

Hello everyone!

As promised, here are our thoughts about the Council's consultation about parking and servicing relating to the Riverside development, taking account of comments received. We would remind you that the **deadline for making comments is next Sunday 12 July**. You are encouraged to record your comments on the Council's website, which you can do [HERE](#).

The consultation questionnaire, [HERE](#), is in four sections, of which only one relates to substance – the other three being administrative and biographical questions. Within Section C, there are only 4 general questions: on the parking proposals, on the Holly Road and Aragon Road carparks in particular, on access and servicing for the Riverside, and on increased provision of walking and cycle paths in the area.

The overall position of RAG is that we continue to support the current proposal for the development based on the Hopkins design that won the competition, **BUT** that is subject to two very important provisos – that the proposed configuration is practical and works on the ground and that the final design and implementation remain true to the original offering (subject only to improvements which are agreed with the local residents' groups). We shall be seeking an early (socially-distanced) meeting of the Council's Stakeholder Reference Group to review the position in the light of this consultation before the next meeting of the Council's Transport and Air Quality Services Committee on 3 September.

We start with access and servicing for the Riverside because this is the most important element of the consultation which has, unfortunately, not yet been addressed sufficiently either in the publicly available documentation or – it appears – either in the Survey commissioned from Systra or in the designers' proposals.

1. Access and servicing for the Riverside. Finding the solution to access and servicing goes to the success or otherwise of the whole development. It has always been a fundamental requirement that any development of the Riverside site should take full account of the need to serve the needs of those businesses and residents located on Eel Pie Island. It is therefore disappointing that there is no clear explanation of how this will be achieved.

There are two very specific aspects. First, it is essential that the large vehicles (on which the industries on the island depend for deliveries) can physically turn round at the Embankment end of Water Lane as required and that they can – within the Hopkins design – turn comfortably into the reconfigured service road. This needs clearly to be achievable while keeping the area safe and flowing for pedestrians, cyclists and other vehicles. The long, vehicles which serve the boat yards include very long articulated

lorries which need substantial space to reverse and turn. Alongside those, other large vehicles serve the Island (for example, delivery lorries and rubbish lorries). The timing of some visits coincide, which means there has to be enough space to accommodate the movements of more than one vehicle at the same time.

Second, RAG questions whether sufficient provision is made in the proposals for the smaller vehicles servicing the daily requirements of both islanders and others in the immediate vicinity. It is our expectation that more spaces will need to be set aside for those.

A final point relating to access, on which we at RAG have been consistent throughout, is that the junction between King Street and Water Lane must remain one-way. Although the proposals do not suggest otherwise, we do not wish to see any change in that decision. Our view is that the one-way and open nature of this junction will remain essential to the character of this key part of the centre of Twickenham and relationship between the town and Church Street in particular.

2. Parking proposals. As discussed in our last email, the main way proposed of addressing the removal of the existing parking spaces from the Embankment is to re-designate all the remaining riverside and other nearby spaces as for mixed use by residents (importantly) and businesses. This effectively removes Pay & Display (P&D) spaces from the immediate area, which means that visitors from outside Twickenham will have to use other spaces further away. While there is some concern that this will disadvantage shops, cafés, and sports clubs in the immediate vicinity, we regard this in general as an unavoidable consequence of the decision to move the current parking from the Embankment and potentially an acceptable compromise, subject to the next related point.

3. Holly Road and Arragon Road (Waitrose) car parks. We are not persuaded that the expanded use of Holly Road will actually lead to more, if any, new available spaces in practice, given that it is already used largely by Zone D residents, although we can accept its opening also to business car-users. We acknowledge that there is some spare capacity in Aragon Road, subject to the proposed reconfiguration to facilitate the use of the lower levels by short-stay users.

We shall be seeking more details on the current usage (compared to capacity) in both these car parks and assurance regarding the actual number of spaces which will become available to help accommodate those vehicles displaced from the Riverside.

4. Increased provision for walking and cycle paths. RAG is happy to support this suggestion, provided it fits with the other requirements of the site, including those outlined above. One of our fundamental objectives throughout has been to encourage more recreational use of the Embankment site by pedestrians and cyclists.

Again, please do respond to the consultation and – as ever – further comments or observations will be very welcome.

Best wishes and stay safe!

Mark, Marion & Peter