

Ham Close Design Workshops: Traffic and Transport

YOU SAID	OUR RESPONSE	DISCUSSION TOPIC / QUESTION	YOUR FEEDBACK
Traffic and congestion Residents have expressed concerns regarding the impact of the proposed redevelopment on traffic and congestion.	RHP and the Council have commissioned WYG to provide initial transport and highways consultancy advice and produce a Feasibility Report to identify the regeneration potential of Ham Close from a transport and highways perspective. This work will inform a future Transport Assessment should redevelopment ahead. Key findings of the draft Transport Feasibility Report: Traffic surveys reveal that the peak hours on the local highway network coincide with school drop-off and pick-up (08:00-09:00 and 15:00-16:00). Traffic surveys suggest that there are not excessive volumes of traffic in the immediate vicinity of Ham Close and it is considered that the expected increase in vehicle trips would not result in a negative impact on the operation of the local highway network. Through an average weekday Petersham Rd recorded an average of 13,028 two-way vehicle trips. The proposed redevelopment has the potential to add, at most, an additional 199 vehicle trips onto Petersham Rd (less than 2% of the existing trips). This equates to approximately 1 vehicle every 4-5 minutes between the hours of 7am and 10pm. This is considered minimal compared to the existing 14-15 vehicles per	Do the findings of the draft Transport Feasibility Report reflect your experiences day-to-day traveling in and around Ham? Are there specific roads / junctions that need to be considered as part of any future Transport Assessment Report? (Fig. 1.7 Site Location Plan and Fig. 2.7 Detailed Site Location Plan) In light of the peak hours on the local highway network (coinciding with school drop-off and pick-up) how can the proposed redevelopment support us to encourage sustainable and active travel to and from school?	

YOU SAID	OUR RESPONSE	DISCUSSION TOPIC / QUESTION	YOUR FEEDBACK
Parking Residents have expressed concerns regarding the impact of the proposed redevelopment on parking provision / availability.	RHP and the Council have commissioned WYG to provide initial transport and highways consultancy advice and produce a Feasibility Report to identify the regeneration potential of Ham Close from a transport and highways perspective. This work will inform a future Transport Assessment should redevelopment ahead. Key findings of the draft Transport Feasibility Report: The parking surveys conducted to inform the draft transport feasibility report showed maximum occupancy levels of on-street and car parks of 27% and 46% respectively. A car parking occupancy level of between 80-90% is generally considered to be the point at which on-street parking is 'at stress'.	Do the findings of the draft Transport Feasibility Report reflect your experiences day-to-day around Ham Close? (Plans illustrating existing on-street parking capacity and occupancy) The proposed redevelopment is likely to utilize a mixture of parking solutions - basement, podium and on-street parking. Do residents have any concerns with or a preference for one parking solution? (Images of podium parking from other developments) How can the proposed redevelopment ensure the level of parking provision across the development is not excessive to avoid encouraging car use in place of sustainable travel modes? (Table 4.1 LBRuT Car Parking Standards) How could the proposed redevelopment promote sustainable travel for residents and visitors? (e.g. provision of a car club and electric car charging points)	

YOU SAID	OUR RESPONSE	DISCUSSION TOPIC / QUESTION	YOUR FEEDBACK
Cycling and walking The redevelopment should be highly sustainable; it should encourage walking and cycling.	Should redevelopment go ahead a Framework Travel Plan would be prepared as part of a planning application. This would include various measures aimed at actively promoting and encouraging travel to and from the site by sustainable (i.e. non-car) modes.	How could the proposed redevelopment promote sustainable and active travel for residents and visitors? (Fig. 2.2 Local Cycle Network and Table 4.2 London Plan Cycle Parking Standards) How could the proposed redevelopment contribute to creating a safe and attractive network of pedestrian and cycle routes? (e.g. improving the cycle network between Richmond-Petersham-Ham-Kingston and / or improvements to the cycle / footbridge into Testington?) How could street design encourage walking?	

OUR RESPONSE	DISCUSSION TOPIC / QUESTION	YOUR FEEDBACK
Following discussion with LBRuT Highways officers TfL is considering an extension to the K5 bus service (to Morden) which currently stops in Duke Ave south of Ham Close (if a turning circle can be provided within the proposed redevelopment)	How could the proposed redevelopment enhance the bus network? (e.g. increasing the frequency of the 371 bus during the AM and PM peak hours)	<p>Could there be a bus which goes down Riverbank Drive (Duke Ave) from CROFT WAY down to Ham Street?</p> <p>Is it bus route to extend a min route - with a new lane added (short cut) from bridge at Ham Close to other side of Ham Close? It will be on it.</p> <p>Could there be a bus which goes down Riverbank Drive (Duke Ave) from CROFT WAY down to Ham Street?</p> <p>Could there be a bus which goes down Riverbank Drive (Duke Ave) from CROFT WAY down to Ham Street?</p> <p>Could there be a bus which goes down Riverbank Drive (Duke Ave) from CROFT WAY down to Ham Street?</p>

Detailed Site Location Plan

Ham Close Design Workshops: Traffic and Transport

YOU SAID	OUR RESPONSE	DISCUSSION TOPIC / QUESTION	YOUR FEEDBACK
<p>Traffic and congestion</p> <p>Residents have expressed concerns regarding the impact of the proposed redevelopment on traffic and congestion</p>	<p>RHP and the Council have commissioned WYG to provide initial transport and highways consultancy advice and produce a Feasibility Report to identify the regeneration potential of Ham Close from a transport and highways perspective. This work will inform a future Transport Assessment should redevelopment go ahead.</p>	<p>Do the findings of the draft Transport Feasibility Report reflect your experiences day-to-day travelling in and around Ham?</p> <p>Are there specific roads / junctions that need to be considered as part of any future Transport Assessment Report?</p> <p>In light of the peak hours on the local highway network (coinciding with school drop-off and pick-up) how can the proposed redevelopment support work to encourage sustainable and active travel to and from school?</p>	<p><i>“Traffic on Petersham Road is massively increased during the winter months as there are less people cycling/walking along the river and all traffic that would normally use the park is funnelled into a single route. (Due to earlier closing times of park.)”</i></p> <p><i>“Car ownership increases with private homes. In neighbouring Kingston (Tudor Ward) this is being expressed in a large rise of 4-wheel cars and people carriers.”</i></p> <p><i>“RUBBISH [...surveys suggest ... expected increase in vehicle trips would not result in a negative impact] – There’s bound to be a negative impact – it’s a question of whether the degree is acceptable to the community.”</i></p> <p><i>“Cassell, Convent, Latchmere House – <u>all</u> these are being developed at the same time which is going to add additional traffic etc. <u>all</u> joining up on the Petersham Road”</i></p> <p><i>“Sandy Lane roundabout – bottlenecks, drivers not giving way, would traffic lights be better? Bottleneck – around Grey Court/Ham Library junction.”</i></p> <p><i>“One way systems along Ham Street and Back Lane need to be considered between Lock Road and Ashburnham Road.”</i></p> <p><i>“There are excessive volumes of traffic at the junction along Grey Court from Sandy Lane to Ashburnham Road, Ham Street and Back Lane. At school drop off 8-8:45pm this is very congested.”</i></p> <p><i>“Traffic on Petersham Road before 8am is moving really slowly anyway, e.g. I have to leave before 7:30am.”</i></p> <p><i>“The problem around Ham Close is that it is mainly single lane traffic in certain areas. So adding more parking or traffic is going to create a number of choke points.”</i></p> <p><i>“Horses riding up Star the Garter Hill can cause long tailbacks. Plus: Polo Club, Sports, Ham House, Ham Common, Rifle Club, Petersham Nurseries, Ham Young Mariners, Stables”</i></p> <p><i>“Riverside Drive – Need to slow traffic. No bus stop along Riverside Drive (walk from centre of estate).”</i></p> <p><i>“Child Safety”</i></p> <p><i>“Ham Street/Ashburnham – hotspot – corner – getting around. Refuse trucks clash with bus. Need to encourage.”</i></p> <p><i>“Ashburnham opposite St Richards Church and School – school, 2 nurseries, Tesco – serious bottle neck. Need measurements there, but also common sense viewing.”</i></p> <p><i>“Sundays – can be worse – Polo club, big do, plus Petersham Nursery popular destination, Ham House, Rifle Club.”</i></p> <p><i>“Wiggins Lane/Ham Street sharp bend. Delivery drivers and builders get stuck.”</i></p> <p><i>“Local car clubs are a must. This would reduce problems with excess car ownership. The nearest Zipcar cars are in Kingston and Richmond. Council should encourage and fund a local co-op car club.”</i></p> <p><i>“Surely the point is traffic on Sandy Lane and Dukes Avenue. Sandy Lane is already congested by parking in the narrow roads.”</i></p> <p><i>“Possible extended opening times of Richmond Park to mitigate current roadworks.”</i></p> <p><i>“Design roads to reduce traffic speeds i.e. <20mph. E.g. narrow road entry provision to slow traffic and reduce crossing widths. Consider visibility for pedestrians and cycling.”</i></p> <p><i>“Big issue: access onto Petersham Road – capacity, junction and highway.”</i></p> <p><i>“Access to Petersham Road from Sandy Lane and Dukes Avenue.”</i></p>

Ham Close Design Workshops: Traffic and Transport

YOU SAID	OUR RESPONSE	DISCUSSION TOPIC / QUESTION	YOUR FEEDBACK
			<p><i>“Number of cars likely to increase with increase in number of affluent households with private ownership.”</i></p> <p><i>“Keep through roads like we have currently for emergency services. 2 single track roads which are one-way so increasing overall space for project.”</i></p> <p><i>“Ham people move here because you don’t cut through. Traffic design must not encourage through traffic onto the site.”</i></p> <p><i>“Increase in traffic will cause unacceptable pressure on Petersham/Richmond Road and increase pollution levels.”</i></p> <p><i>“Particular issue of traffic when park is closed.”</i></p> <p><i>“New builds sold under condition of not owning a car.”</i></p> <p><i>“Needs to be balanced with the cost of doing it earlier.”</i></p> <p>Transport surveys</p> <p><i>“Huff House restrictions – did this affect results?”</i></p> <p><i>“Can we do a survey from another part of the borough, where comparable PTAL and increase in numbers?”</i></p> <p><i>“An extra 7 cars between 3-4pm around schools does not sound realistic.”</i></p> <p><i>“Would be interesting to see traffic using busy months during the year.”</i></p> <p><i>“Did Ham Street have any traffic camera? Did not see one.”</i></p> <p><i>“The Traffic and Transport Survey absolutely MUST monitor Sandy Lane and its function with the Kingston Road.”</i></p> <p><i>“Need to look at capacity of Petersham Road between 7am and 9/10am.”</i></p> <p><i>“The Draft Feasibility Plan does not reflect one’s experience because it has missed the pinch and capacity points and thus gives a false impression.”</i></p> <p><i>“Parking study: 1. not taking into account actual restrictions, 2. Falsifies information – not realistic.”</i></p> <p><i>“Has a destination study been carried out to show how much traffic will/does leave area by Sandy Lane or Ham Cross.”</i></p> <p><i>“Impact survey should be expression in capacity for both peak and off-peak times rather than only the number of cars.”</i></p> <p><i>“When will traffic capacity figures for A307 be published based on only AM/PM peaks in both summer and winter?”</i></p> <p><i>“Need to look at potential road capacity due to layout/location of Ham.”</i></p> <p><i>“Emerging theme: can capacity traffic and transport study be done for consultation in Sept/October?”</i></p> <p>Construction traffic</p> <p><i>“Swept path assessment to assess construction impact.”</i></p> <p><i>“Construction traffic constricting Sandy Lane.”</i></p> <p><i>“Need to consider impact of construction on Sandy Lane.”</i></p> <p><i>“Construction traffic - how managed – which way in?”</i></p> <p><i>“How can I get a 12 wheel truck in? Come from Riverside Drive but won’t get round Croft Way and Ashburnham School/Nursery”</i></p>

Ham Close Design Workshops: Traffic and Transport

YOU SAID	OUR RESPONSE	DISCUSSION TOPIC / QUESTION	YOUR FEEDBACK
			<p><i>“Sandy Lane is almost impassable when contractors are parked outside.”</i></p> <p><i>“When Ham Street had closures due to the new build the area was in chaos!!! And that was just one house.”</i></p> <p><i>“Real data needed or averages for impact on six years of construction. In advance impact of construction workshop.”</i></p> <p><i>“Construction traffic on Ashburnham Road and Petersham Road block traffic which makes it more unsafe.”</i></p> <p><i>“Delivery vehicles blocking route”</i></p>
<p>Parking</p> <p>Residents have expressed concerns regarding the impact of the proposed redevelopment on parking provision / availability</p>	<p>RHP and the Council have commissioned WYG to provide initial transport and highways consultancy advice and produce a Feasibility Report to identify the regeneration potential of Ham Close from a transport and highways perspective. This work will inform a future Transport Assessment should redevelopment go ahead.</p>	<p>Do the findings of the draft Transport Feasibility Report reflect your experiences day-to-day around Ham Close?</p> <p>The proposed redevelopment is likely to utilise a mixture of parking solutions – basement, podium and on-street parking. Do residents have any concerns with or a preference for one parking solution?</p> <p>How can the proposed redevelopment ensure the level of parking provision across the development is not excessive to avoid encouraging car use in place of sustainable travel modes?</p> <p>How could the proposed redevelopment promote sustainable travel for residents and visitors? (e.g. provision of a car club and electric car charging points)</p>	<p><i>“Allocated parking one spot per house and some visitor spaces. No expensive added parking.”</i></p> <p><i>“On street parking has increased significantly in Ham and Petersham over the last five years or so, most notably on Sandy Lane and Ham Common (parking for 65 bus) causing delays and detracting from amenity of the Common.”</i></p> <p><i>“Car clubs and electric charging points are an excellent idea, particularly if they can be extended to include the wider Ham/Petersham area.”</i></p> <p><i>“Free allocated parking depending on cost – basement / undercroft”</i></p> <p><i>“When there are events at Grey Court and/or the Library Community Space, Ham Street/Back Lane get parked up. There has been the recent addition of extra teacher on street parking.”</i></p> <p><i>“All residential units on the proposed development should have at least one designated parking space. Sub ground level parking must be utilised in addition.”</i></p> <p><i>“The parking space available is deceptively false. It assumes space where there is none.”</i></p> <p><i>“Underground parking may not be possible as Ham is built on gravel.”</i></p> <p><i>“Most of area around Ham Close does not have space for 2-way traffic because of number of cars [parked] in Ham.”</i></p> <p><i>“How likely is it that the new influx of residents will have one car per unit???”</i></p> <p><i>“Significant variation in street parking levels on Ham Street and Sandy Lane by school staff. During school term time and non-term time (school times).”</i></p> <p><i>“Can only park one side of Woodville etc. – applies all over. Therefore, overstated levels of parking spaces. Misrepresentation.”</i></p> <p><i>““Waites Estates’ 1 for 1 parking, but garages used for other purpose. Often own 2/3 cars.”</i></p> <p><i>“Impact of school teachers parking around Grey Court.”</i></p> <p><i>“There should be far less than 1 parking space per unit in Ham Close. We want to discourage car use, not encourage it! Obviously coupled with improvements in public transport and cycling networks (see comments there).”</i></p> <p><i>“New private owned Ham Close residents will pay for car park – but only one car park.”</i></p> <p><i>“If there is considerably more street parking, this should be designed/managed not to negatively impact the environment for walking and cycling.”</i></p> <p><i>“Infill – more roads, parks, garages. Better use of existing space as not well connected.”</i></p> <p><i>“Garages – not often used for cars. Need for storage.”</i></p> <p><i>“Hydrogen refuelling station.”</i></p>

Ham Close Design Workshops: Traffic and Transport

YOU SAID	OUR RESPONSE	DISCUSSION TOPIC / QUESTION	YOUR FEEDBACK
<p>Public transport (bus services)</p> <p>Residents have highlighted the additional pressure the proposed redevelopment will place on public transport (local bus services)</p>	<p>Following discussion with LBRuT Highways officers TfL is considering an extension to the K5 bus service (to Morden) which currently stops in Duke Ave south of Ham Close (if a turning circle can be provided within the proposed redevelopment)</p>	<p>How could the proposed redevelopment enhance the bus network? (e.g. increasing the frequency of the 371 bus during the AM and PM peak hours)</p>	<p><i>“Could there be a bus which goes down Riverside Drive (Duke’s Avenue) from Croft Way down to Ham Street?”</i></p> <p><i>“The K5 bus could be extended to Ham House – visitor numbers have trebled (check with Naomi Campbell at Ham House) to deter cars. Plus, schools kids at LC could use it.”</i></p> <p><i>“Round humps can be dangerous especially when icy.”</i></p> <p><i>“More buses. Frequency and routes. Smaller bus straight from Ham Close to station. Similar to K2.”</i></p> <p><i>“If K5 is extended, please consider extending route to Ham House and ferry – perhaps limited hours.”</i></p> <p><i>“Ferry – more practical. Both times, access and fares. All year service.”</i></p> <p><i>“The main problem with the bus service is the congested Petersham Road which causes slow and unreliable travel times.”</i></p> <p><i>“How could capacity be increased to deal with incredible usage?”</i></p> <p><i>“Direct bus route to Kingston or Richmond.”</i></p> <p><i>“New bus route required on Riverside Drive, connecting into Teddington Lock Bridge and Kingston.”</i></p> <p><i>“Frequency of the 371 bus will have to increase if there are increased numbers of people. There will need to be more double-deckers too.”</i></p> <p><i>“Richmond station is in zone 4, Kingston station is in zone 6. As it is in zone 6 it is more expensive and so affects travel patterns.”</i></p> <p><i>“Richmond station is zone 4, Kingston station is zone 6. People travel from Kingston to Richmond to save money.”</i></p> <p><i>“Look at bus stop laybys (e.g. outside German School) to keep traffic moving. Review bus stop locations with same aim.”</i></p> <p><i>“Need to improve existing public transport (bus) to Richmond, Teddington, Kingston. Benefits – jump on/off.”</i></p> <p><i>“How will TfL view Petersham Road increased congestion adversely affecting bus reliability?”</i></p>

Ham Close Design Workshops: Traffic and Transport

YOU SAID	OUR RESPONSE	DISCUSSION TOPIC / QUESTION	YOUR FEEDBACK
<p>Cycling and walking</p> <p>The redevelopment should be highly sustainable; it should encourage walking and cycling</p>	<p>Should redevelopment go ahead a Framework Travel Plan would be prepared as part of a planning application. This would include various measures aimed at actively promoting and encouraging travel to and from the site by sustainable (i.e. non-care) modes</p>	<p>How could the proposed redevelopment promote sustainable and active travel for residents and visitors?</p> <p>How could the proposed redevelopment contribute to creating a safe and attractive network of pedestrian and cycle routes? (e.g. improving the cycle network between Richmond-Petersham-Ham-Kingston and / or improvements to the cycle- / foot-bridge into Teddington?)</p> <p>How could street design encourage walking?</p>	<p><i>“Walking needs to be improved for wheelchairs and buggies, with better curbs (drop) and fluid pathways (particularly around Petersham).”</i></p> <p><i>“Accessibility – e.g. wheelchairs and kids buggies – make pavements high quality around Ham.”</i></p> <p><i>“Route along riverside to Richmond – make it easy to walk and cycle and use wheelchairs and buggies. 8-80 years will be able to use this route instead of driving.”</i></p> <p><i>“Remove barriers to active travel along riverside route to Richmond – cattle grids instead of gates, dry route (for flooded sections) smooth paths.”</i></p> <p><i>“20mph zone and traffic calming.”</i></p> <p><i>“Improve curb drops in all area. Enforce no parking in front of drop curb, as people ignore drops around here as there is no warden.”</i></p> <p><i>“Alley ways are too narrow around Petersham.”</i></p> <p><i>“Car schemes. “Car Club.”</i></p> <p><i>“We don’t want two roads going straight across. “Don’t build roads cutting across the Close.”</i></p> <p><i>“In order to create modal shift significant enough to ease congestion on the Petersham Road, one needs to vastly improve cycling and walking infrastructure to make it safe and pleasant and a good network which follows desire lines.”</i></p> <p><i>“All new cycle and walking infrastructure should be able to be used 24/7 i.e. non-tidal and lit – not muddy or rough).”</i></p> <p><i>“New Ham Close residents are forbidden to have cars.”</i></p> <p><i>“Ham Close’s new homes can only have ecocars.”</i></p> <p><i>“Need a creative solution for walking and cycling including schools. Not hitting potential could setback existing plans.”</i></p> <p><i>“Design the whole estate to be fully committed to sustainability in the broadest of senses, including provision for walking and cycling to encourage sustainable minded residents.”</i></p> <p><i>“Aiming at level 4 code for sustainable homes.”</i></p> <p><i>“Whole estate should be eco-friendly – use that in marketing and sell to certain people.”</i></p> <p>Cycling</p> <p><i>“All my immediate neighbours cycle, and would make great use of improved cycle routes.”</i></p> <p><i>“Could the development provide a contraflow for cyclists on Wiggins Lane?”</i></p> <p><i>“A whole cycling network needs to be introduced in Ham and Petersham to help kids cycling to school and encourage adults to cycle more.”</i></p> <p><i>“Desire lines to encourage cycling.”</i></p> <p><i>“Surfacing of roads – important for cycling.”</i></p> <p><i>“One massive problem is cycling along the Petersham Road as there is no potential for shared space. Cycling on the towpath along the river isn’t always possible as it floods and it’s not lit at night.”</i></p> <p><i>“Bike for every household. Cycling must be safe and secure.”</i></p>

Ham Close Design Workshops: Traffic and Transport

YOU SAID	OUR RESPONSE	DISCUSSION TOPIC / QUESTION	YOUR FEEDBACK
			<p><i>"Elevated cycle-way along Ham side of the Thames to mitigate tidal flooding."</i></p> <p><i>"Cycling – improve route along river. Cycle lanes at top end of Petersham Road."</i></p> <p><i>"Cycling – During the winter/ darker months, cycling along the river is too dangerous due to lack of lighting etc. Also the 'dry route' for the tow path is only useful if you are on foot. If you have a cycle, wheelchair or buggy the gates to the meadow are difficult to navigate."</i></p> <p><i>"Cycling in Ham is seasonal. In winter, solutions would be needed for the flooded river and lack of lights. Also, improved bridge bike access would make a huge difference."</i></p> <p><i>"Cycling on tow path – when flooded, at the side beyond the path."</i></p> <p><i>"Sandy Lane – option to have one side for cycles. One side for pedestrians."</i></p> <p><i>"Cycling – for most it is the most reliable form of transport during peak times."</i></p> <p><i>"A proper, safe cycling route from Ham to Richmond, Ham to Kingston, and linking up local schools is essential. Contact the neighbourhood forum for the proposed routes."</i></p> <p><i>"Weak link in cycle route is across/through Petersham Road."</i></p> <p><i>"Cycle route to Richmond to reduce road space demand."</i></p> <p><i>"Petersham Meadows to Richmond station – poor design layout for cycling."</i></p> <p><i>"Need to improve the cycle routes from Petersham Meadows to Richmond station."</i></p> <p><i>"Could take gates out of Petersham Meadow to help with cycling."</i></p> <p><i>"Remove the gates at the meadow to enable cycling."</i></p> <p><i>"Back sea scouts – could look different cycle route. This could help to create a wider cycle path as it floods at the bottom of Water Lane."</i></p> <p><i>"Could TfL help to fund the sea scouts' new hut by routing cycle route through their land to provide a non-tidal route?"</i></p> <p><i>"Revised cycle route/board walk – lit."</i></p> <p><i>"A local free bike maintenance workshop used to be based in the youth club in Ham Close. This must be reinstated, with a paid leader, paid for RHP/the Council."</i></p> <p><i>"There should be a local 'Boris Bike' – easy to use, easy to register for, available for all Ham and Petersham residents."</i></p> <p><i>"There should be a crackdown on bike theft – more secure biking provision and more enforcement by local police."</i></p> <p><i>"Secure cycle parking."</i></p> <p><i>"Cycle parking at destination just as important."</i></p> <p>Bridge</p> <p><i>"Foot/cycle bridge to Twickenham would significantly increase travel option for Ham."</i></p> <p><i>"Build footbridge from Ham to Twickenham."</i></p> <p><i>Re-lay tow path from Kingston to Richmond and add lighting (like the Twickenham side has!)"</i></p> <p><i>"Foot and cycle bridge to Twickenham is a vital part of the solution in terms of transport and relieving pressure on Petersham Road."</i></p> <p><i>"New bridge to Twickenham to walk and cycle."</i></p>