

Richmond Education and Enterprise Campus

Survey Results Report

1. Introduction

- 1.1. Richmond upon Thames College, Richmond Council, Clarendon School, Haymarket Media Group and Harlequins are working together to create an Education and Enterprise Campus on the College site on Egerton Road in Twickenham.
- 1.2. The current proposal is that over the next six months (between June and November 2014), work will be undertaken on the design and layout of the site, in anticipation of a Planning Application being submitted in December 2014. To inform this work, a series of consultation activities (drop-in sessions and an online survey during May 2014) were undertaken to provide residents and prospective parents of the schools with the opportunity to have their say on the top level proposals for the Campus – helping to shape the plans as they evolve.
- 1.3. Feedback from this consultation and ongoing engagement activity will help inform the organisations involved of residents' concerns and priorities prior to finalising options for the Campus. This report sets out the findings from the consultation activities carried out during May 2014.

2. Methodology

- 2.1. Two public drop-in sessions were held on 1 and 6 of May to provide residents and prospective parents of the school with the opportunity to: see the top level proposals for the Campus; to discuss the proposals with senior members of Richmond upon Thames College; Richmond Council, Clarendon School, Haymarket Media Group and Harlequins; and to give their views in order to help shape the plans as they evolve. Approximately 75 people attended the two sessions.
- 2.2. An online survey along with the consultation material that was available at the drop-in sessions was published on the Richmond Education and Enterprise Campus website from the 28 April to 30 May 2014. Paper copies of the survey were also made available at the drop-in session and on request.
- 2.3. A total of 105 people completed the survey with the vast majority (87%) completing it online and 13% returning paper copies. One duplicate response was identified and was not included in the final analysis. Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding or multiple responses. In addition one comprehensive written response to the Campus proposals was provided by Friends of River Crane.

3. Summary of findings

3.1. Online Survey

3.2. **Profile of respondents:** The vast majority (93%) of respondents were local residents and 19% were a parent of a child at a primary school in the borough. Just under 80% of respondents live in postcode TW2, while 15% live in TW1, TW10, TW11 or TW12.

3.3. All of the respondents were aged over 25 years old. With 13% aged 25-34, 75.2% aged 35-64 and 11.4% aged 65 or over. There was a fairly even split in terms respondents gender (47% male, 48% female and 6% no response). Also the vast majority of respondents (87%) did not have a disability while 83% were of White / White British ethnicity.

3.4. **Overall Proposals:** The elements and benefits of the proposals that were identified as most important by respondents included:

- In relation to education, enterprise and employment - A Campus focusing on equipping young people with skills and providing employment opportunities (56% felt this was important)
- In relation to wider community benefits - Wider social and environmental impact of the design and development of the Campus (65% felt this was important)

3.5. A total of 66 respondents highlighted additional community benefits they felt the Campus should deliver, the most frequently mentioned included:

- Ensuring the site / facilities is accessible to residents
- Concerns about safety, drugs, litter and respect for the local environment and residents by students
- Concern about congestion (particularly smaller residential roads)
- Concern about the volumes of pedestrians / cyclists accessing the site

3.6. **Site Design:** In terms of the appropriateness of the location of different zones on the new site layout plan, 44% of respondents felt the location of the Education zone was appropriate, followed by 38% who felt the location of the Enterprise zone was appropriate. Around 44% of respondents felt the location of the Residential zone was not appropriate and 43% felt the same about the location of the overall site proposal.

3.7. A total of 80 respondents commented on the new site layout plan, the most frequently mentioned included:

- Concern about the impact of traffic, access and pollution on the local community
- Information provided was too vague, lacked clarity or detail
- Concerns about over development
- Negative comments about the residential element of the proposal

3.8. **Height of buildings:** A total of 78 respondents commented on the proposed height zones. The majority of comments raised concerns about the proposed heights; there were also suggestions that new buildings should not exceed 3-4 storeys or the height of existing buildings. Concern

about the accuracy of the existing heights stated on the proposals was also frequently mentioned.

- 3.9. **Access points:** In terms of **vehicle** access points 69% of respondents felt access off the A316 via Langhorn Drive was appropriate. This was followed by 43% of respondents who felt access off the A316 via Egerton Road was appropriate, although 42% also felt it was not appropriate.
- 3.10. Around three quarters of respondents felt all three of the secondary access points were not appropriate.
- 3.11. In terms of **pedestrian and cycle** access points and pathways 69% of respondents felt access off the A316 via Langhorn Drive was appropriate and 58% felt secondary access via the A316 on the North East side was appropriate. Half of respondents (50%) felt the Green Pathway was appropriate and 28% felt it was not appropriate. Opinion was much more split on the remaining access points – 45% felt access via Egerton Road and Court Way was not appropriate, as did 42% about access via Egerton Road and Heathfield South.
- 3.12. A total of 85 respondents commented on access points and pathways, the most frequently mentioned included:
- Concern about impact of traffic on residential roads (particularly smaller roads)
 - Concern about impact of increased volumes of students and pedestrians (litter, safety, behaviour)
- 3.13. **Minimising disruption and impact** – a total of 80 respondents commented on how they felt disruption and impact during the construction phase could be minimised, the most frequently mentioned included:
- construction access should be via A316 (49 comments) Site and
 - or deliveries should be made outside normal working hours - 8am or 9am to 5pm weekdays (21 comments) No building works
- 3.14. A total of 81 respondents made final suggestions on how they felt the proposals could be improved. The most frequently mentioned included:
- and requests to scale it back (18 comments) Over development
 - green space and public access to it (15 comments) Retain open /
- 3.15. **Drop-in sessions**
- 3.16. Key themes that emerged from the feedback provided by attendees at the drop-in sessions included:
- **Traffic** – congestion and parking (potential need for CPZs); more detail was wanted on traffic management measures and traffic assessments. Pedestrian movement (Court Way / Craneford Way) and there was a suggestion for cycling routes to the station.
 - **Access** – impact of school drop-offs, how will the schools, Richmond upon Thames College and Haymarket Media Group ensure pedestrian access routes are used? Vehicle traffic along Court Way and Craneford Way. Feeling there would need to be a

right hand turn on to the A316. Several mentions about strengthening the barrier to Craneford Way.

- **Site** – density of the proposed buildings and proximity to the boundary. A few comments regarding height of the proposal's taller buildings towards the A316.
- **Sports fields** – more information was wanted on what will be built on the fields. Retaining public access; ideally remove the fencing, potential impact of its use (floodlights, noise). How will this impact be mitigated against?
- **Community offer** – how can residents add to and get involved?
- **Environmental offer** – questions asked about whether the environmental improvements are being double counted; improvements needed to footpaths / fencing by the Depot (rear); requests for playground improvements and name of the Environmental Impact Assessment Consultant. Concern about intensifying usage of flood plain land.
- **Housing** – how big will the residential element be? Flats or houses, how much will be affordable housing?
- **Education** – several agreed the need for Richmond upon Thames College to be rebuilt and that the schools were needed. Further information wanted about boundary of Clarendon School and the rest of the site. Excitement about co-location of Secondary School and Clarendon School. Some concern about impact on primary school places of the new residential development.
- **Future engagement** – desire for on-going engagement, support for a local group or forum, also wanted to see further drop-in sessions, email, newsletter etc. Some support for forming a parental advisory group for the Secondary School.
- **Others** – enquiries regarding funding, local bus service issues, potential of sharing space between RFU and Richmond upon Thames College.