

REF NR	ADDRESS	COMMENTS
KR1/KR1bis	Kings Road	<p>The road is a terrible trap. Drivers enter and get caught in traffic with no way out. Aggression between drivers is commonplace, which must cause them stress. The pollution is building, bicycles mount the pavement, and cars are damaged as people have to reverse under pressure. Our car has been scrapped, bumped and smashed over the years. That's bad for us - but the poor road users are having the same thing happen to them. The shouting and honking is getting serious. I saw cars unable to make the roundabout on kings/park road as cars were stuck higher Kings road blocking cars from entering. Above all, the road is getting dangerous and it's only a matter of time before something horrible happens. The park is Kingston's pride and we are not doing it any justice at all.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>I have a busy schedule at school so when I get home I want do homework or have peaceful sleep yet I am constantly woken up by car horns and shouting. I look out of my window and see a congested street due to a stand-off. The people get out of their cars and start shouting and swearing. My parents are always stressed by the road as our car is constantly hit. They don't like the idea of lorries hurtling down the road and cars pulling in and hitting our car.</p>
KR2/KR2bis	Kings Road	<p>Traffic on Kings road is effectively calmed by parking on both sides, which limits flow to a single lane. First objection is that a single lane in one direction will speed up traffic irrespective of speed cushions. Second objection is to the narrowing of the south side pavement because it is used by mothers with children and buggies to the park and school. A wider central roadway can only increase speed, the opposite to that intended. Third objection is against the nimbyism of certain Kings Road residents to shift the problem elsewhere. This is an old chestnut and has been ongoing for some 20 years without solution. It strikes me that these proposals place an onerous burden on Tudor Road and, the unintended consequences are likely to be more traffic in Alexandra Road past the school. A solution no right minded person would support. You conveniently leave Alexandra Road off the map and fail to mention the issue of traffic redistribution and its effect on the school. The Kings Road/Liverpool road rat-run to Kingston Hill will now become the Alexandra Road/Crescent road rat-run. In my opinion there is no satisfactory solution to traffic in Kings Road without a profound negative effect elsewhere, including Kings Road itself with a reduced width pavement. To simply shunt the problem elsewhere is morally indefensible without even mentioning where the money may be better spent.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Concern about entry to roundabout with park road where all other traffic appears to have priority by virtue of being on the roundabout. It will be extremely difficult to exit at peak times, causing traffic build-up in Kings Road thereby negating the alleged benefits. Also concerned about potentially imposing additional traffic on Alexandra Road past the schools.....not a good outcome.</p>
KR3	Kings Road	I am supportive of the move to one way. It is crucial that the traffic calming measures are adopted and monitored to keep the road safe. It would also be useful to indicate to people entering Queens road that there is limited access so that in time people use the wider roads as they should if they are not entering the park.
KR4	Kings Road	This is imperative for the safety of the road users and the residents of the road. The current traffic levels are unsustainable and the inability to safely drive down the road is causing bouts of real road rage. Cyclists are not safe in the current set up. It has to change.
KR5	Kings Road	I strongly support the proposed scheme. The problems the proposed scheme seek to address are wide ranging and acute. They are not limited to issues of through traffic, congestion and air pollution as mentioned in the description above. The problems sought to be addressed also relate to driver, bicycle and pedestrian safety, quiet enjoyment of the neighbourhood, damage to property and traffic management. The proposed scheme takes a sensible holistic approach to the issues which arise. The proposed scheme would address each of the problems. In particular, the proposed scheme would promote reduced pollution levels, increase the pleasant enjoyment of vehicle users, pedestrians and cyclists in the area. The proposed solution would enhance the traffic flow, reduce safety concerns and improve sustainable transport in the area.
KR6	Kings Road	I don't think the plans go far enough. Living in between Park Rd and Acre Rd, there are not enough traffic calming measures. Cars frequently drive far too fast and I think the one-way measures should be extended down to Acre Rd stretch of Kings Rd.
KR7	Kings Road	<p>The road has become very dangerous and polluted. There is a tremendous amount of road rage as drivers who enter get caught. When two cars meet they cannot pass. When each has other cars behind them we have mayhem. This causes greater pollution and a knock on to the surrounding roads with increased accidents for cars, bikes and potentially pedestrians.</p> <p>ADDITIONA VIA EMAIL: Having lived and brought up 3 children on kings road for 10 years the road has now become intolerable. It always was busy but it is now at full capacity. You open your door in the morning to angry drivers swearing four letter words at each other you collect the children from school again having to witness angry confrontations between motorists. The pollution has noticeably increased and I have an asthmatic child. So many pedestrians use kings road to visit the park why can't there be more trees make the whole experience much more pleasant for walkers, families, motorists, cyclists even horse riders. Kingston is growing in size more homes more cars. We all need to do our bit to keep this town a pleasant one to live in. Something has to change and I believe as our councillors it is your duty of care to our younger generation to do something about this. Thank you.</p>
KR8	Kings Road	<p>We live between Park Road and the junction of Kings Rd and Acre Rd. We have two young children and feel some traffic drives too fast in both directions on our section of King's Rd, We are unsure if the proposals will improve or worsen that situation. We would like to see improved traffic calming measures on our section. Many children are in the area due to schools and we feel traffic does need to be calmed.</p> <p>We feel one-way system operating in the opposite direction to the proposal would be beneficial for us.</p>
KR9/KR9bis	Kings Road	<p>Would really appreciate anything that would help reduce the regular visits to the garage to get scrapes fixed, the regular exposure to road rage, cars tooting their horns all day, and the overall sense that something terrible is going to happen one day.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>I think the road is noisy and dangerous. I worry about the environment and all the pollution caused by the traffic jams outside our house every day.</p>

KR10/KR10bis/KR10tris/KR10fourth	Kings Road	<p>The current situation should not be allowed to continue. The difficulty emergency services have getting down the road endangers the whole community. In addition, as the flow of traffic has increased, the confrontations between frustrated drivers who are nose to nose facing each other are becoming more and more common. At some point, there is going to be a serious incident between drivers which has been completely foreseeable. As a minor point, thousands of pounds of damage has been done to our cars as each wing has been clipped, not one incident which has been owned up to, so it is not possible to claim on the guilty party's insurance for the damage they have caused. Our house, which is part of the Conservation area, physically shakes as the heavy goods vehicles go down the road at pace. The houses were not built with lorries and the current volume of traffic in mind. Finally, stepping out onto the pavement can be pretty risky at times, as it is so often used at speed by cyclists when they cannot get down the road. I have narrowly avoided being knocked down on a number of occasions. A child or elderly person may not have been as lucky. The behaviour of the cyclists is completely understandable as they too are often involved in collisions with vehicles.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>The current road layout is not fit for purpose. Most days there are incidents where cars come face to face. Drivers are often out in the road shouting at each other and at some point there is a real risk that there will be violence. I have witnessed a number of emergency vehicles stuck unable to move. That is a risk to the whole community that they serve, not just the residents of Kings Road. Our house is in a conservation area and currently shakes when the lorries race down the road. Neither the road nor the houses were built for the current levels of traffic. Cyclists are often forced onto the pavement and stepping out onto the pavement can be pretty risky as a result. I do not blame the cyclists though, as I have seen a number clipped by the cars, particularly when the road is jammed. As the major cycle route into the Park, more should be done to protect cyclists on Kings Road. The damage that has been done to our cars by drivers trying to squeeze into spaces that are not there totals thousands of pounds.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>As I sit at my desk doing homework, I often hear terrible swearing as drivers scream at each other after blocking themselves in. My whole room shakes as well as the lorries speed down the road, which can be quite frightening at times. Crossing the road, particularly in the mornings is also quite scary as the drivers are just looking to try to get out into Queens Road and do not seem to focus on the pedestrians at all. Pollution is also very bad at times as the cars idle waiting to move. It is particularly bad as often they are idling facing each other with no way of moving. I am strongly in favour of making it one way too in order to protect the cyclists who use the road extensively in order to get into the Park. I have also seen many emergency vehicles stuck in traffic which is a huge concern for the whole community.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>The current road system does not seem adequate for the amount of traffic using it. I have seen a number of emergency services vehicles not able to move as they are penned in by cars trying to come up the hill. When I am doing school work at my desk, I often hear terrible language as drivers scream at each other. The whole house also shakes as the lorries speed down the road. Cyclists are often forced onto the pavement as the whole road is blocked. As the major route for cyclists to enter the Park, it seems strange to force them onto a road with too much traffic. The pollution for cyclists, pedestrians and residents at times seems to be very high.</p>
KR11	Kings Road	How will this proposal affect the rest of Kings Road?
KR12	Kings Road	This needs to be extended for the rest of Kings Road (Park - Acre). On-street parking not suitable for pavement use (not enough space for prams and wheelchairs). Speeding/volume of traffic also very much an issue.
KR13	Kings Road	<p>Q3: The section between Acre Rd and Park Rd of Kings Rd must be included in the one-way system. Our section has the same noise, pollution, speed and issues as Kings Rd section between Park Rd and Queens Rd.</p> <p>Q4: It is unacceptable that the section of Kings Rd from Acre to Park Rd was taken completely out of scope. There are the same serious speed and noise and particularly pollution issues. Pavement Park is a problem also.</p>
KR14	Kings Road	If implemented, we think the volume and speed of traffic on the remainder of Kings Rd needs to be assessed as traffic already regularly exceeds the 20mph speed limit.
KR15	Kings Road	I am not an expert in road traffic so feel that I cannot voice my opinion confidently. I think it should be up to a panel of experts to come up with ways to improve pollution issues, road traffic and similar issues.
KR16	Kings Road	<p>Q3: It's a good start but I think it would be better as access only. I think the current plan will result in the road having higher use of cars and more pollution. I think it is a temporary solution to a bigger problem.</p> <p>Q4: Do not remove parking. Do not allow/change to parking on the curb. I wish the Council would use this roads a bike lane only into the park. It's the featured, populated pedestrian entrance to the park.</p>
KR17	Kings Road	Further conversion plus traffic calming measures on Kings Road from Acre Road to Park Road would be of benefit to residents. Currently, too much traffic. My wing mirror on my parked car has been repeatedly knocked off plus my house shakes when a lorry comes off the speed bump, outside my house at speed.
KR18	Kings Road	Something has to be done before a fatal accident/injury caused by angry confrontation/danger to pedestrians and cyclists.
KR19/KR19bis	Kings Road	<p>Q3: Good proposals - with traffic directions well thought though.</p> <p>Great proposal, we are fed up with constant road rage - often quite aggressive shouting and swearing - also our cars are regularly damaged (scrapes, etc.).</p> <p>Q4: Please implement these proposals as soon as possible to remove the constant congestion created by the two-way road system in Kings Road. Too many vehicles trying to pass each other is too narrow a road.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>We've sent comments back by post but are filling this in to make sure you receive it. Don't trust the post. We desperately need this new scheme. Almost Every day between 730-9am there is a road rage incident as vehicles are unable to advance or reverse. Swearing, shouting, threats etc. The constant stopping of traffic flow means constant running of engines. Residents' cars are scraped regularly. It's difficult to see cyclists when pulling out of a parking space. These plans will really help everyone's quality of life - drivers AND residents.</p>

KR20/KR20bis/KR20tris	Kings Road	<p>Kings Rd has huge safety problems, due to the volume of traffic, including HGVs. Cyclists are regularly on the pavements and the road has high levels of pollution due to volume and traffic jams. It is used heavily by visitors to the park on foot and cycle being the closest entrance. RBK has a duty of care to all road uses, not just the residents. Evidence has been submitted that stands testament that RBK has to act for the many, not the few.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>The road usage by vehicles is to the point of abusive which is impacting not only the residents but other users such as cyclists and pedestrians who use upper Kings road as the obvious gateway to Richmond Park. If other local roads do not want to change then I would be happy for just upper King's road to be made one-way. It cannot stay as is.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Q3: Yes going down but ideally no through traffic. I breathe lots of fumes walking to the bus stop Q4: I can't cross usually as traffic blocks the crossing. Traffic isles waiting to get up the road right next to my bus stop. Pollution is hurting my lungs.</p>
KR21/KR21bis/KR21tris/KR21fourth	Kings Road	<p>The current amount of traffic being forced up and down Upper Kings Road is a major problem, causing (on a daily basis) congestion, pollution, physical and verbal aggression and a danger to drivers, pedestrians, cyclists and public/private property. The decision not to control traffic along Queens road will perpetuate this situation. Making Upper Kings road one way, with traffic calming measures, will help massively, as will doing the same to New Road and Tudor road. This may not be popular with all residents of the latter, but fact is, if something isn't done, all of us in all the roads leading up to the park will suffer. This is meant to be a conservation area but currently, nothing is being conserved. Quite the opposite I'd say.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>The situation is critical. Someone will be hurt if something isn't done soon. Aggression levels are increasing. Drivers are driving dangerously. Cyclists are more vulnerable than ever. These measures have to be put in place ASAP.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>The traffic in our street is dangerous and there is too much pollution. It is bad for the health of people who suffer from asthma. And the traffic makes people, drivers and cyclists aggressive. Something needs to change.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>The current situation is a disaster waiting to happen. Something must be done immediately. NB: this is a conservation area.</p>
KR22/KR22bis	Kings Road	<p>The principle issue is the volume of traffic through this area of North Kingston. All three roads considered in this proposal are only suitable for single file traffic, with each offering only limited numbers of "passing places" where gaps have been left between parking spaces. Where there is room for 3 cars to pull in and let opposing traffic pass, everything is fine until a 4th car follows along and has nowhere to go, which then blocks all traffic from proceeding. On Kings Road this happens multiple times each day during the morning and evening Peak periods. Once the traffic is blocked, motorists start sounding horns, swearing at each other, and in some cases getting out of vehicles to remonstrate with one another. Once the blockage is eventually cleared, other lines of traffic have built up at the top and bottom of the road, all of which is anxious to get through, and the chances of the same problem re-occurring are much higher. Many drivers 'race' along the road to try to beat drivers coming in the opposite direction in getting to a passing place. Levels of frustration and anger are very high and it is only a matter of time before someone is seriously hurt. Because Kings Road is also a major cycling commuter route to and from Richmond Park, many cyclists get trapped in the traffic and are unable to pass on the road. Cyclists then swerve on to the pavement to get past. Our two year old son was recently knocked off his scooter by a cyclist who swerved onto the pavement and didn't see him. In addition - with so much traffic sitting on the road with engines running, levels of pollution are high, particularly in the summer months when many people use the route to get to and from the park. The proposal made would solve all of the above problems, but only by diverting some of the traffic from Kings Road onto the residential roads of our neighbours. This scheme doesn't solve the route cause of the problem, which is the overall volume of traffic passing through a residential area. Residents, cyclists, and pedestrians should be given priority in roads like these, and I would prefer the council took stronger measures to reduce car traffic throughout the whole area. If traffic cannot be reduced, then the one-way scheme together with stronger speed restricting measures on the roads concerned is the best alternative.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>The situation with traffic congestion, speed of vehicles and levels of driver aggression has got worse every year that we've lived in the road. It's now at a point where I worry about parking on our road and getting our two young children (2 & 4yrs) out of the car without being in danger from vehicles driven at dangerous speed. Every day during morning and evening rush hour there is constant horn noise and often shouting. The congestion means there is a stream of cyclists on the pavement trying to make their way into the park entrance.</p>
KR23	Kings Road	<p>Q3: I think the direction of traffic on New Road should be uphill, not downhill as proposed. Q4: I would favour a trial period for the new road directions and monitoring of possible congestion at the mini roundabout and at the entrance to and exit from Tudor Road.</p>
KR24/KR24bis/KR24tris/KR24fourth	Kings Road	<p>It is essential that we solve the serious road traffic issue on Kings Road. The build-up of traffic over the recent years means the road is very dangerous and not fit to operate as a two way road. Road rage is a daily occurrence. Emergency vehicles often get stuck and cyclists are regularly using the pavements.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Ambulances are getting stuck on our road. There's road rage almost everyday. I almost got hit by a cyclist the other day on my way to work. I've lived on Kings Road for 10 years and the recent build-up of traffic is have a direct negative impact on Kings road. Please sort it!</p> <p>-----</p> <p>The pollution on our road has become much worse over the last few years. There are often big traffic jams on our road because cars and vans get stuck in the middle. Yesterday I saw an ambulance stuff in the middle. We need to sort this problem.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>I really hate the pollution on our road due to the increasing volume of idling traffic. Almost everyday cars and lorries get stuck in the middle of the road causing big road rage issues. It's not nice to hear the bad language. Often our car gets scratched but cars getting stuck. Please help!!!</p>

KR25/KR2 5bis	Kings Road	<p>Q3: I think the proposal for Kings Road is good but I think it would be better if either, the direction of traffic in New Road was the same as Tudor Road (i.e. both roads in the opposite direction to Kings Road) or that Kings Road was one way, as proposed, and the other two roads were left as they are.</p> <p>Q4: I also think that action is needed to prevent/discourage heavy goods vehicles and other through traffic from entering the area through measures on Crescent Road and Queens Road.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Q3:By making Tudor Rd the only one-way road in the opposite direction you have provoked an almost 100% negative response from those residents. Even if New Road was also made one way (west-east) most of those roads' residents will be against it as they don't seem to see that there is any problem. I would settle for being the only road to be one way or, failing that, only have the traffic calming measures providing they are effective.</p> <p>Q4: None of the proposed alterations reduce traffic flow which is the root cause of all the problems. A (trial) barrier at the top of Crescent Road (below Kings Nympton entrance) coupled with width restrictions as previously proposed at the beginning of Queens Rd, Liverpool Rd and Crescent Road and a blanket (but effective) 20mph speed limit on all local roads north of London Rd/Kingston Hill would probably lead to a significant reduction in traffic and improved quality of residential roads involved. Doing nothing to the upper (east) part of King's Road is no longer an acceptable option nor is making changes to improve the convenience of King's Road for rat-running through-traffic. RBK needs to show leadership and imagination in producing a neighbourhood solution for all the aforementioned roads. This latest proposal has at least mobilised a much larger and organised response from residents, many of whom did not know what is going on. The council needs to do a much better job of communicating their plans and explaining the longer term and wider area strategies if they are not to continue receiving a majority of negative or inadequate responses. The GLA has clear stated objectives and TfL has two clear strategies and funds for better (healthy, calmer, quieter etc.) residential streets. RBK needs to embrace and promote these initiatives. Once clear to residents, I think a majority will support the necessary changes and councillors will be judged by their voting record on them. There is clearly a groundswell of lobby groups that will help to promote positive changes once RBK have shown leadership.</p>
KR26/KR2 6bis	Kings Road	<p>Q3: The proposed directions seem ok. Please also consider filtered permeability at the junction of Crescent Road and Kingston Hill.</p> <p>Q4: King's Road & the surrounding area is full of young families and teeming with children. These residents ought to be the clear priority. King's Road is fast and dangerous. The current priority is rapid and convenient flow for motorists. In order to make neighbourhoods safe and liveable, passage along the roads must be made less convenient for motorists.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Q3: It would be better to remove one line of parked cars and replace it with a two-way segregated cycle track, then make the road one way.</p> <p>Q4: I think King's Road is dangerous and needs addressing.</p>
KR27/KR2 7bis	Kings Road	<p>Q3: It may make more sense to make New Road one way in the other direction to share the burden with Tudor road. If there are objections to one way routes on New and Tudor Road could Kings Road be made one way on its own?</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Please do something. The current road set up is not fit for purpose. It is dangerous polluting and frequently intimidating due to the aggression caused by the trapped traffic. Cyclists are frequently forced to use the pavement. Lorries cannot turn into the top of Kings Road and have to use the wrong side of the road and pavement to proceed.</p>
KR28/KR2 8bis	Kings Road	<p>Constant issues with vehicles blocking road due to congestion in the street. This has led to numerous cases of road rage and aggressive behaviour from drivers including both physical and verbal confrontation.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>There is an increased issue with congestion due to the current two way traffic flow, causing daily blockage of the road at different times of the day. This has caused many incidents of road rage and damage to parked vehicles. I believe the proposal would alleviate some of the issues we are experiencing.</p>
KR29/KR2 9bis	Kings Road	<p>The road is often completely blocked. This often results in high levels of road rage and high levels of car fumes. Emergency vehicle access is often impossible! I often can't access my own house! Lots of excessive speeding when drivers see the road is clear (at least to the half-way point) - this is very dangerous as there are many children and pets around. Damage to parked vehicles is observed all the time. This has been a problem for years, and something needs to be done about it - people need to access Richmond of course, but it makes sense that other roads should share this traffic burden, so it is less of problem for all involved.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>The road is blocked for substantial periods most days. Cyclists often use the footpath because the road is blocked, which is dangerous to both themselves and pedestrians (also this is even more foolish, as there are driveways which are not easy to spot, especially when the cyclists are travelling at speed on the pavement - which they often are). Road rage is a daily occurrence, this results in lots of verbal abuse. Damage to parked cars as drivers attempt to squeeze past each other is a common occurrence. Drivers often speed quite excessively down this section of road, as they are keen to get through before someone appears at the other end - this can be very dangerous given the number of children who live in this residential area.</p>
KR30/KR3 Obis	Kings Road	<p>I am so pleased that this issue is being addressed. Every day there is an issue with the traffic and whilst the bad language, shouting and horns tooting is disturbing there is a very real issue with safety. I have witnessed countless lorries on the wrong side of the road, reversing out of Kings Road into the paths of cyclists and pedestrians. Daily cyclists, for their own safety, cycle on the pavement. Emergency vehicles often get held up in the traffic, again a huge safety concern. Please make this change for the people of Kingston to be safer on their own streets.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>I think the plans put forward make complete sense. If the road carries on the way it's going, someone is going to get seriously hurt. I have two dogs that have on numerous occasions been almost mowed down. From people mounting the pavement to get in the park.</p>

KR31/KR31bis/KR31tris/KR31fourth	Kings Road	<p>Q3: I support the current directions.</p> <p>Q4: Kings road is long overdue for these measures & we have more support than ever before. Our road is frequently dangerous, jammed both ways, party to aggressive behaviour & dialogue, polluted & our pavements are used as a cycleway because of all the above. It's time for our council to LISTEN to us & take action.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Q3: I think one - way traffic is THE only solution having lived on the road for over twenty years.</p> <p>Q4: I have lived on Kings Rd for over twenty years. I've witnessed all the traffic calming measures that have been introduced and their subsequent failure. The road has become steadily worse which would be fine if it was occasional cross tempers. However the road in my opinion is now dangerous. Certainly for road users such as cyclists (who also regularly mount the pavement), pedestrians (especially school children, my son was knocked down by a speeding van five years ago) and tourists visiting the park. Emergency vehicles cannot possibly use the road at certain times of the day. I honestly believe someone is going to get seriously hurt. But aside from it being dangerous, it's actually impassable in the rush hour morning and evening. Gridlock is the only word to describe it. The noise, profanity and threats emanating from the blocked road is pretty unpleasant. As is the pollution. Furthermore, there is no one in the road I know who has not had their car damaged by other road users. Really the only solution is to make the road one-way which I feel would change things instantly and greatly improve lives an general and perhaps save someone's life in the long run.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Our road is always 'angry' with people who are stuck on it & swearing at each other- I saw someone go to hit another person last week too!</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Too many cycles on our pavements because our road is so bad.</p>
KR32/KR32bis	Kings Road	<p>Q3: I think making King's Road one-way westbound is correct (it can be difficult doing a right hand turn onto Queens Road, which would impede the flow of traffic if the road was one-way eastbound). To me it would make sense for both New Road and Tudor Road to be one-way eastbound. I think it would give a more balanced flow of traffic across the 3 roads, and be a fairer option to Tudor Road.</p> <p>Q4: I have lived on this section of Kings Road for nearly 8 years and the traffic situation is unacceptable. The road rage that we witness is horrendous. My young kids hear other motorists being called 'the C word' (their words) on a regular basis. The fumes are harmful (my eldest child is asthmatic) and very prevalent with the large amount of idling traffic. There is a massive knock on effect of the gridlock on our road that blocks traffic on Park Road and Queens Road and probably further afield. I am lucky enough that I am able to walk for most of my local journeys (school etc.), but I own a car, which is knocked and scraped continually by cars unable to manoeuvre properly and I am left with the expense of the repairs. Please introduce these traffic management measures, as the current arrangement is not working and this situation seems to be deteriorating.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Q3: I support the scheme but I think it would be improved if Kings Road took West bound traffic and both New Road and Tudor Road shared East bound traffic.</p>
KR34	Kings Road	<p>We absolutely need the one way system to ensure the safety and well-being of all that use Kings Road, children, residents, cyclists, pedestrians, animals and drivers. We have loved here for almost 6 years and have witnessed so many concerning issues that at times have included violence and aggression.</p>
KR35	Kings Road	<p>Lots of traffic jams, lots of pollution, lots of shouting of drivers.</p>
KR36/KR36bis	Kings Road	<p>If the proposed scheme does not happen can we still have speed bumps to calm those drivers coming from Lowe kings road.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Please no reduction in parking spaces. If the scheme does not go ahead can we please still have a speed bump at the lower end of upper Kings road. Especially to slow down traffic coming from lower kings road.</p>
KR37	Kings Road	<p>Q3: I cannot believe that to ease the congestion on the top part of Kings Road it requires such drastic action as this. Three one-way roads with cyclists going against the oncoming flow of cars is not safe, and if that is an island outside the park gates that will only squeeze cars and cyclists together causing more problems.</p> <p>Q4: Before implementing these changes surely a cheaper alternative should be considered. Why not try introducing two passing places at 1/3rd and 2/3rd of the way down the road and removing the centre one. I also see you are proposing to reduce the pavement width, which would widen the road, which will help considerably.</p>
KR38	Kings Road	<p>Should consider leaving Tudor Road to be two-way to ensure better distribution of traffic for cars coming down Liverpool Road and Crescent Road. If road is one-way in other direction would make traffic flow simpler.</p> <p>The traffic volume and speed issues also apply to Kings Road between Acre Road and Park Road. You have not considered on-pavement parking for upper Kings Road but are happy to have it on the other part of the road. This is an inconsistent approach. Should also consider having other part of Kings Road one-way.</p>
KR39	Kings Road	<p>Q3: Will the traffic coming onto the rest of Kings Road go faster?</p> <p>Q4: I think there will be problems initially with traffic at the roundabout trying to turn left from Park Road, but that will hopefully ease over time.</p>
KR40	Kings Road	<p>Measures of traffic-flow do not take into account the behaviour of drivers! My parked car has been damaged on each four corners (with no one admitting responsibility). It's only a matter of time before drivers (who already shout and swear) come to physical blows. Often ambulances get stuck in the build-ups. I wouldn't want to be waiting for an ambulance or fire-engine. I think the road needs to be one-way on safety grounds alone.</p>
KR41	Kings Road	<p>New Rd is totally unsuitable for directing large amounts of traffic down whether one way or not. If there is a problem this is just shifting it. I also feel that multiple flows of traffic turning right at a number of junctions could result in more accidents. I also note you are proposing allowing cyclists to contraflow in both New and Tudor road, these are both nasty narrow parking chicaned roads. Unless you are going to supply separated isolated cycle lanes there could be serious contention.</p>
KR42	Kings Road	<p>Q3: Yes, but due to the Kings Road/ Park road junction there will be considerable pressure on the small roundabout so traffic lights should be considered.</p> <p>Q4: We are also concerned that this scheme should in no way affect Alexandra road where there is a school and extra and/or speeding traffic would be unsafe. We would like heavy commercial traffic banned from Kings Road since our houses are badly shaken daily.</p>

KR43	Kings Road	<p>Q3: I fully support the Kings Road proposal but would like to understand why both New and Tudor roads are not proposed to be one way in the opposite direction to help share the traffic load.</p> <p>Q4: Traffic problems have continually worsened over the years despite a number of previous schemes to install speed humps and restrictors all of which have failed to address the fundamental problem that the road is not capable of dealing with the traffic load traveling in both directions. The road grinds to a halt on a daily basis. Since living in the road every single panel on my car has been damaged by traffic with the exception of the roof. I have witnessed three RTA's one involving a cyclist being thrown into the roundabout at the junction with Park Road. We regularly see bikes using the pavement to avoid the gridlocked cars and the bikes they have to avoid the families walking to and from the park particularly at the weekend. The one-way system would act for the benefit of drives cyclists and pedestrians as well as those who live on the road and the surrounding area.</p>
KR44	Kings Road	<p>Please also urgently add signage to prevent adult cyclists riding on our pavements in Kings Road. My small son has been nearly knocked off his feet countless times. It's crazy, and against the law! Cycle lanes in the park lead directly onto the pavements and apparently this is an excuse. They should either get on the road or dismount.</p>
KR45	Kings Road	<p>I agree that there are issues but these also affect the part of Kings Road between Park Road and Acre Road. I would welcome measures to reduce speed but these need to be not all on Kings Road.</p>
PR1	Park Road	<p>This afternoon we received the proposed plans for the introduction of one way traffic to Kings Road and New Road and Tudor Road.</p> <p>Although I have followed the advice to express my opinions, I am making my feelings know quite clearly on this matter:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) in principle the intentions are all well and good but have not really being thought trough 2) the plans only appear to benefit cyclists <p>And so here are my thoughts and opinions on this matter and hope a more common sense approach can be reached. These are the same views expressed on the discussion links, but I wanted some assurances they were actually going to be read and considered:</p> <p>Having looked at these plans, it is plain to see that these changes are only for the benefit of cyclists, who are not necessarily local residents, and not beneficial to local residents or other visitors to the Borough. Under these proposed plans, if I wanted to go for a drive through the Park, I would have to drive away from myself to come back on myself, therefore increasing my carbon footprint, my fuel spend and adding to congestion. I have thought for a long time that some sort of one way system for these roads around the entrance to Richmond Park to make it safe for all road users including pedestrians was needed, but also to help lighten the burden of congestion. I therefore believe that these plans should be re-considered and re-thought. I believe the traffic should flow up Kings Road, rather than down. The reason being people are more likely to travel up Kings Road for access to Richmond Park. Especially if using Richmond Park as a cut through, but I was approaching this from a point of view for visitors to the Borough.</p> <p>Accidents always seem to be caused more often by traffic entering Kings Road from either Queens Road or from Richmond Park. Especially when witnessing the damage to bollards, lamp-posts, sign-posts and traffic islands over the years. Refuse and larger vehicles can turn easier onto Queens Road than they can into Kings Road, however generally they are the cause of congestion on collection days. As there is somewhat of a blind corner on Tudor Road/Park Road, I feel that this should be an up road to Queen's road with the ability to join two way traffic on Queen's Road or at least turn right onto Queens Road, allowing for a cycle path to the left. The main cycle route through Kingston comes up Elm Road and has been a main sign-posted cycle route for many years, way before the recent spike in bicycle usage, therefore this should flow over Park Road and up Tudor Road towards the Park.</p> <p>I would like to know what studies have been made regarding the increased congestion this will bring to Alexandra Road and Park Road given the concentration of population in this part of the grid already? Has any thought been given to the effect of pollution on the schools on this road?</p> <p>I also feel there can be better signage on both sides of Richmond Park Gates to show road users that they can filter out onto Kingston Hill via Liverpool and Crescent Roads and not just via Queen's Road and Park Road, providing more alternatives to road users who may not necessarily be local. Will this idea be spread to other roads? For example Alexandra Road could also possibly be a down road, making it safer for all road users and helping to take some of the congestion away from New Road.</p> <p>I know this is not about allocating blame for accidents, but the way in which many cyclists, not just a few, are the cause to many accidents, they think Kings Road is a part of the 'Tour de France' when speeding up or down with no regard for pedestrians or stopping/slowing for zebra crossings as generally they fail to stop for pedestrians. These plans only favour cyclists and not all road users or local residents. To cut Tudor Road Off is wrong as there is hardly any width to turn a car with the amount of parked cars at all times of the day and is often a cut through for hospital access. At a minimum cars should be allowed to turn right out onto Queen's Road.</p> <p>I will also be writing in the coming days regarding the continuing parking sagas we are enduring and feel these plans will also have a knock on effect of people parking up elsewhere just to make it easier to get out, whether it be for work, school runs or recreation, using up and taking away more of our spaces.</p> <p>On behalf of concerned residents at Park Road House.</p>
PR2	Park Road	<p>The increase in traffic flow outside the school will be bad. This will increase the flow and traffic along Tudor Road - I don't see why we should put up with this.</p>

PR3/PR3bis	Park Road	<p>I do not believe that the current plan should be adopted for a few reasons: - Traffic calming measures are ineffective as they currently are - cars simply straddle/speed over them. - The idea that cyclists can use the road to go in the opposite direction to the traffic is an accident/fatality waiting to happen. - Cyclists will be more prone to use pavements more than they do now to avoid being knocked over. The knock-on effect on pedestrians being hurt is greater as a result. - New Road and Tudor Road are narrower than Kings Road. The houses/flats are not set as far back from road so pollution and noise levels will be greater, particularly for HGVs, oversized lorries, etc. using these roads. - There is a pub on New Road - so their business will be greatly affected by this increase in traffic and the environmental issues this brings. - A few metres from New Road/Park Road is a (soon to be opened) children's nursery (60 Park Road) which has a capacity for 50 children - is it right that these measures will impact on the health of these children/babies as well as their safety (the nursery staff would highly likely take the children for walks to the park)? - Pavements on New Road/Tudor Road are narrower than Kings Road - higher risk for pedestrians being 'clipped' by passing traffic or cyclists using the pavement. - Children/families walking to nearby Primary schools - increased traffic will make it more difficult to cross New Road/Tudor Road - especially as these roads are narrower than Kings Road which currently has a pedestrian traffic island and Alexandra Road has a zebra crossing? What arrangements will be in place for Tudor and New Road? - Parts of New Road and Tudor Road are in the Liverpool Road conservation area (as is Kings Road), how does increased traffic, noise and pollution adhere to this? - How much of this plan is at the request of the Counsellor who happens to live on the affected Kings Road - or is this just a coincidence?</p> <p>Alternatives: * Perhaps the plan should be to keep Richmond Park closed to traffic until 10am and close from 4pm which will reduce the volume of traffic in Kings Road - as most only use that Road to gain entry to the Park - they will then be forced to use Park Road/Tudor Drive to Richmond or the A308/Kingston Hill to Roehampton and beyond. This will also mean that the Park can be used more as a Nature Reserve (protecting the wildlife) and not a cut through for road users to get to their destinations. * Alternatively, reduce the number of parking bays and lay down double yellow lines on Kings Road so fewer cars can park there (encouraging residents to use their own drive ways) - thus allowing for more crossing points for two-way traffic.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>I cannot support this proposal. There is no evidence to suggest that this part of Kings Rd suffers more traffic/air pollution issues than other parts of KT2. Any proposal should also have options. It is not clear why the council is making this proposal and not considering alternatives. There is a safety risk with this proposal. Cyclists are likely to ignore one way streets and may even use the pavement to access Richmond Park. Also, cars will speed (speed cushions are easily avoided). We should not be changing road lay outs to encourage more speeding and car use. Also, Residents themselves need to understand impact of their decisions: large cars, multi car households and increased deliveries = more congestion = motorists behaving selfishly. Option: why not make three passing points on Kings Road (double yellows or reds) outside houses with access to off street parking: 271-277 Kings Road, 300-310 and 301-303. Or persuade Richmond Park not to open Kingston gate until 0930 to take some pressure off rat runs.</p>
PR4	Park Road	<p>Q3: Might be better to make Alexandra Rd one-way as well (same as proposed for Tudor Road) - that would take the pressure off Tudor Rd.</p> <p>Q4: This should have been done years ago! You should also make Richmond Park one-way as well and then make the spare lane a cycle-track (two-way).</p>
PR5	Park Road	<p>This appears to be presented as 'traffic calming solutions' but really this does not support local residents at all. I park my car on Tudor Road because my home is on the corner of Tudor and Park Rd. I cycle or drive through Richmond Park at least 4 times per week. To prevent me from turning into my own road is ridiculous and not thought through at all. The traffic will undoubtedly be increased on our road so in effect causing the complete opposite to 'traffic calming measures'. Solution - Have more passing places on Kings Rd. I travel through the park during 'rush hour' anytime from 7.15-8.30am and cannot see any problem here. Decision making is done by people who do not live here, it's insane. Thank you for your time in reading my comments.</p>
PR6	Park Road	<p>A noted disbenefit is the increase in traffic on Alexandra Rd. This road has two primary schools, a nursery and a regular play group in the church. This road should be the priority for traffic management in the area and any potential increase in traffic should be rejected on the ground of safety plus respiratory health of local children.</p>
PR7	Park Road	<p>Congestion of cyclist going down one way system the opposite way. Problems with new nursery is Park Rd for children crossing road and parents parking (dropping off), causing traffic jams at top of Tudor and New Rd and pollution.</p>
PR8	Park Road	<p>I'm concerned about volume and speed of traffic on Tudor Road, which will be the single eastbound route to the Park. Some sort of traffic calming will be essential. Restricted width would be ideal - unsuitable for refuse vehicles?</p>
PR9/PR9bis	Park Road	<p>Q3: Don't support the introduction of one-way traffic but if it was to be introduced Upper Kings Road should be eastbound, not westbound. Cyclists will bomb down the road (despite the proposed traffic calming) causing dangers at the roundabout - likely to be slowed down if it is eastbound-uphill. Don't think cyclists should be able to go both ways if one-way system is introduced. There are huge groups of cyclists at weekend racing.</p> <p>Q4: We strongly oppose this scheme! This will direct more traffic along a busy part of Park Road where air pollution is considerably worse than on Kings Road and children walk to school. It will be even more difficult to cross the road. It is wrong to channel more traffic on to an already very busy road which is a main bus route. Also, a children's day nursery is about to open on Park Road between the New Road/Tudor Road junctions.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>I've already filled in a paper form but wanted to add that this consultation has been taking place in a time when the situation in King's Road has been severely worsened by the road works at the roundabout junction of Park Road/Kingston Hill/Manorgate and the ongoing gasworks in Park Road. Traffic trying to avoid these works have been using Kings and New Road to try and avoid the temp traffic lights on Park Road and the roundabout. The videos posted on social media over the last week or so are being shown as typical but are not representative of the general situation - the problem is not as bad as a vocal group of King's Road residents suggest and without roadworks there is no problem outside of rush hour.</p>
PR10	Park Road	<p>Q3: Kings Road should be one way in direction of the Park. If one way are proposed, Park traffic will be turning right at the Park Road roundabout, across traffic from Park, to get to Tudor Road. Tudor Road is narrower than Kings Road and not designed for heavy traffic and unsuitable.</p> <p>Q4: This scheme appears to be entirely to the benefit of Kings Road. If parking was on one side only, there is enough room for two lanes of traffic. Regarding cyclists, in my observation it is the behaviour of cyclists that causes problems.</p>
PR11	Park Road	<p>For the small number of households who will get the benefit (top of Kings Road), a disproportional number of properties will be adversely affected by this.</p> <p>For any reason Tudor Road gets blocked - road works, accidents, etc. - the only access to Queens Road would be via Alexandra Road where we have St Pauls school and church. Total cost of this traffic management scheme we can ill afford when we are still suffering pot holes.</p>

PR12/PR1 2bis	Park Road	<p>Q3: When you increase the traffic through New Road and Tudor drive, as the traffic then has to pull out into a main road, which already can be a problem at peak times, this will greatly increase the number of cars idling in these roads causing much greater pollution than currently exists. Pulling out of New Road into Park Road as suggested is already difficult due to cars parked in front of 68 blocking the view of traffic coming from the right. This will just get much much worse and will cause cars to be waiting for long periods in new road. Having a cycle route against traffic flow on new road/kings road is just plain dangerous especially against parked cars. As it is cars drive fairly slowly down these roads, if they are made one way, it will be far more dangerous for all users especially a cyclist seemingly going the wrong way. New Road is a narrow road and will struggle with an increase in traffic. The natural route of people coming from Kings road and crossing Queens road to Liverpool road will mean a diversion to Tudor road increasing for every single car the journey and level of pollution. We live on the corner with New Road and have access to off road parking in front of our house via new road (as do our neighbours at number 66) Most of our journeys are along park road. If these measures are put into place we would have to drive all the way to Tudor road, up there to Queens road and then back down new road just to be able to access our parking space. Thereby driving 4 sides of a rectangle. Even if the no entry was from after our drive, I imagine with the increase of traffic driving down new road to Park road it would be near on impossible to turn into new road from park road making our parking space redundant.</p> <p>Q4: Watching the daily mess of Kings road (at peak times only) my observation is that the problem rests with people who are too impatient and think that their journey is more important than everyone else, so they block the road when they can see there is no way through yet. My experience is that traffic flows if people observe the road ahead and are patient and polite. Maybe put some signs up to encourage people to wait until the road ahead until they can pull in is clear. Whilst I agree there is a problem, I really believe these proposals are wrong and will increase the level of pollution for the whole area both by increasing the mileage done by every car that passes through and increasing the time cars take to pull out of New Road and Tudor Road with a much greater number of cars idling. People already use New Road and Tudor Road as alternatives and speed up/down both roads. This will only get worse. It will be far more dangerous in an area where cyclists and pedestrians share the space especially in the morning as the children are on their way to school. By having two way traffic it forces people to drive more slowly. Whilst we have sympathy for the residents of Kings Road, this problem only exists for a short while in the day. People will have bought/rented houses in New Road and Tudor Road because they are quieter streets. By changing this you will be changing the environment of these streets and probably knocking off the value of all the houses on those streets. This would need to be compensated for.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>I think the traffic calming measures in New Road will endanger cyclists. I cycle New Road twice each day and live on the corner of New Road and Park Road. Unless the traffic calming cushions are wider, most cars will be able to drive over them at more than 20 mph. Cyclists will be faced by a line of stationary cars to their left, and fast-moving cars moving across the road to line up their route to go fast over the cushions. There's also a car parking space on the corner of New Road outside 66 that blocks the view left into Park Road for drivers. A driver will have just been looking at a speed cushion and then will be expected to take into view cyclists turning from Park Road into New Road that'll have been hidden by the vehicle on the corner outside 66. That's a dangerously uncomfortable set of circumstances for cyclists.</p>
PR13	Park Road	Alexandra road will be busier.
PR14/PR1 4bis	Park Road	<p>YOUR "DETAILED MAP" IS UNREADABLE BECAUSE IT IS SUCH LOW RESOLUTION AND DOES IT NOT EVEN SHOW THE JUNCTION BETWEEN TUDOR RD AND PARK RD. INCOMPETENCE.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Q3: Making a road with 2 schools in it one way and blocking a road will cause more dangerous exhaust fumes for the children and more traffic leading to more chances of accidents.</p> <p>Q4: You can't see the map properly it has a big part of it covered with something that says lots of numbers.</p>
PR15	Park Road	<p>Q3: We do not support the plan in any way.</p> <p>Q4: Your current proposals would only serve to increase traffic along Park Road resulting in tough grid locks which always happens when these measures (albeit) temporary are introduced. This would have a devastating impact to emergency services which use Park Road as a designated emergency services route to get to places to rescue, save lives and catch criminals.</p>
QR1	Queens Road	<p>Q3: I agree with making Kings Road one-way westbound, and also New Road a one-way road but feel it should be eastbound. Leaving Tudor Road as is, two-way.</p> <p>Q4: This is a great proposal and very much hope will be approved. The traffic congestion on King's Road is terrible and also dangerous to cyclists.</p>
QR2	Queens Road	<p>Most of the traffic in Kings Road is through traffic, moving from the A3 area towards A4 (M4/Heathrow) and vice versa. Without an overall London plan to re-route such "rush hour" traffic away from North Kingston, this proposal will, as you state, increase both vehicle flow and speed. Accidents will happen. I strongly object to this proposal.</p>
QR3/QR3b is	Queens Road	<p>I disagree with the proposal to make Tudor Road a one-way eastbound road, as this will just move traffic from Kings Road and New Road on to Tudor Road. It will triple the volume of traffic on Tudor Road if the other two roads become westbound-only. It is also very difficult and slow to turn either left or right onto Queens Road from Tudor Road; both lanes on Queens Road need to be clear in order to turn safely. Consequently, there will be long tailbacks down Tudor Road during peak travel times as Queens Road gets very busy, which could possibly then impact on the flow of traffic along Park Road as well. The increased noise and pollution due to an increased concentration of traffic flow will make Tudor Road a less desirable road to live on.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Q3: Need more than just Tudor Rd going towards the park. Either Alexandra Rd too or no entry to any of the small residential roads & direct everyone along Queens Rd & down Kingston hill.</p> <p>Q4: I will not be able to get my children or myself safely into the car on the road side if there is a permanent queue of cars trying to get to the park up the only access road. It is not wide enough.</p>
QR4/QR4b is	Queens Road	<p>This proposal will result in increased traffic speeds and volume on the one way roads, and neighbouring roads); instead speed restrictions (bumps) should be introduced across all of the surrounding roads by Kingston Gate, and width restrictions at the key entrance points (Queens Road and Crescent Road). This will reduce the volume of traffic entering Kings Road and the surrounding roads.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>The proposal is not tackling the issue which is to reduce the traffic flow by Kingston Gate. To achieve this, width restriction measures should be introduced at the key entrance points (Queens Road and Crescent Road), as well as speed bumps along the length of Queens Road). Non-park traffic will then be more likely to travel to Park Road roundabout down Kingston Hill, and not use Kings Road as a cut through route.</p>
QR5	Queens Road	<p>The increase in speed of traffic on one way roads is not advisable and humps encourage acceleration.</p> <p>Increase in volume of traffic on Alexandra Road - with schools should be avoided.</p>

QR6	Queens Road	Q3: I wholeheartedly agree with the proposed scheme, however I feel 20mph limit needs to extend as far as St Paul's church given that all surrounding roads are limited to 20mph. Q4: I also feel that resident parking should now be extended to include a Sunday in the 8:30-18:30 restriction - currently, it's extremely challenging to park anywhere near where we live on Sundays.
QR7	Queens Road	Q3: Tudor Road should follow the same direction as New Road. The proposed directions will cause Tudor Road to be the busiest - Kings Road should remain the busiest out of the three as it effects less residents and less pedestrians (especially children) crossing on school runs. Q4: The proposed directions will cause queuing/crossing traffic at the park gates. Kings Road should go up towards the park and New Road/Tudor Road should go down away from the park.
QR8	Queens Road	Your proposal will simply move the traffic to other roads. Why is the Council spending so much time and money to appeal a small number of residents in Kings Road. They knew what the traffic was like when they bought their houses. The nearest two-way road will be Alexandra Road which has two schools. Pushing extra-traffic there is not a good idea. The only benefits are for people in Kings Road.
AR1	Alexandra Road	Whilst sympathising with residents of Kings Rd, they bought houses on a busy road and your proposal will increase traffic going towards the two infant primary schools. Traffic will simply block on Kings Rd below Park Rd with eastbound traffic unable to turn right at the roundabout to get to Tudor Rd. You will also see increased traffic on Alexandra Rd as eastbound traffic is diverted from Liverpool Rd to Crescent Rd.
AR2	Alexandra Road	Q3: Reduce parking spaces on Kings Road and it will heavily improve traffic both ways. Q4: Kings Road has the best visibility from Park Road /Queens Road junction both ways. If you will move cars to Tudor Road and Alexandra Road, you will not fix the problem, but instead will have even more accidents on New Road, Tudor Road and Alexandra Road. Then you will get complains from three roads.
AR3	Alexandra Road	I live in Alexandra Road and we got lots of traffic as we three schools there. My thought is the scheme will make our road even more open traffic.
AR4	Alexandra Road	Q3: The existing proposed plans will divert a significant amount of traffic along Alexandra Road, which is clearly already very busy with St Paul's and Alexandra schools. At the weekend there are also extra-curricular clubs on Saturdays and Sundays, making any added traffic volumes unsustainable. Q4: In addition to safety concerns for the children at the schools, I am very concerned by the obvious increase in air pollution that would result. I note Kings Rd does not contain any schools, but does have some large houses, so it should be clear whose interests are most important.
AR5	Alexandra Road	Making Kings Road one-way will force more cars down the quieter roads making them dangerous. The problem is there are too many cars on the roads.
AR6	Alexandra Road	One-way traffic will increase speeds and reduce safety. We need more holistic measures to reduce traffic entering the area.
AR7	Alexandra Road	The proposed scheme will drive extra traffic up our road (Alexandra Road), simply moving the problem a few roads down to our street rather than Kings Road. This is not acceptable, particularly as driving and parking on our street can already be quite difficult on a regular basis for those of us who live here and is made worse due to a combination of traffic to the schools and visitors to the churches in the area using the street as a car park (please note these are not just within 'normal working hours' - but evenings and weekends too). But even if the existing issues were not there, the extra traffic down our street which would be caused by the changes to Kings Road would definitely be a problem. It will also increase noise and air pollution in the street, when we already have enough from the traffic mentioned above.
AR8	Alexandra Road	RE Proposed conversion of Kings Road (between Park Road and Queens Road) and New Road and Tudor Road into one way roads. Thank you for your letter of the 14 February 2019 regarding the proposed conversion of Kings Road (between Park Road and Queens Road) and New Road and Tudor Road into one way roads. Alexandra School is one of the two schools situated in the area between Alexandra Road and Princes Road, the other being St Paul's C of E Junior school Kingston Hill. We have been carefully considering your proposal. The proposed plans indicate that: Alexandra Road would be the first two-way road linking Park Road to Queens Road after leaving the roundabout at the bottom of Kingston Hill. The impact of this would be a significant, leading to a huge increase in the through traffic up Alexandra Road creating a "rat run" towards Richmond Park avoiding the traffic lights at the junction of Kingston Hill and Queens Road. Alexandra Road would be the first two-way road linking Queens Road to Park Road after leaving Richmond Park We believe that cars would be more likely to speed down Alexandra Road towards Park Road and the bottom of Kingston Hill to avoid using the one of the proposed one way roads with speed bumps and also to avoid the junction of Kingston Hill and Queens Road. There is one zebra crossing at the Park Road end of Alexandra Road and we have already had reports of cars crossing this without stopping for parents and children to cross. The current proposal will have a huge detrimental impact on the local community and the safety of families whose children attend both schools based around Alexandra Road. It would also have a negative impact on the air pollution in this area. We are certain that both the points above will lead to increased congestion in Alexandra Road, a road that is already very busy. We feel that the proposal should be revised, with particular attention being paid to the health or safety of the pupils attending school in this small area, of which there are over 800.
TR1/TR1b1s	Tudor Road	Traffic levels in Tudor Road will increase as a result of these planned changes leading to more noise and general congestion within the area. We are against the one way traffic proposal. ----- The introduction of one-way traffic is wholly unsuitable. 1) This proposal would mean a disproportionate increase in traffic in Tudor Road, a narrow, quiet road in a Conservation Area. Studies have shown that one way traffic increases the speed of vehicles and thus associated accidents; and the proposed solution to this problem -to introduce speed humps- has equally been shown to increase pollution as cars brake then accelerate. The proposed changes would be detrimental to the safety and the long-term health of residents, pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles in Tudor Road. 2) Already, it is such a tight turn, that it is only possible to turn left into Queens Road from Tudor Road when there is no traffic coming from the left. Having all traffic routed via Tudor Road eastbound would cause long tailbacks and jams along Tudor Road due to this difficult junction. 3) On rubbish collection day this proposed road layout would cause absolute chaos! Tudor Road is not wide enough for an ordinary car to pass a dust-cart if cars are legitimately parked in bays; and if other routes around are westbound only, the traffic would back up and come to a standstill very quickly. I feel strongly that this proposal is a short-sighted "solution" which only benefits the residents of Kings Road, a wider and historically busier road, to the detriment of all the surrounding areas.

TR2/TR2bis	Tudor Road	<p>The proposed eastbound direction in Tudor Road would impede access to my drive as the current parking spaces at the bottom of my drive would make it more difficult to access my drive. In addition the plan does not show any traffic calming positions for Tudor Road. The current two way system is self-calming because people have to give way both ways. With one way traffic this would increase the speed and increase the volume of traffic. It will also increase the pollution on Tudor Road. If there is a problem on Kings Road you are not solving it just moving it elsewhere.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>I strongly object to the proposal. The solution does not solve any alleged problems but will just move the problem to Tudor Road. The increased traffic on Tudor and New roads will increase the pollution on these roads. When road works have redirected traffic to Tudor Road it has caused tailbacks of standing traffic particularly traffic exiting east on to Queens Road. This causes extra noise and pollution and also impedes residents trying to get off their drives.</p>
TR3	Tudor Road	<p>Thanks for your letter of 14th February on the above issue. I appreciate that traffic flows in this area are difficult and complex. The Council needs to balance the competing issues to achieve a correct balance. However the news of a one way system in Tudor Road has come as a shock to me and my neighbours. Your letter is the first indication that such a scheme is being considered.</p> <p>We only have 16 working days to respond under the consultation process. I would like to request the following information so that I and my neighbours can properly respond as a group or individually</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I have seen the traffic flow information for Tudor Road and Kingston Road. I assume this information was gathered during weekdays? The data refers to peak flows. Are the figures for this period for 'cars per hour'? If so what time of the day does the peak flow start (for both AM and PM)? Is there any breakdown of how much traffic flows east west or vice versa? If no such data exists would it be reasonable to assume that the traffic flowing east west and west east is in equal measure? 2 There have been various proposals about traffic calming in the area. My neighbours tell me that Tudor Road residents attempted to persuade the Council to install traffic bumps some years ago in the light of the speed of vehicles travelling in the road. The proposal was rejected on the basis that the bumps would cause problems for emergency vehicles. Do you have any records about these proposals? 3 Can you confirm that your letter of 14th February is the first time that Tudor Road residents have been informed by the Council that a one way system is being proposed for the road? 4. The map of the area attached to your letter does not indicate the positioning of any traffic calming measures in Tudor Road The map for New Road indicates the location of traffic cushions in that road . Can you identify the location of any traffic cushions that are proposed for Tudor Road? is it indeed the case that the proposed traffic calming measures will consist of traffic cushions or is some other method of traffic calming to be put in place (if the proposals are formally accepted)? 5 Your map also indicates that cyclists will be entitled to travel in an east-west Direction against the flow of motor traffic. Can you provide details of how cyclists travelling in an opposite direction to motor vehicles will be enabled? 6 it is not entirely clear from your map as to whether there will be a 20 miles per hour speed limit along Queen's Road between Kings Road and Crescent Road. Can you confirm that this is the intention? 7 Can you inform me whether there has been any consideration by the Council before 2018 of a proposal to implement a one way system in Tudor Road? If such a proposal has been considered can you provide information as to the reasons why that proposal never preceded? <p>I'm sorry for the length of these questions but I'm sure you will understand that they are important to the consideration to be made by the residents in considering these proposals. I suspect that there may be a meeting of the residents early next week bearing in mind the very tight timetable for responses. Accordingly I should be very grateful if you could let me have your reply by close of business on Tuesday 19th February.</p> <p>Kind regards</p>
TR4/TR4bis	Tudor Road	<p>Q3: The recent proposal to restrict vehicle widths down Queens road and Kings road was a good one. It would have helped the situation on all roads in the area. The leaflet we received was so badly worded that we understood that we only had to comment if we disagreed with it! Maybe this is why you didn't receive many replies!</p> <p>Q4: There will be a massive increase in traffic eastbound up Tudor Road. At present eastbound traffic is split across the three roads. The new proposal will funnel all traffic to the park, Queens Road and Liverpool road up Tudor Road. AM peaks will rise from 123 to over 480 vehicles per hour! Allowing cyclists the 'wrong way' down the one-way systems without proper and fully segregated lanes will leave them more vulnerable to anger from car drivers. Any cycle lane running directly next to parked cars leaves cyclists vulnerable to being 'doored'. Due to the single yellow line outside 32/34 Tudor Road it is at present almost impossible for me to exit my drive and turn right when cars park there. (Disabled vehicles all day and other cars before 8:30. I often have to leave 6-8am). The one way traffic will make it incredibly difficult to both enter and exit my drive.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>1/ All this proposal will do is move the current problems on Tudor, New and Kings road and condense them into Tudor Road. 2/ There will be a massive increase in traffic eastbound up Tudor Road. At present eastbound traffic is split across the three roads. The new proposal will funnel all traffic to the park, Queens Road and Liverpool road up Tudor Road. 3/ Turning left at the Tudor/Queens Road junction is only possible at present when there is no traffic coming from the left. Turning right is also difficult and takes time. The massive increase in traffic down Tudor Road will result in long tailbacks of traffic down Tudor Road, dramatically increasing pollution from standing traffic. 4/ The new traffic direction would make it almost impossible for cars to exit their driveways. The majority would have to reverse into Tudor Road, into oncoming traffic and cyclists. A huge increase in accident risks and driver frustration. 5/ Allowing cyclists the 'wrong way' down the one-way systems without proper and fully segregated lanes will leave them more vulnerable to anger/frustration from car drivers. Any cycle lane running directly next to parked cars leaves cyclists vulnerable to being 'doored'. There is no planned signage/indication to cars turning down Kings, New and Tudor Road to expect oncoming cyclists. 6/ On the map there is no indication that speed reducing cushions will be put on Tudor Road. This would result in vehicles speeding up Tudor Road. 7/ When cars are waiting at the Tudor/Queens Road junction it is difficult for pedestrians, dog walkers and people with children to cross the junction. The increase in traffic will make this a difficult and dangerous junction to cross. Car drivers will be frustrated and too eager to get onto Queens Road. The increased traffic turning into Tudor Road from Park Road will also make it significantly more difficult and dangerous for pedestrians to cross this junction. 8/ What about access for emergency vehicles?? 9/ The current generous pavement width on Kings road could be narrowed leaving more road width for traffic and easing congestion The recent proposal to restrict vehicle widths down Queens road and Kings road was a good one. It would have helped the situation on all roads in the area.</p>

TR5	Tudor Road	What an extraordinary proposal. All the traffic coming from Kingston gate and queens rd would come down Tudor rd. I would not be able to access Queens rd which is crucial for me. You can't push a problem two roads down in addition Tudor rd is a narrower rd than the same part of kings rd. maybe residents of Tudor rd should have a petition out to stop vehicles accessing from park rd and queens rd making it difficult for me to get out of my driveway in the mornings and evenings as cars speed up and down the road because there are no speed bumps on our rd. Might I suggest that you only allow parking on one side of kings rd to keep the traffic flowing more easily in the morning and evening rush hour. Kings rd has a roundabout to control traffic Tudor rd does not. There is a pedestrian crossing and two bus stops so the traffic would be chaos. Further consultation should take place as I think there is too much self-interest and no idea of cause and effect this may have.
TR6	Tudor Road	Worried about parking restrictions in Tudor Road which is already bad. Cyclists going too fast coming down from the park if it's one way. Difficulty in reaching my home. I've lived in the road for 50 years recently moved from 23 to 35 because It was a quiet road. If it's one way traffic will be faster even though the speed limit is 20 miles an hour.
TR7	Tudor Road	<p>All I can see from the proposals are that they won't make Kings Road any safer as I suspect the tight two way traffic at present actually limits car speeds on the road. If you turn it to one way cars will actually increase their speed down it despite any traffic calming measures. This has proved to be the case in similar schemes elsewhere. In the meantime my road (Tudor Road) and New Road will become far more dangerous as a result of (1) increased traffic on these roads, (2) one way traffic flow encourages faster speeds than at present (3) No proposed traffic calming measures on these roads at all. Tudor road will also become impossibly congested as both the right and left turns onto Queens road are difficult already and with far more cars coming down Tudor Road that will get considerably worse. Pollution on Tudor Road will increase considerably due to the increased number of cars on it and the congestion stemming from the Tudor Road/Queens Road junction. I also think Alexander Road (WHICH HAS A PRIMARY SCHOOL ON IT) will become much busier as access to Queens Road to Park Road and vice-versa becomes more restricted on other roads. In summary I strongly object to the proposal as I don't believe it will improve congestion or safety on Kings Road whilst significantly worsening safety and congestion on surrounding roads. Tudor Road and Alexander Road in particular. I strongly oppose it.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>In my view the proposal is a bad one as I don't think it will actually make Kings Road any safer as I suspect the tight two-way traffic at present actually has the effect of limiting speed on the road. If you turn it to one way then cars will actually increase their speed down it despite any traffic calming measures. This has proved to be the case in similar schemes elsewhere. So I believe the proposal will actually make Kings Road less safe than at present. In the meantime my road (Tudor Road) and New Road will become far more dangerous as a result of (1) increased traffic on these roads, (2) one-way traffic flow encouraging faster speeds than at present (3) No proposed traffic calming measures on these roads at all, compounding the traffic and safety issues. Tudor road will also become impossibly congested as both the right and left turns onto Queens road are difficult already and with far more cars coming down Tudor Road that will get considerably worse. Pollution on Tudor Road will increase considerably due to the increased number of cars on it and the congestion stemming from the Tudor Road/Queens Road junction. I also think Alexander Road (WHICH HAS A PRIMARY SCHOOL ON IT) will become much busier as access to Queens Road from Park Road (and vice-versa) becomes more restricted on other roads. In summary I strongly object to the proposal as I don't believe it will improve congestion or safety on Kings Road whilst significantly worsening safety and congestion on surrounding roads. Tudor Road and Alexander Road in particular. I strongly oppose it.</p>
TR8	Tudor Road	The sheer volume of traffic trespassing off Tudor Road as well is a nightmare and is very dangerous to say the least. And sooner or later a serious accident will occur. With reference with pedestrians, an accident just waiting to happen.
TR9	Tudor Road	<p>Where are the traffic calming measures you promise for Tudor Road on the plan? You have forgotten to put them on. This is clearly a poorly thought out plan with omissions on your proposal. Your proposal outlines an increase in traffic in neighbouring roads. I do not think this is an appropriate way to manage traffic, especially for a conservation area like Tudor Road.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>SAME PERSON (ONLINE RESPONSE):</p> <p>I would like to object to the proposed King's road traffic calming proposal on a number of levels. Firstly I feel the proposal itself is inadequately assembled: on the plans posted to residents some of the specifications are far too small to read; the bottom half of Tudor Road hasn't even been included on the plans. And, furthermore, traffic calming devices spoken of in the proposal are not even shown in the map. How can you propose such changes to Tudor Road and then miss a significant portion of the road off the plan? The proposal will produce significant disruption to Tudor Road and its residents. By your own admission in the plans, traffic and traffic speed through Tudor Road will increase. Yet you have apparently neglected to include adequate traffic -calming devices on your plans! This is likely to cause significant pollution, congestion and risk to child safety on a very family-oriented road. Furthermore, no measures to slow traffic down on Queens Road are proposed. This has been an issue for years. The traffic at the top of Tudor Road will not be able to cross a notoriously busy road and traffic will back up all down Tudor Road with the inevitable reduction in air quality and road safety. Finally, when I went online to register my concerns, the portal 'Kingston-road-improvements' doesn't even exist! How can local residents register their views when the online portal to do so doesn't even exist? For these reasons I ask the council to reject the proposal.</p>
TR10	Tudor Road	The proposal would make our road (Tudor Rd) unsafe. We absolutely do not support the proposal to make Tudor Rd one way. We would take legal action to prevent it happening as it clearly only provides benefits to King's Rd (if any) and not to us on Tudor Rd at all. It would materially devalue our property to no net benefit to local residents on Tudor Rd or New Rd.
TR11/TR11bis/TR11tris	Tudor Road	<p>Q3: I initially felt the one way system might be a solution but having spoken to family and neighbours, and understanding the proposals better, I am now rescinding my earlier support. The knock on effects to the level of pollution, danger to pedestrians and increase in traffic flow in our road and the area in general will be huge. I therefore urge the council to re think their proposal.</p> <p>Q4: As it is traffic goes too fast down our road so I would still support traffic calming measures.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Q3: There appear to be inconsistencies regarding traffic calming measures, along with no real proposals to ensure no increase in traffic flow. All of the proposals are centred on the preferences of the residents of Kings Road and don't deal with the implications on New Road, Tudor Road and indeed Alexandra Road, even the map doesn't show the whole of Tudor Road.</p> <p>Q4: Park Road and Queens Road are built to be major thoroughfares, whereas Kings Road, New Road, Tudor Road and Alexandra Road ought to have measures in place that restrict all but local traffic. The aim should be to discourage and inhibit drivers from using any of these roads as shortcuts.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>The status quo is better for the area in general than the proposed one way system.</p>

TR12/TR1 2bis	Tudor Road	<p>I am strongly against this proposal and believe it will lead to further congestion in the area for all residents and visitors to the area. On the map the benefits identified are for Kings Road only and there are major disbenefits for the other roads in the area. Currently the 3 roads in this proposal (Kings, New and Tudor Roads) have two way traffic connecting Queens Road with Park Road. This gives drivers and cyclists 3 options for travel. If this scheme is introduced there will be only 2 options in one direction and 1 option in the other. All the eastbound traffic will be directed to Tudor Road leading to traffic queuing on Park Road, increased pollution and residents unable to move their cars off the drive. In addition to this there will be queues of traffic entering and exiting the park. There are 2 schools on Alexandra Road and many children cross Tudor Road at both junctions. The increase in traffic and congestion will make these junctions hazardous for the children and their families. My family and I have lived on Tudor Road for 15 years. We chose this road because it was a quiet, residential road, sadly this proposal would change that adversely. I do understand the concerns of the Kings Road residents but that road is a known through road to and from the park and has been for many years. The peak time weekday traffic through the park is only an issue when the park is open. I believe the council should discard this proposal and explore other options, for example, to widen Kings Road to enable traffic to move freely in both directions and to widen Queens Road to enable better flow. I sincerely hope the council will take my views in to consideration and discard this proposal.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Q3: I do not support the introduction of one way traffic</p> <p>Q4: I am firmly against this proposal for the following reasons, 1. The changes in traffic direction on the 3 roads proposed will lead to increased congestion, pollution and compromise the safety of children and their carers walking to and from school. My children walk to and from school so I will be concerned for their safety too when crossing the road. 2. Instead of taking the shortest route, cars approaching the roundabout at the bottom of Kings Road will need to drive up Tudor Road to access Richmond Park. 3. It is very difficult to turn left and right at the top of Tudor Road and if all the traffic is coming this way it will lead to congestion. 4. Residents will find it difficult to move their vehicles from their drives. 5. If there is a stationary vehicle e.g. refuse truck then cars will be stuck behind it 6. Tudor Road will change from a quiet residential road to a busy, congested, noisy road. My family and I chose to live here because it is quiet. 7. There is a danger to cyclists with this scheme as there is a proposal to allow them to travel in any direction on the road. 8. Kings Road is a known thoroughfare and therefore the council should consider widening the road (in a similar way to the other part of Kings Road) and allowing areas for cars to pass by. Many of the residents in Tudor Road and the surrounding roads do not agree with this proposal. I really hope the councillors will listen to the residents and reject this proposal.</p>
TR13/TR1 3bis	Tudor Road	<p>One-way traffic is a terrible idea on Tudor Road. There is already too much traffic coming up Tudor Road and it's already dangerous enough for walkers, cyclists and children, especially crossing the road. Not to mention, it's not possible to turn on to Queens Road, if there is any traffic in either direction due to street parking. To push all eastbound traffic to Tudor Road is a horrible idea and will surely result in a terrible rise in pollution, more accidents and very frustrated citizens. I only see queues for Kings Road at very peak time and even then it's not that bad. Most locals avoid this road smartly by using other roads. Leave it alone.</p>
TR14	Tudor Road	<p>Q3: The proposed traffic directions are not suitable. I live in Tudor Road and currently struggling with the traffic during school run in the morning and in the afternoon. I find it difficult to use my drive way due to heavy traffic. I end up in a long queue every morning as I use the road to Richmond Park.</p> <p>Q4: Introduce a locals-only system where cars who are local can have access to those roads and non-locals are only able to use main roads such as Park Road and Queens' road. One way through traffic can be around Park Road and Queens Road without having to use King's Road, New Road and Tudor Road. Access for local, emergency and announce them as private roads.</p>
TR15/TR1 5bis	Tudor Road	<p>To make Tudor Road into the main access road into the Richmond Park is to change a quiet highly populated road into a busy thoroughfare. Access onto Queens Road is dangerous and difficult now, under the proposals traffic will be permanently backed down the road causing air pollution and inconvenience to residence. I live towards the bottom of Tudor so will have to drive up onto Queens Rd back down New or Kings to reach Park Rd that I live 20 meters from. If a person moves onto a busy road that is a choice, Tudor Road is a narrow, quiet, family orientated road where children can ride their bikes. That is why we live here and paid accordingly for our houses. We are a mixed community of flats and houses with many children. The proposed plan will mean a huge increase in traffic flow, light and heavy, a huge increase in noise and pollution. I don't understand why it is acceptable to change our lives significantly to placate a group who bought their houses knowing where they were situated. You can't buy a house next to an airport and expect the planes to be stopped because they are inconvenient. As an asthmatic I fear the changes would not be good for my health.</p> <p>SAME PERSON:</p> <p>These proposals make Tudor Road the main access road to Richmond Park. This will completely change Tudor Road. It will become noisy, dangerous, with speeding traffic. Our animals are not used to heavy traffic, there will be fatalities.</p>
TR16/TR1 6bis	Tudor Road	<p>1. Increase in traffic on the road 2. Increase in pollution on the road 3. Harder than now to exit the road and will leave tailbacks down the road 4. Hard for residents to exit driveways 5. Cyclists are at more risk, my partner and sons are keen cyclists 6. The road will become less desirable to live on.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>You are moving the problem not resolving it. I am very concerned about the increase in pollution and traffic on Tudor road a quiet family road.</p>
Comments via email	Tudor Road	<p>This is the first proposal of changes to the Kings rd, New rd, & Tudor rd we have received and the final decision we are informed will be on March 27th.</p> <p>Planning permission to cut down a tree takes longer than that! As a resident of Tudor rd we are not happy about this proposal For Tudor rd to become one way. Tudor rd is much narrower than Kings rd and was originally built as a side rd whereas Kings rd was built as a main thoroughfare. The residents who bought properties there would have known that!</p> <p>We have lived in Tudor rd for 36years and so have seen the difference in traffic in all the roads. Kings rd has always been a through rd and it is unfair to penalise Tudor rd residents with the one way system. There are many reasons apart from the width of the rd.</p> <p>A) Cushions do not work as 4by4's and supermarket delivery vehicles sail over them at speed without even slowing down.</p> <p>B) When driving up Tudor rd and turning left into Queens rd is very difficult anyway and then to turn right into Liverpool rd is also very difficult, so the one way would produce a huge back log down Tudor rd and your plans will be giving any Kingston residents a license to do a rat run up Tudor rd at speed with many more vehicles.</p> <p>C) I suffer from Asthma and there are probably others also, pollution fumes from standing traffic would exacerbate this.</p> <p>D A new nursery school is opening in Park rd between New and Tudor rd. Not only will the increased traffic up Tudor rd make it very difficult for parents to cross Tudor rd to the nursery. Accidents will happen! The contra flow for cyclists down Tudor rd is madness and will make them more vulnerable to accidents.</p> <p>E) Residents trying to turn into or exit their driveways will have a great problem with fast rat run drivers losing patience and causing a backlog again.</p> <p>F) The map that you sent us has completely disregarded the last third of our road where there are flats and houses. They are</p>

		actually the entry point of our rd. I do sincerely hope that you will leave our rd out of this Proposal.
TR17	Tudor Road	I do not think that making Tudor Road a one way scheme is a good idea. There will be too many cars waiting at the top of the road, which will cause more pollution and frustration. It will be dangerous for parents and children heading to school as they will not be able to cross the road and prams will be pushed between the waiting cars. Cars will go even faster down the road and it will only cause more accidents. Please, please re-consider.
TR18/TR18bis	Tudor Road	<p>I strongly object to the proposal for the following reasons: It will simply move the current problems on Tudor, New and Kings Road and condense them into Tudor Road resulting in a massive increase in traffic up Tudor Road. It will funnel all traffic to the Park, Queens Road and Liverpool Road up Tudor Road. AM peak time traffic could rise from 123 to over 450 vehicles per hour - Tudor Road will be gridlocked. Turning left and right onto Queens Road from Tudor Road is already difficult and takes time. The increased traffic on Tudor Road will lead to long tailbacks dramatically increasing pollution from standing traffic. It will be almost impossible for cars in Tudor Road to exit their driveways. We will have to reverse into Tudor Road, into oncoming traffic and cyclists leading to a huge increase in accident risks and driver frustration. Absolutely crazy considering a cycle contra-flow system without fully segregated cycle lanes - accident waiting to happen. Increased traffic will make it more dangerous and difficult for pedestrians. There is a new nursery opening at the end of Tudor Road increasing pedestrian traffic flow. Despite having a 20 mph speed limit on Tudor Road, traffic speed up the road. This will be worse if it is one-way, as no traffic calming cushions are set out on the proposed plan. The proposal will change to nature of Tudor Road. We purchased our house in Tudor Road because it is quiet and very desirable to live here. Increased traffic, pollution and safety issues will have a negative impact making Tudor Road less desirable to live in.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Q3: I do not support the introduction of one way traffic systems in the area</p> <p>Q4: Firstly I believe that the Consultation process is flawed. The petition by some King's Road residents was lodged over 2 years ago. This consultation process was first communicated to Tudor Road residents 3 weeks ago and responses were requested within three weeks. It seems that a decision will be "rushed through" on 27th March. This does not allow for due process and consideration of all the issues. There should have been a meeting just for Tudor, New and Queen's Road residents to explore the proposals before formal consultations started. There was apparently a Working Group established by the Council of local residents. However that Group was described by the Council as being a group to "discuss further options on Kings Road ". The overwhelming number of residents in Tudor Road believed that the Group would not examine a one way system or other fundamental changes in Tudor Road and quite understandably did not become involved. We are now being asked to respond to this proposal in a totally under-prepared way and within an inadequate time scale. There are a number of other criticisms what could be made of this consultation process (including the design of this questionnaire, the lack of background information and the little time given to King's Road residents to voice their views over the last two years) but basically they all concern how the interests of Tudor Road residents have been side-lined. Turning to the Proposal itself, I do not understand why the proposal has been made before a full risk analysis has been made so that all stakeholders can assess the proper risks in a meaningful way. It seems that the cart is being put before the horse. The one area where all parties can agree is that any change to the current layout must centrally address the question of safety. The Council's own statistics and opinions show that 1. There will be more congestion at the west end of King's Road, the east end of Tudor Road and along Queen's Road. 2. The traffic in the area will be more widely dispersed so that pedestrians will need to be more careful at a substantially increased number of road junctions. 3. More congestion will lead to higher levels of pollution in more areas 4. Speed will increase in the one way systems and yet traffic calming measures will probably not significantly reduce speeds, (I note that the Council have not identified any traffic calming measures in Tudor Road) In addition and, as the Response from a group of Tudor Road residents has demonstrated, there will be a much larger number of right turns by vehicles at road junctions if the proposal proceeds. 70% of accidents at T junctions are caused by vehicles turning right. 77% of accidents involving motor cycles at similar junctions involve vehicles making right turns. It is clear that whilst there have been some accidents in Kings Road, it is likely that the proposal will cause many more "accident black spots" and this crucial area of safety issues has not been thought through properly. I would add that (1) there is no evidence that the new scheme will benefit pedestrians. Indeed it is my view that as the proposal would create more risk, it will reduce pedestrian use (2) the Kingston Cycle Campaign has decided firmly not to support the proposal. I realise that no decision has yet been made. However there is momentum behind the proposal and the Committee would not have supported the draft proposal if they thought that it was inappropriate. The concern of Tudor Road residents is that a decision has been made in principle to approve the proposal. The proposal needs much more analysis with the full and equal involvement of all parties. I urge the Committee to reject this proposal and to continue to look for another solution.</p>
TR19	Tudor Road	Making Kings Road one-way will increase traffic volume and speed. At the moment it may sometimes be difficult to navigate but it helps to keep down the traffic volume, noise and speed.
TR20	Tudor Road	This must not be allowed to happen for many reasons, some being the road don't take that amount of traffic, you are bringing the traffic nearer to the school and making it harder for pedestrians to cross the road, people can't. Cars will be blocked if any lorries use this road and they could be damaged or worse. This scheme isn't a solution to the problem - and I haven't even started in the knock-back problems you will get on Park Rd.
TR21	Tudor Road	Re Tudor Rd, it is madness to allow cyclists to turn into Tudor from Queens Rd only to meet oncoming traffic. Cyclists will use pavements to avoid cars (witnessed this while walking in Queens Rd). One-way traffic will present problems while reversing out of drive - cars never slow down to allow for this now. Cars will travel much faster if Tudor made one way. In Norbiton Avenue cars frequently drive at great speed over speed cushions. Therefore, no guarantee it will be different in Kings Rd area.
TR22	Tudor Road	These roads are too narrow for what you suggest.

TR23/TR23bis/TR23tris	Tudor Road	<p>As residents of Tudor Road, Kingston we wish to register our strong opposition to the proposal to make Tudor Road one way.</p> <p>Our main objections are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 The timetable for consultation is inadequate. We have had effectively only 10 days to reply, with no prior warning or information. 2 The proposal forecasts and increase in traffic from 143 to 411 at rush hours. This will turn Tudor Road from a quiet residential road into a main traffic route. 3 Tudor Road is not a viable route for this volume of traffic. Currently, the exit to Queens Road is often delayed because of the heavy traffic on Queens Road. It is also difficult to turn left against oncoming traffic. Queuing traffic backing up in Tudor Road will cause much greater pollution. Car owners in Tudor Road leaving or returning to their drives will delay traffic flow and create danger for residents. 4 The proposal for cycles to ride against the traffic flow in Tudor Road (with no cycle lane) invites accidents and will cause disputes with drivers. 5 Access to Tudor Road from Park Road will be constantly impeded by the stream of pedestrians and people taking their children to the four schools/nurseries in Alexandra Road/Park Road. This will endanger all road users. This crossing is also important for elderly and disabled people using the bus stop to Kingston twenty yards from Tudor Road on Park Road. The proposal will also increase traffic between Kings Road and Tudor Road and delay the 371 bus because of cars waiting to access Tudor Road. <p>To sum up: the scheme as proposed will have at least three results which are in direct conflict with key RBK objectives. It will: increase pollution in Tudor Road, discourage cycling by creating dangerous conditions, generate more car traffic in Richmond Park.</p> <p>The current road pattern is known to be difficult and many drivers avoid it. The new layout will attract more cars to the area and encourage them to drive through the Park.</p> <p>The predicted flow increase from 143 to 411 per hour means that pollution in Tudor Road and its access roads from Park Road will triple, at a time when RBK seeks to reduce pollution.</p> <p>Cycling against traffic in Tudor Road where no cycle lane is possible or proposed will create dangerous discouraging conditions for cyclists.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>The proposal will move the current problems on Tudor, New and Kings Road and condense them into Tudor Road. There will be a large increase in traffic eastbound in Tudor Road: by the Council's calculations AM peaks could rise from 123 to over 450 vehicles per hour. Turning left at the Tudor/Queens Road junction is only possible at present when there is no traffic coming from the left. Turning right is also difficult and takes time. The increase in traffic down Tudor Road will result in long tailbacks, greatly increasing pollution from standing traffic. The new traffic direction would make it difficult for cars to exit their driveways. Many would have to reverse into Tudor Road into oncoming traffic and cyclists. Allowing cyclists to ride the 'wrong way' down the one-way system without fully segregated lanes will leave them more vulnerable to anger/frustration from car drivers. A cycle lane running directly next to parked cars leaves cyclists vulnerable to being 'doored'. The plan shows no planned signage/indication to cars turning down Kings, New and Tudor Road to expect oncoming cyclists. When cars are waiting at the Tudor/Queens Road junction it is already difficult for pedestrians, dog walkers and people with children to cross the junction. The increase in traffic will make it an even more difficult and dangerous junction to cross. The increased traffic turning into the other end of Tudor Road from Park Road will make it significantly more difficult and dangerous for pedestrians, many of whom are elderly people using the bus stops, to cross this junction. On the map there is no indication that speed reducing cushions will be put on Tudor Road to prevent vehicles exceeding the 20 mph limit. Finally, we need an area traffic control scheme which takes in the three roads at issue plus Alexandra Road with its three schools and the parts of Park Road and Queens Road which would be affected.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Q3: I do not support one way traffic it will generate a vast increase in cars in a residential area</p> <p>Q4: Massive increase in eastbound traffic. Long tailbacks in Tudor road. danger to pedestrians taking buggies and children to the three schools in Alexandra Road. Increased pollution. Huge risk of accidents and driver frustration when cars exit their driveways in Tudor road. Cyclists vulnerable because no space for them. Cars will back up in Park Road waiting to access Tudor Road. RBK should be seeking to discourage car use in this area not make it easier or convenient.</p>
TR24	Tudor Road	<p>Q3: I am extremely concerned and hope the Council will look carefully at the adverse implications of the proposal on our three roads.</p> <p>Q4: How about widening Kings Road or allowing two wheels on pavement like other roads?</p> <p>I do not support one-way traffic in Tudor Road. With certainty not contra-flow cycle access. Also, pollution with build-up of traffic from Park Road up Tudor Road. Traffic calming will not deter 4x4 vehicles and delivery vans who will carry on in excess of 30mph.</p>
TR25	Tudor Road	<p>Q3: I do not support the introduction of one-way-traffic into and out of Richmond Park in North Kingston because a suitable remedy has already been proposed by Kingston Council to the residents of upper Kings Road which would enable them to park half-way onto the kerb on both sides of the road, allowing free passage of traffic in both directions, thus reducing congestion and pollution, as already implemented successfully lower down the Kings Road beyond the Park Road mini-roundabout. Residents in neighbouring roads, including New Road and Tudor Road were not informed of this common sense parking proposal or the reasons for its rejection. A TfL highway expert in Tudor Road has explained how one-way systems are now being phased out in Central London (cf Baker Street) because they have been found to cause more pollution, not less, by sending drivers on longer routes, rather than enabling them to take a more direct, shorter two-way route. There is St. Paul's Primary School, Alexandra Infant School and several day nurseries in the adjacent Alexandra Road and Park Road, and the proposed one-way scheme creates far more health and safety hazards for parents and young children, residents, pedestrians and cyclists and drivers than it attempts to resolve. When traffic is forced to queue in a one-way Tudor Road to gain access to Queens Road, drivers will quickly turn to Alexandra Road as an alternative. This proposal is nothing short of irresponsible.</p> <p>Q4: The way the Council has handled this proposal is entirely unsatisfactory and unacceptable for several reasons. The timing and nature of this 'conversation', as opposed to a genuine consultation, seems to be piggy-backing a one-way scheme that benefits solely the original complainants in the upper Kings Road on to a separate TfL cycle-lane scheme with grant. It also appears to have been pre-empted by premature council activity, and is a matter of great resentment and concern in the wider area that even before this 'conversation-consultation' is due to close, the signage posts for the proposed scheme have already been erected by or on behalf of the Council at the end of Tudor Road. This clearly represents a breach of trust and good faith by the Council towards the residents of New Road and Tudor Road. We, and the many other local council tax-paying residents see this as the heavy hand of grant-happy-bureaucracy over local democracy and a fait accompli. It is also well-known that a former Conservative Councillor is a key voice in the proposed Kings Road one-way scheme and would personally enjoy the transfer of traffic from what is and always has been a main access road into Richmond Park to adjoining side roads. This is not acceptable.</p>

TR26/TR2 6bis	Tudor Road	<p>Speeding during off peak & congestion during peak times coupled with difficult junctions will increase safety risks & pollution over a wider residential & school areas. There has been no proper assessment of impact or consultation. The proposal to widen the carriageway to ease the flow & mitigate the problems in Kings Rd should be re-examined.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>The one way scheme is ill conceived. It will cause wider risk to pedestrians, cyclists (including children on their way to school) and motorist. Queuing traffic during peak hours will further extend the pollution.</p>
TR27/TR2 7bis	Tudor Road	<p>Q3: I do not support the proposed one way traffic scheme. I think that the problem is in Kings Road and that adopting parking half on the pavement on one side (probably going down the road) would allow two way flow of traffic and reduce the issues. It would also be useful to restrict wide vehicles and lorries from travelling along residential roads - probably with restrictions at the top of Crescent Road and into Queens Road. Introducing a one way scheme into Tudor Road would have massive implications for the number of cars and pollution levels in the street. The junction at the top of Tudor Road is very tight, especially to turn left. So there is likely to be constant tailbacks down Tudor Road increasing pollution levels. I am also concerned that the bicycle traffic will be very vulnerable as it comes down a street with cars going up. It is important to have the traffic spread across the four roads between Park Road and Queens Road, so introducing one way traffic is unlikely to help this process. Experience elsewhere in London shows that one way streets result in faster traffic, considerably increasing the potential danger to pedestrians and cyclists. There are lots of children crossing Tudor Road to get to the schools in Alexandra Road and the nurseries on Park Road. These people need the roads to be as calm and clean as possible.</p> <p>Q4: I do not think that Tudor Road was given much notice to these plans, and were not invited to the consultations with Younes Hamade. This is in stark contrast to the approach taken to the people living in Kings Road, and not a fair way to behave. There is a risk that the decision will be made before fair consultation and discussion has been had with all the residents affected by these plans.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>This is the wrong time to be proposing such long term changes and they seem to be driven by a few residents in Kings Road without full consultation of the other roads, or evidence to suggest the overall traffic flows will be safer, better or less polluting. Kingston has faced a prolonged period of significant roadworks over at least a year such that there has been the inevitable use of residential streets by non-residential traffic. That work needs to be concluded, traffic flows allowed to return to "normal" and overall measures to dissuade the use of residential streets by non-residential vehicles considered. This is an inappropriate solution being proposed when any evidence gathered recently is not reflective of the long term situation. Kings Road has always been the more significant traffic path, along with Park Road & Queens Road and the residents will have known this. What's proposed is a significant re-routing of traffic onto more minor roads without any evidence or precedence offered that this is a good solution overall. One way roads create their own speed and attention issues, even with calming, so it's unproven as a safer option. Traffic flows by local residents increase as people have to "go round" to get into their road the right way, not to mention the safety issues of multiple turns on crowded streets to do that. Again, where's the evidence that the overall effect will be any better. There is an established precedent for dealing with this which is partial parking on the pavement, probably on one side to allow buggy access on the other given that it's an access route to the park. The residents concerned need to offer evidence as to why that's not a feasible solution that other residents in the borough accept - and not just something they don't prefer.</p>
TR28	Tudor Road	<p>I think the congestion issue in King's Road could be helped considerably by widening measures and/or priority passing places. The one way proposal, of which it appears that Tudor Road would bear the brunt, would cause a dangerous increase in traffic flow and speed in Tudor Road. This would put road users (including cyclists) and pedestrians at risk, particularly at both junctions onto and from the two main roads at either end which are used constantly throughout the day by parents and children attending the local nurseries and schools. In addition, to encourage cyclists to use a one way street in the wrong direction on such a narrow road as Tudor Road with parked cars on both sides is incredibly dangerous. Also, the expected increase in traffic flow would lead to queueing traffic from the Queen's Road junction.....leading to increased pollution from cars attempting to leave Tudor Road. I think the one way proposal will worsen the traffic situation in the whole area and in particular will not only create but actually encourage dangerous levels of speeding vehicles (two way traffic acts as a natural speed reducer) in Tudor Road. I am strongly against the proposal and I'm sure that the best plan would be to re-focus on a physical change of the road layout in King's Road to allow a more generous passing place. Also a ban on large delivery vehicles using the local roads as shortcuts should be considered as these often add significantly to the already congested local road network.</p>
TR29	Tudor Road	<p>To improve cycle safety there needs to be a way to slow cycles down. If you drive around the local roads or through the park doing 20 MPH you have cycles over and undertaking. This area is not a cycle race track and action needs to be taken. Tudor Road is not safe for cycles. The drains at the bottom of the hill don't work and the area is a swimming pool when it rains. There will be more cycle accidents sending more traffic up Tudor Road not less. Fix the drains, and road subsidence if you are to send more traffic up this road and reduce cycle speeds.</p>
TR30	Tudor Road	<p>In Kings Road no more issues than ours. All roads bad when people visiting the Park, but not all year round. I strongly oppose this proposal.</p> <p>This is absolutely ridiculous to think of making this and New Road one-way. You are clearly not aware of the volume of traffic that comes through this road. If you have a delivery lorry or refuse truck and this was one-way we would never get out to work as we couldn't turn back. It's difficult enough getting out of Tudor Road onto Queens Road; also Kings Road is wider than ours so you need to look at that. I don't want to be living here with a stream of vehicles with running engines because of pollution. Who is thinking this up? Maybe it's someone who lives in Kings Road?</p>
TR31	Tudor Road	<p>Q3: I do not support any form of one way traffic system, as this will create more problems than it solves. This will create more risk in Tudor Road for pedestrians and cyclists, and will exacerbate any air pollution problem. One way traffic is shown by the latest research to speed up traffic, and is now being universally limited and reversed, especially here in the U.K. for example Baker Street.</p> <p>Q4: I have carefully measured the Kings Road in all the upper and middle sections, and agree the very best suggestion was the enabling of two wheels to be parked on a modified pavement as it is currently in the middle portion of Kings Road. After meetings with The Kings Road residents at their request, we asked them about this as a solution for them, our group of residents, were shocked to hear that their objection to the pavement parking was that it looked unattractive, and only to be asked by the Kings Road members, would you like it like that in your Road? Showing everyone that their objection to a sensible solution was one purely about the aesthetic, a very superficial priority!!</p>
TR32/TR3 2bis/TR32t ris	Tudor Road	<p>Tudor Road is totally unsuitable to carry the entire burden of eastbound traffic to Richmond Park and Liverpool Road for the following reasons: 1. The road is narrow, with off-road parking throughout, with frequent access to driveways required, which causes total blockage of the road and has poor visibility due to frequent poor parking in on-road bays, often overhanging driveways. 2. Cycle traffic is high in both directions, and at weekends we carry the bulk of cycle traffic from Richmond Park as well as frequent equestrian traffic, which use our road as a safe haven. 3. Due to the current quiet nature of the road, properties are occupied by a large number of people requiring relative tranquillity, including many retirees with health problems and night/home workers, who would be disproportionately affected by increases in noise and particulate pollution. The north side of the road is also a conservation area, where most houses do not have double glazing due to</p>

	<p>planning requirements. 4. The current quiet nature of Tudor and New Roads also means that property prices incur a premium, which would then be lost causing significant devaluation, with considerable financial harm to residents. Property in these roads is currently in high demand as there are many people seeking the rare peace that living here offers. Residents of King's Road have not paid this premium on the grounds that it has always been a broad, busy road, designed for a higher traffic throughput. Due to the quiet atmosphere there is also a high degree of pet ownership, with animals frequently in the road and unused to high volumes of traffic. Likewise, child cyclists also preferentially use this and New Road, especially at weekends. 5. Eastbound traffic has a tendency to fail to stop and give way at the junction of Elm Road and Park Road, which results in near misses on a frequent basis. Increased traffic at this junction, which is not suitable for installation of a roundabout to stop this phenomenon, as is present at the junction of King's Road and Park Road, will result in accidents at this junction. This can also make it difficult to cross Tudor Road at busy times - when there are a lot of children walking to the primary school in Alexandra Road. 6. Turning left at the top of Tudor Road is extremely difficult at peak times, due to the high volume of incoming traffic from the right along Queen's Road. During times where traffic has increased eastbound along Tudor Road (for example on the evening of Feb 21st when there was an incident which drove a significantly larger amount of traffic along this route), Tudor Road is very quickly at a standstill and backed up to the junction with Park Road, causing tailbacks and friction between drivers. Any residents wishing to exit or enter driveways incur threats and poor language during these periods, and tempers fray along with aggressive and unsafe driving practices required to exit at the Queen's Road junction. Cyclists are also at risk as they are either forced onto the pavements, representing a risk to pedestrians, or given very little clearance by car traffic, representing a risk to themselves. 7. The narrow clearance and fast speeds of eastbound traffic accelerating uphill also means that any cars parked on-road on the south side of Tudor Road will be near-impossible to access on the driver's side whilst traffic is flowing. New Road is extremely narrow and is currently used mostly for westbound relief when King's Road is congested. There is very little visibility to the sides, and again there are many pets and the road is a haven for inexperienced cyclists and residents. It would seem more appropriate to keep the broad thoroughfare of King's Road as is, or alleviate congestion by removing parking bays along one side. I think that we would all rather have more competition for occupancy of the on-road parking in Tudor Road than the increase in traffic noise that channelling all of the eastbound traffic would cause. A mini-roundabout or no-right turn/no-left turn arrangement at the junction with Queen's Road could also help reduce traffic flow and any issues which may occur at the junction. A no-right turn would drive some of the eastbound traffic bound for Liverpool Road through Tudor Drive, if New Road was designated westbound-only, which would be far preferable to driving all of the eastbound traffic that way. Also, traffic lights at the junction of King's and Queen's Road may be feasible to allow traffic to exit and enter King's Road safely and with minimal disruption. I am also very concerned by the suggestion that cycle traffic could continue to use Tudor Road westbound against the flow of traffic! Cycle traffic is already at risk when travelling with the flow, as indicated above, and there simply is no room for cyclists to travel on both sides of the traffic simultaneously (on an otherwise one-way road!!). There is also the danger that frustrated eastbound traffic would use Alexandra Road as a rat-run due to inevitable tailbacks at peak times. This would be unsafe for schoolchildren crossing to attend the primary school.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Q3: I don't support the introduction of one-way traffic. One thing I often hear from drivers is how much they dislike the main one-way system in Kingston, I can't see any benefit in adding to the confusion for drivers (especially for those just visiting for the park, Riverside, or some of the other great things about Kingston).</p> <p>Q4: One general comment: the writing on the detailed map linked to from this survey is unreadable - even if you zoom in, it's not possible to read the text in boxes. I am very strongly against these proposed measures. They appear to solely benefit Kings Road, and move more than half their existing traffic onto other roads (i.e. Tudor Road and New Road). This is a huge change (and a large benefit to Kings Road), at a huge cost to the other two roads. By making Tudor Road one way, then the *entire* flow of eastbound traffic will pass through this single narrow road. There are already issues with people struggling to pull out of their drives in the morning. The road is also frequently blocked when delivery vans or postmen stop to deliver, on rubbish collection days, or when cars are reversing out of their drives. Traffic is currently split across 3 roads, which seems both fair and practical. It also means if there are any issues/roadworks/breakdowns blocking one road, then there are still other options. For people on Tudor Road that need to commute towards town in the morning, the change would significantly increase their journey time. They'd need to join traffic on Queen's road (which is already hard to pull out into when it's busy, as cars don't often leave gaps to pull out), and then loop back down and around on one of the other one way roads. Given that it's generally hard to pull out on to Queen's road from Tudor road on busy times, making it one way will lead to significant tailbacks. This sometimes happens at the moment, even with the traffic being 2 way. This has often led to dangerous behaviour from drivers when pulling out on to Queen's Road. Traffic coming up this road from Elm Road is also sometimes an issue - some drivers (especially trade or delivery vans) tend to drive very fast from Elm Road on to Tudor Road without stopping at the junction in some cases. This would likely worsen if all traffic from Elm Road is forced up Tudor Road. Tailbacks up Tudor Road (from traffic coming up Elm Road) have already been a significant issue when King's Road has been congested/blocked - this is guaranteed to worsen if it becomes the sole eastbound route. Tudor Road and New Road are also currently popular for cyclists, dog walkers, and horses heading to and from Richmond Park. There are often families with young children cycling up those roads together as they're safe, this would no longer be the case if traffic increases significantly. It's also likely that any increase in traffic, or introduction of a one-way system would drive traffic on to Alexandra road - this has a school on it, and young children frequently cross that road, these changes risk making things less safe for them. I'd also point out that one of the reasons many people chose to move to Tudor Road and New Road was because they were a bit quieter and less polluted. Many retired people, people with young children, and several residents with health issues I've met have commented that they moved here from noisier and polluted areas especially for that reason. They also ended up paying a lot more for buying/renting a house because of that. While I sympathise with traffic issues on Kings Road, residents will have been aware of that when they moved in, and also paid less for buying/renting because of that. The proposed changes aren't just a minor alteration to traffic, but a massive redirection of heavy traffic on to a quiet/clean road (as well as being a risk to children and cyclists). The proposal for having cycle traffic going against the one-way traffic also seems extremely dangerous. The road is already narrow enough, and cyclists have to cycle in the middle of the road in order to avoid car doors opening, wing mirrors, etc. There simply won't be room for this if there's a constant flow of traffic going in the opposite direction.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>SAME PERSON:</p> <p>I do not support driving half the current traffic from the broad thoroughfare of Kings Road through the narrow street of Tudor Road, which has numerous off road vehicle accesses, high pet ownership and high retiree and night worker resident numbers due to current quiet nature, for which they all paid a premium!</p> <p>When there have been incidents (e.g. as witnessed 5-7pm 21st Feb) driving extra traffic through Tudor Road and New Road, this has caused immediate tailbacks to Park Road, near misses at the Elm Road junction and caused big problems to people needing access to and from driveways. In short, this will cause chaos at the junctions of Elm Road and Park Road, and at Queen's Road plus Tudor Road/New Road.</p>
--	---

TR33	Tudor Road	Remove some 'on-road' parking spaces in King's Road to allow traffic to progress far more rapidly. I've walked along this road for 18 years and notice that the excess of parked cars cause the delays. The imposition of three one-way systems is total overkill and spreads the problem to other road: totally unnecessary.
TR34/TR3 4bis	Tudor Road	<p>Q3: I do not support the introduction of on-way traffic in the area.</p> <p>Q4: While it is clear that the surrounding areas of Kingston Gate (entry to Richmond Park) are busy with traffic, especially at the weekend, the proposed changes and traffic management plan only shifts the problem to other roads. Those roads will be unable to cope and I believe the problem will worsen not improve overall. Tudor road will be severely and adversely affected by the proposal. The introduction of a one way system, will result in all traffic from the surrounding area having to use Tudor Road to access the park and this is unacceptable. Tudor Road would essentially (at least) triple the amount of traffic it has currently as it will receive the existing traffic from both Kings Road and New Road. Tudor Road has off road parking and for those properties, at peak times, they will not be able to safely access the road. Kings Road does not have this problem. We understand that Kings Road is busy but this is not the right solution. It has been poorly thought through and should not be accepted. This area is a residential area, with many families and children, walking and on bikes. The proposed changes will result in increased speeds down Tudor Road in lower peak times causing a safety issue. In peak times, tail backs will be guaranteed as turning right will become problematic. That means cars will be idling on the road causing unacceptable increased pollution - again this is a family area and increasing childrens' exposure is unacceptable. We are also surrounded by schools and childrens' groups.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>I'm strongly opposed to the proposed plan as it would have an extremely negative impact on Tudor Road and other surrounding roads. We chose to live on Tudor Road because it's quieter and we have a young child. I feel that the issue on King's road is being shifted to other roads which should not bear the increased burden of traffic or the additional pollution associated with it. It's not fair on residents of Tudor Road, or other surrounding roads, which would also be adversely affected. I'm also concerned for the possible impact this may have on Alexandra Road which not only has a school, but also St Paul's Church which hosts a very popular children's group several times a week. Any increase in traffic on this road would also be completely unacceptable as children are most at risk from air pollution, not to mention the risks associated with additional cars on that road.</p>
TR35	Tudor Road	<p>Q3: I do not believe the introduction of one way traffic is a good idea.</p> <p>Q4: This is not well thought through - there will be significantly more traffic on narrower roads. Tudor road will become congested with an increase in pollution. My child has asthma and there are health implications for him. There will be a backup of traffic as it will be difficult for the increased volume of traffic to turn out of Tudor Road - this junction is not as wide as King's Road and it is tight already. This will hold up traffic down the road making it difficult for people to get out of their driveways.</p>
TR36/TR3 6bis	Tudor Road	<p>I do not support the proposed one way traffic scheme for this area. As residents we feel it is important that we can use the roads in both directions. Furthermore, these proposals are with the purpose of relieving through-traffic, congestion, and air pollution. The proposal would not solve or relieve these issues, but may actually increase traffic flows, congestion and confusion in the area. The main problem seems to be the sheer volume of traffic in the area due to the Richmond Park entrance, adjacent residential areas, and the historic narrow roads in the area.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>I am strongly opposed to the scheme. I believe, based on the proposed plans and existing traffic plans that the scheme (as proposed) would lead to an increase in traffic throughout the area. The proposal does nothing to provide for alternative means of access or egress to the Park nor does it support alternative methods of travel. From the specific perspective as a resident of Tudor Rd, the one way traffic flow would increase vehicular volume and with it, noise and pollution. Because we're in a conservation zone, we can't easily mitigate against this with things like double glazing: the effect on our quiet enjoyment of our property would be significant. Finally, it would increase the amount of time we would need to spent in our car driving to the shops etc. around Kingston - ironically, this would of course cause more pollution, noise and nuisance for other residents. At the moment, it's far too easy to drive into and through Richmond Park. Rather than cause more problems for local residents, RBK and Royal Parks should concentrate on a joint, comprehensive strategy to reduce vehicular traffic in and around the Park, with a strong emphasis on cycling etc. This should consider reducing parking provision in the park to deter car journeys. Without a comprehensive plan, this is simply moving any problems which might exist around which ultimately benefits no one.</p>
TR37	Tudor Road	<p>Q3: If there had to be any changes, it would be better for traffic to go up Kings Road from Park Road and down New Road and Tudor Road.</p> <p>Q4: Make parking on Kings Road on one side only.</p>
NR1	New Road	This seems like clearly a bad outcome for New Road. It will increase traffic and road speeds on our road and mean we can only leave our house in one direction. It is not clear that this is designed to improve the situation overall, it feels like Kings Road residents wish to move their problems to New Road and Tudor Road. We are concerned about the impact of the traffic calming measures. Cars slowing down and breaking to use them will make additional noise. And if there is any loss of parking spots that will be a big problem as it is already very difficult to park on New Road.
NR12/NR1 2bis/NR12 tris	New Road	<p>I would like New Road And Tudor Road to remain two-way traffic - it naturally slows people down.</p> <p>One-way would undoubtedly increase the traffic and speed of cars, therefore as a resident I strongly object to the introduction of one-way.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>I am happy with current situation as width of road keep traffic speed minimalised, plus we are not interested in having speed bumps plus one-way which would result in extra traffic - also, we prefer option of a two-way thoroughfare.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>VIA EMAIL: Dear sir / madam</p> <p>As a resident of New Road I oppose the one way scheme which has been proposed. Two way traffic automatically slows cars down making it generally safer for local residents and the amount of cars that use the road. One way traffic will increase speed and use of the roads eventually making the proposed roads rat runs.</p> <p>I would be grateful if my concerns are raised at the consultation.</p>
NR3	New Road	I do not support one-way traffic. Particularly on New Road which is very narrow and would become a rat run. It goes against the character of the street to have traffic calming measures.
NR4	New Road	<p>Q3: All park traffic west of the area will be forced up Tudor Rd: simply impossible! All residents from King's Rd and New Rd will also be forced up Tudor Rd to access the park on Liverpool Rd.</p> <p>Q4: There is major problem with this proposal (or seems to be). All traffic going to the park from Park Rd, Tudor Dr and from Ham will be directed along Tudor Rd - a tiny road. Residents from Kings Rd and New Rd also need to go up Tudor Rd to get to the park or Liverpool Rd.</p>

NR5	New Road	By turning (New Rd) & Kings Rd as one way system you'll create more traffic in both ways therefore more noise and risk of collision, and damaging cars parked. The best way is to have humps on New Road to slow down the traffic and cars would choose another way to keep away from humps.
NR6	New Road	We purchased our house in New Road to avoid living on a main thoroughfare. The proposals change New Road into a main road.
NR7/NR7bis	New Road	In New Rd parking is always a problem in the evenings (parking on one side only, when most families have at least two cars, not enough spaces) - with road restrictions, will lose even more parking. For us living in one of the two roads will be totally frustrating to sit in a traffic jam going in the wrong direction that we need to go in to then do it again trying to get up one of the main roads. People will use Alexandra Rd to avoid these two roads, far from ideal on a road with a school on it. ----- I can only see this leading to more congestion in all the roads and surrounding roads, This in turn will lead to more pollution, speeding in other side roads and dangerous driving, the local schools should be very concerned.
NR8	New Road	New Road: exiting onto Park Road is hazardous due to limited visibility to the right. Installation of traffic mirrors would be required at the New Road/Park Road intersection. Extra traffic north-bound on Tudor Road would cause major issues at rush time for those wanting to turn right onto Queen's Road. Traffic in New Road is already very fast; hazards to children. Signage on Kingston Park Gate to indicate new traffic arrangements.
NR9	New Road	New Road is very narrow and all the houses and flats have no front gardens to distance themselves from road air pollution and extra noise.
NR10	New Road	This will mean an extra half mile drive every time I come home or want to go up Kingston Hill. Massively increased traffic congestion. Kings Road buyers knew where they were buying. I will take legal action against the Council if this proceeds.
NR11/NR11bis	New Road	You are not interested in local views on last century's dangerous scheme. 1. It will inevitably increase pollution, on the quiet, narrow roads and endanger the many young children walking down from Liverpool Road to the 4 or 5 schools off Park road. 2. New Road is too narrow to accommodate speed humps. 3. Residents with off road parking find it difficult enough already to get on and off their drives, depending on what is parked opposite. 4. Cyclists, young and old will, literally, be squished out against cars or prevented from learning to ride safely and there will be no safe route to Richmond Park for horses. 5. I hope this idea will not be resuscitated again! ----- SAME PERSON: Again and again this idea has been seen by RBK and residents as unworkable. The roads are too narrow for humps. One-way will restrict, be dangerous to cyclists and walkers.
NR12/NR12bis	New Road	I would like New Road And Tudor Road to remain two-way traffic - it naturally slows people down. One-way would undoubtedly increase the traffic and speed of cars, therefore as a resident I strongly object to the introduction of one-way. ----- I am happy with current situation as width of road keep traffic speed minimalised, plus we are not interested in having speed bumps plus one-way which would result in extra traffic - also, we prefer option of a two-way thoroughfare.
NR13	New Road	The roads are busy at peak times but I don't believe the proposed changes will provide any improvement to the area as a whole. The changes will have a particularly detrimental effect on traffic volume in Tudor Road. At peak times, particularly mornings there will be a huge queue of traffic attempting to join Queen's Road. At peak times I suspect the flow of traffic on Queen's Road towards the park will be such that traffic wishing to turn right into Kings Road and New Road will have little opportunity. The western ends of both King's Road and New Road will be busier as joining onto Park Road will be significantly more difficult due to the traffic that once travelled eastwards on King's Road will be forced to head for Tudor Road. Overall, I feel the scheme address the concerns of a few to the detriment of the many.
NR14	New Road	Q3: Straddle speed ramps are ineffective on one way roads. I hope this scheme is not approved, but full sleeping policemen must be used in all roads if it is. Q4: To the extent that there is some delay caused by restricted space for two-way traffic on Kings Road, surely that is the aim of traffic calming. If you want the traffic to flow faster again, make more 'passing points' by cancelling some parking spaces and/or allowing cars to park partly on the pavement like in the lower section of Kings Road. The proposed one way system is a waste of money that will extend distance travelled, increase pollution and create pedestrian hazards outside two busy schools.
NR15	New Road	Q4: Is it possible to increase the number of parking bays? For example, remove the posts in New Road which were to protect the ticket machine which has now been removed.
NR17/NR17bis	New Road	I do not support the one-way system down New Road and Tudor Road. It is going to cause congestion during busy periods. There is no traffic circle or traffic lights to help the flow during busy period. Kings Road does have a traffic circle which helps the flow. All the benefit of this change benefit Kings Road. Furthermore speed reducing cushions are not enough to stop speeding down New Road.
SR1	Shortlands Road	Kings Rd is a busy road, but only at peak times. The junctions at both ends of this section of Kings Rd will be just as busy and groups of cyclists will go even faster round and between cars. Proposal will increase traffic on Alexandra Rd which has 2 primary schools.
SR2	Shortlands Road	Q3: I do not support one sentence at all (very opposed to one-way traffic). The existing situation is absolutely acceptable. Q4: The parking permit system is absolutely ridiculous (no criminal). Not only have you closed the bend on RD shop (+ Guildhall Office), the system within the tender fine in the north is a nightmare (UNCLEAR HAND-WRITING). Please scrap the permit system and revert back to free parking as was the case before 2003.

SR3/SR3bis	Shortlands Road	<p>Kings Road is frequently brought to a standstill by inconsiderate drivers. I walk to Richmond Park every day with my dog, and am constantly amazed at what I see. Cars gridlocked as some refuse to let others by; road rage incidents; bike rage incidents; coaches and lorries that get stuck trying to turn into the top of Kings Road when they realise they cannot go through the park. It's dangerous to try and cross and cyclists are regularly on the pavement, which is not safe for them or pavement users. The speed some of the cars try to travel at does not help as well. Something urgently needs to be done before someone is injured or killed.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>The sheer volume of cars is immense in this area - the area cannot cope. The resultant pollution has not been mentioned at all in this consultation. The upper end of Kings Road is frequently gridlocked. It's dangerous. Cars parked on this road are often damaged; drivers get very angry; and it's not safe for people walking and cycling to the park. This situation needs to be resolved urgently.</p>
SR4	Shortlands Road	If these are the same residents who insisted on the relocation of playground in Richmond Park, they should be told to count their blessings and not expect the rest of us to pay to their inconveniences. The Council has far more important priorities for their funds.
SR5	Shortlands Road	Great idea - but please provide a cycle lane on Kings Rd leading to the park which is heavily used by cyclists for training. Seems to work ok on Fairfield West for example. Besides this, the sooner the better.
SR6	Shortlands Road	<p>Q3: Traffic coming down New Rd should only be able to turn left onto Park Rd to prevent congestion of cars trying to turn right across Park Rd towards Kings Rd.</p> <p>Q4: Unnecessary expenses to put speed bumps and move disruption of installation to a continually disrupted area due to never ending road works. Traffic congestion in Kings Rd mainly occurs with school traffic - no traffic when park closed and half term school holidays. Money should be spent on keeping our roads and pavements clear from broken glass, dog mess, etc.</p>
SR7/SR7bis	Shortlands Road	<p>Q3: I do not support the one way traffic system, see comments below for an alternative suggestion - restricting parking to one side - which should be considered in the first instance before such a disruption change to other roads.</p> <p>Q4: We do not support the changes proposed as this will only create more havoc for the local residents. In particular, it will increase the risk of traffic and air pollution for more children living in this very residential area. The area has a very high population of children under 10 years of age – the age group which are at most risk of developing asthma and other respiratory problems. Kings road congestion only occurs on sunny days at the weekend. Even roads where schools are, have more traffic during the week compared to this section of Kings road. Having lived here for several years, most other times during Monday to Friday and when not a sunny weekend the road is very quiet and a large part of time, only a couple of cars passing by which cannot justify such a change in the other roads. New Road is a very narrow road and diverting traffic down this road can increase accidents especially at the junction between New Road and Park Road due to low visibility. If this becomes a route – more drivers will also try to drive across park road onto Shortlands Road – this is not a direct path and I have seen a number of near misses as a result of this. The end of Kings road has a wide junction with a roundabout to prevent these sorts of accidents. It would be better to restrict parking to only one side of Kings road – the side that already has many off street parking households. This will thus allow traffic to flow more easily as 2 cars can pass by each other easily – you can see this when there are several free parking spaces and 2 way traffic is very clearly possible. This should be considered as a first option in order to prevent an increase of traffic onto roads which are NOT designed to take such a diversion. We hope you will consider this alternative approach.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Q3: I strongly do not support the proposed solution, I don't believe that it is an issue and would be interested to know what other options were considered.</p> <p>Q4: There are significant number of properties that have off-street parking on this section of Kings Road, yet despite this they still have on-street parking options along the full length of the road on both sides unlike most of Kings Road. This would appear to result in an over capacity of parking as there is often a fair proportion of the parking space unused. The cheapest and easiest solution would be to reduce the on-street parking to allow more efficient traffic flow. Was this option considered at all? Given the number of cars normally utilising the on street parking, reducing parking to one side only would allow two way traffic to proceed unhindered, without impacting the wider neighbourhood. Was this cheap option considered? Even a small reduction of the on-street to provide addition passing places and more space near the junctions would improve traffic flow. Increasing the volume of traffic on New Road would elevate the risk of accidents as the pub on New Road often has families in, combined with the narrow nature of the road will make crossing more risky given visibility issues. The junction New Road - Park Road - Shortlands Road is off-set and often dangerous to cross given the speed of traffic on Park Road. Increasing the volume of traffic on New Road will elevate the risk of accidents at this junction. Encouraging increased traffic to use Shortlands Road is also likely to lead to knock-on congestion as this section of Shortlands is relatively long and does not have any passing places. Even today, congestion often occurs along this section whilst one car waits for the other to drive the length of the road. All the junctions involving New Road and Tudor Road on to Park Road or Queens Road will see increased traffic compared to the current situation. With Park Road and Queens Road busy and relatively fast, without addition traffic calming measures or road layouts, I suspect that these will become new points of congestion, accidents and disruption. Increasing traffic on to Alexandra Road would be problematic during school terms, as there are frequent periods of bad congestion along this road already. Overall this seems to be a very disruptive and expensive solution to something that is not that bad, negatively impacting more residents than will benefit from it.</p>
SR8	Shortlands Road	New Road and Tudor Road are not suitable for an increase in traffic.
SR9	Shortlands Road	<p>Q3: Increasing traffic on Alexandra Road will create chaos, especially as two schools are there.</p> <p>Q4: Why can't cyclists comply the same as cars?</p>
SR10	Shortlands Road	The proposed outlined will have an enormous effect on Alexandra Road where they will significantly increase traffic pollution directly outside two primary school playing grounds. They will also increase traffic on Alexandra Road potentially endangering children as they arrive/leave school. I live very close to Kings Road and do not find the road particularly congested, so don't think the proposed measures are necessary.
SR11	Shortlands Road	<p>Q3: I do not support one way traffic.</p> <p>Q4: 1. Walking up Kings Road into Richmond Park every day at peak periods I have not noticed any traffic issues - the current traffic bumps regulate traffic. 2. Routing traffic from Park Road (from both Ham and Norbinton directions), Kings Road (south), Shortlands Road and Elm Road into Tudor Road will overload the narrow Tudor Road as well as be a potential danger to cyclists 3. Refuse vehicles have problems navigating ALL the above mentioned roads and block them for the short amount of time once a week that they are operating in each road. 4. Cyclist accidents will be moved from Kings Road to Tudor Road (Queens Road and Park Road junctions).</p>
SR12	Shortlands Road	<p>Q3: I agree that one-way proposals are sensible, however I am concerned about the impact on Alexandra Road.</p> <p>Q4: I am very concerned that Alexandra Road has not been considered as part of these proposals .The road has two schools and a church and the proposals would seem to increase traffic on this road, posing safety concerns for children. Please consider Alexandra Road as part of a wide set of proposals.</p>

ER1	Elm Road	<p>Q3: I OBJECT to the introduction of one-way traffic and besides this is a loaded question! I suggest if the council intends to seek public consultation on this proposal that it do so properly otherwise it risks an administrative law challenge on grounds that it has failed to consult properly on this proposal.</p> <p>Q4: The council's proposal to introduce one-way traffic along Kings Road may well ease traffic flow along solely Kings Road during peak hours. However, that will be to the significant detrimental of adjacent residential streets, which will suffer significant increased traffic flow, congestion with corresponding dangers to pedestrians, noise and air pollution. Directing traffic southbound down Tudor Road (currently a very quiet residential back street) is a terrible idea. Not only will it ruin Tudor Road, a quiet residential street, it is unreasonable for the council to expect that traffic to then turn left or right along Park Road, when instead drivers are highly likely to continue along Elm Road, a residential street that already suffers from being a 'rat run' during peak hours and needs no further traffic flow or congestion pressure. Elm Road is frequently used by families and school children walking to the various primary schools in the area and increased traffic flow along Elm Road will cause a danger to pedestrians notwithstanding increased noise and air pollution. Not only will the council's proposal directly affect Tudor Road and Elm Road, it will also cause greater congestion along all surrounding roads as the traffic flow along just Kings Road is eased has a knock on effect of creating bottle necks along these adjacent quiet residential streets. Current peak traffic is confined to Kings Road, a street that is right next to Richmond Park and known to be busy during peak hours. Why does the council see fit to appease residents of Kings Road to the detriment of residents, pedestrians and schools in the surrounding area! The council's plan is not a viable proposal. A far better consideration would be to work with Richmond Park around the times Kingston Gate is open during the week day peak hours to vehicle traffic. The reason Kings Road gets so busy is drivers using Richmond Park as a peak hour commuter through fare. That should not be the appropriate use of the park - it is not there as a rat run for commuters during peak hours. The council's plan seeks to fix traffic along one small section of road. Its plan will have a significant and dangerous detrimental effect on all surrounding residential streets and should be opposed on those grounds.</p>
ER2	Elm Road	<p>Q3: I think it's a good idea but suggest you look carefully at the junction of Tudor Rd and Queens Rd. I often have difficulty in turning left onto Queens Rd without swinging over in to oncoming traffic as it is very narrow and tight bend.</p> <p>Q4: Would it work any better the other way around?</p>
ER3/ER3bis	Elm Road	<p>Q3: Traffic exiting Richmond Park and wishing to turn right into the proposed one way system in Kings Road will be prevented by traffic going North heading for the park in Queen's Rd. Neither New Road nor Tudor Road can accommodate traffic flow, especially Tudor Rd dealing with all traffic heading for Richmond Park. Alternatively have King's Road Eastbound only (towards the park) and have left and right only lanes at the junction of Queens Rd. Make New Road AND Tudor Rd Westbound only.</p> <p>Q4: The current proposal will cause a bottle neck at King's Rd J/W Queen's Rd. With my proposal New Rd & Tudor Rd going Westbound only will not have issues turning into Park Rd as most traffic will have turned East into King's Rd heading for Richmond Park.</p> <p>VIA EMAIL: Regarding the proposed traffic calming measures for the above roads.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is no need for calming measures on these roads due to their narrow widths and two way traffic currently using all three roads. 2. The issue is King's Road. Congestion in this road will no doubt be causing concern of residents, cars stationary and pumping out pollution. Vehicles travelling in both directions spending time stationary being the issue. 3. The proposed scheme is not well thought out. Having lived in Elm Road for over 25 years and using all three roads I have experience of the problem. I prefer not to use King's Road due to the conflict of two way traffic which impacts on my journey time. 4. I support a change in the roads layouts HOWEVER: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Traffic exiting Richmond Park will be blocked from turning right into King's Rd by traffic intending to enter the Park from Queen's Road. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. A better solution would be to make King's Road one way but in the other direction, thereby vehicles intending to enter the park will have a left turn lane only facilitating a free flow of traffic, a right turn only lane at this junction will have some issues in filtering into the traffic from Richmond Park. ii. Make New Road and Tudor Road one way Westbound. Vehicle from the park will take their first opportunity to head towards Park Road, traffic from Kingston Hill may take Tudor Road. At the roundabout at Park Road, Kings Road those heading to the park will have a simple left turn rather than the existing scheme where there would be a conflict in trying to exit King's Road where traffic from Park Road heading South will have right of way. This will back up traffic and the pollution issue continues. iii. Under my alternative proposal traffic exiting from both New Road & Tudor Road will not have problems as most traffic in this area are either heading to or from Richmond park. iv. Under the existing proposal New Road is too small to accommodate all the traffic from the park heading towards Park Road. Please visit this road it really is too narrow. <p>As an aside there is little that can be done to reduce cyclists' accidents whilst they believe Richmond Park is a racetrack and believe they can ride without any consideration to other road users, cutting across motorists, overtaking vehicles with no regard to pedestrians, dogs, horses or other vehicles. A visit to the park on a sunny Saturday and you will see cyclist riding two three or more abreast, over and undertaking cars. As a motorist I have to spend most of my time watching my mirrors. I am sorry for the length of this email but hope you can see my point.</p> <p>Regards -----</p> <p>Having received your letter ad recommendations for the changes to the top of Kings road, New road, and Tudor road in north Kingston I wish to say that one does not resolve anything at peak times. From 930am in the morning during the week (I walk every morning my dog) there is no problem. If someone has been physically there every morning watching the traffic they will see that the peak times between 8am and 930am and at school home times till 530pm there is congestion in Kings road only. The other roads are not affected at all! So why do it? Reasons why not: It will add more traffic to New road and Tudor road which currently do not have any. If you propose one way on kings road going down out of the park this will cause congestion inside the park waiting to come out of the gate and consequently pollution in the park which no one wants!. This is because the cars will have to wait before turning into Kings road giving way to traffic going into the park along Queens road. Anyone watching traffic flow before making such a suggestion WOULD SEE this. New Road is a very narrow road and it has a pub which has very often deliveries by lorry which literally blocks the road! This means the traffic will be regularly backed up there either in Queens road or park road .This will also cause congestion! If you are proposing the traffic goes up Tudor road to go down queens road and into the park that will cause more traffic on: . queens road and going in the park thereby blocking more cars from coming out of the park and going down kings road. . more congestion at the top of Tudor road to go in queens road which does not help the people in Tudor road.</p>

		<p>. blocking the traffic turning down from queens road park end or Liverpool road into New Road.</p> <p>This scheme will cause more congestion in more areas that the couple of hours a day currently ONLY affecting kings road at the moment!!! So why do it ?</p> <p>IF IT HAS TO BE DONE BECAUSE I KNOW KINGSTON IS MAD ON ONE WAY SYSTEMS AND KEEPING TRAFFIC STUCK IN ONE AREA THEREBY CAUSING MORE POLLUTION ,I PROPOSE THE FOLLOWING:</p> <p>ONLY put one way going UP into the park in kings road and leave the others as normal. This would limit the damage you are proposing to 3 roads and allow the natural flow of traffic into the park or up Kingston hill /queens road when park is closed.</p> <p>From a 30 + year resident of the area of Kingston Richmond park.</p>
ER4	Elm Road	<p>Q3: Just Put a 10mph speed limit in place (and enforce it) in the area, get police on the street with guns.</p> <p>Q4: Why are you so concerned with here when there is a far worse situation going on at Manorgate Rd with the proposed LIDL store?</p>
ER5	Elm Road	<p>Q3: I think Kings Road/Queens Road should be no entry as it causes a little neck at the park gates. Therefore, Tudor Road/Queens Road should be one-way; Tudor Road/Park Road no entry.</p> <p>Q4: Need to ensure there is still provision for pedestrians to cross at Park Road/Kings Road as a lot of traffic. Will the "cycle lane island" be made enough to accommodate a buggy/family?</p>
ER6	Elm Road	A great idea!
ER7	Elm Road	<p>Q3: I am very concerned about the volume of traffic pushed onto Tudor Road, Elm Road and the crossroads between them on Park Road, as access routes to the park. Would it be better to make New Road one-way in the opposite direction to Kings Road, and leave Tudor Road as it is?</p> <p>Q4: The proposal is unfair on residents of Tudor Road and Elm Road. They will become the main access points to the park for vehicles and increasing numbers of cyclists. There will be considerable congestion at that crossroad.</p>
ER8	Elm Road	<p>Q3: Although I am sympathetic to measures to reduce traffic on King's Road, the road is much wider and has more capacity than New Road and Tudor Road. New Road in particular is very narrow. It is inappropriate for Tudor Road to absorb all of the traffic travelling up towards Queen's Road - this would represent an enormous increase in flow for a relatively narrow road. It will also cause considerable congestion at the junction between Tudor Road and Park Road. It is highly likely that traffic will be pushed down to other roads, including Alexandra Road, which has two primary schools on it - posing a danger to children from both traffic and air pollution.</p> <p>Q4: Speed reducing cushions are not very effective in slowing down cars in particular (sinusoidal speed bumps would be better). The map provided by the council is very poor quality, some of the captions are barely legible. In addition, no information is provided regarding expected knock-on effects for surrounding roads.</p>
BC1	Beaumont Close	Please consider extending the 20 mph limit to include the top end of Kings Road, New Road, Queens Road and Crescent Road. Justifiable on safety grounds.
CROSS1	Cross Road	<p>Q3: No I do not support the proposed changes at all. I think parking down 1 side of the top end of Kings road would be a good idea to stop the bottle necking of traffic but if you visited the roads today with the current road works you would clearly see the impact the traffic has on these roads. If you make the 2 roads in question 1 way and add speed humps all you will do is push the traffic down Alexandra Rd (which has 2 schools on it). Already the roadworks at the bottom of Kingston Hill has had a massive impact and I now get hundreds of cars going along my road (Cross Rd) to avoid the traffic jams already present on Park Rd. The main problem is there is no way to get thru Kingston without using the basically useless pointless one way system which has certain bottle neck areas.</p> <p>Q4: It would be a good idea if the people who thought up these ideas actually drove round these streets at busy times to witness the impact traffic has on this area already.</p>
CC1	Cherrywood Close	In principle I support the scheme, but only on the condition that peak hour access restrictions are introduced (as was being discussed) in Alexandra Road at the same time.
CC2	Cherrywood Close	We think there will be a "knock-on" effect on the roads around. Despite traffic calming measures, one way system will encourage traffic, not restrict it.
LR1	Liverpool Road	We are looking forward to a reduction in speed in this whole area. The zebra crossing on Queens Rd is so unsafe... drivers plough through as often as stopping. Also we hope this will reduce the amount of road rage we hear down that corner, and in Kings Rd, almost daily.
RPR1	Richmond Park Road	Chevaliers cycling club, based in Kingston, with over 100 members, supports the proposal. We regularly meet at Kingston Gate, and many members have experienced challenges cycling on the short stretch of road (Kings Road between Queen's Road and Park Road). The current infrastructure is not well suited for two way traffic of motorised vehicles alone, but it's highly unsuitable for two way traffic and cyclists together. It's particularly problematic when cyclists are riding in the uphill direction and only able to travel at a speed which frustrates some drivers of motorised vehicles which sometimes leads to them overtaking on a stretch of road where there is insufficient space to do so safely.
RPR2	Richmond Park Road	It is clear that inaccurate SATNAV directions are part of this problem as so many HGVs seem to be using Park Rd/Queens Rd. It would be great if Richmond Park would consider closing the park to vehicular traffic (apart from blue badge) 1 day per month to encourage people to leave their cars at home and enjoy walking/cycling in the park. The park really does need to take the lead in encouraging people to think before they jump in the car for so many reasons. During the mid-week rush hour the park might as well be considered akin to a major A road when you observe the traffic jams in there. This is so wrong.
COW1	Cowper Road	The proposals would allow faster traffic on Kings Road with traffic heading away, downhill from Queens Road. With no on-coming traffic drivers will go faster I believe which will not be good for cyclists trying to cycle up hill on the contra-flow. The proposal also displaces more traffic to New Road and Tudor Road. Tudor Road was/is a signposted cycle route between Kingston centre to Richmond Park and you are proposing to put all the traffic going towards Richmond Park from Park Road up Tudor Road. This appears to be a bad idea for cyclists and pedestrians. If there are insufficient passing places on Kings Road why does the council not propose introducing some passing places? That is the simple and obvious answer.
WR1	Willoughby Road	<p>Q3: Support one way traffic however current suggestions will just push existing traffic to another road.</p> <p>Q4: Yes. The main reason there is a lot of traffic on Kings Road is numerous cars taking a short cut to / from Kingston Hill using Crescent Road and Liverpool Road. Perhaps a way could be found (wide car barriers?) to reduce traffic taking this shortcut? Need to redirect traffic to take Park Road.</p>

WR2	Willoughby Road	<p>Q3: If you are going to do this then you HAVE to extend the scheme to include ALEXANDRA Road as well if you are going to make all the other roads one way (between Park and Queens Roads). Alexandra Road is just as bad for traffic and pollution as Kings, Tudor and New Roads, but has the extra major factors of having TWO PRIMARY SCHOOLS WITH MORE THAN 720 CHILDREN coming and going on the road. It is already hideously dangerous, local parents have already had to fight to get a road crossing after several accidents outside the schools involving children pedestrians. There are daily fights between angry drivers and very dangerous behaviour, the heads have had to call the parking attendants in to help manage the situation. If you use this scheme as it is, all you will do is the push the problems right on the door step of 720 under 11 year old children with potentially fatal consequences.</p> <p>Q4: It's awful that Kings Road is so congested, but councillors were asked to look at neighbouring Alexandra Road and its schools as part of this visit, so am at a loss to understand why Alexandra road and its schools have not been considered in this scheme.</p>
WR3	Willoughby Road	It seems the only option to reduce time and issues for all drivers & the poor residents on the top half of Kings Road KT2.
CR1	Clifton Road	There seems to be a heightened congestion in the whole area down from Liverpool and Crescent Rds. In the winter when the days are shorter the traffic on Richmond Rd through Petersham is increasingly challenging too. The Zebra crossing at Park Gate is regularly ignored by cyclists and other road users. I thought potentially it was worse currently due to the improvements in Kingston's town centre road network being improved but possibly not.
CR2	Clifton Road	The proposals risk increasing traffic on Alexandra Road and subjecting the pupils at both St Pauls C of E school and Alexandra School to further congestion, air pollution and road danger. For this reason, the proposal should not go ahead until Alexandra Road becomes a designated schools street i.e. closed to non-residential motor traffic at drop-off and pick-up times.
DR1	Dinton Road	It is an absolutely awful road, I am surprised someone hasn't been injured. One of the worst roads in the area.
CPR1	Canbury Park Road	I wholeheartedly support the plan to make kings road and neighbouring roads 1 way. This will ease hideous traffic 'stand offs' and make them hopefully significantly less dangerous.
CPR2	Canbury Park Road	This should be a first step to reduce motor traffic. The next stage should be to eliminate all motor traffic from the affect residential roads (apart from for immediate residents) so that traffic is restricted to the main roads only.
RC1	Ravensbury Court	Encourage people to share their car journeys. The school kids could also travel by public transport more often - most of the peak traffic is made up of parents driving their kids around, then going wherever with mostly empty SUVs... Good luck!
IHC1	Isabel Hill Close	The challenge is drivers will inevitably get frustrated with cyclists coming up the hill from a standing start and try to come down the road at the same time.
WRBrent	Windmill Road, Brentford	Use Kings Road a lot as a cyclist and this would certainly improve safety so it gets my vote.
BR1	Beresford Road	It may push more traffic heading away from the park and pollution on to Alexandra Road which has two schools on it.
CG1	Chatsworth Gardens	It would be better to restrict through-traffic completely rather than introduce a one way System.
KV1	Kingston Vale	Too difficult to use that road as a driver and dangerous for cyclists. Something must be done.
SMG1	St Mary's Grove, Barnes	There needs to be a plan to reduce commutes through the Park, charging or something, as that is the real cause of all the congestion not users of the Park.
LG1	Lydden Grove	<p>Q3: We need to do more to deter and/or replace private car journeys in the area to the park.</p> <p>Q4: On week days, most cars seem to be people arriving at the park, using the free parking then walking to the train station. These people provide no revenue to the park, cause congestion and pollution in the park and increase traffic congestion around the park, particularly for local residents. Car parking cannot be free in a Royal Park, nor should it be acceptable to use it as a rat run and cut through.</p>
BEAR1	Bearfield Road	Q3: Directions are suitable but all routes MUST allow cycles to go in both directions. We should not be introducing any traffic management schemes that make is more difficult to cycle.
TP1	The Pleasance	Think the proposed measures are a step in the right direction, but think the council could do more to keep children and families safer on the road during weekends when the circular around the park practically becomes a parking lot with the amount of cars on it. I think finding a way to remove cars from the park on the weekend would be ideal, and only allowing access to the car parks. Perhaps separate entrances can be built to allow cars to park and then walk into the park? Thank you.
PD1	Pine Dell	<p>Q3: It's important to slow down traffic and limit large vehicles. I'm not sure parking on the pavement is a good idea.</p> <p>Q4: This route is used as a cut through increasingly because of roadworks on the one way system.</p>
C1	Compton	<p>Q3: 'If you support the introduction of one-way traffic but...' The wording of this statement does not provide any opportunity for disagreement and any serious alternative to the proposed plan. The remedy to reduce congestion and pollution in the upper Kings Road, and access into and out of Richmond Park, by keeping the two-way traffic flowing, has already been sensibly suggested by allowing the cars to park on 40 centimetres of the pavement on either side of the road. For some unknown reason, this cheap and effective solution was rejected by the upper Kings Road residents, although this parking system has already been successfully implemented on the lower part of Kings Road below the mini-roundabout. Residents have already made detailed measurements of the pavements and roadway which show that there is more than sufficient width available in upper Kings Road to facilitate two-wheel parking on the pavements and clear access for pedestrians and wide buggies.</p> <p>Q4: The document accompanying the residents' petition submitted to the council on 28 February 2019 lists the many arguments that demonstrate how the proposed one-way scheme creates far more problems than it attempts to solve. There are professional studies and environmental research that challenge the out-dated thinking on way-way systems and their early popularity. From the Wiki page: 'One-way streets typically result in higher traffic flow as drivers may avoid encountering oncoming traffic or turns through oncoming traffic. Residents may dislike one-way streets due to the circuitous route required to get to a specific destination, and the potential for higher speeds adversely affecting pedestrian safety. Safety: speeds tend to be higher on one-way streets, and some studies suggest drivers pay less attention on them because there is no conflicting traffic flow.' 1] Jaffe, Eric. "The Case Against One-Way Streets". On that last point of 'no conflicting flow', Tudor Road will indeed pose an increased danger to cyclists who will be permitted to cycle against the flow of the speeded-up and much heavier traffic. At peak times, when more pedestrians with young school and nursery children will be attempting to cross Tudor Road, the traffic flow will increase by up to 400%. This is totally unacceptable in the face of an available solution that is cost-effective, provides good two-way traffic flow and consequently lowers pollution from</p>

		congestion and causes no additional hazard to parents taking children to the three adjacent schools, St. Paul's Primary School, Alexandra Infants, Park School, and several community day nurseries.
KEMP1	Kempshott Road	Richmond park is a National Nature Reserve and Site of Special Scientific Interest but suffers from excessive traffic and consequent pollution, as well as disruption to wildlife. It should be closed to through traffic with motor vehicles allowed only for visits to the park - and not as a short cut.
DAW1	Dawson Road	Q3: New Road is far too narrow for 2-way cycling and 1-way driving to work properly. Needs to be 1-way for all traffic to accommodate the increased volume of cars on New Rd. There's no way anyone on a bike can safely ride up New Rd into oncoming traffic and to make it seem like that's a safe option is negligent, unless a priority to cycles with "give way to cycles" is also signed and enforced. Tudor Rd and Kings Rd are wide enough for 2-way cycling so that's fine. Q4: Speed reducing cushions don't actually slow down drivers as they are generally too narrow and most cars are wide enough to get their tires either side without slowing down or causing a bump. If New Rd is to have 2-way cycle traffic and 1-way car traffic as proposed, it needs to be proper speed tables all the way across.
CRP1	Cranes Park	I think the proposed scheme will reduce congestion around Kingston Gate significantly which can only be a good thing for drivers and cyclists.
NOTT1	Nottingham Road, London	Cycling contraflows need to be done carefully not to be dangerous for cyclists. Car drivers tend to treat one way with cycling contraflow as a one way road, and not consider giving way when (e.g. due to parked cars) if not enough room for car and cyclist going opposite directions.
GC1	Gibson Close	Q3: One way could work, but greater speed reduction measures would be required. Q4: Make it traffic-free.
UC1	Ulster Court	There is a problem with congestion in this section of King's Road, however, the way drivers handle it by helping others to negotiate their way through, does bring out the best in us. Some may find it frustrating, but I feel we can live with it.
Bery1	Berystede	Do not support the proposals. There is a significant issue with through traffic using these roads which is creating a danger to people walking and people on bikes. The proposals will better manage this traffic which could lead to the amount of traffic increasing. As the Council acknowledges, traffic speeds could also increase. This does therefore not solve the problem with traffic on these roads and increasing speeds will decrease safety. An alternative should therefore be found. I believe that the Council should incorporate more roads in its review (for example, Crescent, Alexandra and Liverpool Roads) to reduce/stop through traffic in this area. Through a combination of modal filters/width restrictions, through traffic could be stopped or significantly reduced. Stopping or significantly reducing through traffic will keep motor traffic to main roads, returning residential roads to residents and will encourage sustainable travel in the wider area. If the plans are to go ahead then despite this objection, I support the plans to allow contraflow cycling on all roads. However, better road markings are required to warn drivers that contraflow cycling is allowed (for example, see the paint markings applied to Acre Road). I am concerned that the contraflow cycling lane on King's Road is in the dooring zone creating a risk to cyclists. There is also no traffic calming proposed for Tudor Road which should be changed. All speed humps or cushions should be implemented as sinusoidal speed humps. A raised table should be implemented at the Queen's Road and Tudor Road junction to slow traffic too. I strongly support the 20mph extension proposals as a first step to significantly increasing the number of 20mph roads across the Borough.
BH1	Bowater House	The problem of making roads 1 way is that traffic speeds will increase. Changes should make it less convenient and slower for motor vehicles to discourage rat running.
CA1	Canbury Avenue	I drive and cycle in the area regularly. Broadly I think this is a good idea. My concerns are; 1. Not sure that having New and Kings Rd flowing in same direction is sensible, although proposed direction for Kings is probably best option. 2. Speeds on these roads need limiting to 20mph. One way flow will lead to increased speeds otherwise, so I suspect cameras will be required at the mid-point of each road. 3. This will increase traffic to Alexandra Rd, which has 2 schools. This proposal should NOT proceed without explicitly planning for the impact to Alexandra Rd. Again, strict speed enforcement will be needed including cameras outside each school. Perhaps Alexandra will also need to be made one way. 4. What is the provision for cycle lanes? Will they be protected lanes? Will they be 2-way on each road or follow main flow? This needs to be clear, and needs to be part of the solution as cycle traffic is high here.
CONN1	Connaught Road	One way traffic risks higher speeds and drawing in yet more traffic. A low traffic neighbourhood scheme, by filtering out through traffic, would be safer.
UX1	Uxbridge Road	The proposed scheme will increase traffic speeds; make the roads more dangerous for children, pedestrians and cyclists; and by making traffic flow faster an increase number of vehicles using the road. I cannot support this. Instead the scheme should be stopping these roads being used as rat runs, by keeping through traffic on the main roads.
TA1	The Avenue	Q3: Agree. Traffic direction on Kings road should be from Queens Road towards Park road. So car traffic is flowing with majority of cyclists i.e. traveling from Kingston Gate toward Kingston Bridge. Q4: Impossible to see the small text on the drawing or the proposal. Cannot open the drawing in a way to allow it to be zoomed in.
DU1	Durlston Road	Q3: It offers nothing to walkers and cyclists using the park. These are the types of users we should be trying to encourage. In fact it may endanger cyclists more, as vehicle speeds may increase. Q4: Segregated cycle lanes please. And more space for pedestrians. Please do NOT prioritise motor vehicles in this region near to the park - it just encourages rat-running. Leisure / sustainable users should be front and foremost.
GR1	Gibbon Road	I think it's long overdue sorting the traffic problem on Kings Road, I welcome this.
GLENN1	Glenville Road	I would extend the scheme to Alexandra Road. This road is often congested with traffic going in two directions when there is only room for one lane of traffic due to parked cars on both sides. Making this one way would help that. This would also help with the problems with school parents parking which is causing problems for neighbours, school users and road users.
WIND1/WIND1bis	Windmill Rise	Q3: One way traffic will only serve to move the problem to the next available two way street - rather than solving the problem. Worryingly the next available wide street is Alexandra Road, with two primary schools. Clearly this will increase congestion and subsequently increase pollution and increase the risk of harm to young children. Unfortunately this makes your proposal completely unacceptable and will be met with fierce resistance by local parent groups. Q4: One way traffic will only serve to move the problem to the next available two way street - rather than solving the problem. Worryingly the next available wide street is Alexandra Road, with two primary schools. Clearly this will increase congestion and subsequently increase pollution and increase the risk of harm to young children. Unfortunately this makes your proposal completely unacceptable and will be met with fierce resistance by local parent groups. ----- If you have 3 streets that are all one way then the next two way road will just become extremely busy. This road is Alexandra Road which has two primary schools on it! Please think about the safety and pollution issues for the 100's of children that attend those schools! There is a traffic problem on Kings Road but it would be a better idea to ensure the only people that can park on it are those who live there!

CHES1	Chesfield Road	The proposals would certainly benefit Kings Rd but the deflected impact on Tudor and Alexandra Road is quite substantial. I would support New and Tudor being made one way only though.
YR1	York Road	Q3: One way traffic is not the answer. Q4: Why do they require a change.
KH1	Kingston Hill	Q3: No. It needs to stay two way.
WOOD1	Woodlands Road	Q3: I do not support the changes because this is a missed opportunity to make a better intervention. Q4: I object to these proposals including the following key points: The Council's proposals are unlikely to reduce through traffic and, as the Council notes, could increase traffic speeds. This therefore does not do enough to protect the safety of vulnerable road users on these roads. The Council should be bolder in its proposals and look at ways to reduce through traffic using these and surrounding roads (including Alexandra, Liverpool and Crescent Roads) to keep traffic to the main roads such as Kingston Hill. If the one-way proposals were to go ahead, I am concerned that the contraflow cycle lane on King's Road is in the 'dooring' zone creating a risk to cyclists. In addition, we would like clearer paint markings on New and Tudor Road to show people in motor vehicles that contraflow cycling is permitted on these roads. I would also like further traffic calming to be considered for Tudor Road (particularly as it is part of a signed cycle route). Notwithstanding my objections to the scheme as a whole, we are pleased that cycling has at least been considered in the one-way proposals and that contraflow cycling is to be permitted on all affected roads. In addition, we strongly support the proposals to extend 20mph limits onto Queen's, Liverpool and Crescent Road.
UPR1	Upper Park Road	I support the Kingston Cycling Campaign feedback. These are residential streets and better prioritising of car traffic misses the point. Obstruct them and ensure through traffic uses the main routes.
NL1	Northweald Lane	The proposed one-way flows will create two crossover/friction points at Queens Road/Kings Road and Park Road/Tudor Road as traffic heading in/out of the park will have to cross traffic heading the other way. This is a fatal flaw. If a one-way system is to be introduced then it should be the other way round, i.e. into the park from Kings Road.
KCC	KCC	<p>OVERALL COMMENT Kingston Cycling Campaign strongly objects to the proposed measures on King's/New and Tudor Roads as it will do little to reduce through traffic on these busy roads and, as acknowledged by Council officers, traffic speeds are likely to increase. This area has a long history of cyclists and pedestrians being injured through collisions with motor vehicles and we believe the best way of reducing the incidence of these collisions is to reduce the amount of through motor traffic using these roads and to reduce the speeds of remaining motor traffic. By implementing the one-way arrangements, traffic in the area will become better managed which could increase the amount of through traffic as well as leading to increased traffic speeds. We do not believe this will improve the safety of those walking or those on bikes; reduce air pollution or noise; nor encourage sustainable travel. SUGGESTED ALTERNATIVE Instead of the one-way plans, we would like the Council to be more ambitious and look at alternatives across a wider area to successfully reduce through traffic. We believe that the size of the area being looked at should also include Alexandra, Crescent and Liverpool Roads. Through limiting through traffic using these primarily residential roads, there would be less congestion; noise and pollution with the benefits of improving safety and encouraging sustainable travel methods. From the local residents we have spoken to, we also believe that this would be strongly supported by them. We believe there are a number of methods that could be investigated and trialled to reduce through motor traffic including: permanent bollards; removable bollards; signed closures (with or without camera enforcement); signed access only (with or without camera enforcement); width restrictions; and the implementation of a "school street" (timed closure). Evidence has shown that tackling through traffic on a whole neighbourhood basis can reduce traffic across a wider area (not just in the neighbourhood itself) as people stop taking unnecessary trips by motor vehicle and switch to sustainable methods (for example, start walking their children to/from school). By trialling these low-cost ideas, the Council could see if they are successful and could then tweak them as needed. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss these ideas further with the Council and officers. ELEMENTS OF THE PROPOSAL WE SUPPORT Notwithstanding the above, Kingston Cycling Campaign supports the planned extension of the 20mph limit onto Queen's, Liverpool and Crescent Roads to reduce motor vehicle speeds. The Council should however work with local police to increase enforcement of 20mph limits in the Borough. Although we disagree with the one-way proposals, we do welcome that the Council has considered cycling in the plans and plans to permit contraflow cycling on all affected roads. Therefore, if the one-way plans were to proceed despite our objection above, we support the plans to permit contraflow cycling on all the roads, however, we have also detailed a number of improvements required below.</p> <p>DETAILED COMMENTS ON IMPROVEMENTS REQUIRED TO THE ONE-WAY PROPOSALS If the one-way proposals were to go ahead, we would like a number of amendments to be made as part of detailed design. We ask that the design of the proposed contraflow cycle lane on King's Road is reviewed as it appears this will be placed in the "dooring" zone which is potentially unsafe and contrary to good practice. We ask that contraflow cycle markings are added to the carriageway on Tudor and New Road (TSRGD diagrams 1057 + 1059 as recently added as part of the cycle contraflow works on Acre Road) - this will provide greater clarity that contraflow cycling is permitted on these roads and will provide an additional warning of contraflow cycling to people in motor vehicles. We also ask that cycle markings (TSRGD 1057) are placed in the centre of the each lane of the carriageway on Queen's Road to encourage cyclists to adopt a 'primary' cycling position on this narrow road. We ask that raised tables are installed at the 2 junctions of New/Queen's Road and Tudor/Queen's Road (particularly for Tudor Road which is part of a signed cycle route) to reduce traffic speeds at the junctions where most collisions occur. We finally ask that traffic calming (e.g. sinusoidal speed humps) are considered for Tudor Road to reduce vehicle speeds and that the proposed speed cushions for New Road are changed to sinusoidal speed humps which are generally safer for people on bikes.</p>