



THE RICHMOND SOCIETY

Richmond Town Centre Enhancement Proposals' Questionnaire Addendum Submission.

In May 2005 and again in 2006, The Richmond Society publicised a scheme for improving pedestrian access and safety in Richmond town centre. In summary, this consisted of:

- A 20mph speed limit covering Eton Street, Paradise Road, Red Lion Street and The Green, as well as George Street, The Quadrant and the Richmond end of Kew Road.
- Improvements to the pedestrian crossing points throughout this zone, enhancing safety and using raised surfaces and paving materials to delineate pedestrian priority more clearly.

The aim of the current Richmond Council proposals appears to be specifically to improve traffic management along George Street, The Quadrant and the Richmond end of Kew Road, with particular focus on bus flow.

The Richmond Society questions both the objectives and the likely consequences of the current Richmond Council scheme. We are concerned that overall, the proposals as they stand, in some cases are unworkable and are likely to have a negative impact on the Town. Our response considers each individual proposal on its own merits, based principally on the Society's original criteria: how well it improves pedestrian access and safety in Richmond. In summary, the Society's concerns are as follows:

- (1) The consultation for the Council's proposals presents no conclusive evidence that they will improve overall traffic flow and enhance pedestrian access and safety. The Richmond Society is therefore concerned that instead, the effect will be to:
 - Increase congestion, with consequent delays and environmental damage
 - Displace delayed traffic into residential areas
 - Provide insubstantial improvements for pedestrians.
- (2) Eton Street, Paradise Road and Red Lion Street (where pedestrian safety is a greater problem than on George Street) are not included in the first phase of the proposals, and there is no firm commitment to any second or subsequent phases.
- (3) Conversion of George Street to a single lane with loading bays is likely to increase congestion and pollution and is also likely to displace traffic onto Richmond Green and other areas. Alterations to George Street on this scale cannot be justified in terms of pedestrian safety: in recent years there have been no serious pedestrian injuries there, unlike the area in front of Richmond Station and unlike Red Lion Street which, in any case, is not part of the initial proposals.

The Richmond Society's primary interest is the introduction of measures to improve the safety and amenity of pedestrians in the Town centre. We will therefore support measures where this is demonstrably the main objective but will oppose measures which seek, as their primary objective, merely to improve the through-flow of buses, where the proposed measures do not clearly improve facilities for pedestrians and where ambiguous traffic analysis does not support changes on the basis of there being no adverse affect on surrounding streets and areas of the Town.

Section A: General Improvements

Providing Pedestrians with more space and safer access

1. **Widening the pavements where possible:** We would only support this if widened pavements were devoted exclusively to pedestrian use and a traffic analysis has confirmed that traffic flow will not be impeded and/or will not flow-over into or otherwise adversely affect other areas. As no traffic analysis has been provided to confirm this point, we are generally opposed to this proposal.
2. **Installing Raised “gateway points”:** We would support this proposal provided that traffic flow is not impeded and provided this is not in conflict with the statutory requirements for a 20mph limit not zone. See item 5 below.
3. **Introducing a 20mph zone:** We would only support this proposal if the 20mph were to be a limit and not a zone.
4. **Introducing a 20mph zone around Richmond Green:** The area indicated on the proposal plans is flawed; it is essential that the 20mph limit extends from the Green along Parkshot to the A316 and includes Clarence Street and also extends along Sheen Road and Paradise Road to the junction with Church Road. All of the areas designated as 20mph together with the above and also including Eton Street and Quadrant Street, must be included in the designated and funded “current extent of works” otherwise we object to the proposals outright.

Enhancing the visual quality of the streetscape

5. **Upgrading the quality of the pavements:** We agree with the proposal to use Yorkstone and granite slabs provided that the material is not new sawn as used outside Starbucks. Preference would be for reclaimed material but otherwise suitable stone should be carefully considered for appearance, maintenance and life span.
6. **Upgrading the Lanes to Yorkstone slabs:** See item A5 above.
7. **Paved shared use loading bays:** The current proposed locations and designation of loading bays are unworkable and are likely to cause disruption and difficulties for a number of shops and general pedestrian movement.
8. **Upgrading the side access roads:** We generally support this proposal
9. **Resurfacing the road where necessary:** No opinion.

Increasing safety from crime

10. Change lighting to safer white light source: No opinion
11. CCTV: Yes

Improving signage

12. Remove unnecessary and old signs / introduce new signs: We welcome this proposal, subject to detailed design proposals for the new signs.

Ensuring the proposals meet the needs of people with disabilities

13. Raised tables. We support these proposals but they are currently incomplete and must include crossing points in Paradise Road. The table at the junction of Red Lion street and Hill Street must carry across the entire road way.
14. Texture differentiation. We support the general principal of these proposals provided they meet with the Requirements of the council's Public Spaces Design Guidelines.

Improving traffic flows

15. More clearly defined loading bays: We do not support the current proposals which are impractical and unworkable in terms of both location and detail layout.
16. Shared use loading bays: We do not support these proposals; the number and location are impractical.
17. Charging points for electric cars: Yes in principle but more specific details are required before unqualified support can be given.

Making the area more cycle friendly

18. More cycle parking: Yes.
19. Introducing cycle routes where feasible: Yes

Section B: Proposals related to a specific site in the town centre.

Kew Road / Church Road / Clarence Road junction.

Proposal 1: We object to the removal of the right turn into Church Road as the effect is likely to increase traffic congestion at the Quadrant / George Street / Sheen Road junction.

Proposal 2:

Option a) i): We object to the closure of Clarence Street which will result in unacceptable traffic congestion and confusion for all traffic exiting Parkshot in the direction of Kew or London

Option a) ii): We similarly object to this proposal.

Option b): We object to this proposal as we believe this will result in congestion in Clarence Street / Parkshot.

Option c): We support the retention of the status quo.

Kew Road to the Quadrant including Richmond Station Outside of Richmond station (excluding the station building)

Proposal 3: We support this proposal

Proposal 4: No opinion.

Proposal 5: We support this proposal provided that the alternative provision for taxis and drop-off / collect is demonstrably adequate.

Proposal 6: We support this proposal.

Proposal 7: We have no opinion on the change to a pelican crossing but the location of the crossing is entirely dependent on the narrowing of the carriageway for which no supporting traffic analysis has been made available

Proposal 8: We support this proposal

Proposal 9: No opinion.

Proposal 10: We support the proposal to widen the pavement, subject to traffic analysis demonstrating that there will be no consequentially adverse affect on general traffic flow.

Proposal 11: We support this proposal with the caveat noted in Item 5 above.

The Quadrant

Proposal 12: No opinion.

Waterloo Place

Proposal 13: We support this proposal provided the two well established lime trees remain..

The Square / Eton Street

Proposal 14: We support this proposal.

George Street

Proposal 15: We object to the siting of the crossing in this location as it is likely to be dangerously close to the vehicle servicing access / egress for Victoria Place.

Proposal 16: We object to the narrowing of George Street at the three locations proposed in the absence of any quantifiable traffic analysis confirming that traffic flow will not be impeded or take avoiding action into surrounding streets and areas.

Proposal 17: We object to these proposals which we believe are unworkable. See also Item A7 above.

The routes towards the bus station

Proposal 18: We support this proposal.

Proposal 19: This proposal would be safer if the crossing were to be to the East side of the Paradise Road / Church Terrace junction to allow the safer passage of pedestrians walking from the Vineyard area into the town and avoid there having to cross by the entrance to the bus station / Wakefield Road. This item must also be in the designated "Current Extent of Works".

Hill Street

Proposal 20: We support the proposal to widen the pavement but our comments on the unloading bay proposals are as for items A7 and B17 above.

Hill Street / Bridge Street junction

Proposal 21: We support this proposal

Proposal 22: We have no specific opinion on this proposal but welcome in principal the introduction of a crossing point at the Bridge Street / Hill Street junction.

Proposal 23: We support this proposal.