

Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee

27 March 2019

King's Road

Report by Assistant Director - Transport, Highways and Regulatory Services

Call-in deadline: Tuesday 9 April 2019

Purpose

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

Recommendations

That the Committee -

1. notes the results of the consultation as set out in **Annex 2**;
2. Approves the scheme shown in **Annex 5** on an experimental basis and resolves to authorise footway parking under the provisions of Section 15 of the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1974 on the footway outside 267 / 269 Kings Road to 303 Kings Road inclusive, and between no.s 284 to 328 Kings Road inclusive; and
3. Agrees a report is brought back to the Committee after the footway parking authorised above has been in force for 6 months to assess its impact on the area.

Benefits to the Community:

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

Key Points

- A. An online petition with 42 signatures, from residents in the section of King's Road between Park Road and Queen's Road, was submitted to Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee in Spring 2017. The petition requested that the council implements significant traffic reducing measures to urgently calm and limit traffic using the upper part (eastern section) of King's Road, between Park Road and Queen's Road.
- B. The Committee, at their meeting on 22 January 2019, approved traffic management measures in King's Road area, subject to local consultation.

- C. This report outlines the results of the local consultation, and seeks members approval on the way forward.

Context

1. A Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) ban was introduced in the North Kingston Area, including King's Road in 1985. This was aimed at restricting vehicles greater than 7.5 tonnes from entering the area, albeit the restriction included an 'except for access' element.
2. In November 2006 the Committee agreed to include the section of King's Road, between Park Road and Queen's Road, in an area-wide 20mph speed limit. This was an extension of the existing Canbury 20mph zone, which already included King's Road between Richmond Road and Park Road, and was implemented in 2007.
3. A petition was received in March 2010 from residents of King's Road, between Park Road and Queen's Road. This called for a reduction in speed and congestion and stopping larger vehicles from using this section of King's Road. The petition also requested that a one-way system was introduced in the area, as the petitioners felt that King's Road was not wide enough for two way traffic. Residents also wanted speed cushions replaced with speed humps, and a width restriction installed to prevent large vehicles from turning into Queen's Road.
4. At the meeting in December 2010, Kingston Town Neighbourhood Committee considered a report on the petition issues and resolved that no changes were to be made to the traffic management arrangements in King's Road, between Park Road and Queen's Road.
5. A new online petition was commenced in February 2017, with 42 signatures from King's Road residents living in the section between Park Road and Queen's Road, asking the council to implement significant traffic reducing measures to urgently calm and limit traffic using the upper part of King's Road, between Park Road and Queen's Road.
6. On 22 January 2019 the Committee considered the outcomes of a working group meeting that had been set up to develop options. The Committee resolved to undertake a local consultation on one of the proposals developed, the details of which are set out below.

Proposals and Options

7. The following option was approved by Committee for local consultation:
 - **Option:** To make King's Road one way westbound, towards Park Road and to make New Road and Tudor Road one way eastbound, towards Queens Road. With the current traffic calming measures in Kings Road, this proposal will reduce the level of through traffic, reduce air pollution and remove congestion. However, the proposals for the other two roads are likely to increase the level of traffic and speed in these

two roads, as they have no traffic calming features. As such, it is proposed to introduce traffic calming measures to compensate for the potential issues. See **Annex 1** for more details.

- **Option 2** is to take no further action.

Consultation Results

8. In February 2019, 668 consultation letters were delivered to residents within the scope (please see **Annex 4** for the area of delivery). 179 responses have been received from the affected roads (26.8% response rate), with an additional 76 responses from residents living outside the consultation areas.
9. 102 (57%) residents within the scope think there is an issue with the current situation in King's Road, between Park Road and Queens Road. However, 63 (35.2%) do not think there is a problem in Kings Road.
10. 72 (40.2%) residents within the scope support the introduction of one-way working in Kings Road between Park Road and Queens Road, New Road, and Tudor Road, whereas 104 (58.1%) do not support the proposed one-way scheme in these roads.
11. 48 (32.2%) out of 149 properties responses received from Kings Road between Acre Road and Queens Road, for question one 46 (95.8%) out of the received agreed there is a problem in their road, 2 (4.2%) do not agree there is a problem. For question two 42 (87.5%) out of the responses received support the introduction of one-way working in Kings Road (between Park Road and Queens Road), Tudor Road and New Road, 4 (8.2%) said no, and 2 (4.2%) don't know.
12. 40 (63.5%) out of 63 properties responses received from Tudor Road. 10 (25%) agreed there is a problem in Kings Rd, 22 (55%) do not agree there is a problem, and 7 (17.5%) don't know. Out of these responses received, 1 (2.5%) supports the introduction of one-way working in Kings Road (between Park Road and Queens Road), Tudor Road and New Road, and 39 (97.5%) do not support the scheme.
13. 17 (39.5%) out of 43 properties responses received from New Road. 3 (17.6%) agreed there is a problem in Kings Rd, 10 (58.8%) do not agree there is a problem in Kings Road, and 4 (23.5%) don't know. Out of these responses received 1 (5.9%) supports the introduction of one-way working in Kings Road (between Park Road and Queens Road), Tudor Road and New Road, and 16 (94.1%) do not support the proposed scheme.

14. Overall, including responses received from residents living outside the consultation area, 67.1% think there is an issue with the current situation in King's Road between Park Road and Queens Road, whereas 27.5% do not think there is a problem in Kings Road.
15. 64.5% out of the overall responses received, support the introduction of one way working in Kings Road between Park Road and Queens Road, New Road, and Tudor Road, and 31.6% do not support the proposed one-way scheme in these roads.
16. Please see **Annex 2** for street by street results, and **Annex 3** for comments received.
17. During the consultation period, a petition was received with 173 signatures objecting to the proposed schemes:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Officer's comments

20. RBK officers do not dispute most of the information in the petitions and the comments received, and made it clear that, such a scheme will have displacement to the surrounding roads and junctions, and it is not possible to quantify these changes unless modelling for the area is carried out; such modelling will demonstrate with a value the extent of these changes. This could be be looked at if members want to proceed further with these changes.
21. Reflecting on the above result, it was expected that there is no strong support for the scheme, however, before we recommend any decision, we need to establish the reason/objective of this scheme, the options available, analyse the comments/objections received. in order to be able to make the decision on the way forward.
22. The current traffic flow in Kings Road during peak hours of 514 vehicles per hour, New Road has 116 per hour and 172 per hour in Tudor Road. It is estimated that the proposed scheme will reduce the volume of traffic in Kings Road to about 407 vehicles per hour, increase the traffic volume in New Road to about 200 vehicles per hour, and to Tudor Road to about 250 vehicles per hour during peak hours, these figures are only estimated, to get the correct figure network modeling will be needed.
23. Considering the result of the consultation, the petitions and the comments received, it is not recommended for this scheme as it stands now to be taken to the next stage for implementation, however, the issue in Kings Road between Park Road and Queens Road needs to be addressed.
24. Hence, it is recommended to consider the scheme at **Annex 5** to introduce footway parking on both sides of Kings Road, which will address the conflict between drivers and reduce congestion. The proposed scheme will reduce footway width from 2.2m to 1.7m. It is not ideal but it will accommodate the pedestrians footfall along this section of Kings Road, and the carriageway width becomes 4.8m which will allow cars to pass each other safely. This scheme will make cycling safer as well, however, this may not address the level of pollution and HGV intrusion. It is therefore proposed as a trial to establish whether the issues of concerns have been

addressed, and bring a report to a future Committee meeting outlining the outcomes of this trial. As part of this trial all poles need to be placed at the back of the footway.

Timescale

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

Resource Implications

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

Legal Implications

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

Risk Assessment

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

Equalities Impact Assessment

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

Health Implications

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

Road Network Implications

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

Environmental Implications and Air Quality

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

Background papers -

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

held by author Younes Hamade

Author of report - Younes Hamade, Senior Professional Engineer,
younes.hamade@kingston.gov.uk