



EAST TWICKENHAM IMPROVEMENT SCHEME

The Council are consulting East Twickenham residents on the first of two phases of their plans for a once-in-a-generation “East Twickenham Improvement Scheme” for Richmond Road. **It’s important they hear from as many local residents as possible.**

To find the Council document: search Richmond Council consultations, open the first item and scroll down to item six: East Twickenham Improvement Scheme – closes 30 July.

To help you respond, here are our responses to the survey questions, taking account of what we have learned from earlier discussions with the Council. There are good aspects but it is disappointing that a number of suggestions made by the two local residents associations, RIBRA and TPRA, haven't been included in the proposals, and in one case directly contradicted. The consultation is about details. The plan could be improved but, if the Council does not receive clear feedback, it will be implemented as it is.

1. Currently, how would you describe the air quality in the Richmond Road area?

Answer: Poor.

Although the nitrogen dioxide level has improved in recent years, the 2020 annual average of 32 microgrammes/m² remains high, despite big reductions in traffic pollution caused by lockdowns. In 2019, before Covid effects, it was 39 micrograms, just below the official limit of 40 microgrammes. More worrying, especially now we have the school, are small particulates, known as PM_{2.5} where, according to data from Imperial College, the average in the middle of Richmond Road is around 12mcg/m³ compared to the World Health Organization maximum of 10mcg/m³. This affects everyone who walks or lives on Richmond Road and down the side roads. While more trees will help a bit, we think the plan misses an opportunity to make a step change in pollution reduction by, for example, installing a “City Tree” device (equivalent to 275 trees).

2. Currently, how would you describe the pedestrian environment in the Richmond Road area?

Answer: Poor.

It varies a lot, including places where the pavement is very uneven. There is an opportunity to make Richmond Road a more pleasant environment. The proposal for more trees, and to improve the private area by the pharmacy, will help.

3. Do you consider that trees and greening would improve the pedestrian environment and air quality as set out in the proposed measures?

Answer: Don't know.

Of course, once they are grown, trees will make a big improvement to the overall appearance of the street. Also mature trees will make a limited improvement to air quality. However, the plan says air quality is a key objective but includes no other air quality improvement measures right now. We think the Council could go further – see City Tree comment in 1. above. If everyone says “Yes” the Council will claim “job done”.

4. Do you consider that the proposed resurfacing measures (including the new granite entry treatments on Park Road, Ryde Place, Morley Road, Cresswell Road, Cambridge Road and Willoughby Road) would improve the pedestrian environment on Richmond Road?

Answer: Don't know.

Another tricky one as this asks for a single response to more than one proposal. The proposal for the pavement surface is “Artificial Stone Paving” (ASP) - i.e concrete paving of the type installed outside Lidl. In many other parts of the borough, stone has been used, for example the granite paving in Hampton Hill. We think East Twickenham deserves something better than ASP.

We have mixed views about the granite side-road entry tables. Those in support thought they looked good, improved the balance between pedestrians and cars, and would reduce speeds. Those opposed thought that they are functionally equivalent to the existing drop-kerb pavement for ease of crossing (pedestrians/pushchairs), that there might be a risk of a “speed bump” effect and associated nuisance, that there is a risk of early wear/damage due to the passage of heavy vehicles and were concerned about the loss of parking spaces at the ends of the side roads.

5. Do you consider that the existing slipway to the riverside towpath (green area) requires any improvement works?

Answer: Yes.

The surface is bad, and there is no signage to ensure cyclists take the correct route. We need to see details of the Council's ideas to comment further.

6. Overall, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed measures for Richmond Road?

Answer: Neither agree nor disagree.

There are good and bad aspects. The main bad one, not mentioned in the questions, is the Toucan crossing (cyclists + pedestrians) replacing the existing pedestrian crossing at the foot of Richmond Bridge. Despite proposed pavement widening, this will mix cyclists with pedestrians on what will still be a narrow pavement on the north side, and in the area by the 'By-the-Bridge' cafe on the south side. It is building in probable conflict between pedestrians and cyclists for minimal benefit. We consulted with the main local cycling group and they agreed that this makes little sense.

7. How well do you consider the existing Richmond Road/St Margaret's Road junction works? Changes to this junction would not occur in Phase 1 of this project and would be subject to further consultation

Answer: Quite well or very well.

One idea being considered by the Council for Phase 2 of the project (not part of the current plan) is to eliminate the left turn filter at the lights. We think that would lead to a lot more traffic congestion and pollution - a bad idea. The junction design has been revised several times over the years, and we think it works well.

8. Are there any further comments you would like to make about the proposed measures?

This is your only opportunity to express your views other than in simple yes/no terms. Please take it. While the Council proposals have a number of good points, there are significant opportunities for improvement. This is what we suggest – core of the response in bold:

- ***The proposal for a Toucan crossing in the same location as the existing pedestrian crossing by the bridge makes no sense. It will result in dangerous mixing of cyclists with pedestrians on what will still be a narrow pavement on the north side, and in the area by the By the Bridge cafe on the south. A more imaginative approach is required to accommodate the needs of both cyclists and pedestrians. If that is not possible, the current arrangement must be retained, as it is relatively easy for cyclists to navigate while keeping pedestrians safe.***
- ***The opportunity to make a step-change reduction in pollution has been missed. One option would be to install a "City Tree" device in place of one of the two proposed new trees outside Lidl. That would have a major effect on pollution in a busy street and which is now home to a school.***
- ***The proposal to lay "Artificial Stone Paving" (ASP) of the type installed outside Lidl is very disappointing. Many other parts of the borough have stone, such as the granite paving in Hampton Hill. East Twickenham has been neglected for many years. It deserves better than ASP.***
- ***If the granite entry treatments are to be installed, bollards or other steps are needed. This is to avoid heavy trucks reversing into side roads in order to turn round, risking damage to the new surfaces, and danger to pedestrians.***
- ***The plan takes out nine parking spaces. The Council has yet to share the results of its recent parking survey and, without that, it is not possible to judge the impact of this significant change.***

The Work of Twickenham Park Residents Association (TPRA)

Please join the TPRA and support us in the work we do. This includes:

- Keeping members and residents abreast of developments that affect the area
- Holding public talks and smaller soirees about interesting aspects of the area ranging from its architecture to talks from Twickenham Film Studio to the Eel Pie Island Museum.
- Working with our local Councillors to ensure that pressure is maintained to remove graffiti, improve the quality of pavements and tackle anti social behaviour.
- Ensuring that the greenery along Ducks Walk is regularly pruned back and turning an overgrown area at the Duck’s Walk end of Park House Gardens into an informal pocket park and children’s playground.
- Taking part in the public enquiry about a development that could have threatened the future viability of Twickenham Film Studios.
- TPRA webmasters Dave Wilson and Dave Boyd-Moss ensure that our website has a mixture of news of events that affect our community, as well as an incredibly extensive photographic history of our area.
- Pre Covid, the TPRA organised social events such as talks at our wine and nibbles AGM and a summer party. These will resume when possible.

TPRA Committee

- Colin Hines (Chair) -11 Park House Gardens. 020 8892 5051
- Amanda Carey-McDermott (Vice Chair) - 23 Park House Gardens. 07989 549964
- Trish Mayer (Secretary) - 25 Ellesmere Rd. 07863 146410
- Ann Hines (Treasurer) - 11 Park House Gardens. 020 8892 5051
- Chris & Christine Byron - 26 Beresford Ave. 020 8892 7589
- Cheryll & Richard Resch - 37 Arlington Rd. 020 8241 8575
- Val Coltman - 5 Ducks Walk. 020 8891 0561
- Philip Jeffery - 17 Ravensbourne Rd. 07770 381512
- Ian Robertson 13 Madingley Court, Willoughby Rd. 020 8891 6392
- Eleanor Broad – 59 Park House Gardens. 07729 976782

TPRA 2021 ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION

To join, or update our list, please email to twickenhamparkra@gmail.com with your name, address and phone number - or complete the slip below and hand to a committee member. Membership fee presently is £5 annually per household. Our preferred method of payment is by standing orders, using your road, house number and name as a reference.

Account Name: Twickenham Park Residents Assoc.

Account No.: 60671505 Sort Code: 60-17-31

NAME:

ADDRESS:
.....

PHONE..... E-mail:.....