

Surbiton Crescent TMO-P236 Formal Objections with RBK Response

Themes	Referenced in Objection	RBK Response
<p>Traffic</p> <p>Objections to TMO</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Will increase traffic in surrounding areas including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - other nearby schools - Maple Road /Surbiton Road/Palace Road/Angelsea Road ● Will increase traffic pollution ● Cars forced to treble their journey to avoid restriction <p>Other Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Large coaches parked in the restricted area and on the yellow zig zags result in further pollution 	<p>2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18</p>	<p>Objections to TMO</p> <p>The traffic assessment shows that there has been no significant change in traffic flows in adjacent residential roads.</p> <p>Traffic that formerly used Surbiton Crescent as a through-route has largely re-assigned to Surbiton Road (A240) which, as an 'A road' on the Principal Road Network, is considered more suitable for this type of traffic. There has been some increase in traffic as expected in the northernmost section of Maple Road but, as above, this road is better suited to cater for this traffic as it is a 'B road'. The additional distance that some vehicles need to travel by not using Surbiton Crescent is not considered to be significant.</p> <p>The traffic assessment shows no significant change in overall levels of traffic and congestion and therefore there is no reason to conclude there has been any significant increase in pollution.</p> <p>Other Comments</p> <p>Coach parking, which is related to Surbiton high School, is a pre-existing issue that is not affected by the trial scheme. Coaches and buses are exempt from the restrictions.</p>
<p>Safety</p> <p>Objections to TMO</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cars doing u turns ● Crossing points in surrounding areas are inadequate and now more dangerous, especially for school children ● Hazard to cyclists on busier surrounding roads <p>Other Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Waiting coaches blocking motorist's sight lines 	<p>1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18</p>	<p>Objections to TMO</p> <p>An initial safety audit was carried out prior to the scheme being implemented, and a further road safety audit will be commissioned should the Council decide to make the scheme permanent. During the experimental period site visits have been carried out by independent consultants to assess scheme operations and safety, and no safety issues have been identified.</p> <p>The main entrance to Surbiton High School is in Surbiton Crescent where reduced traffic volumes and speeds have improved the safety of crossing points. On the two roads affected by increased traffic (Maple Road and Surbiton Road) the crossing points already have controlled 'green man' signals.</p> <p>The dissipation of traffic to other routes is not</p>

		<p>considered to have significantly increased hazards to cyclists.</p> <p>Other Comments Coach parking, which is related to Surbiton high School, is a pre-existing issue that is not affected by the trial scheme.</p>
<p>Purpose</p> <p>Objections to TMO</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not enhance the overall scheme Runs parallel to Portsmouth Road and so not required Crescent not busy with private vehicles but with buses - cyclists still have to deal with buses which are a hazard No benefits to closing the road No adjoining cycle lanes, isolated closure Purpose of scheme undermined as cyclists are still allowed to pass on either side of the restricted part of the carriageway and go through it too Cyclists are not using the road <p>Other Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Go Cycle money should be spent wisely / waste of money 	<p>2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16</p>	<p>Objections to TMO</p> <p>Surbiton Crescent is not an isolated scheme but forms a key continuous link in the Go Cycle network. Surbiton Crescent is part of both the Surbiton to Kingston route and the Kingston to Tolworth route. Surbiton Crescent also provides a link to the Portsmouth Road Go Cycle scheme. Adjacent elements of the Go Cycle are in different stages of design and construction but when completed will form continuous cycle routes between major borough destinations.</p> <p>Based on current standards for cycling, traffic levels in Surbiton Crescent were too high prior to the introduction of the trial scheme for safe cycling in comfort. Although buses continue to use Surbiton Crescent, traffic levels have halved and speeds have reduced by 15%, improving safety for cyclists.</p> <p>The layout at either end of the restricted section can be amended as part of the detailed design of a permanent scheme. However the current trial arrangements are not considered to undermine the scheme's main purpose.</p> <p>Surbiton Crescent is expected to cater for higher volumes of cyclists in the future when the surrounding network of routes is complete.</p> <p>Other Comments</p> <p>The Mayor of London's Mini-Holland initiative is a £100 million investment administered by Transport for London (TfL). In March 2014, RBK was one of three boroughs selected to receive programme funding based on its bid and business case demonstrating, inter alia, value for money. TfL has allocated £32.7 million for the RBK Mini-Holland programme. This allocation is subject to approval from TfL on a project by project basis and is solely for the delivery of the Mini-Holland programme, so cannot be used for other purposes.</p>
<p>PCN's / Fines</p> <p>Other Comments</p>	<p>2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19</p>	<p>Other Comments</p> <p>The initial level of PCNs was higher than anticipated but has rapidly reduced. The scheme is not a money-making exercise but is part of the</p>

Enclosure 1 to Annex 4

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● High number of PCN's / money making exercise ● Time wasting to have to appeal PCN's when accessing the school ● Fines shouldn't be made in a trial period ● Tribunals are not sent proper evidence - photos from cameras not suitable ● Monies collected should be returned to motorists 		<p>borough's Go Cycle programme, which supports the London Mayor's transport strategy.</p> <p>Over 5,000 warning letters were sent out prior to any PCNs being issued. There is no reason why PCNs cannot be issued for a TMO of this nature and, given the early level of contraventions, it is quite likely that it is precisely the enforcement action through PCNs that has increased compliance levels.</p> <p>While there were initial problems with some staff and visitors to Surbiton High School being issued with PCNs incorrectly, the charges were cancelled and /or refunded and operational management has improved so that the problem does not recur.</p> <p>The parking service provides appropriate information to the independent adjudication service (tribunal). The adjudicator can find against the Council if the information provided is inadequate. As a statutory body provided in law there is no reason to consider matters relating to the adjudicator as part of the TMO process.</p> <p>The justification for returning funds to motorists who have contravened the marked restrictions of a valid Traffic Management Order is not clear. If the reason is on the basis of this being a trial, to do so would clearly undermine the ability to put in place experimental and new restrictions in the future as drivers may expect any charge to be repaid.</p>
<p>Signage</p> <p>Objections to TMO</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Signs are unclear/misleading ● Lack of signage on surrounding roads ● No advance signs ● Signs too high ● Complicated signage ● Current signage (contrary to the Traffic Management Order) does not legally allow cyclists to use the road 	<p>2, 3, 5, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19</p>	<p>Objections to TMO</p> <p>All signs are in accordance with national regulations and have clear meanings as set out in the Highway Code. The signs are and have been in accordance with regulatory requirements (the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016) at all times throughout the trial closure.</p> <p>Advance warning signs have been installed on the main approaches to the restricted section of Surbiton Crescent.</p> <p>The signs in place are in accordance with the Traffic Management Order and do permit cyclists to use the road.</p> <p>A permanent scheme would allow a further review of the directional signage in the area to take place.</p>
<p>Consultation</p>	<p>2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 11, 14, 16,</p>	<p>Other Comments</p> <p>The trial was included as an information item in</p>

<p>Other Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of consultation • Lack of awareness • Lack of communication • Consultation took place over the summer • No advance warning notice received • Consultation aimed at encouraging people to cycle and about developing cycle routes, primarily gain the attention of cyclists. It is not a substitute for a full consultation aimed at and involving all road users 	<p>17, 18</p>	<p>the Surbiton to Kingston Go Cycle consultation leaflet sent to households in June-July 2016 (pre-trial). 314 people provided comments on the trial, which were then categorised into themes. Of the key themes, 99 people expressed concerns about more traffic congestion in the surrounding area, 72 expressed general support while 34 expressed general opposition.</p> <p>Formal consultation through the Experimental Traffic Management Order (TMO) process has been carried out. The Council is not obliged to carry out consultation prior to introducing an Experimental TMO. The TMO was made on 22 August 2016 with a closing date for comments of 22 February 2017. Notices were placed in the streets affected and copies delivered to interested parties.</p> <p>Feedback from the public has also been collated since the trial began. Approximately 100 items of correspondence have been received since September 2016 commenting the scheme.</p> <p>Over 5,000 warning letters were sent out prior to the issuing of PCNs. The Council is not obliged to send out a warning letter to all motorists that contravene traffic signs.</p>
<p>Access</p> <p>Objections to TMO</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Except for “Access” is not clear • Access to the school is now much more difficult & inconvenient • Unlawful to obstruct access to school? 	<p>2, 3, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18</p>	<p>Objections to TMO</p> <p>The meaning of the exemption for ‘Access’ is set out in the traffic sign regulations and the Highway Code. It means “‘Except for access to premises or land adjacent to the road, where there is no other route.”</p> <p>Access to the school and other properties in Surbiton Crescent is still permitted except from the Surbiton Road end of Surbiton Crescent. Access to the school is not therefore obstructed. There is no change to school access from the south. However, there is small increase in the journey distance for those that used to enter from Surbiton Road.</p>
<p>Existing layout</p> <p>Objections to TMO</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road is not an accident hotspot for cyclists - Surbiton Crescent does not have a poor safety record • All traffic already flows freely 	<p>4, 7, 9, 11</p>	<p>Objections to TMO</p> <p>The scheme was not introduced because Surbiton Crescent currently has a poor accident record, although the reduced traffic levels and speed in Surbiton Crescent should improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians. The scheme was introduced because Surbiton Crescent forms a key a link in the Go Cycle programme and is expected to cater for higher volumes of cyclists in</p>

Enclosure 1 to Annex 4

		the future when the surrounding network of routes is complete. Research studies (for the Department for Transport, TfL and others) consistently show people's concern over road safety is the biggest factor in discouraging more cycling.
<p>Traffic Analysis</p> <p>Other Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic analysis took place in February during half term 	4, 7, 9	<p>Other Comments</p> <p>The surveys in February 2017 were carried out in the week commencing 6th February, which was not half term week.</p>
<p>Discrimination</p> <p>Other Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discrimination as it's a private school, not state run. 	4, 7, 9	<p>Other Comments</p> <p>The proposals are not directly connected to the school but are part of the borough's Go Cycle programme of works.</p>
<p>Travelling to Kingston Town Centre</p> <p>Objections to TMO</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Negative impact on access to Kingston Town Centre Negative impact on businesses 	2, 5	<p>Objections to TMO</p> <p>Access into the town centre remains accessible from a variety of routes, including the A240, which continue to operate satisfactorily.</p> <p>The borough's Go Cycle Programme is part of the strategy to manage the expected population growth in the borough by promoting sustainable transport. As such the proposals contribute to the long term attractiveness and sustainability of Kingston town centre.</p>