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Introduction

1 This study examines the importance and effect of traffic generation resulting from waste management facilities. The report looks at the importance of national and regional planning policy attaches to traffic generation. It analyses the extent to which it is a consideration of local importance by drawing on previous consultations to the South London Joint Waste Plan. This study will then go on to report on previous studies conducted into traffic generation as a result of waste management facilities and look at specific sites within the Waste Plan area that have been assessed by the partner boroughs’ traffic engineers. Finally, the study will draw some conclusions in relation to finalising site and area selection.

Policy Background

2 PPS10 “Planning for Sustainable Waste Management” states that “in deciding which sites and areas to identify for waste management facilities, waste planning authorities should assess their suitability for development against…

- the physical and environmental constraints on development, including existing and proposed neighbouring land uses;
- the cumulative effect of previous waste disposal facilities on the well-being of the local community, including any significant adverse impacts on environmental quality, social cohesion and inclusion or economic development; and,
- the capacity of existing and potential transport infrastructure to support the sustainable movement of waste, and products, arising from resource recovery, seeking when practicable and beneficial to use modes other than road transport.”

3 The importance given to transport considerations in determining suitable locations for waste management facilities is repeated in regional planning policy. Policy 4A.23 of the London Plan (2008) states that “London boroughs should in their development plan documents identify sites and allocate sufficient land for waste management and disposal, [considering] the full transport impact of all collection, transfer and disposal movements, particularly maximising the potential use of rail and water transport.” This policy is replicated in Policy 5.17 of the Draft Replacement London Plan.

4 Therefore, the particular mention of traffic considerations relating to waste management in these policies, when there are a large number of other factors to consider, emphasises the importance of traffic generation in terms of both national and regional policy.

Local Background

5 To date, the preparation of the South London Joint Waste Plan has been subject to the following previous consultations: “Stage 1: Issues and Options” (September to October 2008), “Stage 2: Potential Sites and Policies” (July to October 2009), and “Stage 2a: Additional Sites” (February to March 2010). In all stages, a large number of responses have been on the subject of traffic generation and its associated environmental effects.

---

1 PPS10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management (ODPM, 2005) para 21
At the Stage 1 consultation, consultees were asked to rank the criteria they considered to be the most important in assessing whether locations are suitable for waste management. Table 1 shows a summary of the results. As can be seen from the table, the two criteria which were mentioned most frequently as important, Physical and Environmental Impacts and Social Impacts, both encompassed traffic generation considerations. For example, air pollution, noise, spillage of materials and highway mud from traffic generation all have physical and environmental impacts and these can also have social impacts. Meanwhile, the criteria in third and fourth place in terms of frequency of mention were directly related to traffic generation impacts. Therefore, even at this formative and non-site specific stage, traffic generation was thought by consultees to be of particular significance.

**Table 1: Criteria considered most important in assessing whether Locations are suitable for Waste Management (South London Joint Waste Plan, October 2008)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank of General Importance</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Physical and Environmental Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Social Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Close to the Strategic Road Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Close to where waste is produced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the Stage 2 consultation, consultees were asked to comment on potential sites and draft policies. The report on this consultation provides more detail on the topics raised but Table 2 below highlights some of the most frequent topics raised within the comments.

**Table 2: Most frequently raised topics within responses (South London Joint Waste Plan, October 2009)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Regard of Sites:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Additional traffic will be generated on already congested roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Traffic impact on residential quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Traffic impact on air quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Traffic impact on road safety (particularly where schools, playing fields and residential areas are located close by)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Regard of Policies:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Consideration around air quality impact should be strengthened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consideration needed for the impacts of the operation, particularly night working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consequences of exceeding the permitted levels of traffic should be stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The policy needs to address impacts from increased traffic, not just air quality but also residential amenity, road safety, the suitability of the roads themselves, the spillage from vehicles travelling to and from the site, mud spray and damage to cars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once again, the results of the consultation showed the importance of traffic generation as an issue for consultees. While this study will not deal with the physical effects of traffic generation, such as leakage from vehicles and mud spray, it will look at the number of vehicles likely to be generated according to waste management facility type and site-specific considerations.
Previous Studies
9 The amount of traffic generated by a waste management facility is dependent on a number of factors:

- The amount of waste to be managed at a facility. In general terms, and rather unsurprisingly, the more waste to be managed, the greater number of vehicle movements;

- The type of waste management facility. For instance, a facility which converts waste into energy is likely to have fewer “vehicle out” movements than a materials recycling facility. Table 4 gathers data from various sources\(^2\) to express the output of a type of waste management facility in terms of its input; and,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology Type</th>
<th>Output (as percentage of input)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Materials Recycling Facility</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Vessel Composting</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Biological Treatment</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy from Waste Thermal (Combined Heat and Power)</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrolysis/Gasification</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The type of vehicle used in the transportation of the facility input or output. There are a wide range of vehicle types that can be used: flat-bed truck, pick-up trucks, various vans, skip transporters etc. In terms of municipal waste, the input is usually delivered to treatment facilities in Refuse Collection Vehicles (RCVs), which usually carry 7 tonnes of waste when full, or larger waste transfer vehicles, which carry up to 20 tonnes of waste when full. The latter option is usually used where the waste treatment facility is a long distance from the collection rounds. In such a scenario, it is usual for waste from collection vehicles to be “bulked up” into the larger vehicles at waste transfer stations.

- Whether the site has public access. If the site is open to the public and there is the ability to drop off waste or recycled materials, then the number of trips attracted to the site can increase significantly.

Planning for Waste Management Facilities – A Research Study
10 Surprisingly, there are relatively few published studies on the traffic generation of waste management facilities and even fewer that are applicable to the South London Waste Plan area. In 2004, the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM now renamed the Department for Communities and Local Government) published a study entitled “Planning for Waste Management Facilities” which showed the typical characteristics, including vehicle movements, of the various types of waste management facilities. Unfortunately, it only quoted vehicle movements for notional facilities and not for the actual case studies. Nevertheless, the figures provide a basic guide but are dependent on technology type, site area and

throughput. The predicted vehicle movements set out in the study are reproduced in Table 5.

**Table 5: Vehicle Movements for Different Scenarios from “Planning for Waste Management”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology Type</th>
<th>Throughput per annum</th>
<th>Site Area</th>
<th>Vehicle Movements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-vessel Composting</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>2-3 ha</td>
<td>20-40 RCVs or equivalent per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-vessel Composting</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>1-2ha</td>
<td>20-40 RCVs or equivalent per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaerobic Digestion</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0.15ha</td>
<td>4 RCVs or equivalent per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaerobic Digestion</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>0.6ha</td>
<td>20 RCVs or equivalent per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Recovery Facility</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>1-2ha</td>
<td>20-40 RCVs or equivalent per day in, and 10-20 bulk transport vehicles per day out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Biological Treatment</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>1-2ha</td>
<td>20-30 RCVs or equivalent per day. Fewer if bulk transport vehicles are used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy from Waste (Thermal)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>1-2ha</td>
<td>20-30 RCVs or equivalent per day. Fewer if via a bulking transfer station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy from Waste (Thermal)</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>2-5ha</td>
<td>50 RCVs or equivalent per day. Fewer if via a bulking transfer station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>5-50ha</td>
<td>Approximately 50 waste deliveries per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Transfer Station</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>0.7ha</td>
<td>Significant variation depending on nature of work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rubbish In – Resources Out: Design Ideas for Waste Facilities in London

11 A more recent and London-focussed study is “Rubbish In – Resources Out: Design Ideas for Waste Facilities in London”, which was published by the GLA in 2008. Once again, its case studies do not provide details of actual vehicle movements so it is necessary to rely on the “concept” facilities presented in the studies. These are presented in Table 6.

12 The studies show that, while technology type is important, the biggest determining factor in terms of traffic generation is throughput and so this must be the most important consideration when deciding whether an application for a waste management facility is appropriate for a location or not in traffic impact terms.
\textbf{Table 6: Vehicle Movements for Different Scenarios from “Rubbish In – Resources Out”}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology Type and Throughput per annum</th>
<th>Site Area</th>
<th>Vehicle Movements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recycling (40,000)</td>
<td>4.05ha</td>
<td>73 RCVs per day or 14 20-tonne lorries per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasification (80,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaerobic Digestion (30,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: 150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling (30,000)</td>
<td>2.35ha</td>
<td>39 RCVs per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasification (50,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: 80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaerobic Digestion (10,000)</td>
<td>0.15ha</td>
<td>4 RCVs per day or 1 20-tonne lorry per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasification (40,000)</td>
<td>0.32ha</td>
<td>20 RCVs per day or 2 20-tonne lorries per day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{Site Specific Considerations}

13 To complement the published studies of the traffic generation of waste facilities by type, throughput and size, the preparation of the South London Waste Plan has also been informed by a study of the sites identified as deliverable in the Stage 2 consultation. Each site was considered in respect of its approach roads, junctions etc to understand whether the site is physically suited to the movement of waste vehicles.

14 During the period winter 2009 to spring 2010, each borough’s highway engineers were asked to complete a proforma which explored their professional views on the suitability of each potential site for waste management facilities. Since there is no perfect site in transport terms and all sites require some mitigation, the sites have been assessed in terms of these General categories:
   - Sites with some constraints;
   - Sites with some severe constraints; and,
   - Sites with very severe constraints.

15 A summary of the issues for each site can be found in Appendix A, while Table 7 shows which the category for each site following the assessment.

\textbf{Conclusions}

16 The issue of traffic generation as a consequence of waste management facility developments is an important issue highlighted both in national and regional policy and by the residents who frequently place it as an important factor in the suitability of a location for a waste management facility. Therefore, it is important that this issue is investigated as part of the South London Waste Plan evidence base.

17 From published studies, it is apparent that the throughput of a facility is a critical factor in the amount of traffic generated and this should be taken into account when deciding applications for waste management facilities. While the local planning authority has limited influence with regard to throughput, the Environment Agency permitting regime does have considerable influence and it is important that the implications of the predicted throughput of a facility are fully investigated prior to the determination of a planning application and the issuing of a permit.
18 With regard to the study of sites considered at the Stage 2 consultation of the South London Waste Plan, it is clear that some sites and areas will have considerable constraints to overcome before any waste development facility or more intensive waste development facility will be permitted on the site or within the area. Developers intending to use the sites with very severe constraints will need to produce considerable evidence to show that any proposed development will not significantly impact on the surrounding road network.

19 In respect of all sites in the study, a transport assessment will be necessary and other studies and plans will also probably be needed, such as a travel plan, route management strategy, access strategy, delivery servicing plan/freight plan, a construction logistics plan and a schedule of highway safety measures, when submitting a planning application. Consideration should also be given the emerging Local Implementation Plans of the four boroughs, of which Sutton’s is currently being consulted upon, while Croydon’s, Kingston’s and Merton’s plans will be out for consultation early in 2011.

20 Finally, with regard to planning applications, while some constraints may be able to be mitigated by effective conditioning and/or Section 278 agreements, there may be occasions where a development may be unsuitable and this may occur even on sites with relatively few constraints. This is because amenity and environment issues may be remain even if junction and road capacity is sufficient.
### Table 7: General Assessment of Traffic Impacts of Stage 2 Sites

#### Sites/Areas/Zones with Some Constraints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Factory Lane Transfer Station, Factory Lane</td>
<td>Croydon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Country Waste Recycling Ltd, Beddington Lane</td>
<td>Sutton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Viridor Recycling and Composting Centre, Beddington Lane</td>
<td>Sutton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>777 Recycling Centre, Coomber Way</td>
<td>Sutton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Land at Kingston Road/Jubilee Way Junction, Tolworth</td>
<td>Kingston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Land West of Beddington Lane</td>
<td>Sutton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Severnside Waste Paper, Beddington Lane</td>
<td>Sutton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>European Metal Recycling, Therapia Lane</td>
<td>Sutton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Factory Lane Industrial Estate</td>
<td>Croydon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Factory Lane Industrial Estate (South Side)</td>
<td>Croydon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Benedict’s Wharf Transfer Station</td>
<td>Merton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351</td>
<td>Chessington Industrial Area (Cox Lane/Lion Park Avenue access)</td>
<td>Kingston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352</td>
<td>Chessington Industrial Area</td>
<td>Kingston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>491</td>
<td>Kimpton Industrial Estate, Land North of Minden Road</td>
<td>Sutton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>492</td>
<td>Kimpton Industrial Estate, Land East of Kimpton Road</td>
<td>Sutton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>533</td>
<td>Beddington Industrial Area, Zone 3</td>
<td>Sutton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>534</td>
<td>Beddington Industrial Area, Zone 4</td>
<td>Sutton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535</td>
<td>Beddington Industrial Area, Zone 5</td>
<td>Sutton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>539</td>
<td>Beddington Industrial Area, Zone 9</td>
<td>Sutton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sites/Areas/Zones with More Severe Constraints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Garth Road, HWRC, Garth Road</td>
<td>Merton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>B Nebbett &amp; Son, Ellis Road, Willow Lane Industrial Area</td>
<td>Merton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Rainbow Park Industrial Area</td>
<td>Merton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Willow Lane Industrial Area</td>
<td>Merton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Purley Oaks Highways Depot</td>
<td>Croydon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Purley Way, Lysander Road &amp; Imperial Way Industrial Area</td>
<td>Croydon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Willow Lane Area, by River Wandle</td>
<td>Merton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Deer Park Road</td>
<td>Merton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>532</td>
<td>Beddington Industrial Area, Zone 2</td>
<td>Sutton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>641</td>
<td>Area East of Weir Road, Durnsford Road Industrial Area</td>
<td>Merton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>642</td>
<td>Durnsford Road Industrial Area</td>
<td>Merton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651</td>
<td>Part of Plough Lane Industrial Area</td>
<td>Merton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>702</td>
<td>Garth Road Industrial Area</td>
<td>Merton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5312</td>
<td>Beddington Industrial Area, Zone 12</td>
<td>Sutton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sites/Areas/Zones with Very Severe Constraints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Villiers Road HWRC, Athelstan Road</td>
<td>Kingston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Coal Depot Leatherhead Road, Chessington</td>
<td>Kingston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351</td>
<td>Chessington Industrial Area (Roebuck Road/Mount Road access)</td>
<td>Kingston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353</td>
<td>Chessington Industrial Area</td>
<td>Kingston</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX
CROYDON  Site 1: Factory Lane Transfer Station, Factory Lane  
Site 105: Factory Lane Industrial Estate  
Site 125: Factory Lane Industrial Estate (South Side)

**Summary:**
- The site is suitable for a waste management activity.
- New waste management facilities at any of the Factory Lane sites (or all) would be likely to increase vehicle movements through the junctions identified. In the context of the amount of traffic using these junctions, traffic studies would be likely to reveal minimal change. However, this would depend on the size of the new development(s).
- There is likely to be public access to this site due to similar existing arrangements.
- Factory Lane west of site entrance is not suitable for HGVs due to traffic management measures that limit the size of vehicles that can access the residential area in this direction. Access to all sites is possible from the east section of Factory Lane.
- Controlling hours of use and traffic movements should be considered as sites are not suitable for 24hr deliveries. There are no major amenity issues if there are daytime deliveries.
- All accesses are suitable for HGVs and no major upgrades are envisaged, however, sight lines at access to site 105 may need reviewing.
- Good PTALS (4).
- Localised improvements to junctions along the route should be sought through Sections 278 and 106 agreements. Neither single nor multiple Factory Lane new waste management facilities would give rise to medium or major improvements nor would any minor improvements be likely to be showstoppers.
- It is acknowledged that other issues might arise from Traffic Impact Assessments and from Transport for London.

**General Assessment: Site with some constraints**
**CROYDON  Site 99: Purley Oaks Highways Depot**

**Summary:**

- New waste management facilities at Site 99 would be likely to increase vehicle movements through a number of the junctions. In the context of the amount of traffic using these junctions, traffic studies would be likely to reveal minimal change. However, this would depend on the size of the new development but the size of the site will probably limit the potential size of operation. Two of the junctions have capacity issues and require a significant investment to achieve a solution. TfL has been investigating but has allowed other developments to be approved and this has had cumulative effects on the junctions.

- Site 99 is an existing household recycling centre serving the southern part of the borough. It is suitable for some increase in waste management activity but the size of the site limits the potential for new large scale redevelopment. It is unlikely that development at this site could be deemed a ‘showstopper’ insofar as new waste management facilities are concerned.

- The access to Site 99 might need improvement if there were to be a redevelopment but any changes would be of a minor nature and could be secured through any planning scheme.

- A recent traffic study in connection with a minor planning application for the site has not identified the need for changes to the access or site environs. However, local tailbacks at the site entrance are to be addressed through this planning application; improvements will increase vehicle capacity within the site.

- The land to the east and west is almost entirely residential in nature and not suitable for use by HGVs.

- The Purley Oaks site would not be suitable for 24-hour delivery due to its proximity to residential properties. If it were to be used for additional waste management facilities then the opportunity to control hours of use, traffic movements, HGV routes should be taken.

- No schools need experience significant amenity issues were a waste management facility to be located at Site 99.

- PTAL Level 3.

- Localised improvements to junctions along route should be sought through Sections 278 and 106 agreements. Site 99 would not give rise to medium or major improvements nor would any minor improvements be likely to be showstoppers.

- It is acknowledged that other issues might arise from Traffic Impact Assessments and from Transport for London.

**General Assessment: Site with more severe constraints**
CROYDON  Site 102: Purley Way, Lysander Road and Imperial Way Industrial Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The area is suitable for a waste management activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New waste management facilities in the identified area would be likely to increase vehicle movements through the junctions identified. In the context of the amount of traffic using these junctions, traffic studies would be likely to reveal minimal change. However, this would depend on the size of the new development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The local road network around Imperial Way serves an industrial estate and so they have been designed for HGVs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Some local roads have on street parking that could limit the movement of HGVs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The main access to the area is from Purley Way (A23) via a signal controlled junction. It is unlikely that improvements would be deemed necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If it were to be used for additional waste management facilities then controlling the hours of use and traffic movements should be considered. The area might be suitable for 24 hour delivery subject to size of vehicle, routing and nature of use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Since there are local residential areas lying just beyond the strategic road network, any routing controls considered necessary should be secured through a planning decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In the context of the overall number and type of vehicles using the strategic road network, additional vehicles generated by any new waste management facilities would be unlikely to cause significant amenity issues. No schools need experience significant amenity issues were a waste management facility to be located in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Localised improvements to junctions along route should be sought through Sections 278 and 106 agreements. The area would not give rise to medium or major improvements nor would any minor improvements be likely to be showstoppers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PTALs = 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It is acknowledged that other issues might arise from Traffic Impact Assessments and from Transport for London.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Assessment: Site with more severe constraints**
KINGSTON  Site 6: Villiers Road HWRC, Athelstan Road

**Summary:**
- This site exists as a result of history. A new proposal would not choose this location with its approach via narrow residential roads that pass schools.

- The site is suitable for car borne domestic waste but is less than ideal for use by large waste transporters.

- The site has only one lawful access for large vehicles because of the existing Villiers 7.5 tonne zonal lorry ban. All access is therefore from the A2043 Cambridge Road and then via the local distributor Hawks Road, then Villiers Road. Hawks Road and Villiers Road are not suitable for the expected traffic generation and size of vehicles.

- Two most affected intersections are:
  - **Villiers Rd / Hawks Rd / Fairfield South** is a signal controlled junction (23/14) that already operates at capacity during morning and evening peaks with extensive queuing on Villiers Road and Hawks Road in both peaks. The junction is immediately adjacent to St Joseph’s (primary, infant and junior) School and the narrow footways are crowded at school arrival and departure times with pupils from St Joseph’s School and nearby King Athelstan (infants and junior) School who use the all red crossing phase.

  - **Cambridge Road / Hawks Road** is a signal controlled junction (23/13). This junction is already operating at capacity during both peaks. Queuing on Hawks Road causes extensive rat running through Victoria and Albert Roads. Vehicles making the left turn from Hawks Road to Cambridge Road regularly drive over the footway. The narrow footways and closeness of buildings makes improvements to the junction impossible at present. The full pedestrian facilities and complicated staggered arrangement of Hawks Rd and Chatham Road means that little can be done to increase capacity and reduce delays within existing Highway limits. Capacity improvement may be possible if land was taken from housing to enable widening of road on south east corner.

- Residential and school amenity is a significant concern. Historic concerns voiced include: noise pollution of HGVs, speeding by HGVs, misrouting on prohibited roads and the early arrival of lorries. The HGV route is also a popular pedestrian route for school children.

- Site is not suitable for 24-hour deliveries and there is already an existing restriction on this site preventing arrival of lorries prior to 0700.

- PTAL rating = 1b (very poor).

- It is acknowledged that other issues might arise from Traffic Impact Assessments and from Transport for London.

**General Assessment:** Site with very severe constraints
**KINGSTON  Site 46: Coal Depot, adjacent to Barwell Business Park, Leatherhead Road, Chessington**

**Summary:**

- The site is the opposite side of the railway to Barwell Business Park and does not have direct access from Leatherhead Road.

- The linking road to the principal road has residential properties and a large secondary school on it. This creates amenity and safety concerns.

- The junction of the site in Garrison Lane is very tight and is constrained by the railway bridge structure so improvement is not possible. This junction is by Chessington South Station where many Chessington Community College pupils arrive and depart by train.

- The principal road (Leatherhead Road) is single carriageway and suffers from regular congestion in peak hours and at other times.

- The geometry of Garrison Lane is adequate, except at the site access as mentioned above.

- There are capacity issues and concerns at the junction of Leatherhead Road as this is a priority junction.

- Any further congestion/delay for vehicles exiting Garrison Lane (onto Leatherhead Road) will delay bus route 71 which is a high frequency service.

- The site is not suitable for public access by car.

- If there were an HGV ban and all major deliveries to and from the site were by rail, the issues of amenity, safety and geometry at site access would be less of a concern but the number of smaller vehicles would be an issue with regard to the capacity of the junction at Leatherhead Road. In addition, there would be bound to be still some HGV activity in the scenario.

- Smaller vehicles could be tempted to use Garrison Lane east of the site access. This would be unacceptable but difficult to control. If a lorry ban were introduced it would only apply to vehicles of 7.5 tonnes or over. Planning conditions would not be good enough.

- It is acknowledged that other issues might arise from Traffic Impact Assessments and from Transport for London.

**General Assessment:** Site with very severe constraints
KINGSTON  Site 47: Land at Kingston Road/Jubilee Way Junction, Tolworth

Summary:

- This site could be an acceptable site for public access by car but the stacking length would need to be carefully considered as queuing on the adjacent roads will be an issue, particularly the potential delay to buses.

- It is assumed that the site access will be off Jubilee Way. This will require a new access, which will require a new junction at the access.

- Jubilee Way and Kingston Road are suitable for HGVs; but HGV access to the site from other roads (e.g. the Chessington direction) would not be acceptable.

- There are no amenity issues associated with traffic entering/exiting the site (if it is via Kingston Road) as Jubilee Way is the designated lorry route to and from Chessington Industrial Estate. The site is suitable for 24-hour deliveries, but site operation noise would need to be controlled.

- A240 Kingston Road/Jubilee Way junction is on the Transport for London Road Network. It is fully signalised and is at or near to capacity in the peaks: northbound in the morning and southbound in the evening. Kingston Road/Jubilee Way is already a large junction where junction enlargement would not be acceptable. Traffic assessment/modelling of Kingston Road/Jubilee Way junction is required. This may show that movements through at peak times should be minimised and that the intersection requires upgrading (possibly an extension of right turn lane in Kingston Road and/or possible widening in Jubilee Way to provide more stacking space and split of left and right turn lanes). The impacts would be greater if progressed in combination with any of sites 351, 352 or 353.

- TfL will probably wish to consider impact on Tolworth roundabout (e.g. traffic assessment and junction modelling). The cumulative effect of this development, the ex Government Office (Tesco) site development, and potentially areas 351, 352, 353 (if they are progressed) will need to be assessed.

- The railway bridge in Kingston Road is a lower than standard height clearance and a mandatory height restriction applies.

- The site is not served by rail, but Tolworth Goods Yard is adjacent which is active in receiving and handling aggregates by rail.

- The site is reasonably well served by public transport.

- It is acknowledged that other issues might arise from Traffic Impact Assessments and from Transport for London and Surrey County Council.

General Assessment: Site with some constraints
KINGSTON  Site 351: Chessington Industrial Area

Summary:
- The area has existing commercial uses with good vehicular access. However, lorry intrusion into the residential sections of Roebuck Road and Mount Road is a very sensitive issue. The Council is continuing to try to reduce lorry intrusion. Therefore, Cox Lane and Jubilee Way is the only acceptable route in and out for large vehicles. However, the railbridge on Cox Lane could have lorry limitations or even a ban.

- A240 Kingston Road/Jubilee Way junction is on the Transport for London Road Network. It is a fully signalised junction that is at or near to capacity in the peaks: northbound in the morning and southbound in the evening. Kingston Road/Jubilee Way is already a large junction where junction enlargement would not be acceptable. Traffic assessment/modelling of Kingston Road/Jubilee Way junction is required. This may show that movements through at peak times should be minimised, and that the intersection requires upgrading (possibly an extension of right turn lane in Kingston Road and/or possible widening in Jubilee Way to provide more stacking space and split of left and right turn lanes). The impacts would be greater if the area was progressed in combination with any of sites/areas 47, 352, and 353.

- TfL may wish to consider impact on Tolworth roundabout (e.g. traffic assessment and junction modelling). The cumulative effect of this development, the ex-Government Office (Tesco) site development, and potentially sites/areas 47, 352 and 353 (if they are progressed) will need to be assessed.

- Junction improvement at Cox Lane Roebuck Road will be needed to allow large lorries to use the junction because of intensification of use by large lorries.

- It is vital that residential areas are protected from lorry intrusion.

- Some sites could be suitable for public access but queuing on Cox Lane must be avoided to reduce risk of delays to buses.

- The standard of access to the sites is adequate.

- The site not well served by public transport

- The railway bridge in Kingston Road (A240) is a lower than standard height clearance and a mandatory height restriction applies.

- It is acknowledged that other issues might arise from Traffic Impact Assessments and from Transport for London and Surrey County Council.

General Assessment:
Cox Lane and Lion Park Avenue (and without public access): Area with some constraints
Roebuck Road and Mount Road: Area with very severe constraints
KINGSTON  Site 352: Chessington Industrial Area

**Summary:**

- Some sites within the area could be suitable for public access but queuing on Cox Lane must be avoided to reduce risk of delays to buses.

- The area has existing commercial uses with good vehicular access. However, residents in surrounding area are concerned about lorry intrusion. A 7.5t lorry ban zone is in place with some physical restrictions such as width restrictions. Due to this, the route to and from the area would need to be via Jubilee Way, then Cox Lane and Davis Road, which are in the existing commercial area. HGVs should be prevented from heading west under the rail bridge on Cox Lane.

- There are no capacity issues at the Cox Lane/Davis Road junction.

- A240 Kingston Road /Jubilee Way is a fully signalised junction that is at or near to capacity in the peaks: northbound in the morning and southbound in the evening. Kingston Road / Jubilee Way is already a large junction where junction enlargement would not be acceptable. Traffic assessment/modelling of Kingston Road/Jubilee Way junction is required. This may show that movements through at peak times should be minimised, and that the intersection requires upgrading (possibly an extension of right-turn lane in Kingston Road and/or possible widening in Jubilee Way to provide more stacking space and split of left and right turn lanes). The impacts would be greater if the area was progressed in combination with any of sites/area 47, 351, and 353.

- TfL may wish to consider impact on Tolworth roundabout (e.g. traffic assessment and junction modelling). The cumulative effect of this development, the ex-Government Office (Tesco) site development, and potentially sites/areas 47, 351, and 353 (if they are progressed) will need to be assessed.

- There are no amenity issues for servicing of the site by HGVs.

- The site is suitable for 24-hour deliveries.

- The site is poorly served by public transport.

- The standard of access to site is adequate and does not require upgrading.

- The railway bridge in Kingston Road is a lower than standard height clearance and a mandatory height restriction applies.

- It is acknowledged that other issues might arise from Traffic Impact Assessments and from Transport for London and Surrey County Council.

**General Assessment: Area with some constraints**
KINGSTON  Site 353: Chessington Industrial Area

**Summary:**
- The area has existing commercial uses with good vehicular access.
- Some of the sites within the area are not suitable for public access.
- The area is poorly served by public transport.
- The residents on Oakcroft Road have strong concerns regarding HGVs.
- HGV movements into Hook Road South should be prevented. The preferred route is Jubilee Way/Kingston Road.
- A240 Kingston Road/Jubilee Way junction is on the Transport for London Road Network. It is a fully signalised junction that is at or near to capacity in the peaks: northbound in the morning and southbound in the evening. Kingston Road/Jubilee Way is already a large junction where junction enlargement would not be acceptable. Traffic assessment/modelling of Kingston Road/Jubilee Way junction is required. This may show that movements through at peak times should be minimised, and that the intersection requires upgrading (possibly an extension of right-turn lane in Kingston Road and/or possible widening in Jubilee Way to provide more stacking space and split of left and right turn lanes). The impacts would be greater if the area was progressed in combination with any of sites/areas 47, 351, and 352.
- TfL may wish to consider impact on Tolworth roundabout (e.g. traffic assessment and junction modelling). The cumulative effect of this development, the ex-Government Office (Tesco) site development, and potentially sites/areas 47, 351, and 352 (if they are progressed) will need to be assessed.
- The railway bridge in Kingston Road is a lower than standard height clearance and a mandatory height restriction applies.
- Similarly, the railway bridge in Cox Lane has below standard headroom.
- It is acknowledged that other issues might arise from Traffic Impact Assessments and from Transport for London and Surrey County Council.

**General Assessment: Area with very severe constraints**
**MERTON  Site 9: Garth Road HWRC, Garth Road**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Given the existing use of the site, the principle of a facility on this site is considered to be appropriate. However, the site has a very poor level of public transport accessibility and the main junctions to primary routes within the vicinity of the site experience junction capacity problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The existing access point via Amenity Way will be utilised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No traffic data is currently available for any of the junctions within the vicinity of the site. However, Lower Morden Lane / Grand Drive Roundabout junction and Garth Road / Stonecot Hill (A24) priority junction have capacity issues during peak periods. In addition, the principal roads within the vicinity of the site (A24 &amp; B279) already experience high volumes of traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The junctions of Garth Road/Stonecot Hill (A24) and Lower Morden Lane/Grand Drive Roundabout could potentially be signalised to improve the condition of safety and regulate traffic flow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access to the site will need to be improved in accordance with current design standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is very poor access to public transport facilities (PTAL = 1b).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The surrounding area already experiences regular use by HGVs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There are residential and school amenity issues. However, the site currently used for waste transfer uses and parking of municipal vehicles. A redevelopment of the whole site could reduce HGV movements and regulate hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The site is not suitable for 24hr deliveries. Deliveries between 9pm and 7am should be avoided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It is acknowledged that other issues might arise from Traffic Impact Assessments and from Transport for London.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| General Assessment: Site with more severe constraints |

---
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MERTON  Sites 22: B Nebbett & Son, Ellis Road, Willow Lane Industrial Area  
Site 69: Willow Lane Industrial Area  
Site 127- Willow Lane Area, by River Wandle

**Summary:**

- Given the existing use of the sites and the level of traffic generation, the principle of a facility on these sites is considered to be appropriate from a transport planning perspective. However, a number of transport improvement measures will need to be considered, including a new vehicle access point to Carshalton Road, improvements to existing junctions, and appropriate measures to facilitate the creation of a new tram stop.

- The junction of Wates Way/Goat Road experiences capacity problems during peak periods as it provides the only vehicle access point to the industrial estate.

- Capacity Issues can occur at the junction of Goat Road/Carshalton Road during peak periods, particularly when queuing occurs on Carshalton Road.

- General improvements to the junction of Goat Road/Carshalton Road and Goat Road/Wates Road will be required.

- The existing industrial estate requires a new vehicle entry point to relieve the pressure on the junction of Wates Way with Goat Road. This new vehicle access point should take place directly from Carshalton Road if it could be arranged so as not to adversely affect the throughput of traffic. Additional land is required to facilitate the proposals.

- The surrounding site and roads is suitable for HGVs.

- The sites already experience a high level of vehicle movements, particularly from HGVs. Consequently the overall traffic effects may not be significant.

- There are a limited number of residential properties in the area that may have amenity issues.

- The sites could be suitable for 24-hour deliveries subject to an impact assessment on residential properties.

- The sites have poor access to public transport.

- It is acknowledged that other issues might arise from Traffic Impact Assessments and from Transport for London.

**General Assessment: Site with more severe constraints**
**MERTON**  
**Site 60: Rainbow Park Industrial Area**

**Summary:**

- Given the existing use in the area and the level of traffic generation, the principle of a facility on this area is considered to be appropriate from a transport planning perspective. However, given the location of the area, it will need to be considered whether it may be more appropriate to support alternative development proposals that reduce the level of traffic generation and utilise the good public transport access.

- The existing access point via Approach Road will be utilised. However, the junction of the area access road with Approach Road will need to be redesigned.

- Grand Drive/Approach Road already experience large volumes of traffic. In addition, the area already experiences a high level of vehicle movements.

- The junction of Grand Drive/Bushey Road is likely to require improvements to reduce accidents, improve facilities for pedestrians and cyclists and reduce congestion.

- The area and the surrounding area already experience regular use by HGVs. Large vehicles cannot access the area from the north of the railway line, via Raynes Park Bridge, due to the height restriction.

- Good access to public transport facilities (PTAL = 4).

- Residential and school amenity issues. Any whole area redevelopment should aim to minimise and regulate HGV movement from the current situation and create direct access onto the A298 Bushey Road.

- The area is not suitable for 24-hour deliveries. Deliveries should be avoided between 9pm and 7am. There could also be a problem with HGV movement during school start and end times (i.e. between 7.30am and 9.30am, and again between 2.30pm and 4.00pm).

- It is acknowledged that other issues might arise from Traffic Impact Assessments and from Transport for London.

**General Assessment: Site with more severe constraints**
MERTON Site 126: Benedict’s Wharf Transfer Station

Summary:
- Given the existing use of the site and the level of traffic generation, the principle of a facility on this site is considered to be appropriate, providing that the level of vehicle movements will not be greater than could potentially be generated by the existing use of the site.
- The existing access point via Hallowfield Way will be utilised.
- Traffic data for the junction of Hallowfield Way/Church Road has indicated that there are no existing capacity problems.
- The Church Road /Lower Green West junction and the Church Road/Christchurch Road junction have existing capacity problems during peak periods. Without further analysis there are no obvious improvements that could be carried out.
- Church Road already experience large volumes of traffic. In addition, the site already experiences a high level of vehicle movements. Consequently, the overall traffic effects are likely to be insignificant. However, the impact on the Church Road/Christchurch Road and Christchurch Road/Lower Green West junctions will need to be considered.
- The site and the surrounding area already experience regular use by HGVs. However, Church Road, east of the site, is narrow. There is limited scope to resolve this issue; further analysis may be required in order to determine whether any alternative upgrades will be necessary.
- Access to the site will need to be improved in accordance with current design standards.
- There are possible amenity issues as residents have shown general concern about traffic generation associated with the future development proposals. The adjacent school has also raised concerns.
- The site is not suitable for 24-hour deliveries. The movement of vehicles during night time ambient background noise levels would cause undue disturbance to surrounding properties. This is due to the close proximity of the site entry and access roads to residential homes and the number of junctions on access roads.
- A Transport Impact Assessment has previously been completed that is relevant to site.
- Poor access to public transport facilities (PTAL = 2).
- It is acknowledged that other issues might arise from Transport for London.

General Assessment: Site with some constraints
MERTON  Site 136: Deer Park Road

Summary:
- Given the existing use of the site and the level of traffic generation, the principle of a facility on this site is considered to be appropriate from a transport planning perspective. However, the main primary routes within the vicinity of the site experience high levels of traffic generation and fall under the jurisdiction of TfL.

- The site and the surrounding area already experience regular use by HGVs.

- Council officers are not aware of any significant concerns from residents regarding HGVs in the area.

- Primary Access: Via Morden Road/Lombard Road/Deer Park Road.


- It may be necessary to upgrade the site access with Deer Park Road.

- The area already experiences large volumes of traffic, and the junctions of Lombard Road/Morden Road and Jubilee Way/Morden Road are subject to reasonably high levels of congestion, particularly during peak periods.

- Any development proposals that increase the impact upon surrounding junctions within the vicinity of the site will need to be carefully considered. TfL will need to be involved with this process as Highway Authority for Morden Road.

- Preferred access option: Morden Road/Jubilee Way/Deer Park Road.

- 24-hour deliveries would be possible but are not likely. They would need to be delivered via Morden Road and Jubilee Way. In addition, any development would be subject to noise impact assessments for trucks turning into Jubilee Way, and on site activity given proximity to Deen City Farm. Ideally deliveries should be restricted between the hours of 10pm and 6am.

- The site already experiences a high level of vehicle movements.

- Poor access to public transport facilities (PTAL = 2).

- It is acknowledged that other issues might arise from Traffic Impact Assessments and from Transport for London.

General Assessment: Site with more severe constraints
### Summary:

- Given the existing uses in these areas and the level of traffic generation, the principle of a facility in these areas is considered to be appropriate from a transport planning perspective. However, the areas have a very poor level of public transport accessibility and the main primary routes within the vicinity of the site experience high levels of traffic generation.

- The areas will gain access via the Via Weir Road and/or Endeavour Way junctions with Durnsford Road.

- The junction of Durnsford Road/Haydons Road has recently been upgraded as part of development proposals on an adjacent site. In addition, the junction of Weir Road has recently been improved.

- Minor highway-related measures may be necessary to improve capacity and safety within the vicinity of the areas.

- The areas and the surrounding area already experience regular use by HGVs and minor improvement works to the junction of Weir Road/Durnsford Road and Endeavour Way/Durnsford Road are likely to be required for HGVs.

- The areas currently contain a variety of B-class uses and already experience a high level of vehicle movements.

- The overall traffic effects from the areas may not be significant. However, development proposals that increase the impact upon surrounding junctions and roads within the vicinity of the areas (including Durnsford Road and the Durnsford Road/Haydons Road junction) will need to be carefully considered.

- Residents have shown a general concern regarding traffic generation, particular regarding the Durnsford Road/Haydons Road junction. Entry from the north-east is not supported as this requires travel via narrow local residential streets. Preferred option: Weir Road/Durnsford Road & Endeavour Way/Durnsford Road.

- The areas are not suitable for 24-hour deliveries.

- There is very poor access to public transport facilities.

- It is acknowledged that other issues might arise from Traffic Impact Assessments and from Transport for London.

### General Assessment: Areas with more severe constraints
Summary:

- Given the existing uses in the area and the level of traffic generation, the principle of a facility in this area is considered to be appropriate from a transport planning perspective. However, the area has a poor level of public transport accessibility and the main primary routes within the vicinity of the area experience high levels of traffic generation.

- Access to the area will need to be taken from the junction of Waterside Way/Plough Lane and will need to be improved in accordance with current design standards.

- Plough Lane experiences large volumes of traffic, and the junction of Plough Lane/Gap Road is subject to high levels of congestion, particularly during peak periods. In addition, the area already experiences a high level of vehicle movements.

- The impact on the junctions of Waterside Way/Plough Lane, Plough Lane/Summerstown and Durnsford Road/Haydons Road will need to be assessed. Improvement works are likely to be required.

- The area and the surrounding area already experience regular use by HGVs.

- There is poor access to public transport facilities (PTAL = 2).

- The area is close to residential areas along Plough Lane and Durnsford Road and a school. Redevelopment of part of this area for any purpose would seek to minimise and manage HGV movements.

- The area is not suitable for 24-hour deliveries. Deliveries should be avoided between 9pm and 7am.

- It is acknowledged that other issues might arise from Traffic Impact Assessments and from Transport for London.

General Assessment: Area with more severe constraints
**MERTON**  
*Site 702: Garth Road Industrial Area*

**Summary:**

- Given the existing uses in the area, the principle of a facility on this area is considered to be appropriate. However, the area has a very poor level of public transport accessibility and the main junctions to primary routes within the vicinity of the area experience junction capacity problems.

- Access to the area will need to be taken directly from Garth Road. The access arrangements need to be provided in accordance with current design standards.

- No traffic data is currently available for any of the junctions within the vicinity of the site. However, the Lower Morden Lane/Grand Drive Roundabout junction and the Garth Road/Stonecot Hill (A24) priority junction have capacity issues during peak periods. In addition, the principal roads within the vicinity of the site (A24 & B279) already experience high volumes of traffic.

- The junctions of Garth Road/Stonecot Hill (A24) and Lower Morden Lane/Grand Drive Roundabout could potentially be signalised to improve the condition of safety and regulate traffic flow.

- There are many residential amenity issues in the area and the surrounding area already experiences regular use by HGVs. A whole area redevelopment could reduce HGV movements and regulate hours.

- The area is not suitable for 24-hour deliveries. Deliveries should be avoided between 9pm and 7am.

- There is very poor access to public transport facilities (PTAL = 1b).

- It is acknowledged that other issues might arise from Traffic Impact Assessments and from Transport for London.

**General Assessment: Area with more severe constraints**
### Site 17: Country Waste Recycling Ltd, Beddington Lane

**Summary:**
- This is an existing waste management site.
- Three of the four junctions likely to be affected are on the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN), of which at least two currently operate at or near to capacity. The scope for capacity increases at these junctions is extremely limited. However, a recent Transport Assessment for this site indicated that a 90+% increase waste throughput would only have a minimal impact on these junctions.
- There are no specific accident concerns.
- The surrounding TLRN roads are, by definition, suitable for regular use by HGVs. However, Beddington Lane requires improvement and the Council has a comprehensive scheme for improving this road (the Beddington Lane Improvement Scheme), subject to funding. The developer of this site has agreed to construct 150m of the Beddington Lane Improvement Scheme as part of the redevelopment of this site.
- Access to site would be from the B272. If proposed development of site takes place, access will be very good. The nearest principal road is approximately 1km from the site.
- There are amenity issues at Beddington Village to south of the site.
- The preferred routes would be via A236 and A23/Ampere Way/Coomber Way.
- The site is unlikely to be suitable for 24-hour deliveries by HGVs.
- The PTAL is poor (level 1) and the site is not serviced by rail.
- The site is not currently a high traffic generator.
- It is acknowledged that other issues might arise from Traffic Impact Assessments and from Transport for London.

**General Assessment: Site with some constraints**
## Summary:

- The site is occupied by an existing waste management site.

- Three of the four junctions likely to be affected are on the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN), at least two of which currently operate at or near to capacity. The scope for capacity increases at these junctions is extremely limited. However, a recent Transport Assessment for Site 17 nearby indicated that a 90+% increase waste throughput would only have a minimal impact on these junctions.

- There are no specific accident concerns.

- Surrounding TLRN roads are, by definition, suitable for regular use by HGVs. However, Beddington Lane requires improvement and the Council has a comprehensive scheme for improving this road (Beddington Lane Improvement Scheme), subject to funding. The developer of Site 17 nearby has agreed to construct 150m of the Beddington Lane Improvement Scheme as part of the redevelopment of this site.

- The existing access is just to the north of the B272 Beddington Lane/Coomber Way junction and is adequate. Any redevelopment of the site is likely to require a new access directly onto the above junction.

- The nearest principal road is approximately 0.75 km from the site.

- There are amenity issues at Beddington Village to south of the site.

- The preferred routes would be via A236 and A23/Ampere Way/Coomber Way.

- The site is unlikely to be suitable for 24-hour deliveries by HGVs.

- The PTAL is poor (level 1) and site is not serviced by rail.

- The site is not currently a high traffic generator.

- It is acknowledged that other issues might arise from Traffic Impact Assessments and from Transport for London.

### General Assessment: Site with some constraints
Summary:

- The site is occupied by an industrial use (haulage operations).

- Three of the four junctions likely to be affected are on the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN), of which at least currently operate at or near to capacity. The scope for capacity increases at these junctions is extremely limited. However, a recent Transport Assessment for Site 17 nearby indicated that a 90+% increase waste throughput would only have a minimal impact on these junctions.

- There are no specific accident concerns.

- The surrounding TLRN roads are, by definition, suitable for regular use by HGVs. However, Beddington Lane requires improvement and the Council has a comprehensive scheme for improving this road (Beddington Lane Improvement Scheme), subject to funding. The developer of Site 17 nearby has agreed to construct 150m of the Beddington Lane Improvement Scheme as part of the redevelopment of this site.

- Existing access is from B272 Beddington Lane and Coomber Way (no upgrading required to any). However, any redevelopment of the site should seek to consolidate access onto Coomber Way.

- The nearest principal road is approximately 0.75 km from the site.

- There are amenity issues at Beddington Village to south of the site.

- The preferred routes would be Ampere Way-Coomber Way to the A23.

- The site is unlikely to be suitable for 24hr deliveries by HGVs.

- The PTAL is poor (level 1) and site is not serviced by rail.

- The site is unlikely to be currently a high traffic generator.

- It is acknowledged that other issues might arise from Traffic Impact Assessments and from Transport for London.

General Assessment: Site with some constraints
SUTTON Site 57: Land West of Beddington Lane, Adjacent to Industrial Areas and Existing Waste Management Facilities

Summary:

- The northern part of the site is currently used for sewage operations, while the southern part is undeveloped and is designated as Metropolitan Open Land.

- Three of the four junctions likely to be affected are on the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN), of which at least two currently operate at or near to capacity. The scope for capacity increases at these junctions is extremely limited. However, a recent Transport Assessment for Site 17 nearby indicated that a 90+\% increase waste throughput would only have a minimal impact on these junctions.

- There are no specific accident concerns.

- The surrounding TLRN roads are, by definition, suitable for regular use by HGVs. However, Beddington Lane requires improvement and the Council has a comprehensive scheme for improving this road (Beddington Lane Improvement Scheme), subject to funding. The developer of Site 17 nearby has agreed to construct 150m of the Beddington Lane Improvement Scheme as part of the redevelopment of this site.

- The existing access is just to the north of the B272 Beddington Lane/Coomber Way junction and is adequate. Any redevelopment of the site is likely to require a new access directly onto the above junction.

- The nearest principal road is approximately 0.75km from the site.

- There are amenity issues at Beddington Village to south of the site.

- The preferred routes would be via A236 and A23/Ampere Way/Coomber Way.

- The site is unlikely to be suitable for 24-hour deliveries by HGVs.

- The PTAL is poor (level 1) and site is not serviced by rail.

- The site is not currently a high traffic generator.

- It is acknowledged that other issues might arise from Traffic Impact Assessments and from Transport for London.

General Assessment: Site with some constraints
**SUTTON Site 97: Severnside Waste Paper, Beddington Lane**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The site is an existing waste management site (paper recycling).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Three of the four junctions likely to be affected are on the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN), of which at least two of which currently operate at or near to capacity. The scope for capacity increases at these junctions is extremely limited. However, a recent Transport Assessment for Site 17 nearby indicated that a 90+% increase waste throughput would only have a minimal impact on these junctions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There are no specific accident concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The surrounding TLRN roads are, by definition, suitable for regular use by HGVs. However, Beddington Lane requires improvement and the Council has a comprehensive scheme for improving this road (Beddington Lane Improvement Scheme), subject to funding. The developer of Site 17 nearby has agreed to construct 150m of the Beddington Lane Improvement Scheme as part of the redevelopment of this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access to site would be from the B272 (no upgrading would be required).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The nearest principal road is approximately 0.75km from the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There are amenity issues at Beddington Village to south of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The preferred routes would be via A236 and A23/Ampere Way/Coomber Way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The site is unlikely to be suitable for 24-hour deliveries by HGVs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The PTAL is poor (level 1) and site is not serviced by rail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The site is unlikely to be currently a high traffic generator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It is acknowledged that other issues might arise from Traffic Impact Assessments and from Transport for London.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Assessment: Site with some constraints**
**SUTTON**  Site 100: European Metal Recycling, Therapia Lane

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The site is an existing waste management site (metal recycling).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Three of the four junctions likely to be affected are on the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN), of which at least two of currently operate at or near to capacity. The scope for capacity increases at these junctions is extremely limited. However, a recent Transport Assessment for Site 17 nearby indicated that a 90+% increase waste throughput would only have a minimal impact on these junctions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There are no specific accident concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The surrounding TLRN roads are, by definition, suitable for regular use by HGVs. However, Beddington Lane requires improvement and the Council has a comprehensive scheme for improving this road (Beddington Lane Improvement Scheme), subject to funding. The developer of Site 17 nearby has agreed to construct 150m of the Beddington Lane Improvement Scheme as part of the redevelopment of this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access would be from Greenland Way, not presently public highway (but subject to an existing S.38 Agreement), which emerges onto the B272 Beddington Lane. No upgrading is required to Greenland Way/Beddington Lane junction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The nearest principal road is approximately 1km from the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There are amenity issues at Beddington Village to south of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The preferred routes would be via A236 and A23/Ampere Way/Coomber Way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The site is unlikely to be suitable for 24hr deliveries by HGVs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The PTAL is poor (level 1) and site is not serviced by rail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The site is unlikely to be currently a high traffic generator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It is acknowledged that other issues might arise from Traffic Impact Assessments and from Transport for London.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Assessment: Site with some constraints**
Summary:

- The areas are parts of an existing industrial estate (various B2-B8 uses).
- Only one junction is likely to be affected: A217 Oldfields Road/Kimpton Parkway, which forms part of the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN).
- It is currently proposed to widen the Kimpton Parkway approach to improve capacity. Any further capacity improvements that might be required is a matter for TfL to comment on.
- There are no specific accident concerns.
- The A217, a TLRN road, is, by definition, suitable for regular use by HGVs. Any upgrades that might be required, etc, is a matter for TfL.
- Existing access is from Kimpton Parkway and is considered to be excellent with no upgrading required.
- The A217 is also a principal road.
- There are potential amenity issues regarding Ridge Road, where residents have already complained about vehicle noise and disturbance. The provision of noise barriers/screening along the northern boundary of Area 491 would be desirable to protect the amenity of residents in Ridge Road.
- The preferred route would be via A217 Oldfields Road.
- The areas are unsuitable for 24-hour deliveries by HGVs.
- The PTAL is poor (levels 1-2) and the areas are not serviced by rail.
- Neither area is yet fully developed at present. When both areas are fully developed and in use, traffic generation is likely to be significant.
- If parts of either or both areas are given serious consideration for development as waste management sites, then the previously proposed vehicular link from the areas directly to the A24 should also be reconsidered. This would provide a more satisfactory route for many HGVs from Merton and Kingston than present routes via Gander Green Lane and Sutton Common Road.
- It is acknowledged that other issues might arise from Traffic Impact Assessments and from Transport for London.

General Assessment: Areas with some constraints
Summary:

- The zone is currently occupied by industrial uses (various B2-B8 uses).
- The two junctions likely to be affected are on the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) and both lie outside the boundaries of the London Borough of Sutton. Both junctions currently operate at or near to capacity so the scope for capacity increases at these junctions is extremely limited. However, a recent Transport Assessment for Site 17 nearby indicated that a 90+\% increase waste throughput would only have a minimal impact on these junctions.
- There are no specific accident concerns.
- The A236, a TLRN road, is, by definition, suitable for regular use by HGVs. Any upgrades that might be required, etc, is a matter for TfL.
- Access would be directly from the A236. Any upgrading that might be required is a matter for TfL. The A236 is also a principal road.
- Preferred routes would be via A236 and A23.
- There is a high probability that a waste station in this zone will raise significant amenity concerns. TfL and the London Boroughs of Sutton, Croydon and Merton will need to comment on this.
- There are amenity issues at Beddington Village to south of the site.
- Zone 532 would not be suitable for 24-hour deliveries by HGVs but this is also a matter for TfL and LB Merton to comment on.
- The PTAL is poor (levels 1/2) and the zone is not serviced by rail.
- The zone is considered likely to be a fairly substantial generator of traffic at present.
- There will be limited impact on LB Sutton. Almost all the impacts will apply within LB Croydon and LB Merton.
- Merton residents largely protected from direct effects of zone operations, being buffered by Mitcham Common.
- Croydon residents would be affected by waste management facilities of any significant size.
- It is acknowledged that other issues might arise from Traffic Impact Assessments and from Transport for London.

General Assessment: Zone with more severe constraints
SUTTON       Site 533: Beddington Industrial Area, Zone 3

Summary:

- Zone is occupied by industrial uses (various B2-B8 uses).
- Three of the four junctions likely to be affected are on the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN), of which at least two currently operate at or near to capacity. The scope for capacity increases at these junctions is extremely limited. However, a recent Transport Assessment for Site 17 nearby indicated that a 90+-% increase waste throughput would only have a minimal impact on these junctions.
- There are no specific accident concerns.
- The surrounding TLRN roads are, by definition, suitable for regular use by HGVs. However, Beddington Lane requires improvement and the Council has a comprehensive scheme for improving this road (Beddington Lane Improvement Scheme), subject to funding. The developer of Site 17 nearby has agreed to construct 150m of the Beddington Lane Improvement Scheme as part of the redevelopment of this site.
- The zone has two good existing accesses: one direct from Beddington Lane (northern end of zone) and one from Jessops Way (southern end). No upgrading is required to either.
- The nearest principal road is approximately 0.5km from the zone.
- There are amenity issues at Beddington Village to south of the zone.
- The preferred routes would be via A236 and/or A23/Ampere Way/Coomber Way.
- The zone is unlikely to be suitable for 24-hour deliveries by HGVs.
- The PTAL is poor (level 2) and the zone is not serviced by rail.
- The zone is considered likely to be a fairly substantial generator of traffic at present.
- It is acknowledged that other issues might arise from Traffic Impact Assessments and from Transport for London.

General Assessment: Zone has some constraints
## SUTTON   Site 534: Beddington Industrial Area, Zone 4

### Summary:
- The zone is occupied by industrial uses (various B2-B8 uses). See also sites 21 and 97 which are incorporated within this zone.

- Three of the four junctions likely to be affected are on the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN), at least two of which currently operate at or near to capacity. Therefore, the scope for capacity increases at these junctions is extremely limited. However, a recent Transport Assessment for Site 17 nearby indicated that a 90+% increase waste throughput would only have a minimal impact on these junctions.

- There are no specific accident concerns.

- The surrounding TLRN roads are, by definition, suitable for regular use by HGVs. However, Beddington Lane requires improvement and the Council has a comprehensive scheme for improving this road (Beddington Lane Improvement Scheme), subject to funding. The developer of Site 17 nearby has agreed to construct 150m of the Beddington Lane Improvement Scheme as part of the redevelopment of this site.

- There are various existing accesses from B272 Beddington Lane and Coomber Way and it is likely that no upgrading would be required to any. However, any redevelopment of the zone should seek to consolidate access onto Coomber Way.

- The nearest principal road is approximately 0.75km from zone.

- There are amenity issues at Beddington Village to south of the zone.

- The preferred routes would be Ampere Way-Coomber Way to the A23.

- The zone is unlikely to be suitable for 24-hour deliveries by HGVs.

- The PTAL is poor (level 1) and the zone is not serviced by rail.

- The zone is unlikely to be currently a high traffic generator.

- It is acknowledged that other issues might arise from Traffic Impact Assessments and from Transport for London.

### General Assessment: Zone with some constraints
Summary:

- The zone is occupied by industrial uses (various B2-B8 uses).

- Three of the four junctions likely to be affected are on the Transport for London Road Network, of which at least currently operate at or near to capacity. Therefore, the scope for capacity increases at these junctions is extremely limited. However, a recent Transport Assessment for Site 17 nearby indicated that a 90+\% increase in waste throughput would only have a minimal impact on these junctions.

- There are no specific accident concerns.

- The surrounding TLRN roads are, by definition, suitable for regular use by HGVs. However, Beddington Lane requires improvement and the Council has a comprehensive scheme for improving this road (Beddington Lane Improvement Scheme), subject to funding. The developer of Site 17 nearby has agreed to construct 150m of the Beddington Lane Improvement Scheme as part of the redevelopment of this site.

- There are three existing accesses from B272 Beddington Lane and none of them are likely to require upgrading.

- The nearest principal road is approximately 1km from the zone.

- There are amenity issues at Beddington Village to south of the zone.

- The preferred routes would be via A236 and A23/Ampere Way/Coomber Way.

- The zone is unlikely to be suitable for 24-hour deliveries by HGVs.

- The PTAL is poor (level 1) and the zone is not serviced by rail.

- The zone is unlikely to be currently a high traffic generator.

- It is acknowledged that other issues might arise from Traffic Impact Assessments and from Transport for London.

General Assessment: Zone with some constraints
SUTTON Site 539: Beddington Industrial Area, Zone 9

Summary:

- The zone is occupied by industrial uses (various B2-B8 uses).

- The junctions likely to be affected would depend on whether access was to be from the B272 Beddington Lane, from Beddington Farm Road, or from both. If both, then up to five nearby junctions could be affected. Of these five, four are on the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN), and at least three of these currently operate at or near to capacity. The scope for capacity increases at these five junctions is extremely limited. The London Borough of Sutton has no information on the fourth junction and there are no capacity issues at the fifth junction. However, a recent Transport Assessment for Site 17 indicated a 90+% increase in waste throughput would have a minimal impact on these junctions.

- There are no specific accident concerns if Beddington Lane was the main access. If Beddington Farm Road was the main access, safety improvements at its junction with the A23 should be considered. However, this would be a matter for TfL and the London Borough of Croydon.

- The surrounding TLRN roads are, by definition, suitable for regular use by HGVs. However, Beddington Lane requires improvement and the Council has a comprehensive scheme for improving this road (Beddington Lane Improvement Scheme), subject to funding. The developer of Site 17 nearby has agreed to construct 150m of the Beddington Lane Improvement Scheme.

- There are various existing accesses from Beddington Lane and Beddington Farm Road and it is likely that no upgrading would be required to any of the accesses. However, any comprehensive redevelopment of the zone should seek to reduce number of accesses and consolidate these onto Beddington Farm Road.

- The nearest principal road is approximately 1km from the zone and the preferred routes would be via A236, A23/Ampere Way-Coomber Way or A23/Beddington Farm Road.

- There are amenity issues at Beddington Village to south of the zone. The zone is unlikely to be suitable for 24-hour deliveries by HGVs if main access were from B272 Beddington Lane. If it were from Beddington Farm Road, then this is a matter for the London Borough of Croydon to comment on.

- The PTAL is poor (level 1) and the zone is not serviced by rail.

- Given the large size of zone and the number of existing activities, the total generation (although spread over several accesses) is likely to be significant.

- It is acknowledged that other issues might arise from Traffic Impact Assessments and from Transport for London.

General Assessment: Zone with some constraints
SUTTON    Site 5312: Beddington Industrial Area, Zone 12

Summary:

- The zone is occupied by industrial uses (various B2-B8 uses).
- The only junction which is likely to be affected is on the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) and also lies outside the boundaries of the London Borough of Sutton (in the London Borough of Croydon). The junction has an estimated 0% capacity during peak hours and occasional weekends.
- The scope for capacity increases at this junction is a matter for TfL to comment on.
- Safety improvements at the junction of Beddington Farm Road and the A23 should be considered. However, this would be a matter for TfL and the London Borough of Croydon.
- The A23, a TLRN road is, by definition, suitable for regular use by HGVs. Any upgrades that might be required, etc, is a matter for TfL.
- There is good existing access to the zone from Marlowe Way, with no upgrading likely to be required.
- The nearest principal road is approximately 0.5km from the zone.
- There are amenity issues at Beddington Village to south of the site.
- The preferred route would be via Marlowe Way/Beddington Farm Road/A23 Purley Way.
- The zone is probably suitable for 24-hour deliveries by HGVs.
- The PTAL is poor (level 1) and the zone is not serviced by rail.
- The zone is considered likely to be currently a high traffic generator.
- Redevelopment of the zone would have limited impact on the London Borough of Sutton. Almost all the impacts will apply within the London Borough of Croydon.

General Assessment:
For Sutton: Zone with more severe constraints
For Croydon: Not assessed