

LONDON'S ARCADIA - HAM AND PETERSHAM phase 2 consultation – October/November 2006

* For name / organisation of respondent see page 6

** Projects numbered: 1. Melancholy Walk, 2. Ham Car Park, 3. The Avenues (as questionnaire)

Respondent No *	Summary of open ended comments –general or by project ** Projects numbered (as questionnaire) ○ 1. Melancholy Walk ○ 2. Ham Car Park ○ 3. The Avenues	Officers comments	Executive Committee Recommendation
1.	2. Omission of bund wall east to be replaced by hedgerow – no explanation as to why changed from earlier plans Hedge will collect rubbish. Its function screening of car park will be minimal and be offset by maintenance costs	Bunds to be removed as required by EA. Current low bunds can stay. Hedgerow height can be adjusted and it serves as biodiversity element-ask for Exec Comm views	Agreed no additions to existing bunds No hedgerow on east side but fine on south
2.	Do not try to deal with floodscape	Not applicable	Agreed with officer
3.	Restart the project for Sandy Lane to Ham Common – at least in part	Address in phase 3	Agreed with officer
4.	-	-	-
5.	-	-	-
6.	1. Good that boardwalk being raised as gets muddy 2. Ham Car park – no access to landing to south of car park	2. We could include a path to slipway Seek Exec Com views	2. Leave design as is and review paths after a year to see if additional links required
7.	1. Not appropriate to adopt the proposed rised route-contrived and unnecessary as this is rural route –please reconsider	It will still be rural but we must upgrade to avoid health and safety issues and DDA regulations	Agreed with officer
8.	Support and thanks for giving ample opportunities for consultation	-	-
9.	3. Scheme fine. But traffic drives too fast along the Avenue (ave spd 39mph) - up to 60mph	In reference to Ham Gate Ave-agree- pass along comment to LBRuT Transport and Ward Cllr's as Arcadia cannot take on traffic calming issues	Not applicable
10.	Welcome scheme –great asset to Ham House area Concerned about state of path from Ham House to Gatehouse Petersham Road	Agree- but we need £100,000 to put in new path. Council has put a bid in to TfL.	Not in budget

LONDON'S ARCADIA - HAM AND PETERSHAM phase 2 consultation – October/November 2006

* For name / organisation of respondent see page 6

** Projects numbered: 1. Melancholy Walk, 2. Ham Car Park, 3. The Avenues (as questionnaire)

11.	2. Approve but concerned that the protection around new trees dominant and unsightly. Could another method be used eg sleepers or under planting Concerned that if 'reinforced grass' means plastic honeycomb it will melt with the frequent barbecues held here Where is reference to species of tree around car park?	We need some method to protect against vehicle bumpers. Spoke to KWA about reinforced grass system which will be very heavy plastic about 5cm below the surface so it should be fine. Ash- tree species is listed on drawing	Agreed with officer Sample of grass reinforcing to be brought in and detail required – in worse case situations it can be lifted and replaced
12.	Deserved support Other comments have been dealt with directly 20.11.06	-	-
13.	Needs to be read in conjunction with plans as so many comments 2. Reposition planting of trees on East side of riverside Ham Car Park so as not to obscure Ham House visitor's view of Octagon room. Consider a bench on viewing point for Octagon room -near entrance to Ham house and gardens (See plan)	See supplied map and notes. Tree canopy should be high enough to allow view through. We will supervise planting and/or modify as per comment 37. Seek NT view on bench	Delete line of trees on east of car park to allow for views and more organic flow using existing grove of trees. Ensure position of trees will not conflict with view on site prior and during planting.
14.	Very impressed	-	-
15.	-	-	-
16.	2. Not sure about rationalising car parking spaces. Would not want spaces to be marked as they would not last long	No car park marking as it is gravel	Agreed with officer
17.	Lovely proposals will preserve and enhance 1. Dry link huge improvement and like pond idea 3. Gap filling restoration will ensure enjoyment in future	-	-
18.	Guided walk shows lot of thought gone into proposals 1. Pond great idea 3. Tree works good idea	-	-

LONDON'S ARCADIA - HAM AND PETERSHAM phase 2 consultation – October/November 2006

* For name / organisation of respondent see page 6

** Projects numbered: 1. Melancholy Walk, 2. Ham Car Park, 3. The Avenues (as questionnaire)

19.	<p>1. How substantial is bridge- large structure inappropriate. 2. Does this mean reduction in spaces? Would marking help reduce wasted spaces. 3. Concern that Petersham and South Avenue are quiet places and more shielding/hedges could put people off. It needs to be kept open for visibility.</p>	<p>1. Bridge will be more substantial than now especially with required (H&S) rails 2. No 3. Hedgerows should not impact openness as they are along wall edges</p>	Agreed with officer
20.	<p>2. Tidying up welcomed but resulting loss of space is not. When busy 3-4 lanes down middle have parking.</p> <p>Planting ash tree near towpath not fair on disabled and elderly (View) Choice of <i>Fraxinus excelsior</i> ash tree not good. Very tall, not good autumn colour, fork low and are cankered. If you remove branches they will become top heavy and look out of place.</p> <p>Fail to see how car park will accommodate Great River Race/other big events.</p>	<p>2 Car park has a capacity which is reached on occasions but this issue will never be totally resolved. Ash trees are a good tree for that location considering height of trees, native and flooding. Raised tree canopies ensures clear views to river and Richmond Hill. GRR has been consulted and we will address to make sure that we can accommodate them as per their comments as with film crews</p>	Agreed with officer- we must ensure turning radius and provide dropped curb area in central island for GRR.
21.	-	-	-
22.	<p>Seems to provide improvement without destroying natural beauty. Like the pond by dry link but sorry tree has to go and boardwalk is straight rather than as is at present.</p>	-	-
23.	<p>1. Drain Melancholy Walk sucked down adult dog –could also be child - when very high tide. Strength of undertow from drain meant 18 yr old could not hold onto the dog. Otherwise the plans seem well thought out</p>	<p>We will provide a new metal cage that should prevent small child from being taken into drain but this could be a problem at any time hence need for fencing to reduce risk</p>	Agreed with officer

LONDON'S ARCADIA - HAM AND PETERSHAM phase 2 consultation – October/November 2006

* For name / organisation of respondent see page 6

** Projects numbered: 1. Melancholy Walk, 2. Ham Car Park, 3. The Avenues (as questionnaire)

24.	Disappointed Great river Avenue not included-although reasons have been explained.	-	-
25.	2. Question need for trees along the riverfront -destroys the view -car being pushed back will reduce impact on view from Rich Terrace Central island reduces size of car park-too large Small demarcation posts better to structure car park	Total area (length of the car park) along river front will not be altered. Raised tree canopies ensures clear views to river and Richmond Hill. Must also consider view from MDDX back to car park which is unsightly so tree planting will soften impact from MDDX	Agreed with officer
26.	Do not prettify existing natural landscape with improvements	None of this landscape is natural and it is unclear (subjective) on what "prettify" means.	Agreed with officer
27.	Having been on walk –very impressed by all improvements	-	-
28.	Fairly happy with what proposed but on the Green the Avenue should not detract from relaxed spaciousness.	Comment refers to Ham Common Green. Seek Exec Conm views	Do not alter proposed plans
29.	Projects 1 & 3 see no problems with. 2. Have substantial reservations. As regular year-round user unhappy about rationalisation of spaces. Unhappy about car parking set back behind trees. I have limited mobility – my regular pleasure and other elderly users to must sit and contemplate 'sweet Thames run softly'. We park courteously and carefully already. This is the only car park of any size between Richmond and Kingston and further along. Resurface yes, but planting trees will reduce its size and put users behind barricade. Surprised and disappointed that area where informality is its charm project lends itself to such restriction and regulation.	Seek Exec Committee views. Total area (length of the car park) along river front will not be altered. Raised tree canopies ensures clear views to river and Richmond Hill.	Plans to be altered as mentioned above but disagree about issues of access, and views. These elements of the proposal address these very issues to a much higher standard.
30.	2. More waste baskets/bins and dog waste bins near the car park 3. Do not remove too many trees. Need more to maintain natural country appearance	2. Good idea- added to KWA 3. removing 13 and planting 104 trees- seek Exec Comm views	Agreed with officer

LONDON'S ARCADIA - HAM AND PETERSHAM phase 2 consultation – October/November 2006

* For name / organisation of respondent see page 6

** Projects numbered: 1. Melancholy Walk, 2. Ham Car Park, 3. The Avenues (as questionnaire)

31.	<p>Generally good job. Do not cut down too many trees/shrubs as habitats. 2. Need improvement to litter bins/rubbish collection 3. Do not take away natural looking appearance and make too formal</p>	<p>3. The concept and garden design around the avenues is 'formality and regular rhythm' which sets the tone for approaching/leaving Ham House. This is the rationale for Heritage Lottery funding.</p>	Agreed with officer
32.	<p>1. Wet area granite setts in appropriate in semi-rural area. Also dangerous, slippery when wet. Unpatriotic if cheap imported Chinese/Portuguese Sleepers- danger of seepage of preservative into tidal wetland 2. Trees will block river view for old/disabled visitors in cars</p>	<p>1. For Exec Comm to comment on setts. Sleepers are not railway sleepers and they have no preservative- we will only use UK/European sustainable wood 2. Again as above- not true</p>	<p>Leaver in granite setts but use UK reclaimed. Agreed with officer re sleepers. Agreed with officer re trees obstructing view- they will not obstruct views but enhance</p>
33.	<p><u>Criticism of consultation process.</u> Notice in R&TT disappointing Site notices good If had info earlier could have leafleted members Walks and Exhibition well organised good opp. for detailed discussion</p> <p>1. Welcome idea Would like bridge to be as wide as possible to accommodate cyclists. Would appreciate disruption to towpath being kept to a minimum. 2. Like planting proposal but some elderly/disabled afraid wide river views might be obscured by trees and hedge. We have been assured that tree spacing and crowning would take care of this and endorse need to reduce visibility of cars from Richmond direction. 3. Happy with proposed gapping up lime trees and small scale removal of unsuitable trees. Would like to see planting on Ham Common deferred until Autumn/Winter 2007/08 given huge watering need and the fact that trees here are particularly exposed.</p>	<p>The approach is to use a mix of relatively low cost methods of informing and consulting to engage as broad range of interested parties as possible.</p> <p>1. Max width of 2m most likely due to budget 3. Maintenance of trees will be a part of the contract</p>	<p>Agreed with officer</p> <p>1. Agreed with officer max width 2m with 1.8m useable space. 3. Agreed with officer</p>

LONDON'S ARCADIA - HAM AND PETERSHAM phase 2 consultation – October/November 2006

* For name / organisation of respondent see page 6

** Projects numbered: 1. Melancholy Walk, 2. Ham Car Park, 3. The Avenues (as questionnaire)

34.	2. Support proposals re screening/landscaping but understand same number of cars will be in a smaller area. Prefer to see the present area retained allowing a few extra cars as this would reduce danger/ugliness/inconvenience of overflow of cars parking in nearby road.	Not really possible as one cannot put in two rows of cars without making the space bigger.	Agreed with officer
35.	-	-	-
36.	1. Sustrans Route 4 currently runs down Melancholy walk on 3m shared use. Plans extension to Richmond. Link should be 3m wide with smooth surface and no steps allowing shared use for cyclists. Hoggin not a durable surface better to have resin bond gravel or existing surfacing.	1. Likely to be no more than 2m-shared use with Pedestrian priority Existing surface is mud? Not an appropriate space with a grade II* landscape to have tarmac- besides rest of links are in gravel.	Agreed with officer as above. Provide a clear rural link to Mel Walk
37.	2. Need access for crane at slipway for Great River Race and turn around area for trailers at centre. Concerned about canopy of trees at eastern side for marquees. Need to be certain that the turning radius for vehicles with boat trailers adequate.	One tree will now not be included at centre for clearer access to slipway to allow for crane. Line of trees to east will now not be included to allow for a more organic flow using the existing grove of trees. Provide a drop curb in central parking landscape tree line to facilitate Great River Race turning access. Transport engineer modelling demonstrates layout of car park is adequate for the turning area of the largest turning radius vehicle permitted on the roads in the UK. Implementation not set until September 2007 after next GRR so opportunity to review further	Agreed with officer.

LONDON'S ARCADIA - HAM AND PETERSHAM phase 2 consultation – October/November 2006

* For name / organisation of respondent see page 6

** Projects numbered: 1. Melancholy Walk, 2. Ham Car Park , 3. The Avenues (as questionnaire)

<p>38.</p>	<p>In general, proposals are welcome. 2. Concerns: a. Proposed trees will restrict viewing access for partially/severely disabled people in their cars. Would have welcomed more reference to issues of access and disability in consultation documents. Many during summer/weekends travel some distance for the views. b. row of trees will limit parking availability –what alternative arrangements are being made. Rationalising parking must mean fewer parking spaces. When busy (summer/weekends) cars are forced to park along the road leading to car park causing difficulty in traffic flow. Health and safety issue as many parents walk with young children along river/to Ham House. Also horses exercised in the immediate area. c. As funding insufficient –key priority must be to make area safer and usable at all times. New Bridge and levelling path in from car park should be first task. d. General comment: Unless Richmond Council shows greater commitment to maintenance of riverside enhancement will be compromised. Richmond/Kingston residents spoken to over past 12 months delighted by view but disappointed by lack of basic maintenance. (Grass under trees not cut for 5months, 13 posts broken/missing from car park/after the Great River Race over dozen tyres left. Could Council have partnership arrangement with volunteers to provide trimmer for grass Large waste bins with lids must be supplied. Twice this summer when collecting rubbish at weekends I noticed personal items scattered along riverside. Notices about rubbish disposal and safe use of fire for parties may be helpful.</p>	<p>2- seek Exec Comm views a. As above- I disagree b. As above- I disagree- car park difficulty slows traffic thus reducing conflict with pedestrians as do horse slowing traffic. I can pass along comment to LBRuT Transport Engineers to review about traffic calming measures but I don't see this as necessary. Proposal also provides more space for pedestrians on towpath c. Not an issue d. Maintenance issue for LBRuT Parks and Highways but it cannot be a point that we don't progress because of grass height, litter etc.</p>	<p>Agreed with officer</p>
------------	---	---	----------------------------

13th December 2006 updated 28th December 2006.