>Proposed 8.30-12noon Loading Only, max stay 30mins, no return within 2hrs. Then 12noon to 6.30 Free Parking, max stay 1hr, no return within 2hrs, to be referred for councillor approval. If agreed, draft TMO for shared use bay and send a copy to businesses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>