



Meeting Title	Steering Group
Date	Monday 20 August 2018
Location	Marble Hill House
Present	Jill Jones, Sheila Hale, Katy Lamb, Julia Neden-Watts, Alex Sydney, Celia Holman, Janine Fotiadis-Negreponde, Denise Carr, David Bird, John Anderson, Maureen Coyle, Simon Webb
Apologies	Rachel Worley Reality Dog Training, Maria Walker Twickenham Studios, Alan Carter Crossbats, Berny Simcox Environment Trust, Claire Chapman Brilliant Play

Item	Topics	Actions
<p>1. Minutes of the last meeting</p>	<p>The minutes were approved with the following changes: Suggestion from CH regarding someone from a judicial background. Minutes recorded that CH did not think Michael Symes was independent. CH stated that this was an inaccurate representation of what she said– CH felt he might not be appropriate in the view of some other people in the Steering Group.</p> <p>EH believes for anyone independently reviewing evidence needs to have sufficient knowledge of the subject matter and therefore should be a landscape historian with knowledge of 18th century landscape garden history...</p> <p>CH asked for it to be noted that in her opinion the July Marble Hill Community Update newsletter was misleading in stating that the conclusion of the symposium was that the gardens did begin to be laid out from the 1720s onwards. as She noted that the symposium did not come to a formal conclusion.</p> <p>AS responded to say that the participants of the symposium have all confirmed that the Love Marble Hill presentation did not change their views that the gardens were laid out from the 1720s onwards.</p> <p>JF-N asked for clarification about fencing around landscape areas. She requested that it be put onto the record that fencing will not happen. AS confirmed that whilst fencing was now to be included around the Woodland Quarters in the English Heritage’s revised proposals, EH no longer had any plans in the short term or long term to fence off the wider area between the House and the River.</p> <p>CH noted that three people questioned the viability of the business case of the Marble Hill Revived Project at the last meeting but that this was not reflected in the minutes. AS agreed that this was correct and agreed that the minutes should be amended accordingly.</p>	<p>1.1 CH does not represent Twickenham Riverside Trust. CH to send some wording to AS.</p> <p>1.2 CH to send some revised wording for this section of the minutes to AS</p> <p>1.3 AS confirmed Pleasure Gardens will not be fenced as outlined in early plans.</p> <p>1.4 AS to add and minute three people questioning the business case of MHR.</p>

<p>2. Brief update of other and forthcoming meetings</p>	<p>2.1 AS noted that a number of meetings have taken place in relation to the café. EH has been developing an alternative café proposal which stays within the foot-print of the Stables as much as possible, based on a design by Martin Habell. EH is working with architects to develop those plans and have had meetings with MH to talk through design issues which have arisen. AS confirmed that EH will continue to work with MH in this way until the end of the design process.</p> <p>2.2 On 3rd August, Kate Mavor(CEO of EH) and senior members gave a briefing to Cllr Gareth Roberts and 4 other councilors including Julia Neden-Watts. Everyone had found it a useful process – a number of points had been made during the meeting which had been taken on board by EH including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A marquee adjacent to the house was unlikely to be well received in a planning application. As a result, EH has decided to remove that from the planning application and the area will now be planted as an orchard. <p>JFN: Does this mean the café will host weddings? AS Confirmed that it did not and that no wedding receptions would now be taking place onsite.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport – Cycle Racks will be incorporated into the proposal to provide lockable space for up to 40 bikes, at 2 locations within the park. • A path will be incorporated along the inside of the park on the edge of the west field, for the length of Orleans Road so pedestrians can walk along the path and not the road. • Redesign sports changing facilities so the toilets in the block will be made publicly accessible. This will facilitate a net increase in the number of publicly available toilets in the park by 5 despite the proposals resulting drop in toilets at the stable block itself. <p>2.3 Events roundup : KP outlined the events which had taken place during the summer of 2018 including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Free family fun day organised by Inspired Women -Sell-out Ecology Event – Insect Hotels -Dog show -Family Heritage Morning – tours of Marble Hill for the very young, with crafts at Marble Hill Play Centre -events with the Environment Trust including event for 90 schoolchildren -Music at the park – concerts which attracted families and lots of locals of all ages. -Outreach at the National Play Day event at Orleans House 	
<p>3. Transport report summary</p>	<p>SW, i-Transport LLP consultant, introduced. Presentation given (appended to minutes). SW explained that the presentation was ‘work in progress’ and subject to</p>	<p>3.1 PowerPoint to be sent to members after the meeting.</p>

checking/change as Vectos had not yet completed their work.

Additional information and comments during presentation:

PTAL public transport accessibility level – goes from 1 – poor to 6- very good. This site is 4 - good.

Orleans Road – problems – used by both cars and pedestrians. This causes an H&S issue The insertion of a path in the park should help with this.

Broadly car use is about 10-15%

Walking and running – 75 - 82%

Question from member of group as to whether children are counted? Children are counted in the car occupancy count but SW was not able to confirm if they were interviewed in the visitor interviews.

A question was asked about why EH thinks it can attract c.50, 000 visitors to Marble Hill House when Chiswick House only receives around 15,000 a year.

AS responded to say that Chiswick House charges for entry, and as the gardens are free to enjoy, paying the entry fee of £7 is a big disincentive. Here, because entry to Marble Hill House will be free, if people have spare time they'll visit, which means a much higher level of visitation. 26 per cent of people who come to the house will come by car; it is forecast as a 'worst case' which is double the existing observed car borne modal split.

Queries from steering group included:

- i. Can we be sure the house will attract additional visitors and boost park numbers?
- ii. If HHs story were better presented many would come and learn more. It would be part of the heritage hub in this area.
- iii. Questions regarding the data sourced for decision making – should pay and display machine info be used, etc.
- iv. On busy days local parking is at or over full capacity

AS added to presentation:

EH does not have a policy of attracting coaches to the house. Drop off points are not a viable option.

The only reasons for coach visits are generally 1 – school visits, 2 – travel trade. EH has made the decision that Marble Hill will not be a travel trade site, so the only potential uses would be school groups. Orleans House (OH) will be EH's education provider. They have an existing policy which encourages public transport. Hardly any school groups visit MHH. It is envisaged that existing groups would, following the project come to OH for full day and visit Marble, rather than just visit OH for a half day. There will be an increase in school visits but they will be encouraged to use public transport.

River – discussing use of river to visit Marble Hill House.

Points raised by Steering group members:

3.2 AS to investigate second path near main gate for families.

- i. EH should encourage teams to use public transport
- ii. EH should use all streams of data available and the previous transport report does not use every source of data.

Additional measures over and above project

- Request additional signage to stop vehicles going down residential roads: Orleans Road and Montpelier Row
- Trying to link existing walking and cycling routes to Marble Hill
- Improved sustainable travel advice on EH website
- Additional offsite car parking on weekends – discuss with other local providers. OP school indicated they would be prepared to allow us to use additional space if we wanted to. This is backup. We already have an alternative plan lined up.
- Entry where cars come in, children and pedestrians come in at same place. EH will be investigating creation of a separate post code for the car park to make sure vehicles arrive at the car park.
- EH is reviewing car park pricing.
All this will have a beneficial impact on the travel characteristics to the site car usage which has not been factored into the Vectos report.

The following suggestions were made by members of the steering group:

- Where cars enter the site, children come in at same place. A separate path at this point would be great.
- Local Councilors – can leverage funding for improving disabled access in the area
- JFN: Coaches for Orleans Gallery park in front of local resident’s house which is potentially dangerous to children alighting. AS noted that this was useful to know as EH can talk to them about this.
- CH asked to circulate her own transport projections based on assumptions contained in the previous version of the transport report. AS suggested that this was not done as it would be misleading – he suggested that instead CH waits until the final report is ready when she will have all material to make accurate assumptions.

EH committed to circulating the final transport report to the Steering Group in advance of the planning permission being submitted.

Final Transport Report circulated with these minutes.

3.3 MC to discuss with OH surrounding coaches and alighting at OH for Marble tours.

4. AOB	Meeting in 2 weeks' time. 4 September. At this EH will outline 2018 planning application summary.	
5 Dates of Future Meetings	Tuesday 4 September 6.30pm	

MARBLE HILL REVIVED

TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT OVERVIEW

Simon Webb BSc (Hons) CEng MICE FCIHT

- Managing Partner
- i-Transport LLP



CONTENTS

- ▶ Introduction
- ▶ Existing Situation
- ▶ Existing Visitor Numbers
- ▶ Forecast Visitor Numbers
- ▶ Net Increase in Visitor Numbers
- ▶ Other Transport Issues
- ▶ Parking Issues
- ▶ Potential Complementary Transport Measures
- ▶ Conclusions/Discussion



INTRODUCTION

- ▶ i-Transport LLP
- ▶ Vectos work not yet concluded
- ▶ Sharing initial conclusions
- ▶ EH will issue final report

EXISTING SITUATION

- ▶ 6 pedestrian/cycle accesses
- ▶ Principal vehicular access onto Richmond Road
- ▶ Secondary delivery/service access to the west onto Richmond Road
- ▶ 76 space car park on site – Pay and Display
- ▶ Bus services along Richmond Road
- ▶ Rail Station – St Margarets
- ▶ Richmond Underground/Overground station
- ▶ PTAL 4 – Good
- ▶ 5 year review of personal injury accident statistics – 10 slight, 3 serious

EXISTING VISITOR NUMBERS

- ▶ Counts undertaken in June 2015
- ▶ Interview surveys undertaken in July 2017
- ▶ Currently 692,000 visitors pa to the Park
- ▶ Currently 2,900 visitors pa to the House
- ▶ Approximately 695,000 visitors pa

FORECAST VISITOR NUMBERS

Marble Hill Park and House Visitor Numbers – High Season

Year	Total Visitors	Total High Season Visitors	Total Low Season Visitors	House Visitors	Daily House Visitors	Daily Park Only Visitors- High Season ²
2017/2018	695,000	463,333	231,667	2,940	47 ¹	2,516
2021/2022	806,200	537,467	268,733	67,183	442	2,570
2027/2028	811,294	540,863	270,431	54,086	356	2,660

1- Based on 2016 opening dates (25/03/16– 30/10/16, weekends only): 63 days
 2- Based on 183 days High Season

FORECAST NET INCREASE IN HIGH SEASON VISITOR NUMBERS

Marble Hill Park and House Visitor Numbers

Scenario	Park Only Visitors	House Visitors	Total Visitors
Existing (2017/2018)	2,516	47	2,563
2021/2022	2,570	442	3,012
[Increase]	[+54]	[+395]	[+449]
2027/2028	2,660	356	3,016
[Increase]	[+144]	[+309]	[+453]

- In high season:
 - +145 visitors per day to the Park;
 - +310 visitors per day to the House.

FORECAST NET INCREASE IN HIGH SEASON VISITOR AND VEHICLE NUMBERS

High Season Daily Total Vehicle Generation

Year	Marble Hill Park		Marble Hill House		Total	
	Arrivals via Car	Total Vehicles	Arrivals via Car	Total Vehicles	Arrivals via Car	Total Vehicles
2017/2018	375	250	12	8	387	258
2021/2022	383	255	115	77	498	332
2027/2028	396	264	93	62	489	326

- Apply modes of travel and vehicle occupancies
- Worst case assumption that 26% of visitors to the House (not 10-15% observed) travel by car
- Weekend high season forecast of +74 vehicles per day

Net Increase in High Season Daily Vehicles

Scenario	Park Only Visitors	House Visitors	Total Visitors
Existing (2017/2018)	250	8	258
2021/2022	255	77	332
[Increase]	[+5]	[+69]	[+74]
2027/2028	264	62	326
[Increase]	[+14]	[+54]	[+68]

PARKING

- ▶ 7-day survey of car park occupancy (July 2017)
- ▶ Maximum observed on-site occupancy = 47 spaces/76 spaces = 62%
- ▶ Weekend survey of on-street parking July 2017. High levels of occupancy, particularly on certain streets such as Orleans Road and Montpelier Row
- ▶ 30 public spaces free for use at busiest period (3pm on Saturday) i.e. more free spaces at all other times
- ▶ Ongoing analysis using increased visitor numbers and duration of stay
- ▶ Demand can be accommodated on-site

OTHER TRANSPORT ISSUES

- ▶ Café deliveries
- ▶ Coaches
 - Procedures in place
 - Use discouraged
 - Will not use Orleans Road
- ▶ Sport Pitches
 - No increase in intensity of use
 - Able to be used at other times

POSSIBLE COMPLEMENTARY TRANSPORT MEASURES

- ▶ Improved signage/way finding
- ▶ Links to walk/cycle routes
- ▶ Improved travel advice on website
- ▶ Additional offsite car parking on weekends
- ▶ Specific postcode for car park
- ▶ Travel Plan
- ▶ Consider revising car park charges
- ▶ Not allowed for in analyses

CONCLUSIONS

- ▶ The site has a 'good' level of public transport accessibility (PTAL 4)
- ▶ The car parking is to remain as existing with a total of 76 parking spaces, including 3 disabled parking bays, continuing to operate a 'Pay & Display' system
- ▶ Minor increase of 74 vehicles per day at high season when compared with the existing baseline
- ▶ Complementary transport measures will be developed
- ▶ The proposed development will not result in a material impact on the surrounding highway network
- ▶ Preliminary conclusion that parking can be accommodated on-site