

# Southfields Public Realm Improvements - design group

In December 2017 a group of representatives for the resident and business community in Southfields were invited to be part of a design group to deliver a public realm improvement design approach for the central Southfields shopping area and Southfields Station.

The objectives of the group were to:

1. ensure successful delivery of final scheme design ready for build
2. ensure the views of stakeholders represented are conveyed and considered at Southfields Public Realm design group (SPRdg) meetings
3. contribute and collaborate with SPRdg members to deliver final design
4. champion the aims and principles of the project and ensure accurate information is passed to parties represented when opportunities arise.

Wider public consultation regarding potential public realm improvements for the area had been sought in late 2015/early 2016. Using the initial consultation results work was commissioned to Project Centre to begin working up design principles for a scheme.

In January 2018 the Southfields Public Realm design group met twice to discuss the design principles and work collaboratively to represent particular groups and refine the final public realm strategy report and final proposed approach for a scheme.

The Southfields Public Realm strategy report incorporated two rounds of changes reflecting the work of the group. The final report was issued on 5th Feb 2018. While not all parties were in agreement on some elements of the design approach, officers and designers have sought to address concerns raised and make compromises to the original proposals in order to create a balanced approach which retains the objectives of the scheme.

Over the course of both meetings representatives from the following organisations attended and provided written feedback and commentary outside the group meetings::The Gardens Residents' Association, Southfields Business Forum, Southfields Triangle Residents' Association, Living Streets, All England Lawn Tennis and Croquet club, Wandsworth Mobility Forum, Edgecombe Hall Residents' Association, Southfields Grid Residents' Association, Sutherland Grove Conservation Area Residents' Association, Councillors from Southfields and West Hill wards, with facilitation by London Borough of Wandsworth (LBW) and the Project Centre team..

# Southfields Public Realm Improvements - design group

The following table outlines the key concerns and opportunities and possible solutions suggested by the group. The last column provides a definitive response from LBW.

| CONCERN/OPPORTUNITIES  | POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS/EXPLORATION  | RESPONSE   |
|--|---|--|
| <b>REPORT:</b>   |   |  |
| Incorporate more of residential priority in introductory text  |   | Residential priority included in executive summary |
| Duplications of statistics and other anomalies/mistakes  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Margaret Brett to forward all details to JT</li> </ul> | Amended in report re-draft                         |
| p.78 and 79 concern re: stats and time/day of week assessments were taken – occupancy is high – cannot argue that there is space in Elsenham to compensate for the loss of parking on Replingham | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Margaret Brett to forward all details to JT</li> </ul> | Amended in report re-draft                         |
| Trees have a calming effect on a street – make more of this in report  |   | Incorporated in Healthy Streets section.           |
| Report does not directly reference provision made for increased accessibility<br>Desire to comment further on the accessibility page.  |   | Accessibility pages included in final report.      |

# Southfields Public Realm Improvements - design group

| WIMBLEDON PARK RD. (SOUTH)   |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Bus stop too close to junction</p> <p>Is it possible to move the bus shelter?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Move bus stop further south t/wards Gartmoor Gardens</li> <li>• Remove car parking to accommodate moving bus stop rather than moving too far away from station</li> </ul> | <p>Further clarification of bus stop location and approach will be determined by surveys (see p. 98 of PCL report)</p>                                     |
| <p>Teenagers running into road at junction</p>                                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leave guardrail or put in other mitigating separation from road so it is less easy to do so</li> </ul>  | <p>Guard railing removed will be replaced with a street furniture zone. This creates a pedestrian permeable edge which creates a degree of separation.</p> |
| <p>Bins not being emptied and bins being taken away and not replaced</p>             |  | <p>Outside scope of scheme, will discuss location of bins proposed with LBW cleansing team to agree bins are able to be serviced regularly.</p>            |

# Southfields Public Realm Improvements - design group

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p>For guardrailling being lost which provides informal cycle parking opportunities LCDS recommends an amount of replacement with formal cycle parking is made.</p>                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase amount of cycle parking</li> </ul> | <p>Project team will seek to install additional cycle parking where street space permits in conjunction with other demands being made such as Hostile Vehicle Mitigation requested by Met Police/AELTC</p>   |
| <p>Sainsbury's lorries cause congestion at junction area.<br/>What consideration has been given to Sainsbury's construction programme in relation to Southfields PR construction</p> |  | <p>The proposed loading bay should reduce incidences of congestion. Sainsbury's and Southern Gas Network both have works scheduled in Southfields over the coming year. When preparing the construction programme liaison with relevant organisations will take place.</p> |
| <p>Residents near Gartmoor Gardens concerned with visibility exiting junction (strongly request parking space due to be removed is removed)</p>                                      |  | <p>Removal of parking bay is proposed in final design approach</p>   |
|  |  |  |
| <p><b>ELSENHAM STREET</b></p>  |  |  |

# Southfields Public Realm Improvements - design group

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <p>Congestion will be increased by narrowing junction with Replingham Rd. as cannot accommodate both left and right turning out by vehicles.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not reduce width of carriageway</li> </ul>                 | <p>Wish to dissuade rat-running through Elsenham and reduce severance for pedestrians crossing Elsenham Road where it meets Replingham Road. Reduction of carriageway will help achieve this and enable cycle contra-flow facility.</p> |
| <p>Could we have a drinking fountain?</p>  |  | <p>Further investigation will be conducted in the next phase of design. Ongoing maintenance of water fountains may be problematic.</p>  |
| <p>Pedestrian priority will not be retained if junction narrowing is not implemented</p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduce width of carriageway</li> <li>CPH crossings</li> </ul> | <p>Wish to dissuade rat-running through Elsenham and reduce severance for pedestrians crossing Elsenham Road where it meets Replingham Road. Reduction of carriageway will help achieve this and enable cycle contra-flow facility.</p> |

# Southfields Public Realm Improvements - design group

| <b>REPLINGHAM RD.</b>   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| Haven't accounted for sufficient parking spaces lost if zebra crossing remains in proposed location | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can the crossing be moved further east?</li> <li>• Does the crossing location meet pedestrian desire lines?</li> <li>• Was the original request through 15/16 consultation for crossing to be further East?</li> </ul> | <p>Have reviewed location against evidence base of KSI statistics and observations this location indicate this is the most appropriate location for facilitating safer crossing facility.</p> <p>Given the concerns cited by the group regarding loss of parking, the zebra crossing proposed has been removed, and a raised table facility proposed. This gives back 2 no. parking spaces.</p> |
| Tree planting takes out parking spaces  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can the trees proposed be placed on the footway?</li> </ul>  | It is not possible to plants trees in the footway due to public highway space limitations.  |
|   |   |   |
| <b>WIMBLEDON PARK ROAD (NORTH)</b>  |   |   |

# Southfields Public Realm Improvements - design group

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| Landlords are issuing evictions notices to tenants in this row of shops   |  | Outside scope of report/scheme   |
| 8 bike parking spaces at M&S need to be retained  |  | These will be accommodated within the new design where cycle parking will not obstruct pedestrian movement.  |
| Could one space be allocated for Blue Badge holders on Wimbledon Park Road'   |  | Blue badge holders can park on double and single yellow lines. Will consider request for dedicated bay alongside current parking arrangement review.                             |
|   |  |  |
| <b>GENERAL</b>  |  |  |
| All supermarkets load/unload more than is stated in the report – what they say and what they do is not the same thing |  | LBW is limited in their capacity to enforce loading and unloading. When possible we are happy to work with supermarkets and relevant stakeholders to help improve the situation. |

# Southfields Public Realm Improvements - design group

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <p>Cycle parking needs to be disseminated around the town centre.</p>       |  | <p>Project team will seek to install additional cycle parking where street space permits in conjunction with other demands being made such as Hostile Vehicle Mitigation requested by Met Police/AELTC</p> |
| <p>Has a Cycling Level Of Service assessment of the junction been done?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Run the test</li> </ul> | <p>Will consider running assessment during next commission to PCL</p>  |
| <p>Healthy Streets agenda – does the scheme meet this agenda</p>            |  | <p>A Healthy Streets assessment has been conducted and the result are in the final report</p>  |

# Southfields Public Realm Improvements - design group

Shops may not be able to survive without parking bays.

The scheme ambition is to improve the public realm and increase the time people want to spend in Southfields on foot because the street environment supports them to do this easily. In order to achieve this will involve removal of 12 of the 42 spaces available at present. By creating a better place for all users of the street we aim to create a better experience for all users of Southfields and the facilities and services it has to offer, however people choose to travel.

# Southfields Public Realm Improvements - design group

Even, standardized footway surface throughout the whole scheme area is desired – will we be able to gain agreement with private landholders?

- Tenants in shops cannot make decision, private landlords need to.

A representative of Southfields Business Forum and the scheme project manager have visited shops and businesses, requesting permission to liaise with them regarding improvement of private forecourt areas. Any landlords with known addresses have been sent the same letter. The deadline for indicating an interest is **28<sup>th</sup> February 2018.**

# Southfields Public Realm Improvements - design group

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Is top quality paving material possible throughout the scheme area, preferably in a natural stone?</p>  |  | <p>Cost of materials and tying in with rest of area to create consistency is important to allow the architecture of the area more noticeable and the street materials and furniture to enhance rather than detract from the unique features of Southfields. A potential materials pallet is proposed in the report and will be considered alongside ongoing maintenance costs, availability and any structural requirements.</p> |
| <p>Wasteful to spend money on artworks when this could be spent on the scheme/materials</p> <p>Group in favour of living wall on bridge at station</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do not spend any money on artwork</li> <li>• Feasibility of living wall to be explored further</li> </ul> | <p>Artwork proposed is optional only in the report and does not need to be pursued further.</p> <p>LBW and Project Centre are pursuing further engagement from TfL to introduce the living wall at the station.</p>  |

# Southfields Public Realm Improvements - design group

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Strongly object to any form of raised structure proposal above Kinleigh Estate agents</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not include the in the report</li> <li>Do not spend any money on artwork</li> </ul>   | <p>Artwork proposed was optional only in the report and has not been pursued further.</p>  |
| <p>Support removal of all guard railing as these are a crush hazard.</p>                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove all guard railing in the scheme area</li> </ul>   | <p>Guard railing removed will be replaced with a street furniture zone. This creates a pedestrian permeable edge which creates a degree of separation.</p> |
| <p>Concerns about removal of guard railing to stop people walking in the road</p>            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Put in other useful street furniture in place of guardrail (seating/cycle parking) which also form Hostile Vehicle Mitigation measure</li> </ul> | <p>Guard railing removed will be replaced with a street furniture zone. This creates a pedestrian permeable edge which creates a degree of separation.</p> |

# Southfields Public Realm Improvements - design group

Retaining a 'traditional style' and consistency of street furniture throughout the scheme area.

The bench underneath windows outside Costa Coffee is a Silver Jubilee bench which group would like retained.

Street furniture options have been provided in the final report in line with the identity of Southfields and consistent with other village/town centre in LBW. The street furniture proposed includes seating provision. The aim is to retain existing seating provision and add further opportunities to rest where possible. The fingerpost sign outside station will be retained and some timber elements are proposed to reflect existing street furniture used in the area.

# Southfields Public Realm Improvements - design group

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Individual forecourt areas – can they all be done in the same material?</p> |  | <p>A representative of Southfields Business Forum and the scheme project manager have visited shops and businesses, requesting permission to liaise with them regarding improvement of private forecourt areas. Any landlords known have been sent the same letter. The deadline for indicating an interest is <b>28<sup>th</sup> February 2018.</b></p> |
| <p>Pinch point at corner of Wimbledon Park Rd/Replingham Rd.</p>               |  | <p>LBW are not able to restrict use of private forecourt areas. Tracking drawings have been completed which show an extension to the footway at this pinch point to increase pedestrian safety/comfort (see p.68)</p>  |

# Southfields Public Realm Improvements - design group

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <p>Not sufficient provision to encourage new cyclists/Barriers to cycling</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Enable 2-way cycling on Heythorp and Elsenham</li></ul> | <p>The focus of the scheme is to improve pedestrian access first and foremost while also accommodating other modes of transport. Two-way cycle facilities proposed on Elsenham and Heythorp will increase cycle permeability. Proposed reduced running lane widths and removal of centre lines will assist with enabling cycle users to 'take the lane' and move into Advance Stop Lines safely.</p> |
|---|---|--|

# Southfields Public Realm Improvements - design group

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Narrowing of carriageway could make conditions worse for cycling</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider early start lights for cycle users at junction</li> </ul>   | <p>There is insufficient carriageway width to provide adequate width dedicated cycle lanes on the approach to the junction. A reduction in width of carriageway assists cycle users to 'take the lane' and avoid the car door zone adjacent to parking. We will consider early start lights for cycle users and Countdown signs for pedestrians at the controlled crossings which would require TfL approval. The lane width in either direction will be no more than 3.2m to comply with TfL guidance for buses.</p> |
| <p>Road danger reduction needs to increase</p>                          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce junction envelope</li> <li>• Sinusoidal ramps on Replingham Rd.</li> <li>• CPH crossings</li> </ul> | <p>The removal of guard railing, planting of trees throughout, CPH crossings proposed and raised crossings on Replingham will have a calming affect on traffic.</p>   |

# Southfields Public Realm Improvements - design group

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Can wheelchair accessibility to all shops be considered in design?</p> <p>Can the railings next to Greggs be removed as they no longer serve purpose</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ramps/footway re-grading on private forecourts</li> <li>• Railings next door to Greggs to be removed</li> </ul> | <p>Private landlords/owners will be offered forecourt re-surfacing and removal of redundant railings, if costs are not prohibitive and private owners are willing.</p>   |
| <p>AELTC desire to supplement permanent installations with further temporary measures to cover both the station forecourt and the opposite corners of the junction - particularly as your draft report recommends the removal of railings.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AELTC provide desired plan overlay and equipment to LBW</li> </ul>  | <p>The design will be revised to accommodate street furniture to create a street furniture zone while still retaining pedestrian permeability. LBW will work with AELTC to implement Hostile Vehicle Mitigation (HVM measures.</p> |
|  |  |  |
| <p><b>WAYFINDING/NOTICES/CLUTTER</b></p>   |  |  |
| <p>The green sign board outside the wine shop is ugly.</p> <p>Can a replacement community notice board be placed near station</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove the green sign board</li> </ul>  | <p>Yes, the green sign will be removed.</p> <p>Will investigate location for new notice board in detailed design work.</p>   |

# Southfields Public Realm Improvements - design group

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <p>People like the old fashioned fingerposts and do not want them removed and replaced with Legible London wayfinding</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Is it possible to have a map board outside the station?<br/>Retain the existing wayfinding fingerpost?</li><li>• Could there be a combined community board with the wayfinding map?</li></ul> | <p>Fingerpost is to be retained as requested by group. Legible London is proven to be well understood and appreciated by people travelling on foot, esp. if not familiar with area. Will consider how this can be incorporated in the area sensitively.</p> <p>The Legible London system is already used throughout London in other sensitive/conservation locations. The report provides more detail regarding Legible London (See pp.74-76). Will investigate location for new notice board in detailed design</p> |
|---|---|--|

# Southfields Public Realm Improvements - design group

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <p>The telephone box is only used for advertising – could it be removed</p>                  |  | <p>Correspondence from LBW officers confirms the phone box outside Oxfam on Replingham Rd. is scheduled for removal. Where other opportunities arise to remove phone boxes LBW will support this.</p>   |
| <p>Proliferation of A Boards in area – particular concerns for visually impaired people.</p> |  | <p>LBW cannot enforce A boards on private forecourt areas. The Southfields Business Forum Representative stated businesses are aware that A boards can be hazardous and impede pedestrian movement.</p> |
| <p>Wayfinding signs should continue to Wimbledon Park</p>                                    |  | <p>Outside scope of scheme area.</p>  |

# Southfields Public Realm Improvements - design group

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <p>Wayfinding signage too modern and adds to clutter.</p>           |   | <p>Legible London wayfinding is consistent with other major conservation areas across London and is proven to reduce clutter and provide a helpful wayfinding guide for people moving on foot. Additional wayfinding destinations can be considered &amp; map board size which is sensitive to Southfields considered.</p> |
| <p>Additional notice board could be placed outside the station.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wimbledon Park needs including as a destination. Decision point is gate at Wimbledon Park</li> </ul> | <p>Will investigate location for new notice board in detailed design</p>   |
|   |   |  |
| <p><b>TREE PLANTING/GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE</b></p>                    |   |  |
| <p>Could there be a wider choice of trees?</p>                      |   | <p>Trees in the report have been chosen in relation to how the species will grow to not interfere with stats and visibility. Trees also need to be agreed with LBW arboriculturalist.</p>  |

# Southfields Public Realm Improvements - design group

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Could some of the permanent features be planters?</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AELTC will converse with local people/ reps of SPRdg about AELTC maintaining planters</li> </ul>   | <p>Planters are unlikely due to ongoing maintenance requirements and potential to be used for rubbish disposal.</p>   |
| <p>Met Police have advised AELTC to put public protection measures in place for the championships</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove vehicles altogether during the games</li> <li>• Every event that involves children needs to pay for extra hostile vehicle mitigation measures</li> <li>• AELTC/Met Police to provide LBW/Project Centre with plan showing what they want where for review/discussion</li> </ul> | <p>Only under extreme circumstances would vehicles be removed completely. An element of reasonableness needs to be applied when considering possible mitigation measures. The design will be revised to accommodate street furniture to create a street furniture zone while still retaining pedestrian permeability. LBW will work with AELTC to implement HVM measures.</p> |
| <p>Bins and lighting columns are all mismatched</p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide lamp columns at appropriate scale for street</li> <li>• Provide consistent design of lamp column</li> </ul>  | <p>Desire is to achieve consistency and uniformity in line with scale of area and LBW maintenance compliant furniture.</p>  |

# Southfields Public Realm Improvements - design group

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| Not enough litter bins  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Provide more bins</li></ul> | Some new bins have been added. The report shows existing and proposed street furniture arrangements (see pp.58-62) Checks will be made with LBW maintenance re: locations & whether more bins are feasible for their maintenance regime. |
| Request for zebra crossing on Augustus Road to facilitate routes to school. - |   | Outside of scheme scope.   |
| Ensure adequate seating provision throughout.                                 |   | The street furniture proposed includes seating provision. The aim is to retain existing seating provision and add further opportunities to rest where possible.  |

# Southfields Public Realm Improvements - design group

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p>White lining marking to mark out parking bays on Replingham Road has gone, although single yellow line has gone back in? How can Parking be enforced?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarify parking arrangements</li> </ul>       | <p>If it is not possible to enforce existing parking arrangements as a result of incorrect lining, civil enforcement officers will report this to LBW if required The proposed public realm improvements will make parking arrangements clearer once in place.</p> |
| <p>Water fountains are recommended in the new London Plan</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can a water fountain be installed?</li> </ul> | <p>This will be further investigated in the next stage of design.</p>  |
| <p>More public toilets are needed</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can these be installed?</li> </ul>            | <p>Insufficient provision in maintenance regime. Outside scope of scheme</p>   |